

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 –
05/29/1968, 05/31/1968, 06/05/1968, 06/11/1968,
06/19/1968

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

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

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD MAY 29, 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: I want to welcome some guests here. Glory Morgan, an exchange teacher from the United Kingdom, in the Sacramento City Unified School District, and five American Field Service students representing a number of countries around the world, and Mrs. Gunderman's class from Buckeye School here in northern California. Welcome, glad to have you all here. And I do have a statement here to open with.

(Whereupon the Governor read Release #366.)

GOVERNOR REAGAN: The plain truth and the tragedy is not only in the country, but even more so here in California, that while we still struggle with the great problems of welfare and unemployment there are probably more jobs going begging for workers in the country than there are unemployed, and the only difference is the difference is the lack of skills on the part of the unemployed to fill the jobs that are going begging. Now, open for grabs.

Q Governor, it was suggested to me that I ask you for a comment about the Oregon primary.

VOICE: We got apprenticeship we are talking about.

A I thought you were going to delve into this whole deep subject of apprenticeship here. A comment on the Oregon primary. Well, I think it was a very impressive turnout, a great surprise on the other side of the fence

May
29

with regard to the -- the manner in which that turned out. If you are asking for something person, and I suspect perhaps you are, since I was not a candidate and didn't solicit anyone's vote or ask for their vote in Oregon, I am personally pleased and gratified by the vote that was given to me. I'm very proud and grateful to the people who made that possible. To -- also I think to come out with as many votes in so-called liberal Oregon or as high a percentage as I did in conservative Nebraska is an indication that perhaps a lot of labels have been falsely applied.

Q Governor, the T. V. commentators from up there last night said that you ran a terrific campaign and this was a smashing defeat for you, you spent \$2 million dollars. I don't know how much that works out to per vote. I wonder if you have any comment on that?

A Yes, I've got a comment on that, if any of them are interested in wagering, not that I want to go in for gambling or anything, when they have to file their campaign expenses, I'd be willing to give them quite some pretty good odds that they are about 20 times above what was probably spent from what I know. But I didn't wage a campaign. I had nothing to do with it and no connection with it, and of course I realize that there are commentators and commentators, and some of them deal more in fiction than in fact.

Q Governor, would the results of the Oregon primary cause you to re-assess your position now as a national candidate?

A No, there is nothing to re-assess. I'm exactly in the position I was clear back in the New Hampshire primary.

Q Did Oregon lock it up for Nixon?

A I don't know, I think only time will tell. I think it was very impressive and solemn win for Nixon. You know that I have believed it will be an open convention. I still hold to that belief, although I say that the factors have increased and could perhaps make some uncommitted

delegations or Favorite Son delegations move; whether they will or not we will know, I'm sure, in the next several weeks.

Q Governor, you say you are not personally involved in Oregon and yet there was an awful lot of film of you being shown up there. Isn't this the kind of involvement, didn't you lend yourself in that way?

A Well, I don't know how I lent myself. I had nothing to do with that film, either in making it available or even having anything to do with putting it together. The film you are referring to is a half hour film that I understand was put together excerpts from things like this, from news reels or speeches and so forth, and actually the effort was not that large.

Q Governor, last night down at La Jolla you told me you were delighted that Robert Kennedy did not show very well in Oregon. What exactly did you mean by that?

A I just think that all of us in -- all of us have our own personal tastes even with the other side, and I was perhaps expressing just my own personal idea there. At the same time I think it is kind of exciting that the race for the Postmaster General is now wide open.

Q Governor, if you weren't a candidate in Oregon how do you know how much was spend^d up there in your behalf?

A I don't, I just said I'm just willing to bet from the reports that have come down, from things that people have told me that are going on up there. I have been in at least one campaign now myself. I know something about the costs for campaigns and when somebody said that \$2 million dollars was spent, I'm just willing to bet dollars to donuts that, as I say, they are about 20 times too high.

Q Is Rockefeller about through as a candidate, do you think?

A You'd have to ask Rockefeller. I don't know.

Q Well, how do you interpret his Oregon showing?

A Well, the Governor Rockefeller made it plain

when he began that he was not interested or going to make an attempt in the primaries, that he had a different strategy and what that strategy is, I suppose, is in the field of backstage of delegates, and you'd have to ask him as to how his strategy is working.

Q Speaker Unruh this morning said that the fact you did not campaign in Oregon was irrelevant, that your vote would have been the same even if you had. Do you agree with his assessment?

A Well, I think we have to face the fact that this morning the Speaker is doing a little re-assessing himself and he's probably a little low right at the moment and looking for any bright light he can find.

Q Governor, you said on Meet the Press last Sunday that you wanted a good vote in Oregon to help you get your program through the Democratic legislature here. Do you think you did get a good enough vote for that?

A That's not exactly the way I said it. I said once you've been injected in a race of that kind, in this particular business you have to face that a very bad showing could have an effect on your prestige and thus have an effect on the job you were trying to do here, it would be used against you and used to try and downgrade you in the people's eyes and so I'm very well satisfied.

Q Governor, you say that your name will be entered in nominations as a Favorite Son at the convention and then the delegates will do what they want. Will you appear before any delegations either before or after the convention to either seek their support or let them take a look at you?

A I have no such plans.

Q Do you have any plans to make any more trips out of state before the convention?

A Wherever possible. As a matter of fact, there is a Governor's Conference coming up. As long as I have to be gone, I'm going to pick up one, an invitation that's been long standing, and I might add it's in a state where the primary is already over.

Q What is that?

A Indiana.

Q Governor, if you were asked to speak to a delegation at the convention, would you accept?

A Well, if I was -- I don't know, this would depend on the nature of the invitation or under what -- what misapprehension they might be. If, for example, a delegation asked for some kind of meeting with regard to the course that our delegation and theirs might be following, this would be one thing. And if I was invited on the idea that I was an active candidate, that would be another.

Q Well, Governor, has any delegation asked you to appear before them on that?

A No, no.

Q Governor, you had a few observations about the Postmaster General job now being open. Mr. Unruh reassessing his position this morning. I wonder if you could for me give me some observations on what you think the results of the Democratic vote was in Oregon, what that means?

A Well, I think you've already had a session this morning, that opportunity to ask those of someone who has been much closer to the scene, and actually participating in the campaign. I think a certain myth of invincibility has been shattered. It would have been interesting to know what the vote might have been with all three of the candidates on the ballot.

Q Does your delight at Robert Kennedy's defeat mean you are an admirer of Senator McCarthy?

A No, I'm in quite disagreement of the philosophy of Senator McCarthy.

