

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

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

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

Folder Title: Press Conference Transcripts –
04/04/1967, 04/11/1967, 04/18/1967

Box: P01

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>

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD APRIL 4, 1967

Reported by:

Beverly Toms, CSR

---oOo---

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

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Is this a present from you fellows?

VOICE: I wish I could afford it.

VOICE: When did this happen?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Before we begin, we have some more visitors up there, Dr. Harvey and some visitors from Whittier College. Very happy to have you here.

MR. ^{B. Barrons} BARRONS: Wait till we get these around, till we know what it is all about.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well, you've got more details there than I've got in my statement. I'll wait till you get this because this is a backup. In the meantime I'm going to look at this.

VOICE: I never saw it before.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I'm all surprised.

VOICE: I don't know where it came from.

VOICE: I think it is for Burns and Jesse.

VOICE: It says "Governor of the State of California."

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Maybe that's switchable. Well, does everybody have these now, because I have two announcements to make before we begin the questioning.

(Whereupon Governor Reagan read the announcement.)

Q Governor, the \$23,000,000 for the 4% pay raise,

what is that compared to the \$39,000,000 you have in the budget? Where does -- is this in addition to the thirty-nine additional you asked in the budget?

A No, this is all part of the \$39,000,000.

Q Governor, in regard to the 5 per cent increase, does this parallel Senator Molby's request that he's asking each chancellor to pledge that in the future any teaching personnel who desert their classes to participate in strikes or demonstrations will not be paid? Does this --

A I don't know if there is any connection on this. This certainly is not tied in in any way. This would -- I'm sure would be effected by whatever decision was made with regard to that. To ask that it is recommended --

Q Governor, you favor his bill then?

A Well, I haven't seen it, but I've also made a statement at the time when the striking was occurring that I felt that faculty members who joined in that strike were in violation of their contracts with the University.

Q Would you like to see that tied to the 5 per cent raise, though?

A Oh, no, I don't think you can do that. You are not just tied to a raise, you are tied to the over-all salary. You are tied to the working conditions as to whether someone who walks out and doesn't fulfill his duties should or should not be paid, and I would think that that would apply as to whether the pay as it is now or whether it has been increased in the future.

Q Is your general philosophy then parallel the fact that the teachers should not be paid if they walk out on strikes?

A Well, I think I made that plain. I believe that they are in violation of their contract. We are not talking about them striking in the sense of a labor-management situation. We were talking about that when they walked out to join student picket lines and did not comply with their obligations to the University.

Q verner, there is another strike going on, the American Federation of Radio and Television Artists of which I understand you are an active member. What do you think of that strike?

A Well, now, I'd rather not comment on that now. I'm in a different position. I've not been privy to the discussions. I don't know what has been going on. I know that as far as the union of which I did participate as an officer and member, the Screen Actor's Guild, the only time I ever engaged in a strike there we were eminently justified to do that, and quite successful having done it. (Laughter)

Q Would you comment on the CRA action this weekend?

A Well, this CRA action? They were pretty busy.

Q Denunciation of Chico. *Kuchel*

A I don't read it so much as a denunciation. From what I have read, when I was present I was there just to speak. They being an endorsing organization have chosen, and I gather from the press, almost unanimously to seek or back another candidate, and I see nothing wrong. This is why we have open primaries with that -- the thing that I stressed in my own talk to them was that once the campaignning starts, then it is the manner in which the campaign is conducted that involves the 11th commandment and this is where I would hope I have every reason to believe that they will conduct that campaign on the basis of positive support for whoever their candidate might be and not violate the 11th commandment with regard to any primary.

Q Along that same line what is your comment about the fact that the retiring president and incoming president, one of them said he would not sign the 11th commandment, agreed to that, and the incoming president is very wishy-washy about it, hasn't made up his mind yet?

A Well, I happen to believe in the 11th commandment and think it was a large part of our success in '66.

At the same time I know the other evening, and I've read a statement since, the outgoing president, Dick Darling, made a flat assertion that he would be for a candidate but he would not be against a Republican candidate and he would unqualifiedly support whoever was the nominee of the party, which I think would indicate that he intends abiding by the commandment.

Q If you are in favor for open primaries in the Senate race, why are you running as a Favorite Son and freezing out Romney and these other Republican candidates for President?

A Just the other day after the alarm went off, I was figuring about that and saying I bet you somebody is going to ask that question. Well, I think there is a difference. First of all, this is a sort of tradition with regard to Governor's of California having Favorite Son delegations. I think at the same time there is a difference between invading the right of the people here in the State to choose their representatives and to have an open primary and very frankly while I have, as I have always stated, favored the open primary all the way I do think we are justified this time in being aware of the extent to which a Presidential primary could with a number of candidates coming in break open the wounds again in our party, and I think we are justified in trying to preserve the unity. I think also the basis of the last election was broad enough to indicate that a delegation reflected in this sense a Favorite Son would be pretty representative of the whole party, because we obviously had pretty much the whole party behind us in this last election.

Q Are you changing your mind about not -- about sometimes you say you are not freezing out any other delegation. Do you consider this to be a freezing out of the delegation?

A Well, now you mean in the sense of asking someone not to come in?

Q Yes.

A Well, I've said that I hoped that wouldn't be necessary. I'll meet that problem if it does come along. At the moment in the past we found that a Favorite Son delegation or candidacy has tended to in a sense freeze out that the others have observed that not come in.

Q Governor, it will shortly be your hundredth day in office. What do you feel you've accomplished thus far in office?

A Oh, I don't know what's so magic about that hundred days. I know what I thought was magic about it before I took office. I had been led to believe there was a honeymoon period, but evidently I lost the license on the way to the church, because I haven't had any honeymoon for a hundred days. (laughter) I think we have made a good start. We have implemented with proposals and suggested legislation virtually all of the campaign promises that I made. I would think that probably the greatest characteristic of the hundred days has been the surprise of a number of people who have almost accused me of breaking political union rules in that I did attempt to carry out campaign promises. I didn't know that you weren't supposed to do that. (laughter) But then you see I was inexperienced. I think that we have made a good start. We have accomplished we can estimate now better than \$20,000,000 in economies in the remainder of this year in the spending, and the program that was not ours. That we did not create. We have, if we can get our budget accepted, we have made the biggest singly economies in a proposed budget that have ever been effected in a State, \$127,000,000 and that could even come up more. We have already put into the field our teams of businessmen and industrialists who are going to survey every department and agency of the State. In short I believe we have made a good start toward implementing the creating society.

Q You mentioned your campaign budget, sir.

Specifically what do you feel you carried out?

A Well, we have introduced legislation asking for reforms. The idea of the judicial appointments. We will be introducing legislation with regard to some suggested labor reforms that I talked of. The economies alone that we have effected. You name them, the promises and I think I can show you where we are on top of every one of them. Our crime program, the crime legislation that has been introduced. I recognize this has all been introduced. It now is up to us to be able to get legislative approval of all that.

Q Governor, speaking of your economies as you did a moment ago, are you planning yet to visit any of the State hospitals where those cutbacks are being made?

A I don't have any such visits scheduled, no.

Q On the same question, Governor, Dr. Lowry is going to ask you to reconsider the layoff in the immediate future. Do you have any plans to consider that?

A No, I saw that story and the story admitted they did not have the details. I do have the details and I concur with Dr. Lowry. Let me point out that Dr. Lowry is in full charge of implementing this program of staff reduction. And over and over again I have stressed that we will do everything we can to minimize the hardship on any individual who is slated for layoff and Dr. Lowry in charge of that, and we have kept ourselves elastic on this -- has come forth with some suggestions which will not affect the over-all savings or the over-all reduction, but a change in the scheduling of reductions principally for the purpose of minimizing the effect on the individuals to be laid off and I concur. I agree with him that they should be done.

Q Then you will not make these layoffs in the next two months then?

A That's basically what it amounts to, yes. This delay and then larger group layoffs at one time, but not the phasing out beginning immediately.

