

# 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 –  
03/05/1968, 03/12/1968, 03/19/1968

Box: P02

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library  
inventories visit:

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

Contact a reference archivist at:

[reagan.library@nara.gov](mailto:reagan.library@nara.gov)

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

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD MARCH 5, 1968

Reported by

Beverly Toms, CSR

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

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Good morning.

SQUIRE: Governor, can we get the non-candidacy stuff out of the way first?

(Laughter)

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Yes, sir, I reiterate, I am not a candidate. Does that clear that up?

Q Governor, what is your reaction to that group who filed yesterday intending to file a slate of delegation in opposition to your delegation in the primary?

A Well it is certainly within their right. They have a right to do it. Since so many of them are employed in higher education, I of course am trusting that they will do this on their own time.

Q Were any of the names familiar to you, Governor?

A No.

Q Governor, Barry Goldwater says he couldn't support Nelson Rockefeller if he did in fact win the GOP nomination. Could you support Rockefeller in that eventuality?

A Yes, I've told you this, I'll support whoever is the nominee of the party.

Q Do you think Barry Goldwater is guilty of violating the 11th commandment by saying that?

A Well, we're in one place where Barry and I are in disagreement. I'm sorry, I can understand his bitterness in saying this. I can also wish that he hadn't, because I think we have got to follow a different path. Stakes are

Mar  
5

too big.

Q Governor Reagan, you were quoted yesterday as saying that Romney's withdrawal from the presidential race will hurt the Republican party. Could you elaborate on that statement, please?

A It was in the context of the question that was asked as to what effect and whether I thought it might, and I said, well, in the sense that it would take some of the meaning out of primaries around the country if they continue virtually an uncontested primary. It was in this -- in this sense.

Q Governor, this morning Richard Nixon said if he is elected president he would end the war in Vietnam, and bring peace to southeast Asia. Do you think this is a campaign statement or is this really possible?

A I think it is possible and I think it is the position the Republican party has to take. The other party as I have said frequently in here -- leadership of the other party has failed to do it and it is now the longest war in the history of our nation and I think the american people want an answer. They either want it ended or want an answer to why it can't be ended, and I believe it is ridiculous to assume that it can't be ended when you compare the power of the two countries.

Q Governor, Newsweek and CBS both did various surveys on the delegate strength and they came up with the same figure that Mr. Nixon is within 46 delegates of having the nomination. Do you agree that Mr. Nixon is that close to getting the nomination at this point?

A I don't have the information to comment on that. I'd be a little surprised if they are correct in that. If they are, then everything I've said about a -- the decision being made at the convention is kind of out the window.

Q Governor, why would you be surprised that he would be -- would not be that close?

A Because this announcement seems to suddenly come

as a bombshell when most knowledgeable politicians and pros in the party have been saying that it is pretty wide open and the decision will be made at the -- at the convention. There are a number of Favorite Son delegations and unless those delegations have already made a commitment they haven't announced, it would be difficult to add up that total.

Q Do you believe as Governor Rockefeller maintains that if he did in fact enter the primaries he would do nothing but create dissension within the party?

A Oh, I don't know whether he said it. I know that he has said repeatedly he would do nothing to cause dissension. I don't know whether this would follow automatically that there would be dissension by doing that.

Q Governor, the day that Romney dropped out you declined to say that you felt that -- that this wrapped it up for Nixon. Since then Rockefeller has said that he wants his name taken out of the Oregon primary. On a week's reflection do you still feel that there is some other **contender**, **serious** contender other than Dick Nixon that can challenge Nixon for the nomination?

A I thought Governor Rockefeller made it apparent if proper evidence as shown to him of a sentiment on the part of the people in the party that he's amenable to that kind of draft. You know, it is one thing to say you want your name taken out of the Oregon primary, and it is another thing to be able to sign the actual affidavit that's required.

Q You are still not willing to say then that there is no one else other than Nixon?

A There is Mr. Stassen.

Q Anyone else?

A No, there are a great many names that continue to be talked around and suggested and as I said last week, after the Romney announcement, I'm quite sure that there will be people who will be taking another look, a second look and perhaps even a closer look at some of the others that have been from time to time mentioned.

Q Does that include yourself, Governor?

A No.

Q Isn't it quite possible, Governor, that Richard Nixon may well win the nomination almost by default?

A That's possible. Always possible.

Q Would you step forward in that eventuality?

A Step forward to what?

Q Test him.

A No. No, I'm not a candidate.

Q You think a draft is possible for Rockefeller?

A Well, there seems to be sudden movement. I noticed in the paper this morning that such program is now started in another state and in Massachusetts, so --

Q Why don't you think there is a draft possible for you then?

A Well, because I didn't read in the paper that one started for me in Massachusetts. Have we cleaned that one up?

Q No. Nelson Rockefeller said if drafted he would be a candidate for president of the United States and you echoed his words about two weeks ago when you said you wouldn't be a candidate. Do you want to change your statement in regard to that?

A No, that's -- we came to a fork in the road. He changed his position somewhat; I haven't changed mine.

Q Governor, if Governor Rockefeller doesn't enter any of the primaries around the nation this year, then it would appear the people won't really have an idea of his vote-pulling strength. Do you think he should enter at least the Oregon primary?

A This is a decision he's going to have to make for himself. I wouldn't comment on it one way or the other.

Q Well, the people will not even know his views on Vietnam or any of the issues of the day. Shouldn't he go out in the countryside and engage his -- and debate on the issues of the day so people will know what they are getting?

A I would think that in view of the fact that he has said that this would be acceptable to him, that I would think that he'd consider now making some public statements on some of the national issues, but that's again -- that's his decision to make.

Q Well, do you think he should do that in -- I mean --

A I'm going to leave it up to him.

Q Do you think that write-in votes for a candidate in a primary speak louder than votes that are cast for someone who's running?

A Well, when you stop to think of the difficulty of getting people to go to the polls at all and to even completely mark a ballot, I would think that someone that goes to the trouble to write in, this is an indication of a hard and fast feeling on the part of someone who will make that effort.

Q Would write-ins in any of these primaries influence you in your decision?

A No.

Q Governor, suppose there were a great number of write-in votes for you in a primary election and that -- and that leading Republicans asked you to consider whether you'd be on the ticket. How could you with your strong feeling about the Republican party turn them down?

A I'll tell you, that's just like those legislative bills you asked me about, I'll wait till such a thing happens and make a decision then.

Q Governor, in the week-end interview with James Reston of the New York Times you indicated you were not closing the doors to the Vice Presidency. As you have told us before --

A Bless you, I'm glad you asked about that because I'm not blaming James Reston and not blaming myself. I feel there must have been a typo in there some place because when you read on in the article it becomes apparent that I didn't say that. As a matter of fact, no, I was answering

as forcefully as I could that I felt the job and the opportunity I have here for what I believe in are too much, that I'm not a candidate and would not under any conditions accept that. And then I went on to answer, as he continued, that it is true that I have refused to make the Sherman statement as I have explained in here a number of times. So the insertion of the word "vice president" in front of there, I think that sentence correctly was supposed to read with reference to the Sherman statements, and as I say later in the article, it became plain that I had said no, and I do say no.

Q Governor, have you had any communication from Governor Romney or anyone close to him about the Man from California's statement that he is alleged to have made?

A Not directly or personally, no. The statement that he did make clarifying that which I was very happy and gratified to see. Have we done it?

Q Change the subject.

Q Same subject. Governor, when you first commented about Governor Romney's withdrawal you had some pleasant things to say about him, the way he did it. Then a couple of days later when he made that statement about a man from California you talked about him appealing to a certain faction within the party. Why did you suddenly change your mind and you think he is still doing that?

A Well, I was disturbed. In the statement that I made after he had then amplified, I was willing to let that pass the first time when he seemed to be appealing to a faction this could simply have been the wording of a statement that must have come at a difficult time for him. But when I thought then that he was going down that other road, as I say I'm gratified that he's explained that since, contrary to what some commentators have voiced, I was not angry in that statement and intended to imply no anger. I simply said I regreted that he felt the necessity to make the statement since I wasn't a candidate and then again made a plea for unity. But he has since clarified it and I'm satisfied.