Q Governor, you did say earlier, though, that all of us have our own personal tastes even on the other side of the political fence. Would you care to say who your personal choice would be on the other side, who you would like to see --

A Oh, no, I don't have any personal -- personal choice on the other side. That's up to them to decide.

It is just somehow you always get a kind of a kick out of an upset.

Q Governor, on this addressing the delegates, if you were asked, if they were just curious about you and wanted to hear you as delegates meet during the convention, the way these delegations meet, would you come down and talk to them, the delegation from the state just wanted to hear you, would you accept that type of invitation?

A Well, I doubt if anyone would put it on that basis. I think usually there is some reason for an invitation and just pure curiosity, why they --

Q But you've said that once your name is placed in nomination you will technically become a candidate and at that point then would you since you are technically a candidate, would you then speak to these delegations?

A Well, not on the -- on the basis of campaigning. What I was indicating was that at a convention there is an exchange between delegations as to views, on the candidates, on what course you are going to follow, on the platform that is going to be constructed there, and I'm sure some of this is going to go on, an exchange of this kind between delegations. But in the sense of being invited to come in and put on a display in our own behalf, I wouldn't be interested.

Q Governor, most recent polls show that McCarthy is the one man who could beat all the Republicans, including Nixon. Doesn't that frighten you somewhat rather than give you joy in what happened in Oregon?

A I'm frightened at the prospect of any Democrat able to beat the Republicans at this time because I don't think this country can take many more years of the mismanagement that we have had and I think all of the candidates on the Democratic side have shared largely in the philosophy that has brought the country to its present state and I don't think they are changing the philosophy, just their campaign sounds. Someone else?

Q Mr. Nixon said the other day that he would pick his own running mate. Do you think it is conceivable he

may make inquiries to see if you are available for that job?

A There's been no indication of it. I would doubt that. I would doubt that really from the standpoing of even though technically he is a New Yorker, which I understand now rules out going the other direction, I think in a great many people's minds, and for all practical purposes he's a Californian also. I would think that geography alone would rule that out.

Q Are we finished with this -- this subject?

Q Well, this is somewhat related. You've been making a number of speeches, Governor, on -- on foreign policy and things of this sort, and not directly related to state problems. Could you tell us -- I assume that you've had some advisors on this, supplying you with memoranda and other information, expert views. Can you identify who these brain trusters or advisors might be?

A No, I don't think that would be proper. I've sought not only by way of reading, but by way of personal contacts with acquaintances that I have, not only in the field of journalism, military and otherwise, get all the information I can. California leads the nation in casualties in the Vietnam war and I think in an election year that anyone who is elected in a party has an obligation or responsibility to bring to the attention of the people what we think are the shortcomings of the present administration and so this is why I've touched on those. I don't think, if you are going to go out and speak nationwide, as I have at these fund raisers and party affairs, that you can -- you should go out and belabor the audience for the full speech on the problems of California.

Q Why don't you think it would be proper to disclose their names?

A Well, I just don't think it would be good politics, I think, suddenly first of all to -- I've never done a bibliography on this and there are some reading of the writings of some people with whom I'm not even acquainted, put together with facts that I get. Such information, I

don't think there would be much of a point in holding this up and suddenly sounding as if someone has been writing a script for me, because no one has.

Q Governor, instead of us having to wait until Theodore White's next book, I wonder if you'd mind telling us -- at some point there is a decision to do things in a certain way regarding the presidency, it would appear either not to declare candidacy, not to seek the job, to wait and have the job come to you. Would you mind telling us what is the history of your attitude toward the presidency?

A The history has been very consistent from the very first. You know that almost immediately after taking office these rumblings and this talk began and from the very first I've said I was going to tend the store here and that I was not going to be tempted into any move of any kind, and I followed that policy.

Q Governor, in that regard, one of the state's major Republican newspapers suggested editorially that a vote for you in the June primary is simply wasted because you yourself have said you -- repeatedly that you have no presidential ambitions or could be tempted into it, and since there is no way for any Republican to vote for anyone else the thing to do is simply boycott the presidential section of the ballot. How do you feel about such a move, boycott move?

A Well, it would be awfully funny if California turned up at the delegation -- or at the convention without a delegation. There is a long history in California of Favorite Son delegations. Almost every Governor who's preceded me has gone to the convention in that capacity, on both sides, Democrat and Republican. We know at this particular time it was not my idea, I was talked into it by the party leadership from the standpoint of selling the unity that we achieved in 1966 and making sure that we did not break open the old wounds and on that basis I agreed, contrary to my own views, to be a Favorite Son candidate in the interest of unity. Now, I'm quite sure

that there will not be a great turnout of vote because people just don't bother very often to mark in an uncontested election, so I'm not anticipating anything in the nature of a vote say that I received in running for Governor. Just as I think this -- this has been made evident in the primaries, even though my name was there, I was not contesting or asking for votes or campaigning. I would think that the paper that editorialized to that effect was a paper that's principal interest must not lie with the Republican party.

Q What reason would you give a Republican to vote for you in the June primary?

A In order to have a delegation at the convention, and in order to have a delegation that could represent California's best interest as well as the interests of the party and the nation. The idea of a Favorite Son candidacy is to have a delegation at the convention that can take a course of action designed to enhance the position of the state in the future administration, if you are successful in the election.

Q Since you do still believe in the free and open primary, don't you think Californians should be at least allowed to write in a name in the primary election?

A You are talking about the law and the law prescribes that they can't.

Q My next question is, are you prepared to suggest such a change in the law?

A No, I haven't -- I haven't actually gone into that or a study whether it is changed. I think California has done pretty well with the exception of at least one Favorite Son in our past history who couldn't make up his mind in time to even get California into the voting for the presidency.

Q Governor, a two-part question. Through how many ballots do you think that you will be able to hold the California delegation? And secondly, how many of the votes in the California delegation do you think Mr. Nixon

might be able to eventually get?

A I wouldn't be able to guess. The delegations completely cover the span of the party. All viewpoints are represented there. It is truly a unity delegation. No effort was made to get a delegation that could be pushed in a certain direction. The only thing I can tell you in answer to your questions is that you have to play that, and I'm sure the delegation will, as to what is the best thing for the California delegation to do; when to make a decision and what that decision will be depends on the future meetings of the delegation on the basis of the facts that we have.

Q How about another subject?

A I'm in favor.

Q Well, yesterday the Republicans in the Assembly turned around and supported the Democratic changes in the tax relief program and it went sailing out of the Assembly. I wondered what comment you had on the tax program as it -- property tax relief program as it now stands?