Q Then there is to be no reconsideration of the layoffs themselves?

A Well, the reconsideration is built in again, and I have said this a number of times. This program will be watched carefully every step of the way. We think we are right. We believe that we made these decisions based on good comprehensive study and on the facts as they were, but at the same time we have said that the primary thing is consideration of care for the patient and therefore we will keep watch on this program every step of the way and if at any time it should indicate or appear that we were wrong, we will be in a position to stop or reverse this gradual phasing out.

Q Some of the Administrators of the State Hospitals, Governor, have said that they feel very strongly that the care of the patients will be hurt. Is Dr. Lowry not able to give these people or are you --

A I will point out that Dr. Lowry is respected in the nation as probably the number one man in the nation in this field, that he has brought California in the direction of these institutions to a place that is paramount and in the lead of the whole nation, and it would seem to me that Dr. Lowry who's administering this program, who's in agreement in this program, should be the one to be considered. Now, with respect to or with regard with some of the fuss and furor that is being raised, I would like to point out that I have evidence indicating that quite a concerted campaign is being waged among State employees in those institutions, including instructions to them as to how to address letters to the editor without signing them or indicating they are employees, in order to try and muster public opinion against this program. And I would charge that the people who are instigating this and people who are doing this are not as qualified to know the answers as Dr. Lowry or those people in our administration who arranged this plan.

Q Are the State Employees Association officials in this campaign?

A The evidence that I have would indicate that, yes, they are.

Q Which officials?

A Mr. Hanson.

Q Governor, you don't mean to include in that group Mr. Bob Nagan and Mr. Venegan and Mr. Duffy (phonetics) who are opposed to the costs and who are going to meet with you this afternoon to ask you to reconsider?

A No, they are not going to meet with me to ask me to reconsider, and they are not opposed to the cut. We have already had one meeting, the members of the Legislature, both parties who are directly affected, because these institutions are in their districts -- we have had a meeting and we have agreed that not only will we keep watching this program as we said we would, but that they are going to join with us and we are going to have repeated meetings because it is in their district and they are directly not only affected, but directly aware of what's going on, so that we can have their help in this. We have agreed on this. We have also -- and perhaps this is where the idea comes that there is some opposition -- we have already agreed with them on continuing study and a further study of the situation with regard to the local care centers. So that this is the critical area and here is the chance where there is possibly some elasticity and where there could be some changes made, some alterations in the plan with regard to those.

Q Does that mean that the day treatment centers say in San Francisco and Southern California, is there a chance that these might be phased out gradually instead of closed on June 30th?

A No, what we are looking at -- you mentioned Los Angeles. Let me give you the facts about Los Angeles so that you can have an idea what we have in mind. In Los Angeles County there are 18 county centers

run by the county. There are only four run by the State. The 18 of the County, if I have the figures correctly, are handling better than 18,000 patients. The four State run centers are only handling about 1200. Now, we have augmented the Short-Doyle fund for the counties so there will be no reduction at all in this program, with the idea that such as in Los Angeles County, possibly these four or possibly our aim is that the limited work being done by the four will be absorbed by these county health centers. Now, if, in some areas the figures are not all the same -- if it isn't as possible for the county to take over even with the augmented funds, then we will review this before we will allow patients just to be denied any chance for treatment.

Q Then does that mean in San Francisco that that one might be continued beyond July 1st as a State operated clinic?

A I'm not as familiar with the figures yet on San Francisco as I am on the Los Angeles area, but again it will be looked at. If the situation is comparable it will be handled the same way. If not, again the patient will be the prime factor in the ultimate decision.

Q Governor, do you have retrenching on your previous commitments to close these centers?

A Do we have what?

Q Are you then retrenching?

A No. No, from the very first I've said this is a program we believed is justified, but at the same time we are not just closing a door and saying we have made this decision, there is no chance of change if it develops that with all of our study a risk develops as far as the care of the patient is concerned. No, we are not retreating on this.

Q Governor, there's been an argument that requiring the counties to pay 25 per cent of these mental health programs is sort of a reverse property tax relief. Would you care to comment on that?

A Yes, I'd like to comment on it. First of all that's again just a part of the sound and fury. Let me go back to the Los Angeles example again, because you have the figures on that. The total spending for the year in the four State centers there is \$167,000, for all of Los Angeles County. Now, as I say, the State is providing funds, matching funds under Short-Doyle for any increased burden on the County. Now, that would indicate that \$167,000 for all of Los Angeles County is hardly going to be reflected in an increase in property tax at the County level.

Q The Assistant Superintendent of Agnews has said that under the Civil Service regulations they have to lay off the psychiatric technician trainees because they are probationary employees, when your economy program or freeze is changed that they are not going to have anybody to draw on. This is going to have an effect for years to come. What is your comment on that?

A Well, my comment is going to sound a little harsh. I don't mean to try to tell someone else his business, but I'll tell you this, every time we tried to effect an economy in this State I have found that there are certain individuals directly involved whose only approach to the economy seems to be to try and make the cut where it will hurt the most and be the most damaging in order to muster public opinion on their side. And I would suggest that I'm very confident that Dr. Lowry will see that this doesn't happen, that the cuts are made in the area of fat and not muscle.

Q Governor, you said that you hoped the counties would be able to pick up the cuts. The County Supervisors association has said they wouldn't be able to pick up those cuts. Do you have any comment on that?

A I'll wait to see what the individual County Supervising Counties say.

Q Governor, you were talking about efforts by employees associations to more or less plan the type of

letters that would go to newspapers and what have you. What is really wrong with employees organizing to oppose your programs?

A Oh, nothing wrong. If their opposition is sincerely based on concern for the care of the patient and not just concern on the idea that once employed by the State no change can ever be effected in that and no employees ever reduced even if there is no longer a need for them. Also I would suggest if they have a legitimate case that they should be able to state in a letter to the editor or anyone else their name and their position and why they are qualified to write such a letter instead of signing it "interested citizen."

Q Governor, what do you plan to do with Mr. Hanson and the C.S.E.A.? Do you plan to ask him to stop this practice?

A We had a meeting just last week in which we pledged mutual cooperation and good will to each other. Maybe we best have another meeting. (laughter)

Q This has occurred since that meeting then?

A Yes.

Q Governor, I didn't quite understand your answer. Do the hospitals have discretion under Civil Service? Can they lay off people who are permanent staff and keep probationary people if they choose?

A Well, I'm not going to get into the complicated area of all of those rules, because very frankly I only know there are many of them and I'm not familiar enough with them. But I do know that when you get into the area doors are opened when you get into the area of a job that no longer exists. This is a little different than just discharging an employee.

Q Do you have evidence that in the Department of Mental Hygiene that the cuts are being made to get at the muscle rather than the fat in some particular State hospitals?

A No, I just say that in the first furor of most

cuts this seems to have been a tendency to hastily announce -- now the cuts haven't been made as yet, so I can't say any cut has been made, but the announcement has usually been made of the dire threat to the very heart of the program rather than saying well, there are some areas that could be effected that wouldn't effect patient care or if it is in another department, something else, the vital purpose of the program.

Q Didn't these list of cuts that we got, given to us, come from Dr. Lowry's office?

A Yes, I believe they did and as I say, he's in charge.

Q They said that the trainees would be the first to go.

A Well, this is very possibly true. I'm quite sure if you are going to -- in an area of a technician, that you will drop the one who is in training rather than the one who is already qualified and performing a service.

Q Governor, what is your viewpoing on Senator Schmitz' plans to remove from the welfare rolls any woman on welfare who has more than one illegitimate child?

A Well, I know that that program, both nationally and at the State level, must be thoroughly reviewed. It is a program that's out of hand and this is nationwide and the conference of Governors, among the 50 Governors there was no question but that this is of the greatest concern to every Governor because this is the one that can hurt us the most. Now, I don't know his exact program. I know that it sounds, from what you say, as if it is based on the philosophy of the Louisiana plan. Now, Louisiana has a plan whereby any woman on the aid of dependent children program, if she has another child after she goes on that program, she is taken off the program and the children, all of them are put in foster homes or institutions. I'm not prepared to say that is the answer to this problem. I don't have the answer. I do know that you cannot penalize the children.