Q But do you still think he would be appealing to one faction?

A Well, he since hasn't repeated those words and so I think that he'll strive for unity also and he has since pledged himself to anyone.

Q Governor,--are you going to be on the same subject?

Q Yes.

Q O. K., go on.

A That's right, you wanted to change the subject again, didn't you? Let me do this one and then he's going to change the subject, too.

Q I wanted to change the subject.

Q But I'm not.

A You are not changing the subject.

Q No. I'm not. In regard to the roll of the governors in this apparent appeal or attempt to line up a number of the governors in favor of Governor Rockefeller, if there was such a move that did develop between now and the June meeting, would you take any steps to attempt to stop such a movement?

A No, I might not do that, I wouldn't do that, and yet at the same time I wouldn't participate. I don't necessarily believe that we should think automatically that the governors have got to have a unified opinion and a majority rule basis get together, more or less, as if the governors occupy a different position than any other elected representatives of the party. So -- and I think that a great many governors feel that way and that's probably why no such concerted move came out of the governors conference. Now you and then we will let you change it, too.

Q Governor, the President's anti-riot commission has made its report. What is California going to do to implement the recommendations in that report?

A Well, California is already going a long way in that direction. As a matter of fact, there was much in that report, many of the recommendations that were identical with recommendations made in the McCone report



after the Watts riots. And we have for sometime been implementing the recommendations of that report. We are doing this by way of our job opportunities program. We are doing it by way of the Chad McClellan program. We have a very fine teenage youth summer job program under way. It started too late last year to really have it as effective as we believe it can be. But we are hopeful of putting thousands of young people to work in summer jobs in private industry and in those positions that are open to the state, not make-work, but actually necessary work that should be done. We are exploring several areas with regard to housing problems, and so I would think that -- that there is no question about where we stand with regard to the real causes.

Q Governor, would you approve the commission's recommendation for a national open housing bill?

A Well, I'd rather not comment specifically on any of that because all I've seen is the press summation and reports. It is a very voluminous document, as you know, and I haven't had a chance to get into exactly what they mean and what they specify in those things. So I'd rather -- I have broadly several reservations about the report, particularly with regard to law enforcement; the emphasis they place on where they believe the causes of the riots lie -- but as to actual specifics of that kind, I'd rather wait and see in total what they said on that subject.

Q Governor, would you say what you are doing in housing? You mentioned you are exploring several areas with regard to the housing. What specifically are you looking at?

A We are looking at one that has to do with Monagan's piece about the idea of improving housing and using the people themselves to contribute labor. We are exploring a very interesting situation with regard to the freeway that will run through the Watts area of Los Angeles, with regard to the transferring of an entire neighborhood with

state help instead of simply paying people off for their dwellings and leaving them on their own to find another place to live.

Q Governor, what's so wrong with make-work?

We had to resort to it in the depression when an awful lot white of people were out of work. Now --

A Well, let's be plain. There is an awful lot of white people out of work today. This isn't purely a racial problem. In California, where we continue to have a higher unemployment rate -- it is lower now than it's been in some time, but it is still higher than the national average -- when I say make-work, there have been a number of instances under the poverty program, particularly with regard to youth, where the job is so obviously invented and serves no real useful purpose that the young person given it, they are too smart for that, they know that there isn't going to -- society isn't going to come unglued if they don't perform that job, so they know that something has been invented to give them a paycheck and to supposedly keep them out of trouble. Now, back in the depression days under WPA, there is no question but that due to local leadership in many instances, there was some boondoggling and digging holes and filling them up, but you can still go around the country and find monuments to WPA in fine work that was done, structural work, improvements that were made in many communities. In my home town in Illinois, a small town, this ranges all the way from the making of a -- of a park along a section of riverfront that was once nothing but a swamp in a wilderness to bridges up in our forestry areas and so forth. Under the CCC a great deal of work was done with regard to trails, camping areas and so forth. This was not make-work. It may be make-work in the sense that it is a job that's not being done, but it is a job that could be done if you had the facilities and the means and the people to do it. Now, in our own summer jobs we are thinking in terms of fire trails and the stepping up of program of hiking trails in our wilder-

ness areas and so forth. The similar kind of CCC work.

Q This sort of thing requires money, though, Governor. Have you allocated anything in your budget either to it or to Bob Monagan's housing concept?

A As I said, we are looking at that one. On the other this work within the state, there is no question but that if we could find -- and we have had our setbacks recently, as you know, with regard to the budget -- if we could find some additional funds, it wouldn't be in tremendous amounts, we could do a little more. Even so a lot of this would be done through the budgets of already existing departments and we believe there is some flexibility in there to get things done.

Q Would you give it a higher priority perhaps than you do some of the things that are financed in the budget? In order to -- if the situation is as critical as the riot report seems to indicate.

A Well, that budget is so close to the line that I don't know whether we could now readjust any priorities in there. We might take the money out of the higher education budget.

Q You indicated that you will support Monagan's housing plan to the point of authorizing bond issues -- a ~~small~~ bond issue as he recommends?

A Let me tell you, as we -- I'm not prepared to give you an answer on that or a decision on that. We are looking.

Q Governor --

A Now, wait a minute, there was somebody on the first ~~one~~ who tried to change the subject.

Q Well, they changed --

A Are you changing the subject?

Q No.

A No.

Q Governor, the President's commission takes a rather grim view of the situation between the races in this country and the future they say that the programs you've mentioned today are almost irrelevant because they haven't

reached enough people and don't have enough money. Do you share this -- this rather pessimistic viewpoint of the commission and how do you size up the relations between the races in the United States today?

A Well, I disagree with the report in that regard. I think that it failed to recognize the efforts that have been made by millions of right-thinking people in this country of all ethnic backgrounds and of all racial backgrounds who have been trying and making consistent progress, particularly in the era since World War II, who deplore bigotry and discrimination and prejudice have been working very hard to eliminate it. With regard to the funds that are being -- have been expended by way principally of the poverty program and the charges that these are not enough, I'd like to suggest that perhaps there is less evidence to indicate that we are not spending enough money than there is evidence that we haven't been getting enough for what we have been spending.

Q Are you quibbling, then, Governor, with the conclusion that white races is to blame in part for the riots?

A Well, there is no -- there is no question -- well, there is no question that prejudice is going to bring about animosity and prejudice whichever way, but I -- again, if you ask me to be critical, I'm critical in the sense that to speak only of the root causes, the things that we should be eliminating simply because it is morally right to eliminate them. So to speak of them only in the context that this is the cause of riot and do these things only to prevent having a riot, I disagree with that -- that approach. I think that the answer is to jobs, to equal opportunity, to better way of living and better housing and education. These are the things that we should be doing if there was no threat of riot any place in the offing. We should be doing them because they are right. But to ignore the fact that there are people who are agitating for disorder and riot and who have been partly, at least, responsible for the -- some of the disturbances that we have

had already, these people are not tying their cause to these root causes. Whatever ~~axe~~ they have to grind, it isn't tied in with equal opportunity. They are purely destructive. By their own words they want to tear down the structure as it is which could be destructive to their own people as well as to the majority community. And to note face up to this and recognize that if you would -- if you had made a start in all of the things that I think we have made a start in all of these other areas -- whether we are progressing as fast as we'd like, that's a different question -- but to say that there wouldn't be any riots if we made this start this is to be pretty naive about the Stokely Carmichael's and the Rap Brown's who are traveling from state to state, city to city, inciting to riot and disorder.

Q Governor, in view of that report and other circumstances, do you think that it would be regarded by Negroes in this state as a slap in the face if a bill to do away with the Rumford Act was passed this year? Would it be -- would it fan the flames of disorder and --

A Well, I'm sure that it would be used by those who fan the flames of disorder. Again, of course, as I said before, you have a constitutional issue that's involved here with regard to individual rights and it is a -- it is a question of how courageous the people want to be in the face of a threat.

Q What is your feeling about it now? Should there be a Rumford Act revision this year in your opinion?

A Well, I've never changed my position that I believe there should either be extensive modification or stop and start -- eliminate and start over again.