A I'm a little surprised at the way the property tax relief program has been treated by those who covered yesterday's activities. Yes, the Republicans voted along after trying and filing, only because we were outnumbered in the Assembly trying to kill the amendments voted to keep it alive with the hope that at some later stage we can get rid of those amendments. But I was amazed to find that this has been treated as a property tax relief bill for \$180 million dollars being urged by the opposition. The plain truth of the matter is anyone who analyzes it knows that those amendments are designed to kill property tax relief for the people of California, not to upgrade it or make it bigger or make it more possible. And I think that it is a trick of a political year. I think that it is playing politics with the welfare of the people of California, and I think that it is a shameful thing to do this. I think the people are entitled to the property tax relief and these amendments are designed to make that impossible, while at the same time designed to try and take

any onus or blame off those who put forth the amendments.

Q Would you say that Senator Miller now has the upper hand in his desire to reduce the sales tax?

A Well, we will find out over on the Senate side. I don't think that that's a good exit. I think reducing the sales tax is a step backward in the whole area of tax reform. We know that proper tax reform should be based or aimed at getting more broad-based taxes that are geared to our modern economy. The property tax is not one of those. The property tax should be taking a lesser place in the raising of revenues and more dependence should be put on sales and income taxes, taxes geared to the economy and so to let a half a cent of the sales tax lapse instead of going back to the counties where it could be used to substitute for some of the property tax, this is a backward step and it just makes it more difficult when we come forth with further proposals as we will for tax reform.

Q Well, Governor, your latest revenue figures show a much greater surplus than \$35 million. Why couldn't you just go ahead with another \$35 million that's lying around and Unruh today mentioned \$194 million that you can tap.

A Well, the Speaker is talking about ink instead of money. When he says \$194 million -- the so-called surplus melts away when you look at the finish of next year. In other words, next year the state will still be spending because of the great increase in certain programs we are trying to correct, will still be spending more than the revenues of the state, but we will be able to make it by way of the so-called surplus, the bulk of which is the result of our own economies and savings. Now, we are still hoping that we can continue to make savings in the coming year. The idea is in making these savings and economies to try to come to the point where we can offer the people of California some relief, some reduction in what they have to pay for the cost of government. So far we find ourselves continually having to use the results

of our economies and savings which are sizeable to pay for something else that is still costing too much. Last year it happened to be Medi-Cal. Last year we were able to balance the budget in spite of \$102 million over-spending in Medi-Cal, simply because of the savings we had made plus a return from the educational fund. This year a great many of the savings that we have made are going to be used up paying for the AB 272 which was supposed to apportion to the schools \$245 million -- yes, \$245 million and which wound up some \$70 million more than that. I look forward to the day when perhaps there won't be a goof and we can come to the end of a year and say we have made it with much extra, now we can find a way to give it back to the people.

Q Governor, would you have to veto the tax relief bill if it came to you with the Unruh amendments in it?

A Well, I'll give you my usual answer on all of that, I'm going to wait to see what gets to my desk.

Q The statement yesterday that that kills the bill, so that was a clear indication of --

A Well, there is still the Senate to go and we may find that the Senate can make up its own mind about something.

Q Could you elaborate a bit on just why -- just what your objection to these amendments is and why these amendments will kill the chance of a property tax bill?

A Well, for one thing, the tying in -- tying in of the Constitutional requirement, the tying in once again of a year's end to the program, it is going to be rather difficult for local communities or the counties to budget and plan if every year they have to wait till the end of the fiscal year in Sacramento to find out whether they are-- we are going to reinstate the property tax savings or the half a cent of sales tax for them. How do they make out their property tax bills? How do they make out their budgets? The fact that they are going to -- that this bill calls for a double standard of property taxation, this is the very thing that put a couple of tax collectors

in jail here in California. I believe it is contrary to the Constitution just as I believe it is contrary for an outright gift is suggested in this of money to property taxpayers. I believe that we made a sizeable contribution in the reduction of property tax for the senior citizens last year and I believe the thing that has now been injected to more than double this, while at the same time ignoring the basic problem, the over-all problem of property tax relief, all of these things were designed in combination to make a bill that the Legislature just could not adopt.

Q Governor, may I change the subject?

A Yes.

Q I'd like to get to your feeling about the changing of the poverty programs on the state level, from the local government --

A Yes.

Q The Conference of Legal elected Officials charged that you really want to take it out of local government and put it in the state. What is the purpose --

A The purpose is exactly what Congress intended when a very liberal Democratic Congressman -- Congresswoman, Mrs. Greene, from Oregon; as the result of an investigation into chicanery and stealing and inefficiency in too many of the poverty programs, Congress came forth with an effort that would involve or that would get the involvement of more locally elected officials in the poverty programs and to that end they put upon the states the very thing we are doing, and the thing that the state did in suggesting itself as the contractor with OEO was in -- in reply to a -- a request from our own local communities and county governments that we do this. Now, this doesn't mean that we interfere or that we put a layer of government between them and the Federal government. Any local community, any local elected officials, county government or city government is free to go its own way and when they do that they do it without interference from us. We, on the other hand, are in a position for those county governments or city governments that haven't put themselves in this position, this is aimed at control, a better control on those poverty grants that

go not through any government representatives or elected representatives, but go to citizens groups or organizations within a community and my own hometown back in Illinois, a little town of 10,000 people, we had the example of a little half dozen people who put themselves together, no one elected them, no one chose them, they appointed themselves and got a poverty grant of tens of thousands of dollars to do a survey and find out if there was poverty in that town. You could find out if there was poverty in that town by walking up and down the streets for about two and a half days. Almost everybody in town knows everybody in town by name, knows all their relatives and how much they make. The same thing the poverty program. Many examples that I've used in addresses, of the 50 per cent or better going for administrators salaries, this is the type of thing that this is supposed to cure. We are carrying out the intent of Congress but you might as well face it that right now by doing this, carrying out this intent, we have put ourselves in the middle of the fight between a selfish gigantic beaurocracy, OEO's beaurocracy, and the Congress of the United States, and the beaurocracy as so many of them do is trying to fight and depose and keep Congress from putting into effect what Congress has passed as our elected representatives and the -- there is either a misunderstanding on the part of the people who are opposing this here in California or some of them perhaps have a vested interest because they are the very administrators who have had quite a pot of gold on their doorstep by being able to dispense this money and the record of dishonesty throughout the country is a scandal. We know this already from investigations that have been launched. The poverty program, very little of the money has reached the people it was really intended to help.

VOICE: Thank you, Governor.

---oGo---

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD MAY 31, 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---

LYN: Can I have your attention for just a moment. We'd like to limit this particular press conference to the subject that the Governor will open with, and maybe one question on the presidency, but aside from that, if we can stick to this I'd appreciate it.