It is not their fault. They must be cared for. I do know on the other hand that we must not subsidize immorality. That isn't the purpose of the program, and I know that it is a very hard and a complicated one and I know that I'm along with 49 other Governors in believing that this program -- and with the Federal Government, we must find a better answer than we have now.

Q Governor, can we get back to the State Fair for a --

MR. BEHRENS: Let's finish with this other thing first.

Q I have a state -- question on the State Fair.

Q Governor, copies are being distributed of a letter purportedly written by you in August to a staff member of a State Hospital, in which you are quoted as saying that if it should be possible to reduce the size of Government it would never be my thought to lay off or discharge anyone and then you go on to mention attrition. Is that -- that accurately states your position at that time?

A That's right, no question to that. I stated in here we set out hopefully and at every opportunity will make any reductions that have to be made simply through attrition. But every once in a while factors that are introduced -- I hope not too often but like this one, where this just was not called for, where something additional was called for. I don't believe that the people of California should be bound by this hope of mind that it could be the other way to the extent of keeping a \$20,000,000 payroll at their expense that is no longer needed. So we have taken this additional action. But for the most part, we have followed the policy completing this through attrition.

Q On the Fair now? This report ---- General Lolli says the initial construction should contain ingredients to better meet agricultural needs. Now, does this indicate that they feel there has been too little emphasis

in agriculture in planning for the new fair?

A Well, I have not been on top of all of the testimony in the recent hearing on this, but I do know that there was criticism of the plan for the combined exposition and fair in that the fair part, the fair being for the purpose of aiding and stimulating agriculture, that it was believed by him to fall short, that there was more emphasis on the amusement part than there was on the actual fair part. So I'm sure that that's what this refers to, to upgrade that and bring it up to where it would be consistent with the policy of a fair.

Q Governor --

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Wait a minute, Mike, I did recognize him and then I forgot.

Q Thank you, Governor. In General Lolli's letter to you, which you just distributed to us, he said to close this gap the City and County should be encouraged to address -- participate as joint users. Does this mean that you will intercede in present efforts to build a downtown City-County center, have them use it out at the Fair instead?

A No, you are into a detail that I haven't gotten into that or on anything. I haven't had a chance to -- as a matter of fact I've been gone for a few days to talk to General Lolli about what he has in mind in that regard, but I wouldn't foresee anything of that kind.

Q Governor, on point 5 in General Lolli's letter here he mentioned about the existing State Fair site. Do you know if he has any other supporting recommendation on land use at the old site as to what might be developed there?

A No, I don't know what his views are on that. I know that's now going to be a problem to be solved.

Q Are we off the Fair now?

Q No. Governor, would you press for a short term loan to shore up the Fair if it is needed as General Lolli indicates it could be, because of time elements and

deadlines.

A Let me answer that after I talk to General Lolli.

Q Regarding the Consumer Council's office, Governor, Mrs. Valerie's report has been on -- at least in your office for several weeks and there's been no announcement as to what will be the future of that office. Can you tell us now?

A No, I could talk to you about that later, because I have a meeting with Mrs. Valerie on that subject this afternoon, scheduled for today.

Q Would you comment on it later this afternoon?

A I don't know whether this afternoon -- see how much I have to think about after that meeting. But I'm not prepared now.

Q Will you make her report to you public?

A Well, let me say that I think all the facts in the case will be made public.

Q Governor, are you going to go to Spain for the San Diego Bicentenary?

A I don't know who announced that. It is a wonderful idea, but no, this is one administration that doesn't have a foreign policy.

(Laughter.)

MR. BEHRENS: Any more there, fellows?

Thank you, Governor.

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REGAN

HELD APRIL 11, 1967

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

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REGAN: First of all I have an introduction. We have a special guest here, Arizona State Senator John Connelley. Welcome aboard. Don*t tell me you came over here because the climate was bad right now in Arizona.

I am sorry to have to announce today that I am losing one of the most competent and trusted members of my staff. Tom Reed, who was my northern California Campaign Chairman and since the election has done a magnificent job as appointments secretary in finding outstandingly qualified people to fill top-level State positions, is leaving to return to his business interests. I will indeed miss him. However, I am grateful that he has agreed to continue, as his time permits, to help us seek out talented people for government jobs and also to help us on special projects that involve the independent sector with government in attempting to build a creative society.

We are fortunate to have found a very able replacement for Tom as appointments secretary. He is Paul R. Haerle, who has been working with Tom for the last two months. I am sure Paul will continue to produce the same quality of personnel that Tom has been providing us.

I would like to call your attention to legislation that has been introduced on my behalf in the broad field of pollution -- air, water and land. The measure -- to be titled the "Waste Management and Environmental Quality Act of 1967" -- has won bipartisan support and will be carried by Assemblymen Don Mulford and Frank Lanterman and by Senator Tom Carrell.

I think California has a unique opportunity in this approach to the problems that plague our environment. It is the first time that any State in the Nation has developed a total program designed to eliminate and control pollution.

I trust that with the backing of such respected and knowledgeable men as Assemblymen Mulford and Lanterman and Senator Carrell that this legislation will be approved by the Legislature for the benefit of all Californians.

That is all I have in the way of announcements.

Q. Are there any of your programs, Governor, that will not be introduced in this session?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: You, know, I honestly can't answer that. We are trying for all of them. I would have to consult with the task force to find out just on a time level alone. There may be some things that have to hold over. But certainly the meat of the program is going to be introduced.

Q. Governor, can you tell us what went into your thinking for not intervening in the case of Aaron Mitchell, the man condemned to die?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well, because here was a case in which every legal avenue had been tried: the U. S. Supreme Court twice, the California Supreme Court twice. The clemency hearing before my predecessor, Governor Brown, resulted in recommendation for no change, or no clemency. There was nothing new introduced that would alter the situation, no new evidence upon which anyone could base a change in the decision. I would be putting myself above, if I altered this, all the judicial bodies, all of the appellate means that we have. And I feel that there was, as I say, nothing introduced to alter this.

Q. Would you ask for a last minute reprieve?

A. Not unless there is something to be introduced which has not been introduced as yet.

Q. Mitchell's attorney says you were too busy running for National Office and getting ready for the Academy Awards to attend a clemency hearing.

A. Mr. Mitchell's attorney is a liar -- and I don't use that word lightly. But Mr. Mitchell's attorney has also made some statements, I understand -- at least they have been quoted to me -- that also he did not know that I would not be present at a clemency hearing, and that there were other irregularities. Let me say this: We started the investigation of this case in February, February 22, at the time the sentence was confirmed, as we do with all such cases. Finally we were disturbed because we had not heard anything from Mitchell's attorneys with regard to a clemency hearing as of last

Tuesday, and last Tuesday Ed Maies contacted those attorneys about this and heard nothing from them until he received a wire Monday morning that was sent at 9:57 on Sunday night. Prior to this he had heard from the U.P.I. who said that the attorneys had made some statements about a clemency hearing, or trying to get one, and they had not even replied to his statement, although on the previous Tuesday when he notified them they expressed great appreciation for his having brought this to their attention. Now, they were told at the time that we were returning to the policy that had been maintained by Governor Knight, Governor Warren and the Governors before them of the Governor not personally attending the clemency hearings. This was repeated to them prior to the clemency hearing here. For them to make statements that they were unaware of this is absolutely false.

Q. Governor, what is your reaction to the request by the Episcopal Bishop of California, C. Gilman Myers, that all Episcopalian churches at the execution hour ring their church bells, as he put it, for our part in this judicial and legalized murder?