Q Governor, Assemblyman -- I'm still on the same subject, in regard to the riot report. Assemblyman Don Mulford says there is a very, very explosive situation in the East Bay area, and I don't want to fan any flames of riots or disorder, but I wanted to know if you could really tell us how explosive that situation is right now and how potentially explosive it could be if nothing is done this

summer.

A Well, I haven't had a report so far this week, this early in the week on that. We are kept pretty apprised of situations of that kind and I'm sure that there are -- when I can meet with some of our people I will get the latest on that. I think the situations are explosive and they are aided in that explosiveness by the very thing that I mentioned a moment ago, because Stokely Carmichael, Rap Brown, others of that ilk are frequent visitors, have been holding meetings in those areas and there is no question but what they are fanning the flames. It is -- anyone would, -- I think would be foolish to try and put his finger on or guess where is the first hot spot. But I challenge that some of the language that's been used also in discussing this is again inflammatory with this sort of acceptance that everyone is to blame and unless something is done right away showing an immediate answer or almost an instant solution that the rebellion will be automatic and even imply that it will be justified.

Q Governor --

A Are we still on the same subject?

Q Yes.

A We have to be --

Q Governor, how could you assure the minorities of equal opportunity in housing without some type of open housing?

A Well, because this implies that California has large segments or areas where restrictive covenants are allowed and we don't -- there is no area denied. The open housing feels you are getting down to the right of the individual and I'm in favor of any laws that prohibit others from banding together or that prohibit them from influencing the home owner or the renter ~~and~~ the landlord who has no discriminatory practice. I'm in favor of laws that prevent people from getting together and pressuring this individual to join them in their sick prejudice and bigotry.



Q Governor, you mentioned about the Stokely Carmichaels in this area, like that, are you somewhat in agreement with George Wallace that these people are holding the cities for ransom?

A I'm never in agreement with George Wallace. My rival is on the ballot already.

Q New subject.

A If there is a new subject we have -- are you a new subject?

Q No.

A All right.

Q Governor, now that the Foran bill which would have put in a tax on automobiles to finance the BART deficit seems to have hit the rocks, they now start talking about the possibility of raising the Bay Bridge tolls. However there are a lot of legislators who feel that you would not accept Bay Bridge tolls to be used to finance BART. Would you?

A Well, we have been discussing this very complicated question and our discussion has lead us more to the idea of giving the local communities on their own decision either by way of their own elect~~ed~~ representatives or by way of a people vote the decision with regard to the use of sales tax for additional sales tax for this. I'd want to -- I'd want to go in much more to it and look much deeper into the use of tolls for that. But my own idea is that we are-- we should allow actually the choice of financing by way of the local communities.

Q Governor, on that, would you favor a gasoline sales tax to be used for BART?

A No, I'm talking about a sales tax.

Q Not specifically --

A Allowing a percentage of increase of sales tax that would be collected with the regular sales tax but given to the community.

Q You say local government, you mean the Board of Supervisors would then have the taxing authority to give to



the state or Bay Area Rapid Transit?

A We had originally recommended to all of the counties in the regional areas the idea of a vote by the people. There are some who believe that the people have already expressed themselves in an election that they want such a system as they have in San Francisco and it has been suggested back to us that we broaden that approach to mean that the elected officials, the county supervisors could make such a decision.

Q Well, Governor, have you been advised that any raise in tolls on the Bay Bridge for BART would harm the financing of the southern crossing?

A No, but this -- there may be such a report on its way to me or such a recommendation. I couldn't tell you that.

Q Why has it been that you are cautious about raising tolls on the bridge to finance rapid transit? The same people would be using the facilities?

A Well, maybe it is just because my first glance I believe in the broader base tax for the area.

Q But it doesn't have anything to do with financing southern crossing.

A No.

Q Governor, to use one of your phrases from last session, are your feet in concrete on this or --

A No, no, I just expressed a leaning on my part. After all it is still up to the people in the local area.

Q New subject.

A New subject. Well now if it is a new subject, wait a minute, he's got a --

Q That was an old subject, go ahead.

A Old subject.

Q Governor, there is a teacher's strike which apparently is being settled in San Francisco. What is your feeling on teachers --striking of teachers in general?

A Well, I hesitate to comment because of this is still in the process of being adjudicated or decided there in San Francisco. I've always been -- but I don't mind

telling you I'm opposed to the idea of public employees striking. At the same time I have turned our people loose to investigate and research what we could propose or what could perhaps be advanced as an answer to the problem of worker's grievances and wages and working conditions, hours and so forth, of machinery that could be set up for that purpose to give them an answer, but at the same time avoid the possibility of the strike.

Q Governor, on another subject. The legislature last year set up the California Advisory Commission on Marine and Coastal Resources. When do you plan to appoint people to that commission?

A Wait a minute, we have our -- we have our own state commission on this under Colonel Gillenwaters.

SQUIRE: Anything more?

Q I got one. Wait a minute, one other subject. Governor, what is your reaction to the Little Hoover Commission's refusal to approve your government's reorganization plan last week? There were several Republicans that wouldn't go along with some of the Democrats on that body.

A Well, I'm sorry that they feel that way. We have been operating pretty much under the very organization plan that we are asking. It works, it is extremely successful, and I don't suppose that we are always going to be in agreement, the Hoover Commission and myself. But I fail to see their reasoning for this because this isn't a theory that we are trying to get over. This is now a proven practice and as I say, a successful practice and I'm sorry that they have seen fit to disapprove.

Q Actually, do you need a law on it or if you don't get a law would you just continue operating the way you are doing?

A Well, that's -- that's what I would prefer to do unless they take some action to try and throw a roadblock in front of it. There might be some things that we wouldn't be able to do without their permission.

Q Governor Reagan, the Democratic caucuses in the Assembly has charged that your budget is truly \$358 million dollars in the red. Can you comment on this?

A Well, I read that statement this morning. That was by Mr. Shoemaker and once again Mr. Shoemaker has revealed why the financial conditions of the state are in the mess or have been in the mess they are and with that we inherited because he reveals a surprising ignorance about the facts. First of all, he did try to dump \$125 million of the school deficit over on us, and as it is not our responsibility. I am happy to see that, though, Mr. Shoemaker recognizes that the legislature will have to take some action. They will have to take action with regard to that. They will have to take action with regard to the almost \$80 million that we have asked for in reductions in Medi-Cal and welfare, the flexibility to make those reductions or it will be that amount out of balance. And then of course what he is proposing is just his own difference of opinion as to whether an additional several million dollars worth of construction should be termed capital construction or not. The legislature could block us if they made such a decision that it isn't just that. But he is -- Cap Weinberger has already answered his statement and informed him of where he is inaccurate and incorrect in his other evaluations.

Q Governor, Senator Sherman has -- property tax relief to a higher school apportionment next fiscal year. Could you conceivably support that?

A Well, I think that this offers less of a chance of it being reflected directly back to the property taxpayer than the method we suggested. They have expressed a great deal of concern the county supervisors would simply spend the money and not reflect it in any reduction of property tax and I just happen to believe that by turning it over by way of school programs you've got less of a chance of it being sent back to the individual taxpayer and more of a chance of it simply being added spending on top of the present spending.

Q Does that mean you won't support it then?

A I still prefer our system.

SQUIRE: Any more? One more back there.

Q In this evaluation by Mr. Shoemaker he estimated it would cost \$50 million to implement the staffing standards you have accepted now. Is this consistent with your estimate of that? For mental hospitals, staffing standards.

A Is he speaking now of the total by the time we achieve all that we'd like to, because -- well, I don't have an estimate on it right now, but also what we are talking about is phasing this in over a period of time. So I don't know whether his total in that is correct or not, and I'll look up my figures myself. I won't take his word for it.

SQUIRE: Thank you very much, Governor.

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD MARCH 12, 1968

Reported by

Beverly Toms, CSR

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

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Our guests today are 12 American Field Service exchange students who are living at homes here in Sacramento and spending a day at the Capitol. Glad to have you in here.

SQUIRE: Governor, could we stick to the politics first, get that out of the way?