PAUL: The statement we will have for you, if not by the time the press conference is over, right after that, the one he will open with. You don't have to write it down.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I want to thank all of you for giving up your Friday holiday and I know it was very difficult. The garage downstairs is very empty today. But seriously the reason for this, I asked you here in a sense to report back to you on some of the things we have done to attack the problems of minorities in California.

(Whereupon Governor Reagan continued to read from release #371.)

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Now I'd like to have Bob Keyes introduce these new men and give you their assignments. Bob?

BOB KEYES: Thank you, Governor. First gentleman I'd like to introduce is William Thompson. William will be working in the Richmond service center and will be serving the entire East Bay area.

Next gentleman is Charles Booker. Charlie will be working in the San Francisco service center and will serve the West Bay area.

May
31

Ralph Morales. Ralph will be working in the East Los Angeles service center and will serve East L. A.

Ray Parr. Ray will be working in the Watts service center and will serve south central Los Angeles.

John Alston. John will be working in the Venice service center and will serve West Los Angeles and the Santa Monica Bay area.

Ted Patrick. Ted will be in the San Diego service center and will serve San Diego.

The final one, Larry Harrington. Larry will be based in the State Capitol, will coordinate the activities of these 6 community relations consultants and also will serve the Sacramento area. Thank you.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: There are two additional not here, but they are actually filling positions that did exist in this capacity. One will be in the Los Angeles Governor's office down there, and there will be one also on our staff up here, and those names will be given later; both of those gentlemen are Americans of Mexican descent.

Q Governor, how will you serve the Central Valley, Fresno and Bakersfield?

A I have a hunch that there are no service centers there. That's going to have to come, I suppose, in working out of our existing personnel and out of this office here.

Q Is that part of this plan or is it just an absent spot?

A Inasmuch as their stations are in the multiple service centers and we have none there, this is the way this will have to be handled. We are not setting up new offices or facilities any place.

Q Governor, you said you'd like to rid the state of the last vestige of discrimination. What will these people do to do that?

A Well, for one thing, as I say, this is a dual communication post, back and forth, so there is more information of what we are trying to do. We discovered in the meetings that in many instances some of the complaints ~~we~~

we heard we were able to say to the people we met with, show people the concrete evidence that we were already meeting with regard to that or meeting that problem. But the word hadn't reached them. There had been no communication on it. Also to get back the word that we can have a policy at this level and have had a policy for sometime but we have discovered that sometimes human nature being what it is, when you get down through the layers of bureaucracy down to the firing line, down to the people who actually -- the employees of the state that actually deal with the people that we received specific complaints of areas where the policy was not being carried out, personal or prejudice or bias or just unwillingness to cooperate, was not going on. We now will have -- it's very difficult for someone to take up with the Governor directly that someone in a state office a few hundred miles away is not matching the words of the administration, the deeds, and now they will have someone closer at hand for those complaints

Q Governor, what sort of a budget are we talking about to implement the program?

A Actually there is no change in the budget. All of these gentlemen are covered within the existing budget of the organization because as is typical of government there are always budgeted but unfilled positions. This will be true in almost every department of the state. So they come within that -- there is no budgetary changes at all.

Q Governor, why have you injected politics into this? You criticized the Democratic party rather strongly in your statement.

A That's right, and I criticized it and I would criticize whatever party was in power on the basis of again what we received in our meetings with these people. It was over and over again the complaints of the promises that have been made and the frustration of promises made and broken were not kept, of the changing on a whim of programs once announced or established and someone in the planning

offices in the nation's capitol decides to go a different course, different direction, but in the meantime well-meaning people at the local level and the neighborhood centers have gotten under way with these programs and in some instances we found people who are continuing on their own literally as one man said, pulling themselves up by their bootstraps and they didn't have boots, to keep going, in order to try to keep, particularly with the young people, some of the promises and I think again, and I would -- this sounded partisan, let me then quote some Democrats. I will quote the largely Democratic committee of the Michigan legislature that went into the Detroit area after the riots and these gentlemen almost entirely Democrat came back and said to make promises that you do not or cannot keep, to make promises particularly to the poor is a fraud and they said this is what has been done.

Q Aren't you making promises to them?

A No, we are offering them a channel of communications. We specifically will tell you that we are not -- we told them this is a long hard road, we are going to do everything we can and we are trying to keep the promises. We are now investigating, as we said we would, researching and studying the job requirements in State positions to see where some requirements for these jobs can be lessened where the job didn't require, for example, a high school diploma, and we are going to change those rules and regulations to open this up. We are carrying out our summer employment program. We are carrying out by way of the Chad McClellan program, a very extensive employment program that has had a sizeable effect on the ratio of minority unemployment as compared to white unemployment and that has had a sizeable effect on unemployment in California in general. We are at the lowest point of unemployment that we have been in the period since World War II. We are going to keep them, but we are not going to go out and promise an instant tomorrow or we have vast spending programs that are suddenly going to dump money on people's

porches. We are not going to do that because we can't do that.

Q In a sense are these gentlemen going to be ombudsmen to report to you on the function of the state bureaucracy, is that what you are seeking?

A You can use this title if you wanted to. I never thought of them as that. I'm not a believer in the ombudsman. I'm a believer in trying to simplify the bureaucratic structure, but it will offer close at hand, as I say, a manner for two-way communication.

Q Governor, how are these men chosen? Were they recommended by community groups or how did you pick them?

A Well, perhaps Bob could answer that better than I could because Bob has been personally involved in this and they will be working through his department.

BOB KEYES: Well, actually it was a combination of both. These people had excelled in their communities through various organizations, getting involved, solving some of the problems that they were confronted with, and as a result through various community people they were recommended to us and we, of course, were not able to bring them aboard until just the first of May because of other problems. But I think there was a combination of both to answer your question.

Q What is the salary for each man?

BOB KEYES: The salary for the community relations consultants is \$900 a month. The salary for the coordinator is \$950, and will go up to \$998 the first of June.

Q Governor, how do you answer the criticism that this is just another layer of bureaucratic fat the people have to fight through to get action at the state level?

A Well, I don't think it is a -- I think it is a step if -- now this brings us back to whether it could be technically called an ombudsman. No, it is not. It is actually a direct connection, you might say, with the Governor's office. It is not another layer instituted

in the bureaucratic structure. For example, without these men, let's say there is a complaint, -- supposing the labor -- the State Labor office, a complaint of the performance of someone in a local state labor office. As of now that complaint has got to come up through the bureau and through the Department of Labor before it eventually gets to us and as was evidenced in some of the complaints we received they haven't been reaching us. Now, they make the complaint here. Here's someone who can check at that local level and if something isn't being done there or a correction cannot be made there it comes directly to me. And the Governor's office can start from the top down to make a correction in that local office.