A. Well, anyone is entitled to his view in this controversy over capital punishment, whether it is proper or not. I have expressed myself and evidently he is expressing himself. I would be heartily in favor of any one, and certainly any church at this particular time, engaging in prayer with regard to the soul of the man that is to be executed. I am not sure that I believe he should be using this occasion for what he is using it for. If people feel strongly enough about this and want to take action there are channels by which they should do it. But I would suggest there could be another purpose in the prayer.

Q. What about his blanket indictment that all of us are involved, so to speak, and to blame for this?

A. This is the theory of people who are sincerely opposed to the idea of capital punishment. As I told you many times before, I believe that no case has really been presented that would indicate that capital punishment is not a deterrent. In this particular instance the man, the father of two children, what was killed was a policeman. I think that if we are going to ask men to engage in an occupation in which they protect the rest of us at the risk of their life, we of society have an obligation to them to let them know that society will do whatever it can to minimize or lessen

the danger of their occupation. I think any policeman is entitled to that. There are no bands playing or flags flying when he shoots it out with a criminal in our behalf.

Q. Governor, another law officer expressed himself on this today. The Attorney General's office has a report on criminal homicide. The Chief Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Charles Obrien, today said that capital punishment was no real deterrent. On that basis would you might not take another look at the possibility of clemency?

A. Well, there isn't very much I could do if I did take another look, is there, until the people, through their representatives, or by direct initiative, make a change in the philosophy. The law is very clear and explicit, and I am sworn to uphold the law. I might suggest that Mr. Obrien could have a very interesting discussion with that former inmate of death row who was committed to life imprisonment and has expressed himself as believing that the death penalty is a deterrent, and has expressed without hesitation his belief that it should be maintained.

Q. You say in relation to the bell ringing tomorrow that there be other avenues for them to take. Are you referring to the Mitchell case?

A. No. I was just simply saying that I think anyone who has a religious nature, and I certainly am, must have a prayer in his heart for his fellow man in a situation of this kind.

Q. A few weeks ago you expressed in a press conference here some concern about the responsibility that weighs on a governor in deciding on clemency. Now that you have made your decision today can you tell us just how you feel now that you have made it?

A. Maybe some of the things I have said in my reactions to some of the questions have been kind of apparent. There is no question about it. This is one of the worst features of this job. But it must also be just as bad for the judges involved, for the jurors, for all the others who have had to participate in this. And the law is the law, and it must be upheld. We are treating each one of these cases on its own merits. And certainly if clemency is indicated no one would be happier than I would to be able to recommend it. It is not an easy task to finally be the last resort and to have to deny clemency.

Q. In viewing the death penalty as a deterrent to capital punishment, how would you feel about changing the regulations in the Department of

of Corrections to allow televising of the execution?

A. No. I can't see that there would be any useful purpose served in this.

Q. You say you would like to see a referendum on the people's opinion. Televising an execution would certainly give the people something to vote on.

A. Is this the proper way to make a judgment on this? Well, I think it is going back to the days of the Romans. I don't think it is a step forward to civilization. I felt that if the law is to be changed then the people, through their representatives, or by their direct referendum, should make this change. But they should not ask someone, either a judge or a jury, or a governor, to go in contravention to the law while the law remains, and to take a stand over and above the law. I have taken an oath to uphold the law.

Q. Governor, if the people of the elected representatives, namely, the legislators, should vote for the bill currently before it regarding capital punishment, would you then go along with the wishes and sign it?

A. I would want to know that this represented also the thinking of the people, and I think this would be very apparent. I think in legislation, when hearings have been held and it finally reaches a vote, you have a pretty good indication as to whether the Legislature is expressing the will of the people. Believing that if they had done that I certainly wouldn't stand in their way.

Q. Don't you think that making an execution a visible part of government -- wouldn't that add to the deterrent value of the death penalty, if in fact it is a deterrent?

A. On the other hand, don't you think this suggestion is not aimed at making the deterrent so much that this is aimed at attempting to arouse an emotional response to this?

Q. You mean my question?

A. No. I mean the idea of televising such a thing. We might go by the same thing in war and say maybe we can all call off war if we set up cameras on the battlefield, like the Academy Awards affair, and they can see how brutal it is.

Q. On this same question, Governor, war is an antagonism between peoples. An execution is not the same. Our questions are based on the education of the public and how they should vote with regard to a death penalty. If they have seen an execution don't

you think they would vote more intellegently?

A. Well, this is a subject I think we can be here all day on.

I doubt this. In the Roman co collaseum when they were slaughtering people, their viewing it didn't turn people away from continuing to slaughter, did it? As a matter of fact, it debased the people.

Q. If we are through with this subject I have a question on another subject.

A. I hope we are through with it.

Q. Last week you were quoted again as saying you would veto withholding. I want to ask you if withholding comes to you as it is now in one bill as a part of a total tax package, conceivably your own package could be amended. Would you feel it necessary to veto the whole package in order to ~~get~~ ~~get~~ the withholding?

A. Unless I feel there is a great change in public sentiment, again I wouldn't stand in the way of the public on this. But here is one issue on which I do believe the public has made itself plain on how they feel, certainly during the campaign. Unless there has been a change I just would feel obligated to do this.

Q. But you can't cross withholding out of a tax package bill.

Q. I would have to do the whole thing over, wouldn't I.

Q. What would you do for the new taxes then if you did that?

A. We have to start over again then, wouldn't we, with a new tax bill, unless the Legislature wanted to override a veto. But I find the idea of withholding tax is a discriminatory tax against the wage earner, the man with a salary check. He is the only one from whom it is withheld. I would like to call your attention to something else that is a little along this concept. My predecessor made a statement about the ^{recurring} windfall you get with withholding. Now, this is a nice phrase. But I think we better analyze what it means. The recurring windfall is that every year there are a lot of people, either through lack of knowledge or carelessness, that have overpaid their income tax and have refunds coming, and they don't get the refunds. They don't apply for it or they don't go after it correctly, or they don't know it is coming. So the State inherits a windfall every year of money that is taken away from people that the State is not entitled to. I don't think this is a very moral position for the State to be in. I don't think that the State should gleefully look forward to this as some kind of a recurring windfall. The State is entitled

taxes, and the people are entitled to pay the taxes they they know are assessed against them. I had an experience a few years ago. I had fifteen dollars coming a few years ago. After filling out quadruplicate forms quintupletic times and still was no closer to my fifteen dollars, I must confess I wrote a letter and said that I have come to the conclusion that once the State had the money in its hands no mere citizen could get it back. And I gave up on the fifteen dollars.

Q. Governor, there is a new fact that may be involved here, and that is that Assemblyman Veneman said that neither your tax bill nor his bill will meet the cash flow deficit that will face you this December, that both bills will be at least seventy million shy in this deficit. Does that influence your thinking perhaps --.

A. There is no question but that if we can find some ways to even out income better than we have done that this would be a great help. I am not sure there isn't a controversy here within our own ranks on the figures in regard to this, and there are those who are stating this is not true. There is no question but that we come close. As I said, we figured out as little as we could manage in tax increase to do these things that have been outlined -- the property tax relief, the balancing of the budget and the necessary increase that must take place with inflation; and we knew that where the lines join that along about December this is the low point; and we knew that we were right down close to that line and then the tax revenue begins going up and you get out of this. We might possibly be a few points off one way or the other here; but, as I say, there is a conflict right now among those best qualified to know on this issue, and we are looking at it and trying to find out who is right, or whether any of us are right.

Q. Governor, with Republicans in the Legislature advocating withholding, and Lt. Governor Finch saying he would accept it under certain conditions, and Controller Fleurnoy saying there were certain advantages, do you feel deserted by your own party now?

A. No, not at all. As a matter of fact, Bob's statement was with regard to his strong feelings about the necessity to repeal the inventory tax. Well, I share those feelings. In other words, Bob said that he could lean over this other way if it meant the repeal of the inventory tax. I think we can have the repeal of

the repeal of the inventory tax, not immediately, not this coming year, but in the very near future, and perhaps on an installment basis. And I am all in favor of that.

Q. Governor, how do you happen to have the press conference up here when you were in Los Angeles this morning and going back tonight?