MR. NOFZIGER: Aren't you going to let him read the statement first?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: First I've got a statement, Squire, that I'd like to make and then I thought that we completely exhausted the subject of politics and wouldn't even have to bring it up today.

SQUIRE: All right.

(Whereupon Governor Reagan read a prepared statement.)

Q Governor, in that connection yesterday the Senate passed on a 71 to 20 vote an open housing statute. Can you tell us whether you support that statute.

A The Senate in Washington?

Q Yes.

A I haven't seen it or been able to read the Civil Rights bill that was passed out. Certainly it must have some merits. I notice that our two California Senators voted for it. But again it is just as it is in the legislation here, it still has its way to go through the Congress and I'd rather wait and comment after I've read it and after I see what it is once it's completed its passage

Mar  
12

through the house.

Q Governor, is your point in this that even though we have an open housing law it isn't effective?

A No, my main point is I've never changed my opinion and have not changed it now, about the inability to solve some things with legislation or with law. But this is the type of thing that I've been talking about where the main problem must be solved by people, and by right-thinking people making it uncomfortable and unpopular for someone to practice the sickness of bigotry and prejudice. Now it happens that these two men are veterans of Vietnam. It happens that both of them were terribly wounded, in combat and I only cite this because it dramatizes it, because it would be just as reprehensible if it were some civilian who had not made such a contribution to his country but it serves to dramatize it better and reveal how ridiculous is prejudice and bigotry when two young men who have proven themselves in their devotion to their country, as these have, should have to be embarrassed and face difficulties of this kind.

Now, again let me point out that in the statement I made it plain that we are checking on the story and there is the if, assuming that the story has been correctly reported and that these are the facts, but it doesn't do any harm to point out there is going to be more of this and I would think that if we don't do something at home voluntarily to clear up things of this kind, there are going to be about a half a million angry young men come home from Vietnam one day who are going to make their opinion known because they have been standing side by side and haven't been asking any questions about racial or background or religious differences or anything else.

Q Governor, if these two cases happen to be typical of the attitude of people of the State of California, as some people suggest proposition 14 -- the proposition 14 vote proves, what then do you think California can do to change that attitude?

A           Fortunately I don't think they are typical. I think these are much in the same category as the Willie Mays incident a few years ago in the city and once the majority, the right-thinking people found out what had happened, they took action and I'm just -- I'm hoping the same will be true, but in the meantime we are going to look into this completely from the standpoint of whether the state has any involvement or anything it can do in this case.

Q           What action do you think the right-thinking people can do to make, as you say, it uncomfortable and unpopular to practice this sort of prejudice?

A           Well, I would think one of the beginnings could be large numbers of landlords who would immediately make it known and contact these young men and make it known that there are apartments available and in their range in their buildings. The place where one-by-one those who practice the other way will stand isolated.

Q           Do you think that such voluntary action can solve the entire problem or do you think that any kind of legislation is needed to insure that this doesn't happen?

A           No, we have some legislation, I think, such things as our own laws outlawing restricted covenants and so forth. But I don't think and I've said repeatedly, I think we have placed too much faith in trying to legislate morality by law and not enough in using the leadership of the people to bring about the voluntary changes that must be made. You can pass a law, but you don't change the heart of the individual who is discriminating now. But I think that people can be changed. I think there have been great changes in a number of people who have simply been thoughtless in the past and the rest of us have to do some hard thinking about this.

Q           Governor, Assemblyman Bagley today issued a press conference urging you to support the Federal housing law that just passed the Senate, to push it through the rest of the Congress. What is your answer going to be to him?



A Well, I think the word he used was that he beseeched me, and I've been sitting by the phone all morning waiting to be beseeched.

(Laughter)

Q He said he sent you a copy of the press release this morning.

A Well, it evidently hasn't wended its way through the halls to reach me now, but any time he wants to beseech I'm -- I'm there.

Q What will be your answer when he does?

A What

Q What will be your answer when he does?

A It would have to be so far the same one I have given here, I haven't had a chance to read it.

Q Governor, in your statement here you infer that there is a problem also of discrimination in the apprenticeship programs, some of the unions, some of the trades. Is there anything you would like to see state government do that it isn't going to solve the problem of apprenticeships examination?

A Well, I would like first to see -- having been a part of organized labor for a lot of years, I'd like to see organized labor clean up its own house in this regard. Incidentally, I must say it is my understanding -- this is why that I say we must check out this story carefully -- it is my understanding that particular union that we have been involved in this one case is one that has a very good record and evidently does not practice any discrimination at all. So I'm hopeful that maybe here there is just a case of poor communications or a slipup with regard to the answer, but we are going to find out.

It is also true that there are unions where they are dragging their feet in this regard. Now, I think this would bear looking into to find out what could be done to --

Q What unions specifically, Governor, do you see as having a particular problem in this area?



A Well, let me just say that there is a block of unions and I'd rather -- I'd rather not take a chance in specifying here and finding perhaps that I had mistakenly named one or the other, but all of us have been aware that there's been a slowness in certain trades with regard to opening their doors to the minority group members.

Q Governor, may we change the subject now?

A It is all right with me. All clear?

Q Apparently the Southern Pacific is going to discontinue the Lark of San Francisco to Los Angeles and the Public Utilities Commission has given its approval today. And today Bill Bennett says that it is the fault of the commissioners that you appointed and by indirection your fault. Can you comment on that, sir?

A Well, about the only comment I could make on that is that if the sun doesn't shine tomorrow, according to Mr. Bennett, it is my fault. I just think I'll have to shoulder the blame that Mr. Bennett assigns to me and do my best to live with the burden.

Q Do you approve the discontinuance of the Lark, Governor?

A Now, you've touched me on a sentimental point here. I have -- I have no way of knowing without reading the facts. I know that there is a great problem with regard to passenger traffic and whether the railroads can continue it or not. Sentimentally, I fly my flag at half mast any time that a train discontinues because I still love trains.

Q Governor, back around the end of January, about the 23rd, I believe, you said that you were opposed to withholding of income tax, not only on principal, but because it was a convenience for the state and not a benefit for the taxpayer. Now, I assume that you still hold this position, but I wonder in view of the comments yesterday in San Diego by Gordon Luce that he said your administration if it was forced to swallow withholding would insist upon a two-thirds majority vote of either house. Now, is this

your new position? Is this the way you accept withholding?

A No, I wasn't talking about withholding in the two-thirds thing. I would like to see it made more difficult for the legislature to raise taxes on the people. I would still -- I would still have to be convinced, as I have said before here in this room, that if the -- I believe that in my stand against withholding I have been speaking in the sentiment of the people. If the people have changed in overwhelming numbers in that regard, obviously I can't and would not stand in their way. But I would again want them to know all the facts. I would want them to know, for example, that withholding is an increase in taxes, and there is no other way to describe it. They will be asked to pay even though the rate doesn't change. They will be giving the state tens of millions of dollars more out of their pockets than they are presently giving and I think the people should understand that.

I think they should also understand this, that the issue of withholding right at the moment would not have come up and would not be so warned, had it not been for the great increase in the personal income tax which is proof of what I've said. Had we put withholding in at the same time this present increase took place, I doubt if there would be any outcry about the size, proving that it is easier to sugarcoat with withholding an increase in taxes and as I say, it is a convenience for the state. The only convenience the individual gets is that he doesn't have to worry about paying in one lump, it is taken away from him but he -- more is taken away than he deserves to pay.

Q Governor, the constitution now requires that bank and corporation taxes and insurance taxes be approved on a two-thirds vote. Would you favor the sales tax and the personal income tax having to go on a two-thirds vote basis instead of a simple majority in the legislature?

A I'm going to have some more to say about that. I'm readying a statement for the near future with regard to the entire problem and our question of tax reform and

the costs of government. So, let me wait until I make all of the statement instead of just piecemeal here, saying some of the things that will probably be included in that statement.

Q Governor, last week you indicated, at least for the area of rapid transit, the indication of favoring a sales tax increase to support that realm. That's a tax increase. What is the difference between that and income tax?