Q As a group how would you characterize these gentlemen, are they businessmen or experts or what?

A Well, I haven't gone into exactly their particular backgrounds. Let me simply say that I'm hoping that they will turn out to be experts in this particular field. Every effort was made to find people that would be understanding, who would know what the problem was, and who at the same time would have the ability to -- to contact and to deal with the community.

Q Is there a time factor there, is this going to be a -- a one-year appointment or what?

A No, no, this is -- we believe that as long as there is a need we are going to continue this.

Q Governor, what are the political --

A I haven't inquired into that.

BOB KEYES: And I haven't.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Bob says he hasn't either.

Q The meeting down in Fresno was a meeting where some of the people refused to go into the meeting, and now there will be no representative there. Aren't they going to feel that some of their problems haven't been filled, haven't been carried out there, there will be no communication?

A Well, you are talking about the meeting with

regard to --

Q The meeting where these appointments came out of, the group meeting up and down the state.

A No, we have -- we have proven by the very nature of the fact that we conducted the meetings that we are conscious of the various areas and we are going to try to get into them and solve them. Fresno happens to be, as a matter of fact, since you've named that and you mentioned the Central Valley, Fresno happens to be our experimental city where the entire welfare program or all of them have been consolidated into one and we are conducting this experiment which is leading toward jobs in private enterprise, private employment.

Q But they haven't started yet. I was wondering about how -- have you scheduled another meeting down there to follow up on that first meeting? They were going to -- they were talking about such a thing.

A We haven't set the date yet, but we realize that we have further meetings to go. As a matter of fact, very shortly I'm going to have a meeting in San Jose. This was nothing more than the fact that we haven't completed some of the meetings ~~and~~ we intend to hold with representatives of the Americans of Mexican descent.

Q What are these men going to be empowered to do and say when they hear complaints of job discrimination in private employment, something that follows along with the client coming in for problems of the --

A I suppose if it is something on their own initiative that can be handled at that local level, they will. But other than that, if it requires communication directly they are working out of Bob's department and he is in my office and they will bring it straight to us.

Q You envision where Bob, for instance, might be able to himself relay that to the private employer in one of these cities?

A Oh, if this has to do with -- it would depend on the nature of the complaint and where -- what agency of

government we think is the one to get involved. It could actually, if you are talking of the private sector, this could actually involve the FEPC, which incidentally is now a part of our multiple service centers, where it wasn't before.

Q Mr. Nofziger promised us a question on the presidency.

PAUL: Actually he was being facetious.

A Well, we will keep even a facetious promise, but let's make sure we have covered all of this.

Q When do they start to work anyway, immediately?

A Bob, when is the starting date or have they started?

BOB KEYES: May 1.

A They have started May 1.

Q What have they done so far if they have already started?

A Well, I suppose you can take this up with Bob and with these gentlemen here, any questions you have as to them, as to what -- so far I imagine this has --

VOICE: Thank you, Governor.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: What is your last question?

Q The Ripon Society which is considered a moderate GOP group said you would be unqualified for any national post that required either administrative or diplomatic ability or you would turn the free ticket of Rockefeller into a nightmare. Do you have any comment on that?

A The Ripon Society?

Q Yes.

A I've been attacked by extremists groups before and I've never bothered to answer.

Q Could we ask Bob -- could we ask each of these gentlemen to give their political affiliation?

A It is up to them, but they have a right to refuse if they want to, constitutionally. You gentlemen want to?

VOICE: I would rather not.

---oOo---

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD JUNE 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: Gentlemen, I have one statement that will be the sum and total here.

(Whereupon Governor Reagan ^ard press release No. 377.)

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I don't believe we should continue with the press conference.

VOICE: Thank you, Governor.

Q Governor, a question was asked this morning about whether you were offered Secret Service protection.

A They will take care of that.

MR. BECK: Contact me and I'll be very happy to answer it.

Q Will they amplify this statement?

MR. BECK: Sure, we will amplify anything you want. If you have any requests for me --

Q So there is no misunderstanding, it refers to demagogic and irresponsible leaders. Can you be more specific?

MR. BECK: No, I think -- no, I think the statement speaks for itself.

Q Can we answer the first question first?

MR. BECK: First question, no. The answer is no.

Q To what?

MR. BECK: The first question.

Q What was it?

Q Was he offered the protection.

June
5

MR. BECK: No, he was not offered Secret Service protection.

Q Have security measures in the Governor's instance been increased?

MR. BECK: Security is a situation which we have always had under review and just as we have it under review now.

Q Has any immediate action been taken, though, to increase security today?

MR. BECK: I don't particularly care to get into that.

MR. NOFZIGER: We would just rather not discuss security.

MR. BECK: I don't think there is really any point to be served. We have taken security measures in the past and that's about as far as we want to go.

Q Without getting into details, is it yes or no to that?

MR. BECK: Yes or no to what?

Q To have you increased security.

MR. BECK: I don't want to go beyond that.

MR. NOFZIGER: I think we will just let it stand.

Q If you are spending state funds and using state personnel, why wouldn't you tell us whether or not you are using them?

MR. BECK: I'm not going to go beyond that, Murray, thank you.

Q Paul, is there any -- does the administration have any specific plans like supporting gun control legislation or anything specific that you are going to do?

MR. BECK: We have nothing specific in mind right now.

Q What is referred to here by aid and support to our local governments. What does he have in mind?

MR. BECK: Whatever the state -- whatever the state has and can assist the local government we will make it available if they have any need for it. For example, the Department of Justice obviously has the CII, and things like

that, anything like that.

Q Paul, I think we are entitled to know who you and the Governor thinks has thrown our nation into chaos and confusion.

MR. BECK: I think we are referring to people who are doing things that reflect a lack of respect for law and order primarily.

Q Which so-called leader in and out of public office, for instance, do you think fits this kind of category?

MR. BECK: I think that would be a judgment that you fellows can make better than I.

Q But you've made the judgment.

MR. BECK: I would rather leave it to you to interpret.

MR. NOFZIGER: We are just not going to get into the position of calling names or making accusations against certain people in this country. We are not going to get into that.

Q Lyn, you've already done that in the statement.

MR. NOFZIGER: Well, then we will stand on the statement and we will stand right there.

Q I was wondering if that refers to Kennedy himself.

MR. NOFZIGER: Well, you'll have to draw your own conclusions because the statement is there and we do not intend to go beyond it.

Q Paul, what can we assume in your ~~com~~mission of your security officer increase for the Governor, do you feel there is some sort of conspiracy involved here or there could be statewide repercussions or why are you doing this?

MR. BECK: Doing what?