A. No. I came in last night.

Q. Couldn't you have saved by staying there?

A. But I would have missed a whole day and some pretty important meetings including a conference on the results of the hearing yesterday. We were in touch all day on the phone. But I came up here for this.

Q. Governor, if the Legislature sent you a bill with withholding in it you would not feel that this was an expression of the sentiments of the people?

A. Well, again I suppose this is like the other thing. I am making a statement now based on my assumption and my belief in what the public feels now. Again if there was evidence the other way that would alter this -- but I can't see anything that indicates there has been any change in public sentiment on this.

Q. I have two questions on mental health. The patients in Mendocino State Hospital are under the impression that you are going to visit them. They got this when they sent somebody to see you, I understand, last week. I wondered if this impression is correct, and if you have any plans to visit that hospital or any hospital.

A. Not at the moment, no, I don't.

Q. And the second question is, exactly how will the in-patient treatment of alcoholics be handled to replace a program at Mendocino State since there is no other similar treatment available for these patients either on the State or the County Level?

A. Well, I can't answer that for you right now because there are a lot of details in this that we are still studying, as we told you before. It is true we do have some alcoholic programs in the State, and this one I know is supposed to represent an experiment in a different kind of treatment on a small basis. What decision will be made with regard to whether this can be carried out under these other programs I am not prepared to say now.

Q. Some of your neighbors on 45th Street are apprehensive about the capital punishment picketing out there. Do you think this

this lends credence to the argument the new mansion should be built in the Capitol Complex rather than in a residential area?

A. Maybe we might put it on a farm way out in the country. It could be kind of a travesty if you are going to have to build a residence for governors or other officials in such a way that it will make it more convenient and less troublesome for the demonstrators and the pickets in a society such as ours where there is every safeguard of a public right and every way by which the public can exercise its right to change legislation. Nothing is going to be achieved by this. I regret it if it happens. And I am sorry with regard to the neighbors. Maybe they will forgive us as time goes on unless it gets to be too much of a thing.

Q. Governor, two or three weeks ago when we asked you about withholding you said you would sign a bill to defeat a fire, or something of that sort. I seem to detect a little less of a firm stand. Have you backed off a little bit on your adamant opposition to withholding?

A. No. I was interested to note that one paper editorialized to the effect that they read the inflection wrong. They said that this was an indication that I was saying to some one to go ahead and hold an iron to my feet and I will give in. If I have changed my position at all on this it would only be that the iron is going to have to be a lot hotter. No, this was not meant to be a weakening at all. I thought that I was saying it with a tone that implied that I was pretty rigid on this.

Q. Governor, what is your reaction to the report of the Governor's Commission on the Rumford Act? Has it changed your position in any respect?

A. Well, I can't tell you what I have had time to study this. I looked at it, gone over it and have a general idea of what is in it. I must say that I want to study it more in detail. But I would say that from the glance I have had so far I am in disagreement since there seems to be no change with regard particularly to the single dwelling in this recommendation. And I think this would indicate my position.

Q. Governor, I wonder if you could tell us if and when you might be willing to proceed again with the investigation of the student discontent at the University of California, in light of the earlier statement and in light of --.

A. Well, when I first made that statement -- and, as you know, the speaker has taken the same terminology out of its own investigation or inquiry into the master plan of education -- I made it on the basis I thought in view of what happened, the search for a new president, that anything like this could simply hamper this effort. And so I am not even thinking of reopening this under these circumstances.

Q. The investigation is needed though at sometime in the near future?

A. Well, I would make that decision again after we had a new president. I think a new president should have some time on the campus to present his own views to the regents, his own philosophy and his own idea of what he feels might be needed.

Q. Would you comment on Clark Kerr's appointment as a part time professor at Berkeley?

A. Just a matter for the regents. The regents made a decision. He has tenure as a professor and so he is going to be a part time professor at Berkeley. I am not planning on enrolling.

Q. There have been reports that Doctor Lowry might step down, and today Senator Alquist asked that he do so. Would you comment on any reports that ~~Senator~~ Lowery might quit?

A. I know of no reports that he would quit, and I would be very sorry if he did. I think he is one of the most respected men in this field in the Nation.

Q. Governor, you have frequently stated your belief in public knowledge of governmental affairs and that your office has refused to release either your Redwood Park Plan or the report of the Commission on the Rumford Act or the mental health staffing study. How do these two things jibe?

A. You are talking about a lot of things that, as I just revealed here, we are still studying. I just had a meeting with Mrs. Valery before I left down there over this last weekend and had her report with me on the weekend to read over the weekend. We have announced the result of this. Mrs. Valery has done a fine job in regard to her study of the agency. In regard to the Redwood Plan, this is because it is still in a state of discussion between various groups that are involved in finding a suitable solution. I think it would be embarrassing if some of our people in Washington now talking for me were to speculate on what might be the eventual result of some of this putting together of these various factors. Basically our

principle is in this plan that the bulk of any national park should be made up of already existing lands. This does not rule out the acquisition here and there of certain other scenic park-type groves. But also the underlying principle that I think we should stick with is that any plan must preserve the present economy of the area at the same time that we preserve or conserve as we have very successfully this great natural asset. And I would think that out of this should come a solution that would end once and for all the harassment of the people in the area with regard to this whole subject, the solution with regard to a park when it is decided upon.

Q. Last week after you meeting with Republican legislators concerning the mental hygiene ~~at~~ Assemblyman Veneman said you would look at each individual case on its merits. Can we interpret this as perhaps backing off a little?

A. No, because I know people just delight every time that you try to be reasonable. You can't win. You set your feet in concrete and say here I stand or fall, then you are being stubborn and unreasonable. When you try to indicate that the world is a fallible place. You do your best and you make decisions on certain facts, but you try to keep yourself with an open mind so that in the event that any place along the line your judgment has been incorrect you can -- for example: I don't think it was backing away having entrusted Doctor Lowry with the administering of this reduction and having stated from the very first that we were going to do everything we possibly could to minimize any hardships on the individuals who might be laid off. Then when Doctor Lowry came in and made proposals that resulted in a lay off taking place for a two-month period because he said that we could do a better job of placing these people and so forth, and we said yes -- I don't think this was a backing off. I think this was completely consistent with what we said from the first. It would be very easy to take the decision and fire all the ones and worry about patient care afterward. I am not going to do that. Any place along the line if there is any indication, as I said before, that some of these facts and figures are not borne out and there is going to be suffering in the quality of treatment for the patients, we are going to pull the string on it.

Q. Governor, a letter made public by Jack Warner, Jr., says that

you are guilty of putting dollars before people in this mental health problem.

A Well, Jack's letter arrived just before the weekend also. I didn't really have time to read it until I got in the airplane, so I have not had time to answer him. I am glad that you specified the difference. There is a little justice here and so that carried that letter as being from Jack Warner, period, and not Jack Warner, Jr.. I have known Jack for a long time and we are friends. I think that Jack is very sincere in his view point. I don't think he has the facts correctly. I must be in disagreement with what he believes is going on. I even have to be in disagreement with his evaluation of the people that make up our administration, particularly, as I said before, of Doctor Lowry who is in charge of this. I don't think you can find a better man for the job in the country, and the rest of the country seems to recognize this.

Q. On the same subject, Charles Warren, the Democrat Committee Chairman, called you a cavalier type of governor shooting first and then thinking afterwards.

A. Well, it will just be a happy day for me when Charles Warren finally agrees and decides that I did not steal in in the middle of the night. It was in the middle of the night, but I didn't steal in, it was official and legal. He seems to have a feeling that I am a usurper to the throne.

Q. Governor, about fifteen legislators apparently met with you last week and brought you facts and figures about mental health and hospitals. Didn't they convince you that maybe you should put the thing on your program?

A No. Actually this meeting was with the legislators who have hospitals in their districts and who, of course, are concerned, and are going to be in on the ~~meetings~~ on the running of this, and we will have access to them for their knowledge and information of those local areas. We are going to work together very closely on this. There is nothing of a controversial nature in this at all.