A There is one difference. That tax increase, the sales tax increase that I've suggested is one that the people themselves have the right to vote or not vote in the rapid transit districts as a way of financing rapid transit and I -- my proposal is that the state grant the people the permission up to a ceiling figure of passing that in their districts to finance rapid transit. This is a decision of the people.

Q In a situation as we had last year, where it was absolutely necessary that a large tax increase be approved by the legislature, would you have liked to have had more difficulty for them to pass it last year, more votes?

A Yes, I'm not going to make it easy on myself. I think -- I have faith in the people's wisdom. I have faith that when told all the facts they make the right decision. I think the fact that a survey last year, after the passage of the tax will, with some 70 per cent of the people recorded themselves as regretfully in favor of the tax increase because they understood its need, is indication that you can trust the people.

Q Governor, on taxes, can you clarify your statement last week before the California Taxpayers Association regarding you said something that you were not optimistic you would be able to submit a tax reform program this session?

A Yes, and I'm glad you asked. I'd like to clarify that. I'm sorry, I really used a bad choice of words there. Evidently it gave the impression that there would be no proposals for tax reform. What I was trying to say was, first of all, apologizing that we haven't been able to come out

with it already and indicating that we are still aiming *at* getting it before this session. But we are not moving as fast as we should. We are still hopeful that we can and if we run into problems and can't, why we will keep on working and present it as soon as we can, but it is true, I gave the impression that perhaps it wasn't going to -- that we had no chance of getting it out and I didn't intend to give that impression.

Q Could you indicate just what the problem is in getting that?

A Well, it is a very complicated problem. You have to -- you cannot treat the state taxes without tying them into the entire tax structure of the local communities.

Q Governor, you said a few minutes ago, as you have in the past, that you might re-evaluate your stand on withholding if the public seemed to be re-evaluating their stand. Do you see indications of the public attitude toward withholding in fact changing toward favoring it?

A No, but I just have a hunch that with the state income tax coming due in April that if anybody is going to think about taxes they are going to be thinking about them now. But it wouldn't change my position. I simply said that I did not conceive that I could stand in their way if this was the overwhelming sentiment of the people. So far I have no indication that there has been that change on the part of the people.

Q That means if the public attitude as such was an attitude of acceptance that you would sign a withholding bill then?

A I said if the people made it -- and I think it is easy to find out and to know if the people feel strongly and have made it -- a great change in their thinking, I think it is only natural to say that an individual can't stand in their way and I wouldn't.

Q How can you --

Q Governor, on that same point, don't you think that next month when income tax is due that the majority of

the people of the State of California are all going to favor withholding, and if you do what you said and would you introduce legislation at this session to institute it?

A No, I'm not going to introduce the legislation.

Q How can you gauge that public support or opposition, Governor? By an agency such as the Field poll or by talking with legislators or through your mail?

A I think there are a variety of ways. I think it is rather easy to -- to really determine when there is a public move and public sentiment for something. Government has been run that way for a number of years. When the people really make their wishes known --

Q You don't believe that the legislators through the feeling expressed them by their constituents --

A I think you can count on getting a great deal of information from them. They are -- they are in constant touch with their own.

Q Would the majority of them favor it; would you go along?

A What?

Q So if the majority of the legislators go -- favor it, would you go along with them?

A Maybe in a few of their cases I'd sneak into their districts and do my own checking.

Q Well, Governor, may I get it plain from you that you will or will not sign a withholding bill if it is passed by the legislature at this session?

A Murray, come on now. There is no such bill and there is no such bill reached my desk and I won't make the decision now, as I won't about any other bill until it reaches my desk. In the meantime, I was simply reiterating what I've said before, that I believe the position I took and have taken on withholding is in keeping with the sentiment of the people certainly during the campaign and up to and including the present. And I've said in the past, if the people drastically change overwhelmingly, endorse this idea, obviously I -- I wouldn't -- couldn't stand in their way.

Q Your feet are no longer in concrete then, is that right?

A What? My feet still are. I would be ideologically opposed. I would be a reluctant bride.

Q Governor, change the subject?

A It's all right with me.

(Laughter)

Q In your session with President Eisenhower there has been predictions or thoughts of a Nixon-Reagan ticket.

A No. The truth has all been told about that. I was invited to join a group of former President Eisenhower's friends who every year come out to the El Dorado Club down in Palm Springs, some several weeks ago when I played golf with General Eisenhower. He told me about this annual affair and said if it was possible at any time while they were out there and they were there for about a week every year, that I'd come down, he thought that I would enjoy meeting them, they'd enjoy meeting me, and so the opportunity came this week-end and we had a lunch in the dining room with the club. Certainly was no secret about it, and they honored me by showing an interest in what we were trying to do here in California and I told them about our task forces, about the economies we have attempted, and the modern business practices we are instituting in government. They were happy to hear about this and I was happy to tell them about it and that was about the extent of it.

Q There is also now another one going about for a Texas tower and a California conservative. Do you have any feelings there?

A Well, since I don't believe in labels, I don't know who they are talking about in California.

Q Governor, is there any doubt in your mind then Governor Rockefeller will now become an active candidate?

A There is no doubt in my mind he has a decision that he has to make and apparently, according to the reports of the meeting in New York, he is trying to arrive at a decision one way or the other, but I think that's one he's

going to have to make on his own.

Q Governor, did anyone at any point during this luncheon bring up the Vice Presidency?

A Oh, yes, Leonard Firestone, who was the host, opened it. The idea was to get questions started and Leonard opened it by saying, "I know the answer to this one already," but he said, "Would you be a Vice Presidential candidate?" and I of course answered as he expected I would that I wouldn't.

Q Governor, could you tell us who some of the other guests were at the luncheon?

A Well, now, they weren't my guests, and I'm sure Mr. Firestone would make a guest list available. If I started naming, I'd hate to do that because I'd name some and I would ignore others and thus~~e~~ might look like some made more of an impression on me than others.

Q Do you know whether there were any other office-holders other than yourself?

A No, no, there weren't.

Q Governor, you don't suppose because you told that group in Palm Springs that you wouldn't be a candidate for Vice President you'll never be asked again, do you?

(Laughter)

A No, sir, I think it is just like those female mosquitoes that have been bothering us here in Sacramento, they are going to keep right on coming up with it.

Q Have you taken any further action in Oregon to get off the ballot for VP?

A I haven't heard back an answer to my wire as to whether it is going to require an affidavit. If it does, I'll sign the affidavit.

Q Governor, how well will Mr. Nixon have to do in New Hampshire to satisfy you?

A He doesn't have to satisfy me. I think the -- I think probably the biggest news coming out of New Hampshire is going to be in the other party. Obviously New Hampshire has been robbed of any significance for the Republicans by



the fact that it is virtually a one-candidate race now. And I think most of you gentlemen will probably treat it that way, but the interesting thing is going to be, see what Mr. McCarthy does.

Q Well, Governor, from that luncheon was there anything there that would indicate that there was an emissary in that group or some official action to make you a second member of a Nixon-Reagan ticket or a --

A No.

Q Or a Rockefeller-Reagan ticket?

A No, and -- no, there wasn't and let me say again that there was no significance to the meeting because they are there every year for about a week every year at this -- see, somebody, and it was just the General's hospitality and kindness in suggesting if I could get down I might enjoy being there, a lunch or a golf game or anything, and so I was able to get there for the lunch.

Q Did the fact that Mr. Firestone was active in Rockefeller's 1964 campaign, would that cast any significance to his question to you?

A No, I don't think so, because he's now a member of our delegation and he happened to be my host for the week-end.

Q You say that New Hampshire has been robbed of significance for the Republicans? Would a large write-in vote for Mr. Rockefeller be significant in your opinion?

A Oh, I think it would. I think that -- I think you would all treat it as such if that should happen. There hasn't been much time to organize such a thing. If it should happen, I'm sure that this would be discussed.

Q Governor, how about your meeting yesterday with Senator Knowland, did politics come up there, too?

A No, as a matter of fact, mainly that's been quite some time since I'd seen him, wanted to bring him up to date on what we are doing over here, tell him about some of the things going on and plans legislatively and in turn solicit his views on some of the things we have been doing and what

the effect has been and that was the nature of it.