Q Increasing security.

MR. BECK: I didn't say we were increasing security.

Q Are you?

MR. BECK: I didn't say we are not. I'm not saying.

Q In the ~~om~~mission what can we interpret?

MR. NOFZIGER: Paul, let Ed talk to this.

Q Speak in the microphone.

MR. BECK: Be my guest.

MR. MEESE: The thing on security is that we have been reviewing security all through the time here just as other Governors have done. As far as any unusual precautions today, that would be special and peculiar to today, the answer is generally no. At the same time we are constantly reassessing and we are reassessing in terms of this particular situation as we have been. So as far as getting into details of how many people we have and that sort of thing it is just not a good idea to have a lot of publicity about what precautions we are taking.

Q But generally there is a feeling that there are other problems that could be created in the state here as a result of the Kennedy's --

MR. MEESE: We know of none.

Q Have you been in contact with General Ames with reference to possibly alerting the National Guard?

MR. MEESE: I've been in contact with General Ames as we are almost every day and there's been no need found to alert the National Guard.

Q Could you tell us what your office's relationship is with the Police Chief in Los Angeles as far as direct investigation of this case?

MR. MEESE: Yes, the Governor, as he mentioned earlier, has indicated that any state resources, whatever that might be of help to the Los Angeles Police Department have been offered, but I think as you have seen from our own news information they have the situation pretty well in hand. The Attorney General also has offered the full assistance of the Department of Justice.

Q You feel that the Los Angeles Police Department is handling the situation well as it can be handled?

MR. MEESE: It is not for us to make judgments about any Police Department, but I think the results would give you the best conclusion on that.

Q Can we get a copy of the message you gave Mrs. Kennedy?

MR. BECK: It was a telephone, he just called.

Q He talked to her personally?

MR. BECK: No.

Q Paul --

MR. BECK: She was asleep at the time.

Q Do you have any ruling so far on the Supreme Court decision on the death penalty?

MR. MEESE: No, the Attorney General has not yet given us a ruling after examining the actual text of the Supreme Court decision.

Q When do you expect that?

MR. MEESE: I imagine we will hear something by the end of the week.

Q Do you think then there is a doubt, that the Supreme Court ruling does not apply to California?

MR. MEESE: This is what the Attorney General says, that he doesn't know whether it does or does not until he's had a chance to study the text of this opinion.

Q Can you tell us why you won't tell us that there are an increase or non-increased security measures for the Governor --

MR. BECK: Murray, I explained it quite well, I think.

Q You just said --

MR. BECK: Thank you very much.

---oOo---

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD JUNE 11, 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 read release # 394.)

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Now questions.

Q Governor, does the State of California need stricter gun control legislation?

A Well, the State of California already has probably the best gun control laws of any state in the union. There are areas -- any time that we can close loopholes with regard to the control of guns or keeping them from those people who shouldn't have them, we are interested in that. Always improvements that could be made, there is one that could be made at the federal level which we would anticipate and that is the -- a better control with regard to mail order guns. Not the banning of buying guns from mail order, but the idea of, for example, a provision to have mail order guns purchased by way of a licensed dealer within our own state so that on a national level we can force conformity within the state to our own already stringent laws. What is needed in addition is better use of the laws we already have. For example, if the Courts, which have largely ignored this, would make use of the fact that in California we have a law that increases the penalty quite severely in the case of crimes where the suspect is carrying a gun at the time of the crime, whether he uses the gun or not, and this is just not used as much as it should be used, that -- in other words, the idea that if a man is committing a crime and has in his possession a gun, you must assume that he had in mind using that gun, if forced to, and therefore he should pay an added

June
11

penalty.

Q What do you think of Mayor Alioto's effort in San Francisco for a gun turn-in?

A Well, I have difficulty seeing the use of it. I can see two particular kinds of people who would use it. First of all, the law-abiding citizen who represents no risk in possession of a gun and the possibility of a criminal in possession of a hot weapon that's been used in a crime and he has now a chance to dispose of the evidence.

Q In San Francisco they are proposing their own gun law that would be somewhat tighter than anybody else has. Do you think they are going too far?

A That's up to them. I'd have to see what they had in mind.

Q Governor, do you think that the waiting period should be increased between the time a person applies for a firearm and is allowed to purchase it?

A I haven't gone into that deeply, but it is my understanding that the present waiting period does not offer as much time as could be used for checking on the purchaser of the weapon. And if that's true, then it should be extended.

Q Governor, are you opposing this bill then that's before the Assembly Criminal Procedures Committee today?

A You know I don't comment on any bills till they get to my desk.

Q You've already commented on this bill SB 124.

A Well, this happens to be a bill that's part of the legislative -- part of the administration's program. So I comment on the things I asked for.

Q Do you think there is a certain hysteria attached here in the California legislature now to gun control laws as a result of the assassination of Robert Kennedy?

A I'm concerned--whether you want to call it hysteria or not, I'm concerned that all over the country because of this tragedy there is a tendency to look for the easy answers, and I'm concerned that -- that somehow people will focus their attention on this one facet and ignore a great many

other things that could be done and a great many other causes for the violence that's sweeping our land. I think that we should be paying far more attention to court decisions that have added to the permissiveness that we have in our land and that is a kind of over-simplification in leading the public down a road to believe that all that's needed is better control of guns and again I say this, any legislation which will aid in controlling the wrong person getting the gun is valuable and we should certainly look at it. But too much of the legislation that's proposed will have no effect on the potential criminal at all. It is just going to make it more difficult for the law-abiding, and so no useful purpose is served.

Q Governor, do you think violence portrayed on television has anything to do with the problem?

A Oh, I don't know. I'm not a psychiatrist in that sense of analyzing what reactions -- I really don't know. Perhaps -- I think that there is a lot of bad taste today in the -- in the violence, we are taking anything away from the imagination. I know in my own background in fighting I always used to say in a story that there was suspense in the story up until the time the fight started, but once you and the bad guy started to fight, the suspense is all over because every audience knew the good guy was going to win and there is a tendency today to keep trying to top the other fellow, and we have come just about as far as we can come without using real weapons in some of that violence. But, how far it goes in affecting children, I once -- I once got so disturbed about some of this myself that I went down and bought Grimms Fairy Tales and decided instead of television I was going to read my children Grimms Fairy Tales every night, and the first story I read, when I came to the 7th baby that had been murdered, I decided that maybe it had been going on for a longer time than I was aware.

Q Governor, do you think there is a need to extend existing state firearm controls to rifle and shotguns that would be done by the Crown bill?

A Well, again I don't want to get into specifics of

commenting on that. We have always recognized that it is the hand gun that the criminal most often uses. Again you would be getting into legislation that might be aimed more at the legitimate, law-abiding citizen.