Q. I would like to ask you how you can justify the release of the information of the study on the Consumer Counsel office and yet withhold the information ~~thethe~~ details of the study that lead to the results.

A. What I tried to explain was --. What do you mean "withhold"? Let me look at it first, will you? I mean, you don't just read

something like you read an item in the paper and cast it aside. It is on my desk. Now, there is no deep, dark secret. Basically the idea for the change is that there are many functions that are being performed in the interest of the consumer by already existing agencies, and that a large emphasis in this program should be the directing of complaints or requests, need for information to the proper agencies instead of duplicating and doing the same thing that some agency is already set up to do.

Q. Governor, did I understand you to say that you have decided to keep Mrs. Valery on as Consumer Counsel without having read the report which was supposed to be the basis of that decision, and by the same token didn't you submit the budget without the Consumer Counsel's staff money before you ever even asked for the report?

A. No. She was in there making that study and for me to make a decision -- it was possible for me to make the decision about adding her to our staff to work directly out of the governor's office at the same time. It is a very lengthy report. There are many other recommendations in there. There are many things she has discovered in the course of these few months.

Q. Will you make those reports public, her's and the Rumford Act summation and the others?

A. I think all the information in them will go to the public.

Q. You said there was nothing controversial. Senator McCarthy, and Assemblyman Bagley and Belotti all were opposed to the cuts. So is Assemblyman Monogan.

Q. No. There was questioning. But when I said "controversial" I don't mean this was anything in the sense of a delegation calling on us in opposition to what had taken place. There was questioning about some of the things, and some of them felt the information that they had received from employees was at variance with the things that we had found; and the agreement was that we are going to continue to share this information and we are going to continue to work together.

Q. Governor, several other governors have indicated they had been offered a hot line telephone to the White House. Have you been included in that? If not, I wonder why.

A. No. I think we have an emergency phone. What I mean, a disaster phone. There is a disaster phone connecting governors. I don't think we can call in. They have to call us. When that one rings run for the basement. I feel like a little general in Beatle Biley. Do you think I have been overlooked?

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD APRIL 18, 1967

Reported by:

Richard J. Fong, CSR

---oOo---

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

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Good morning. No statement except I would like to point out and welcome -- we have some guests here today in the nature of exchange students, foreign students who are here with us, who are attending the University of California at Berkeley. There here on a Capitol legislative seminary, so we will come to the fun and game. We will just open up with out any prepared statement.

Q Governor, I might ask you on Senator Teal's hearing on educational spending. How by reducing the budget and ultimately raising fees help bring students more into line?

A Well, in our state univerties here, first of all in reducing the budget you get this reflected -- in one sense what now develops is a reduction in the applications for enrollment for the universities. The budget was based on an estimate of some nine ~~thousand~~ and increase in enrollment, and as of a few weeks ago the applications for enrollment were running seven percent below last year instead of an increase. But the actual charging of fees was based on helping alleviate the tax situation with regard to the general fund expenses because our state university does not make a provision for taking students who are economically deprived or under privileged. The enrollment at the universities is based solely on scholastic achievement, and the economic bracket of students going to our state universities runs almost exactly parallel with the economic bracket of those who are presently going to and affording the independent schools where they do pay a tuition. But also of that degree there was

contemplated charging a portion of that which would be used to provide scholarships and help, grants for those who might be deprived of a chance to go because of the expense of getting an education.

Q As a man who once led the students to Boalt Hall, do you think the students are worse behaved than they ~~use~~ to be?

A Now when we talk about students, let's draw a line there. I think the overwhelming majority of the students are fine students intent on getting an education. I think there is a small minority that's carried dissent beyond the taste, the lines of good taste, and they have tended, you might say, smear the entire student body or the youth movement. Basically, I want to tell you that the overwhelming majority, I think, are better informed than we were at their age and have more knowledge than we had. They are more sophisticated and are more mature, and I think it's regrettable when there ~~brining~~ more dissent down to the demonstration and the disturbance of the peace, instead of the legitimate debate that we should expect in academic circles.

Q Governor, I wonder if you would discuss with us your view of the long-term affects of your program on universities. Chancellor Hines, among others, has said already some new faculty members the universities hoped to attract had drawn back and don't want to come here until they see the dust has settle.

A Well, perhaps Chancellor Hines and some of the people of the universities didn't take want to take the responsibility for that. We set out to try and meet in co-operation with the university the financial problem of this state recognizing the need to keep the university at its high level. We intend to meet with them around the table, quietly, and with our ~~xx~~ people, our administration, the financial people, and the budget department to see how the university, which is a large share of general fund spending, how they could co-operate with us, to help us meet this financial problem and not harm the quality of education, and within twenty-four hours we were being attacked by these people as if we had laid down an ultimatum, and we were out to destroy education.

I think it was a betrayal of our attempt in the

spirit of goodwill to find an answer to this problem. I think a great^{deal} of the sound and fury was without foundation or any basis in fact, and if there is a disturbance in the academic community which makes somebody merely come here -- I think it was brought out at the last regent meeting that there was not going to be an increase where there would be a need to turn a way students.

Number two, they had to admit basically there's no difference in the representation that the faculty has been in the years past, no professors are leaving the campus in great droves and there's no difficulty in recruiting here. And I am sure there are individuals who get a better offer, and we noticed this over the last couple of years, they can't deny that. The universities of California have staged such an aggressive recruiting roll of faculty members in the rest of the country. Now by the competition they have created, the rest of the country have retained their professors and have even come out by increasing their salaries.

You see, it's just like big league baseball. There's not enough stars to go around.

Q Governor, do you support the current legislation to repeal the Rumford Act?

A Well, let me say this, yes, if this bill comes to my desk, I will sign it.

Q What was the question, Governor?

A Do I support the present legislation to repeal the Rumford Act.

Q Governor, is your office giving consideration to the request that truth serum be administered to the condemned man Daniel Roberts?

A Edwin Meese is going to have a consultation with experts and with many people with which we can get on this subject to make sure. You see, there's a great deal of controversy to whether the truth cure is infallible, whether this might be just something further to cloud an issue.. There's a great deal of doubt in medical circles as to whether it's just infallible by telling the truth under this. So I think there's an issue that has to be decided, just as there's just a controversy in law with regard to the use of a lie detector.

Q Wouldn't it set quite a precedent if you gave the truth serum to every condemned man who made a clemency bid?

A Wouldn't you first have to determine such a thing may be, then we would have to do a way with our trials. All we will have to do is put a psychiatrist in front of the jury and accept the findings as final. As I say, there's medical testimony that indicates that that's not the answer. You wouldn't be able of always getting the truth.

Q Governor, if the Rumford Act is repealed, will you support any legislation perhaps next session, another investigation of a fair housing bill?

A Well, I think in the -- If I am reading it correctly, this proposed repeal, this doesn't touch other provisions of fair housing that were contained in the Unruh Act. These are not being touched by this. And there were some provisions that were acceptable to the people of California. It was mainly the one area where the people believed their rights to personal possessions were being interfered with. If there is any area where further legislation could help in this situation, I think we ought to look at it.

Q Governor, are you familiar with Assemblyman Bagley's Bill on open housing?

A In a general yes. I haven't read it in detail.

Q Would you prefer that to the repeal of the Rumford Act?

A I am trying to recall now what it is I know and where the points of differences were with which I disagree. Let me say between the two here I rather wait and see what comes downstairs. I am sure that in the legislative process there's apt to be some amending and changing that would incorporate features of both.

Q Governor, what's your present and future plans as far as the New Hampshire primary is concerned?

A My future plans are what they've always been. New Hampshire is three thousand miles away, and I have no intention of going there and having anything to do with it.

Q Governor, is it true this summer you're going to plan a nation wide speaking tour?