Q You don't feel in any sense that he was an emissary of Senator Goldwater for example?

(Laughter)

A No, I invited him and several weeks ago.

Q Governor, in the New Hampshire primary again, if Senator McCarthy obtains the 20 per cent, what do you think that would mean for President Johnson?

A Well, I think it would -- I think it would indicate that possibly there is a split for real in the other party. And I would take smiling note of it.

Q Governor, as head of the California Delegation and since you are going to be a candidate yourself, at some point you are going to have to decide which of the candidates you would turn to. Are you going to decide that on the basis of primaries? Do you give more weight to the primary or is it as it's been called a broker convention at which you go there and decide along the line somewhere that you favor Nixon or Rockefeller or someone else?

A Well, I've said that I think it is going to be an open convention. I think -- how much weight the primaries have now is going to depend on whether other candidates enter those primaries. They are not much of a contest as it presently stands and you'd have to weigh that accordingly by the time you get to the convention.

Q Does that -- I'm thinking though in terms of the way you might make up your mind as to which candidate you would go to. How important do you personally feel the primary is?

A Well, as I say, at the moment you can't place as much importance on them as you normally would unless some one else gets in and it is really a test of the people's sentiment. I think all of us are concerned about reading what is the will of the people in our party and the factor of wanting a victor, who's going to give us the best chance in November.

Q Do you think that Nixon can be stopped if no one

cpntests him in the primaries?

A Well, there are a great many favorite son delegations. It is going to depend a lot on whether those delegations on the basis of the primaries begin to commit themselves. So far there's been no indication that they have done any differently than we have done, that they are still favorite son delegations uncommitted.

Q Speaking of reading the will of the people, suppose Richard Nixon comes to you at convention time and says that with you as his running mate he can win; without you he cannot win and therefore if you don't join him on that ticket you will change the course of american history. Then what would you say?

(Laughter)

A I bet you used to stick pins in butterflies.

(Laughter)

A I'd tell him I didn't believe him. No, I feel very strongly about this, as you know.

Q Can I ask one more on that same topic, Governor? I think you said a minute ago about the concern for finding a winner, as far as you are concerned and your influence with the California voter, and your position as head of the delegation, would you in the face of a steady string of primary victories for Mr. Nixon, and as you say they might not be too -- if you felt that someone else was a, more of a winner even though he hadn't proved himself anywhere in the country, would you be willing to turn to him rather than to the -- rather than to the obvious, more obvious choice?

A Well, I've been around to a question I can't answer. I've asked all of our delegation not to speculate on choices or anything and I don't think that I should start it by speculating. It might be very -- treated very well by all of you here who heard my answer, and in the proper context, but things like that, if you tried to answer it, have a way of getting repeated without the proper context and first thing you know, you are reading in the paper that you took a stand for someone or against someone. I don't want to do that.

Q Would Mr. Nixon really relax his loser image if he has no opposition in any primary?

A I'm sure that must be of great concern to him and to others who feel he does have that image.

Q You said a moment ago that a write-in vote for Mr. Rockefeller would be of significance. Would a large write-in vote for you in any state you deemed important, would that be significant?

A Well, it would be heartwarming and something to remember, but I don't think it is going to happen.

Q Could it make you reconsider your position?

A Not unless they had such a primary that happened in 50 states.

Q Governor, have you made any further decision on how long you are going to ask to hold the delegation?

A No, that is too far away.

Q Is the key decision, you feel the delegates have to make, is who is most delectable; that is the main thing you have to look at?

A I think it is going to be of great concern to the people of the Republican party this year, because I think that the party has learned that -- that philosophically they are all pretty much in the mainstream, so to speak, and therefore I think the great concern is going to be someone that can carry the party to a victory.

Q Are there any particular planks you would like to see in the Republican platform that you would push for when you get there?

A I tell you, it is going to depend a lot -- I've always been one who believed that the platform should be more a statement of broad general principals than specifics. It might have more of a chance of being read, if it were short, and what is on that. But if it does deal in specifics, actual specifics, then yes, I would like to see some emphasis given to the return of sovereignty to the states, and this by way of more freedom of action on the administering of programs that are now helping the federal

government. More of an approach of block grants or tax sources to the states rather than the grants as they are now given with strings attached. I would like to see our party go on record as opposed to the continuation of deficit spending and a policy of deliberate and planned inflation, and I would like to see our party go as strong as it is possible on the national scene with regard to control of crime, law enforcement.

Q Governor, what would the party planks say if you could write it on the war that would differentiate it from the Democratic plank?

A Well, I've never been one who quarreled with the fact that we should be there. I have quarreled with the manner in which we are waging the war, and I would myself like to see this country use its full resources to terminate this conflict, and at the same time I believe that this country should have a general plan for hot spots wherever they may be in the world, so that we can without being caught by surprise and always reacting of a pre-conceived plan of how we are going to meet aggression in the world where it is to our national interest; where it is not. I don't think we can just be the policemen maintaining law and order all over the world, but where we should be involved is when it affects us and our national safety.

Q Could you elaborate on your definition of full resources in that?

A Well, yes, I think that certain restrictions have been imposed on the military with regard to bombing targets, with regard to areas in which they will fight. I think if the same restrictions had been imposed on the commanders in World War II we wouldn't have won the war.

Q How do you react to the talk about 200,000 more troops?

A Well, that's a military decision and I'm -- again don't have access to the information that caused it. If the military leaders say we need <sup>them</sup> to bring about that victory, I endorse it.

Q Governor, there are now discussions in Washington regarding foreign negotiations with the north with regard to pulling out in Vietnam. I'd like to ask you what your feelings are with regard to negotiations. Is it possible to pull back and negotiate and still win in Vietnam?

A I think those negotiations, if they come with the cease fire, and then you sit down, this of course is the way historically combat has ended in the world. The thing we must be on guard against, the type of negotiations we were lured into in Korea and negotiations where the combat goes on and it becomes apparent that the enemy is using negotiations just as another means of achieving his goal. There were more casualties after the negotiations started in Vietnam than there were before we sat down in Panmunjon. I don't think those are legitimate negotiations. The enemy has made it plain to the world, the negotiating table to him -- he first approaches it as a means of achieving what he hasn't been able to achieve by force, and in those areas where he has really given up, he just went away. He did this in Greece, if you'll recall. In the Berlin airlift this wasn't negotiated out, we were blockaded from Berlin. When he found out he couldn't win with what he was trying to do, he just one day he wasn't there, the blockade was lifted. And I think we have to face this and we have to be very careful that our desire for an end of the bloodshed and desire for peace doesn't lead us into another panmunjon on which we continue to see americans die while we go on in endless arguments at a table month after month.

Q What safeguards or requirements would you ask to go with negotiations?

A I would think that negotiations would be accompanied by a ceasefire. They stop killing each other.

SQUIRE: Any more? Thank you, Governor.

---oOo---



PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD MARCH 19, 1968

Reported by

Beverly Toms, CSR

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

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Good morning all. No opening statements, no visitors to introduce.

Q Do you think the entry of Robert Kennedy into the race will have a direct bearing on whom the Republicans eventually nominate?

A Oh, I don't know. I think that this will certainly have to be a consideration, but we won't know who their nominee is. Perhaps there will be some indications by way of polls and things that -- but I just -- I think this is a Democratic problem and it's given them too many questions to answer for us to be concerned.

Q Why would it have to be a consideration?

A What?

Q Why would it have to be a consideration in the Republican nomination?

A I suppose I've seen already speculation by some journalists about how this might have a bearing on which of the prospective Republican candidates might run better against one or the other.

Q Would you sign Assemblyman Ralph's bill regarding the delegation if it comes to you, permitting delegates to jump from one slate to another?

A Well, as I have already said in legislation, I'll wait till it gets there and make a decision that -- I have been curious as to whether he had a provision in that that would only apply during Republican administrations.

Q Yesterday at the news conference, Dr. Rafferty



said that in the event of a close race between Nixon and Rockefeller at the Republican convention, there could be only one deadlock breaker and that would be you. Would you have any comment on that? Do you think that is a rational outlook?