Q Governor, last week you said that you did not intend to tolerate the spirit of permissiveness in courts and other institutions; I wonder if you'd tell us specifically what you intend to do about courts and the campuses and other institutions which you feel create -- help create the climate that caused the assassination of Robert Kennedy.

A In a large sense there are some things that we can't do about the courts. I think we have had a crime program -- for example, last year we were successful in getting passed the increase in penalties on crimes of violence here in the state, which I think was a healthy addition to our criminal procedure. We certainly intend to stand behind the administration of the colleges and universities and indeed do everything we can to bring to an end the lawlessness that has taken place on the campuses to enforce the right of the administration of those campuses to administer the rules, to take whatever action is necessary to bring this to an end.

Q Have you asked for any specific program or any kind of assistance or help from the campuses or from the courts themselves?

A Well, you've seen already, Chancellor Dumke has proposed a program and we stand behind that. I think as a trustee and as a regent, as an individual on those two boards I'm going to go much deeper into where we need to give further responsibility to the administrators for administering the campuses. I think there has been a tendency of recent years in answer to pressure from faculty groups and students to share that responsibility and I don't think they can delegate or share it. In the last analysis when the decision is made, the administrators must make the decision.

Q Governor, just last week you referred in your statement to leaders, words of leaders. Could you expand upon that?

A I don't think there is anything to expand on, Bill. I haven't kept a bibliography, but we know that all you have to do is check back through the press over a period of recent years and there has been expressed many times, sometimes with good intentions, perhaps; sometimes not -- but there has been a tendency to excuse the taking of the law in the individual's hand and if they are dissatisfied with it to encourage demonstrations and the -- and the breaking of the law and I use the word "demagogic", and I think in most instances the --

Q Governor, some people have interpreted that that you also meant Senator Kennedy as well as others. Did you mean to imply Senator Kennedy in use of those words, too, or not?

A No, I would think if you reviewed the words of Senator Kennedy and what he's been saying in the last few weeks here in California he had been advocating just the opposite, law and order and getting together and healing of the divisions, and the wounds between people and trying for peaceful settlement.

Q Yet only a couple of weeks ago, Governor, in a law and order statement you quoted Senator Kennedy directly and verbatim as an example of demagogic and irresponsible words of so-called leaders. And I'm wondering if that might be the cause of the confusion here. Also, who did you mean in your statement last week?

A Well, I think I've already answered that. Who did I mean, I said I didn't keep a bibliography. I think if you go back in a number of years and you will find and over the last decade, repeated statements by prominent people that did encourage and could be interpreted by those hearing them as encouraging them into violence with regard to dissent and taking literally the law into their own hands, encouraging all the way from civil disobedience on up to these more violent demonstrations, and I suggest if you want to compile a list of the names, you just simply go back through some of them.

Q Governor, after the murder of the Senator, by saying that we were the victims of an attitude brought by

these so-called leaders and yet you refuse to tell us who these leaders are.

A Yes, because I think for me now to suddenly try to pick out one or two, those would be the only names mentioned, without going back and seeing that there has been a whole atmosphere, a climate of this sort of thing.

Q How do you define demagogery, Governor?

A Well, I think we have defined it pretty well in the conversation right here. Those who with a lack of responsibility encourage others to do this kind of violent action to suit whatever purposes they have in mind.

Q Did you subsequently change your mind in any way on that, though? I see where you were quoted in the Joey Bishop show saying that it was a murder committed not over American issues, but over Jordanian issues. Do you think this climate -- so-called climate of permissiveness in this country has anything to do with that?

A No, I was saying that in answer to something else. I was saying that as a refutation, and I will repeat it -- a refutation of those people who immediately wanted to castigate 200 million Americans and make us feel some sense of guilt for this senseless act that has taken place, and I was pointing out that this wasn't even connected with any of our present American divisions, that here was a violence from a foreign war that was imported by an alien into our country that caused this tragic act.

Q Governor, do you see much value in the Presidential Commission appointed to look into national violence?

A Well, I hope that it won't be used simply to delay taking some of the action that should be taken; for example I hope that it wouldn't be used as an excuse for not signing the present crime bill that is on the President's desk.

Q Do you look on it really as a whitewash in the making?

A I didn't say that. I said I hope that it wouldn't be used to delay action that I think could be taken. I think that while studies are always valuable, I -- I believe that

there is a pretty good evidence today to indicate that the rise in crime rate can be laid to the inability any more of achieving swift and certain justice after the commission of a crime.

Q Governor, I'd like to get a couple things clarified. First, are you specifically equating the demonstrations of violence on campuses with the Kennedy assassination? And do I understand you to say that there is or is not -- should be or should not be a sense of guilt on the part of all of us for Kennedy's assassination?

A Not in the sense that some people immediately rushed in to call us a sick society. I don't think we are. I think that the most of the people in this country and have proved it in these last tragic days, if they are sick, they are sick with grief and they are sick with anger that these things should and could take place in a land where the overwhelming majority of us believe in law and order, and believe in a nation of laws. And I think the anger is of those who have over the years, have allowed this permissive-ness to grow, this idea that the criminal is not totally responsible, that he's a victim of society rather than an enemy of society.

Q Can we go to another subject?

A All right.

Q On the Alquist measure that's passed the Senate calling for open Presidential primaries, would you support that or not if it gets by the Assembly?

A Well, again let me wait till it gets downstairs and see what it says.

Q Do you have any strong feelings either way on it at this point?

A I haven't really had much time to go into that whole thing in my own mind, even as to whether I do or don't believe. I have always more or less believed in open primaries, as I said on a number of occasions, but at the same time I wonder how far we should go in restricting the judgment of a party; the selecting of nominees of a party really is in the hands of that party, and I haven't made up my mind yet

however I think we should go -- I think that the Oregon primary style I'm not in agreement with that. I challenge the allowing people to simply put on and then require the affidavit they do for anyone to get off that ballot.

Q Well the proposed primary would be very close to the Oregon primary. Does that mean then you would be unfavorable toward it?

A As I say, I haven't really had time to get into this and look at it or crystallize my own thinking.

Q May I get another clarification of one thing there that Larry asked. I don't think you answered directly. Do you think the equation between the violence on campuses and the assassination of Robert Kennedy is any co-relation?

A No, I think I was drawing the parallel more there with the charges again that this assassination was the result of a sickness on the part of the American people. And I think we -- I think we tend to overlook that political violence is not just ~~knew~~ to this period. We have had recently several shocks, but we tend to forget that again people from outside our country a few years ago actually tried to invade a dwelling of the President of the United States when it was Harry Truman, and some Secret Service men were killed in that assassination attempt. We forget that there was another group that came into the gallery of the United States Senate and sprayed the Senate chamber.