A No. As a matter of fact, I finally backed down where this came from. There is on foot by the California Businessmen and Industries, the idea of a tour, to go out as other states are doing here and sell to the country and to businesses in particular the advantages of California; the moving industries here, stimulating business and trade, and it was suggested by someone, wouldn't it be a good idea if the Governor joined in on this. And someone on my behalf said that that would undoubtedly be impossible, but that perhaps I could in some way kick it off or do something of the kind, or make first hand appearance.

Q Are there any plans or date set?

A No. This is completely outside of the government. It just came out, that suggestion, if it were possible the Governor join in with it. As I say, I have no plans. As a matter of fact, with what is going on in the legislative program, I think it's pretty optimistic to plan anything for the summer.

Q Governor, Oregon, however, since it's ^{not} three thousand miles away, and your name will doubtless be in the primary there, will you go to Oregon?

A I will do anything to discourage my name being put under that type of primary. I won't lift a finger if it's put in, and that's all I can do. Because as I said before here in this meeting, the nature of the affidavit that one must sign to withdraw his name if someone enters, is such that it would be pretty inconsistent with my being a favorite here in this state.

Q Governor, you said you would support legislation to repeal the Rumford Act. Is that what you said to Mike?

A Yes. I said if it comes down to my desk, I would approve it.

Q You would sign it?

A Yes.

Q Is there comments you want to throw at Bagley before you make that decision?

A No. Somebody asked me about Bagley's Bill, and I said wait until it comes down to my desk. Both bills are up there at the legislature. As one of you gentlemen said to me, a bill at one stage could be a dog, and a cat next week.

Q Are you rejecting the government's commission report

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Lyn Nofziger
445-4571 4.18.67

MEMO TO THE PRESS

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

In today's press conference transcript, please note
that Line 1, Paragraph 1, Page 6, should read:

"I am in disagreement with the majority of that
commission because....."

Thank you.

#

which suggests modifications and changes rather than outright repeal?

A I am in ^{dis}agreement with the majority of that commission because I didn't feel it did anything left to change the present situation. The changes were very minor. I thought the minority report, which indicated the greatest problem, particularly having to do with single dwellings, private homes, that the minority report was more in conformity with my thoughts and what I think the people indicated than the majority report.

Q Governor, you decided to extend the state financing of the mental health clinics for another ninety days pass the close off date of June 30--

A I don't know ~~anything~~ along that line. I know this whole program is very flexible, both to insure the quality of care of the patient, and also to do everything possible to minimize whatever might happen to the individuals involved.

Let me point out something, too, that hasn't been made clear on that. The declining rate of the patient population in our hospitals continue. This proposed reduction of staff will actually result not in a reduction of the present ratio, but of maintaining the present ratio. We know throughout the past year with regard to the staff, to patients, that if we don't do this were rapidly coming to a point with which that ratio will get out of balance. It isn't already, but basically if this is carried out as we propose, if the ratio rate of decline of patients continues, there will be just about the same ratio on the staffs at the end of this cutback as there is at present.

Q On the same subject, Governor, there's a published report this morning, not relating to the mental hospitals, but it quotes Spencer Williams saying that the daycare centers, such as in San Francisco and Los Angeles, will continue after three months after July one to give the county a chance to phase into the program --

A If he made that statement, that's in keeping with what always has been part of the plan; that in looking at these, we knew there had to be a transition period in transferring the care from the state care centers to the local or the county care centers. And we never made a statement how long this might take or we didn't have the information as to how fast this could be accomplished. If they have those figures now, why that --

They were the one who were looking at -- the answer to that question is whether it's the same all over the state. I won't know until I have a chance to talk to them.

Q Governor, on the rivers and parks. In regard to the area you support in the exclusion of national red wood parks and the conditions set forth in the senate yesterday, would it make virtually that there would be no park setup?

A This is up to the federal government. The area that we are talking about, basically we start with the principle of the Clausen Plan, and it was a good principle. As it developed, there were several specifics that just weren't practical to apply. We are talking about an area of literally two areas in our whole state system, the ^{Jedediah} ~~Jedediah~~ Smith and Del Norte. These two parks are being joined by forming a corridor requiring the taking of some acreage in the Miller Creek Area from the Miller -- I never can remember -- the Miller ^{Retty?} ~~Reller~~ Company, and this acreage is to be exchanged. In going to a national park, this acreage is to be exchanged with the United State Forestry, lands that are being lumbered. They've been lumbered for quite sometime on a contract basis.

Now this would be in an exchange. There's no guarantee that Miller Reller would not be put in a liquidating position. They will continue there on a personally sustained basis. The actual amount of acreage depends on the Miller Reller Company and the forestry people making a trade based on the timber. Now this wouldn't be based on acreage so much, because one acre of land here may have more timber than another acre of land. It is our contention that the two parks should be ^{for} exchanged/presently owned federal land.

Now in Del Norte County alone the federal government and the government all toll own 72 per cent of the total land, and we want in addition to these principles, we want an end to the constant threat hanging over the area of what is or not going to be taken as public land. We want exchange based on value of the land that we would be giving, the state would be giving in return for land which would add to our recreation potential, because here again the federal government owns almost 50% of the total land in California. Most of it is beach land, forest land, and desert land; and we would like that kind of exchange.

Q Governor, the land you are talking about is owned by the Department of Agriculture; the parks are owned by the Department of Interior. How long do you think it would take to convince the Department of Agriculture they should give up any of this land to enhance the Department of Interior, and has that ever happen before?

A Well, whether it has happened or not, the idea of the exchange of locally owned land or local government lands for federal lands, it's not new at all. I am kind of surprised the federal government would continue to call this -- this is something so -- a few days ago I signed a bill which traded some county land down in the southern part of the state for some federally owned land. As a matter of fact the county traded three for one acreage to get more desirable land for the Federal Government. It involved a school district. This is done. But is it a little ridiculous that the government is so departmentalized and divided into departments that between them each of them owing or claiming federal land, that they in the interest of a national park can't get together and find out how they can exchange land. I am wondering whether they are concerned holding the land for the personal advantages or whether it gotten to be some kind of a game so that each one can count up his holdings and enhance the prestige of the department. But it doesn't make sense to me. If there's a value in having a national park, for one department of the government to hold back and say we won't let any of our lands be transferred to the federal --

Q Governor, I just want to follow this. What would be your stand than, would you settle for cash or what kind of settlement?

A I don't see how there would be any other settlement and meet the requirements which must be met of preserving the economy of the area, preserving or conserving this great natural resource, beautiful resource for future generations. I don't see that this is such an insurmountable obstacle if the federal government, let's say, stands in the way, then someone in the federal department is not going to, for example, have a part. It might be nice for prestige and I think it might be helpful to have a national park. Again, I say there can be no proof given that a national park is necessary in order to preserve the redwoods,

because the State of California has done one of the most remarkable conservation measure that has been accomplished any place in the world with regard to preserving the redwoods. This is due to the people as well as the previous state government.

Q Governor, on the redwoods, also, with this move of trade for trade with the federal government, are you going to carry this through with other national government conservations and see if the other states --

A If any of the other states have the same problem, and if they want to ask how we came out, I would be very happy to tell them.

Q Governor, could we get back to Rumford --

MR. BEHRENS: There's one question here.

Q Governor, I have just one simple question. What is the state going to do with the former federal land when it gets it?

A Well, the idea is what are we going to do with the former federal land. The idea is not to acquire an acre, but to find out, for example, there's still miles of beaches in this state still owned by the federal government. We know that the state has steadily acquiring it as it can afford beach land for the future, because of all the sports. This is probably the one where we require the greatest expansion.

Q To be used for recreation?

A That's right. There are other areas in natural forest lands, natural timber lands, for example, you know that Humbolt County, which is an issue in the red park area, we got must under sixty thousand acres of state land, and the federal government has 330,000 acres, in addition there's 30,000 acres in the King Mountain Range which is Federally owned; the same in Del Norte. The six rivers national forest is something like 415,000 acres. There's a lot of protential recreational land here which can be acquired by the state.

Q Governor, what do you prefer, modification of the Rumford Act or outright repeal?