(Laughter)

A It is a Rafferty outlook. Oh, I know there's speculation of that kind going on and every convention there's talk about deadlocks and then who could break it, and again I have to say I think the months ahead, by the time the convention comes around, we may see a great many names that are suggested in that -- in that line.

Q You think we are going to have a clear winner by the time they go in the convention?

A What's that?

Q Do you think there will be a clear winner?

A Oh, there is a possibility. I have always expressed myself as not thinking that would happen, believing it would be an open convention, but there is always a possibility that with the primaries the snowball could start to roll for someone and this would cause some of the Favorite Son delegations to -- to make switches, but I still believe that it will be the open convention.

Q Senator -- or Governor, that bill by Senator Alquist that you opposed last year, which provides for an open primary on the Oregon model, was sent to the Senate floor this morning. Do you still oppose that bill or have you had any second thoughts about it? It only applies now to 1972.

A Well, I've said that I'll wait until that gets to the desk again and make a decision and see what it says.

Q Governor, regarding your recent -- your announcement this week of your choices for National Committeeman and woman, the incumbents, Gardiner Johnson and Mrs. Bowler expressed surprise at that decision and particularly they indicated that they had wanted to be considered for

re-election. Could you comment on why they weren't informed or whether they were asked whether they wanted to stay in there or not?

A I don't think there was anything unusual in the procedure, just as they were chosen to succeed two others in 1964. I don't think there was anything wrong in my indicating a recommendation. I'm sorry if there was any failure in communications, but if there has been, it's been rectified now and certainly they have a fine record of service to the -- to the party. As I say, I don't think this was anything unusual.

Q Governor, Representative Dellenback of Oregon this morning charged that you are indeed seeking the Presidential nomination and have a large corps of people in Oregon working for that end. What is your comment?

A Well, I don't know how large the corps is supposed to be or how large it is. I'm aware as all of us have been and you asked, questioned me before in this room on the fact that there are people in Oregon who have announced the intention of doing that and I do not have a connection with them and I have said and informed them I am not a candidate. So he won't be the first member of the Legislature in Washington that I have disagreed with. As a matter of fact, I could name another Oregon one, Mrs. Green not too long ago said that I favored selling the post office. At the moment I don't think you could get much for it.

(Laughter)

Q Governor, Speaker Unruh said on Sunday that there is a likelihood of a deal for a Rockefeller-Reagan ticket or he said he wouldn't doubt that such a deal has already been made. Would you comment on that?

A No deals and I'm aware of that -- I have to be aware of, I've read it and with all this talk and everything, I still stand in my position, no, I'm not interested there or in any way.

Q Did the Rockefeller people ask you if you would

be interested?

A No, there has been no approach to me whatsoever by anyone in this regard. I think it would be a violation of all the customs and traditions of politics if anything like that did happen this far in advance of the convention.

Q Back to the Oregon primary for a moment, Mr. Nixon said the other day he believed if you stayed in the race, Mr. Rockefeller would have to be the odds on favorite. That if you withdrew he, Mr. Nixon, would stand a very good chance. Does that change your mind at all?

A No, and I'm sorry. I've done everything I can to discourage any contest, and certainly I'm not going there to do anything, but as I have said before, I would suggest any of you who still question this, look at the affidavit and look at the affidavit I had to sign to be a Favorite Son candidate in my own state, and you actually would be guilty of perjury if you signed both those affidavits. There is no way that I could take my name out of the Oregon primary and continue to be a Favorite Son.

Q Would you do so if you could now?

A What?

Q Would you do so if you could now?

A Well, I have done in every primary where I could -- there are only three in the country where this situation prevails, -- in all the others, and I think my record of stopping any efforts in New Hampshire is indication that I mean what I say.

Q You think the dialogue between Governor Rockefeller and Mr. Nixon in Oregon is going to be a good thing for the Republican party?

A Well, I think we have learned our lesson. Both men have pledged and have indicated so far that there is going to be nothing devious but they are going to campaign against the opposition and my goodness, you've -- you got a lot of leeway. There's a great deal of speech material with regard to the opposition.

Q Speaking of deals, would you care to comment --

could we have your reaction on the reported deal between Senator Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson which is that Senator Kennedy would stay out of the race if the Vietnam policy were re-assessed?

A Well, it seems to be some conflict with regard to the statements of both sides as to the suggested deal. But there is no question that the deal was not made, and I think it reveals that the deep animosity between those two personally that has long been suspected and denied by both, is indeed for real, and I have a hunch in the days ahead we are going to be treated to quite an exposure of that animosity, which I'm sure I will be able to bear without great pain.

Q How about the morality of such a -- or the political wisdom of such a preliminary deal? Would you make such a deal, for example, if you were in such a position?

A No, no, not at all. I think if such a deal was proposed, I think it was an affront to the very office of the Presidency.

Q Is it your personal opininn that Kennedy could take Johnson in the June primary as the California Field poll indicates?

A I was a little bit surprised by that poll. I wondered about it. I haven't made any such assessment and wouldn't be able to speculate on that. I was surprised and my own opinion would be that Senator McCarthy who had the courage to stand on his convictions with certainly no personal feud involved, I was of the opinion that he would do far better than that poll indicates. And not only in California, but elsewhere.

Q 15 years ago would you have been a McCarthy supporter?

A Let me see, 15 year(s) ago -- somebody help me subtract from '68, that's 1953. No, by that time I was in the Eisenhower camp. Wait a minute, someone new --

Q He has another question on the same subject.

Q I wanted to change the subject, too.

C Governor. I'd like to get your reaction to the

Penalties which raises serious questions about the effectiveness of our current correctional system and in addition to that I'd like to add that a private comment made to some of the researchers by one of your officials said that 50 per cent of the prisoners in state prisons and correctional facilities in California were safe to be released at this moment.

A Well, without commenting specifically on that, because I haven't done any great study of this report, I know there are controversies and some of our correctional people disagree with some things in the report. I don't think anyone disagrees that we don't have all the answers with regard to crime prevention and the effectiveness of our system of rehabilitation, and punishment, incarceration. And we have had a meeting just recently with our own people in this field who go into a number of things that we think should be looked at, as to how to make this more effective as an instrument to control crime. I'm sure there are some people that -- the great problem, I imagine you could make that statement any time about any prison, that there are a great many people who could safely be released. The great problem is who is the soothsayer who can look at a person and decide that that individual could be released without returning, because unfortunately countering this is the fact that we do have a great rate of--excessive rate of repeat of released prisoners who go back to prison again having committed another crime. The problem is how to find out how to determine which are the ones it is safe to turn loose.

Q Last week you mentioned the special interest which was going to kill your CHP radar bill. Would you care to specify which interest exactly you meant?

A No, as a matter of fact, I'm not in the business, I hoped, this morning of making enemies any place. I'm going to have an uphill fight trying to get our legislative program through in this election year. I'd suggest that you ask some of the legislators who are opposed what

swayed them and what caused them to vote against this bill. I have a hunch that if this were -- if the people were informed, told of the actual savings in highway patrol expense, told of the effectiveness of this as a weapon in lessening fatalities and automobile accidents, that the people would be well nigh universally in favor of it, and it just seemed to me, I used it as an example, how strange, year after year, I was trying to point out the apathy on the part of the people who can let this thing go on. Year after year it's almost a standing joke the bill will be introduced and it will get no place and right at the moment it is especially important when we are faced with the expense of increasing the size of the highway patrol. And while it would still have to be increased, I'm sure that we could make it more effective at less cost if we had the aid of radar and I do not hold with those people that think that catching speeders is some kind of a game where you play by the rules, and there is something not quite cricket about using radar to catch them. We are talking about human lives, the part that speed plays in accidents and there is no game to it.

Q Governor, in the past the State has contributed one-third of the cost for new hospitals and remodeling for -- part of which -- which is partially financed by Hill-Harris or Hill-Burton funds, and our county authorities have been told that you would blue pencil any state contributions this year for such construction. Is that true and if so, why?

A We have cancelled this out of the budget this year, one of the only states in the union that has been doing this. We have talked to all of them in advance. They were informed, they know that we are going to have to do it and again it is just one of the measures in an attempt to balance a budget which is now out of balance pending legislation and even more out of balance until the legislature corrects the mistake in AB 272.

Q Does that mean you would veto the Teale bill? To put the funds back in the budget?



A I'm afraid that I would have to unless the Finance Department was able to tell me that a rich aunt had died and left the state a lot of money.

Q Governor, back to the radar, has any representatives of this lobby you are speaking of personally contacted you and attempted to influence you should the bill reach your desk?

A No, no.

Q Governor, were you talking about the teamsters and the truckers? Are those the interests you were referring to?

A I'm saying I would suggest you get it firsthand right from the horse's mouth. Ask the legislators why they have decided against this measure.

Q Governor, what is the status of your tax reform program and how hopeful are you of getting it through?

A We expect to be able to present this program before the deadline within the month. And from there on, of course, why the struggle will begin. But we will have it introduced at this session.

Q Does your office receive any comments or complaints from the liquor industry about the enforcement policies of Mr. Kirby, as perhaps being a little bit too tough?

A No, not at all. As a matter of fact, just recently I had one man very prominent in that field tell me that they are all of them happy about his fairness, about the fact that they are being treated as a legitimate business with legitimate dealings and that they couldn't be more delighted. He has my full backing, what he's been doing.

Q Governor, <sup>the</sup> / legislature has been in session now for almost two and a half months. What is your over-all assessment of its progress so far? Are you satisfied with the work that's being done up there?

A Mike, that's pretty hard to say at this time. We know that the -- that the first part of the session has

to be given over to the introduction of bills. I have heard some legislators themselves complain that a lot of bills are being introduced that are evidently just for the sake of getting bills introduced. Some that they have very little hope for or concern about. I am happy that it is less than half of the amount that we introduced in the last session. But it is possible that we could have moved a little faster on some of the more important ones.

Q Do you feel that possibly some things are being slowed down in the legislature because of your possibility of being a part of -- I mean is it an election year session? Would you describe it that way?

A No, I've quoted that some of the legislators themselves have been pessimistic in saying that because it is an election year they won't allow things to go through. Some of the problems to be solved in this session -- I think that's sad if it is true, if it follows through. But I believe the base is about the same for the average session. They get into high gear pretty quickly now and the hours begin to get long.

Q Governor, have you or your legal section in your office had any indication at all of any Brown power or riots or disturbances scheduled for the central valley on behalf of the Mexican-American population?

A Well, now I haven't checked completely on this, recently. I do try to keep a finger on it and we are observing all of these possibilities and threats. I was interested to see that Mr. Chavez the other day made quite an impassioned plea for non-violence. So I can only hope that that won't be one of the things we will have to watch out for.

Q The Mexican-American Political Association over the week-end commented on a report by the Department of Motor Vehicles, reports in all Spanish speaking people in Los Angeles County, only 4 Spanish people were working in DMV offices; only 3 in the San Diego area, and only 5 in the Stockton-San Juaquin valley area, and that this was discrimination against the Mexican-American.

A        If there is discrimination, it is simply our inability to do what we have been trying to do as fast as we would like to do it. Because I think if you would check there have probably been more minority community appointees in our administration than there has been in any other for a number of years back, and it is a plain case of you can't do everything all at once. Particularly, you can't do this when you are in a -- in a position of reducing employees by way of a freeze on replacements. That has reduced our ability to just simply go out, branch out and employ. There are two things. We have and are committed to trying to get a better balance and to use wherever possible the state positions to achieve that balance of employment, but at the same time we cannot impose on the taxpayers of this state by simply hiring unneeded people in excess of need to try and bring about such a balance. But if they charge discrimination, I would say to them they only have to look at our policy and what we are attempting to do and they will find that we are on the road to exactly what they are talking about. I can't believe that some of these spokesmen for that community are speaking the sentiment of the very large community of americans of Mexican descent in California, because by and large they are fine citizens and they are -- have a great devotion to freedom and independence. They want nothing more than an opportunity to earn their way and we are doing everything we can to see that that comes about.

Q        Along that line, Governor, do you support the principle of the Chavez movement, the unionized farm laborers and give them bargaining power the same as other unions?

A        I have always said that certainly I can't be an opponent of organized labor, but I've always said that labor should be organized from the ranks of the workers themselves who want this and there is a great deal of evidence to indicate at this moment that he still does not

speak for the overwhelming majority of those who are working in that field. The evidence of this has been the thousands of people in the areas and valley who are out there working and who did not support his boycotts or respect his picket lines and I am opposed to the organizing of labor when it is done from the outside on the basis of a small clique, controlling the working conditions in behalf of the people instead of the people themselves controlling it.

Q Do you consider him to be from the outside?

A Well, he is one who has expressed the belief openly admitted that it would be impossible to have a union in the sense of the rank and file having a voice, that they fluctuate too much, that they come and go. They are not a solid group and that therefore a little group would have to make the rules regarding working conditions and rates of pay and so forth for the rest of them, and simply tell them what the rules were and I don't believe that is true organized labor. That's what's too often wrong with organized labor.

Q I understand that your field representative, Bill Orozco, is leaving you today in Los Angeles. Have you decided on a replacement for him?

A No. We will get at that right away because that job must be filled. I want to say in his leaving that it is not going to be an easy job to fill because Bill has done a great job and has certainly served us and served the state very well. And I wish him well.

Q Governor, since the Agricultural Labor Force does fluctuate and move in and out, aren't the comments you just made tantamount to saying that there shouldn't be unionization in the field? How would you have it if -- if you got a fluctuating labor force? How would it be possible for a union to be formed, except by a small group?

A Well, there is a proportion of the labor market, the farm labor market that isn't migrant and that is a permanent force. Every farm has its permanent employees,

and I'm sure that this would be where the nucleus of such an organization would come from and then as is in so many other unions, as others came in they would abide by rules and rates of pay that had been determined in legitimate bargaining by the rank and file, the permanent membership of the union. This is not an unusual thing in labor at all. I think that those who believe that you can impose though on the farm economy the industrial type of union have failed to see some of the farmer's problems. For example, while I have respected in the union the right to strike and have helped a union in strike, I don't see how you could possibly have collective bargaining in the farm economy without some protection against calling a strike at harvest time, when there could be no legitimate bargaining and when there could be nothing but coercion and blackmail in such a strike.

Q If Cesar Chavez invited you to speak at a union meeting in Delano, would you appear?

A Well, I'll wait until I get such an invitation. So far there has been no indication such a thing is going to happen.

Q Is the one time -- I'm sorry, same subject.

A Go ahead.

Q As a labor man, what do you -- how do you assess Chavez, his leadership of farm labor? Speaking in terms as a labor leader, what is your assessment?

A Well, I've had some difficulty reconciling some of his statements with some of his next echelon of command and their actions. They have -- there has seemed to be a tendency toward disruption certainly on their part in spite of his words, and again, as I say, it is not -- it does not seem to be the grass roots type of organizing that I believe should take place.

Q When did he say that there would have to be a small clique? I don't recall him saying that.

A I think you will find this was contained in some of his remarks at a press conference -- now timewise, I



have to go back to more or less his beginnings here, when he first started this and which he admitted that the people came and went and changed so much that it would be impossible to have a union in the sense or the democratic procedures that are normally attended upon a permanently based union.

Q Governor, on the subject of discrimination, can you give us a follow-up report on these two San Francisco soldiers you were telling us about last week? Have you checked that out and what have you done about it?

A Yes, we did. We found that one already solved his problem by leaving the state and there wasn't anything to do about that, and the other I am thankful to say, he wanted to make no official protest or appeal for any state aid because thank heavens, the very thing I spoke about, it happened to him. Others who were not guided by bigotry had solved his problem and found him proper living space and he has now settled in an apartment with his wife and is satisfied with what he has and he has a good job. So this was a happy ending to that particular story.

Q Is that in a segregated housing area? That is defacto segregation, do you know?

A Actually, I don't know. I didn't check on this. I don't know that. He is satisfied and he says he wants to make no complaints or asks for no --

SQUIRE: Any more questions? Thank you, Governor.

---oOo---