A Well, I am sure with outright repeal we would very possible than have to turn around, probably, and put back some of the features which there is no argument, because the Rumford

Act did incorporate features of the Unruh Act which became a kind of an omnibus package. But if this is the most expeditious way to get at this problem, than I would say repeal it.

Q What specific features would you put back?

A There are features which have to do with large apartments.

Q You say "if", Governor, does this mean you do prefer a repeal over the --

A No. I am saying that it looks like perhaps it's the most expeditious way of getting at the problem and solving it once and for all, rather than go to any lengthy discussion in attempting to get to a point of agreement on modifications. As I made it plain, I would settle for whatever is the best way, whichever approach is the best way to cure the problem that disturbs the people of this state.

Q Assemblyman Bagley told me that he had seen you after the election and other legislators prevailed upon you to change your repeal to a revision, insinuating that you had given your support to his bill for revision.

A Oh, that goes clear back to the August meeting here in outlining the platform, the Republican Platform. Yes, I made it very clear, and I hope I made it clear here, if revision could solve the problems that caused the passage of fourteen by the people of California and retain the other features that belong to the list here and one were accepted by the people, I could go for revision. I am going to wait and see what it is when it comes downstairs.

Q Governor, you said, this is about if repeal, if it comes to you and you do sign it you will put back something, large apartment buildings. In order to have a law concerning discrimination in multi-unit pass a certain number --

A There's a certain area in there that we always accepted, because it's kind of a gray area that involves conditions^{as} opposed to the term public accommodations, and this is the area which I think most people, particularly under the Unruh Act, found these provisions acceptable. There are a number of other technicalities. We are getting in a pretty thick bill. In regard to how the bill is handled, with regard to the person's ~~xxxx~~ right in court, and so forth, these are all provisions which I think you have to sit down and say if

it's outright repeal or does it mean to change some of these or eliminating some of these. You have to go back and review this position and see what is needed.

Q Governor, there's been concern also by some people that repeal of the Rumford Act might result in an increase in demonstrations, civil right demonstrations. In the majority do you think that's true?

A I think it would be tragic if it did. I wonder if there's a number of things -- there are some people that I think we all have to be aware of using this issue in an emotional way and for whatever purpose they have in mind. I don't know. But to create this kind of disruption, this kind of disorder, and I just wonder sometimes if it isn't one issue were trying. There's no doubt it becomes a very emotional and a very great responsibility rests on us in Sacramento to make sure to the best of our ability, and anyone realizing the aim by perpetrating discrimination or is endorsing bigotry or discrimination. It's an effort not to erode certain constitutional principles if I think they are eroded and reflected against the good of all of us.

Q Martin Luther King, Governor, warned us last weekend that there very likely will be rioting in the streets this summer. He named a list of the cities and two of those cities were Oakland and Los Angeles. The reason for this, he said, was because the conditions which led to riots last summer and the summer before have not been corrected. Does your administration have any plans to correct, which they considered, to be the cause?

A Well, I think we have had plans. I think we are implementing and we are moving as fast as anyone can move; certainly faster than we moved in the past. I would think the program that Chad McClellan is heading up, providing employment, is one such area where we are doing it. I think our whole approach in the job training and our trying to cure economic problems, would indicate we are trying to do this, and I would challenge Doctor King is not aware of all of the facts. Unless he wants an instant solution to a longtime problem, then I have to feel that either he is misinformed as ^{to} what we are trying to do, because certainly there is no one, either party,

who is not vital concerned with this, and I am sure interested in eliminating as quickly as we can any injustice or allowing bigotry or prejudice to take some rights away from them or erode those rights. And we are working as fast as we can to accomplish these ends.

Q Governor, if you approve or agree with the minority report of the commission, would you not favor or support efforts to ammend the bill to that minority?

A Well, I think this is what's going to happen upstairs .

Q Are you familar with the California Taxpayers Association plan to require people with \$15,000 in income to pay half of their income tax in September?

A I only know that I've been told about it, and we are going to take a look at this as well as anything else that might be helpful.

Q Do you think this might be a good substitute for raising money by withholdings?

A Well, I don't know. What I think is it's possible. It's an area to explore with regard to whether we can meet some of the problems withholding is suppose to sovre, such as a leakage or a loss of taxes, or to get a way from the big bump coming all at wonce. This is a possibility we are going to have to look into. But this is all I can say at the present time. I know they made this proposal, and we haven't had time to look at it.

Q Governor, Doctor William McCandless is running for election and he claims he has your support for that election on that board. Are you supporting him in that election in San Diego?

A As Governor, I am not certainly going to interfere in any local election or inject myself. I think following the regrettable incident here, I wrote him a letter expressing my good wishes, and I hope nothing happened here which would interfere with his own desires and his continued services on that board, but I am not going to inject myself into any local election.

Q If we can back up to mental health minute. You have indicated Doctor Lawry has the power to reverse the stand if it appeared the problem of care would deterriocate. Would this

be possibly under the department's plan in order to close and demolish a portion of the various state hospital buildings?

A Well, it's my understanding there are some buildings that are long overdue for demolishing, that we house some of our patients in, some almost temporary type quarters, that were intended to be eliminated a long time ago. Now a long time ago when we were still on the policy of, as I call it, warehousing the patients, putting them in storage, in institutions for the rest of their lives, there was, if a building is demolished, the need for replacement. But we have gone from 37,000 to 22,000 patients in those institutions because of this transition to the local care center. And I might add a transition to the local care center resulted in improved cases. And the eyes of the nation are pretty much on California in the gains we have made in that regard, and we are continuing. I know there does come, of course, about a point at which there are patients who cannot be treated in this local manner, but what that point is we don't know. We evidently haven't reached it yet.

Q Governor, do you feel ~~as~~ you have been cornered politically over withholding tax?

A Cornered politically, no. It's as simple as what I tried to explain last week in here. I believe that the people of the state overwhelmingly are opposed. Every experience I have encountered during my campaign indicated that. Now if for some reason the people of this state do an about face and change their minds, any elective official should heed^{to} the public's will. I personally happen to be opposed to it. So I made a stand. There's no pussy footing around that I might be persuaded when I just know, barring this change in public opinion that I am not going to be persuaded.

Q Governor, how would you test that public will? How would you gauge it?

A Oh, if I guess wrong, I know they will let me know.

Q Governor, if the statewide policy is that people favor withholding, would you sign a withholding bill?

A Now, wait a minute. I need a little more evidence than just a single poll. I don't think it's that difficult to find out the will of the people. I think they would make themselves pretty well heard on these issues. But at the moment I would

say there's noth. ; to indicate to me there could be any changes in my mind.

Q Governor, on a different topic. How do you feel ^{about} ~~feel as~~ Bob Finch for vice-president?

A Bob is a very capable fellow and a talented fellow, so much so that it would break my heart to lose him here because he is directly in charge as far as administration. It could be we're using him so hard that he is looking for another job. He hasn't indicated that to me.

Q Do you think he would make a good vice-president?

A Certainly he would.

Q Do you think you would make a good vice-president?

A No, I don't like to travel that well.

Q Governor, are you feeling a loss of Mr. Tyler in the Department Finance?

A Oh, I am sure Gordon is. He was a very fine and helpful man and we all regretted his going. Unfortunately he had some personal business problems that just didn't work out without his personal attention the way he had hoped it would.

Q Have you replaced him yet?

A I don't know. This is actually Gordon's position. This is an appointment he can make since he is the deputy.

Q Governor, there's a bill which would call for the floridation of water. Would you support this bill, sir?

A Floridation at the state level. We leave that for the local community. That's one, I believe, that could well be left to the local community to make their decision. My only view on that whole business is I don't understand the sound and fury on both sides. It's available in any drugstore in a number of different ways. And I do not subscribe to the theory, but at the same time I do not want to floridate everybody's teeth.

Q You won't support it , the bill if it came to you?

A I personally believe some things be better left to the local area.

MR. BEHRENS: Thank you, Governor.