LYN: The House.

A Was it the House? All right, the House. Are you sure about that? I thought it was the Senate.

(Laughter).

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Let's look it up.

Q Governor, what bills presently before the Legislature do you consider to be major plans in your creative society platform -- program, rather?

A Well, of course I'm vitally interested in the one that will now be reconsidered -- we had the judicial -- the Merit Plan, the judicial appointments. I haven't actually totalled up yet to see what still is up there. The pornography bill, of course, we have been trying for

that. There are a number of others I'm sure that are getting no place that are buried in committees, things that we tried last year and were disappointed in. Some to do with crime. Some to do with the secret ballot in labor unions.

Q Governor, now that Dr. Rafferty has won the primary, are you supporting him in his campaign for election?

A I certainly am. As I said before, and I would have supported whoever was the victim -- the victor.

(Laughter)

A Come to think of it, after my own campaign pressure in mind, I think the first word was right, too.

Q Governor, there's been some talk about a write-in campaign for Senator Kuchel. Would you be in favor of this?

A No, I think this would be divisive. The decision has been made by the party and I have a feeling that Senator Kuchel would react the same way.

Q What do you think put Dr. Rafferty over?

A I wouldn't honestly know. I know that there was a dramatic change apparently in the polls shortly before the election in which he started coming up, so I wouldn't know at this stage how to analyze that. I only know that my interest now is in seeing that a unified effort goes forward behind the choice of the party so that we can hold that seat for the Republican party.

Q Are you satisfied the 11th commandment was properly obeyed in all particulars during the campaign?

A Well, I have to say that I've run into no evidence of bitterness. It was a heartfelt campaign. They were both critical of each other and the positions and so forth, but evidently there were no personalities injected in any way that caused a great walk away or bitterness.

Q Governor, can I ask you again, since the assassination have you taken any steps at all to try and repair the climate to which you alluded in California, either the campus or anywhere else? Have you initiated any kind of

program, inquiry?

A . No, since the -- when I say no, not that I don't think there is much to be done, but this has been a belief of mine that we must come to this -- an end of this kind of soft permissiveness, soft on crime approach, so I've already been embarked on everything that I could do to end this in California. And if so there was no great change needed whatsoever.

Q Do you have -- you haven't answered -- well, there is a letter that has been sent out to every trustee and regent from you calling for some specific things. I wonder if you could tell us about that.

A Well, this is a letter, again, as I said earlier, that's in general support of instituting more authority in the hands of the administrators of the colleges and universities, and this, too, was approved prior to the tragedy.

Q Governor --

A It is not as a result of it.

Q Have you accepted the offer of security proposed by President Johnson for presidential candidates?

A No, our -- our own people are in constant touch and liaison with regard to this, accept any help with regard to reviewing our own procedures. There is a constant and going review of them here. I haven't bothered with the details of that myself, but I've --

Q Would you reject it if it is offered to you?
Have you rejected it?

A No, as a matter of fact there's never been anything in the nature of a kind of offer that was made to the avowed candidates in the campaign who were out campaigning. I believe there's been an inquiry made and I know our people are speaking to this inquiry as to perhaps a review of our own procedures.

Q Who made the inquiry?

A This inquiry came by way of -- directed by way of the Treasury Department.

Q Secret Service?

A Yes, the Treasury Department is the agency in charge of the Secret Service.

Q What did they inquire about?

A Well, this was an inquiry, as I say, that was made only with regard to whether they could be of any help, whether we had any problems and as I say our own staff here are undoubtedly in communication with them regarding their suggestions or seeking their advice. Anything they can suggest as an improvement.

Q You haven't made a final decision yet, Governor, whether you would accept this offer?

A As I say, it wasn't so much an offer. It was an inquiry.

Q But no decision has been made by your office?

A No.

Q Governor, the moment you become an actual candidate when you are nominated, then will you accept the offer of the Secret Service people?

A Squire, you are a bad boy.
(Laughter)

Q Well, you said you were going to be nominated, Governor, as a Favorite Son candidate in California.

A Well, actually they are at the convention, and I -- I have never thought into such details with regard to that. It is my understanding that the present avowed candidates weren't really asked and had very little to say about whether they would have this protection or not. Maybe I'm wrong, but it is my understanding that the government just simply provided this protection and you know in the days of the President himself, when that decision is made there is the open area the President cannot overrule. He obeys in this instance. He cannot second-guess or order any changes with regard to Secret Service procedure. They tell him what the procedure will be.

Q Do you think you need any extra security with the security you already have?

A I don't know. As I say, there is a constant review going on just as there was a review of the whole capitol

security after the invasion of the Assembly.

Q Governor, have the Nixon people contacted you since the California primary?

A Now, wait a minute, I'm trying to remember whether it was before or after. I've had a telephone conversation with Dick Nixon, yes.

Q Would you care to tell us what it was about?

A Nothing more than the same kind of conversation that -- that I had with Nelson Rockefeller which was regard to both of them with letting me know that they were considering speaking dates here in the state, coming into some of our service clubs and making speaking dates, and I told them to let us know their schedules so that we could do everything we could to make transportation available and so forth.

Q Did the word "Vice President" ever come into the conversation?

A Never, not once.

Q Governor, do you plan to change your method of campaigning or public appearances now

A No.

Q In any way?

A No. I don't think I've -- I'm as free to make as many in these last weeks here of the legislative session. I want to do all that I can and I hope when the campaign really gets under way to actively support the party and the party's candidates.

Q Governor, now that the primary is over, will you consider it proper for Mr. Nixon or Mr. Rockefeller to come into California and seek second or third ballot support from the members of your delegation?

A That's the name of the game. I have confidence that either or both of them doing that would at the same time respect the reason for having the kind of primary we did, and in other words they wouldn't do anything to now create a divisiveness or a bad spirit to suddenly render useless the effort that we have made so far.

Q Do you expect they will do that?

A What's that?

Q Do you expect they will do that?

A No, I said that I was quite confident --

Q You expect they will come into the state?

A As I said, I've had inquiries already from them or notice that they did want to accept some invitations here.

Q Governor, are you concerned or disturbed at all about Republican party unity in that, Governor, the overwhelming of the Republicans did not vote for your Favorite Son delegation in the primaries?

A Well, the overwhelming percentage of Republicans did not fail to vote for -- as a matter of fact, my percentage of vote was just about the same as the Favorite Son percentage for the other Favorite Sons who have run uncontested in the state of California. It was somewhere in the neighborhood, I think, of 65 per cent or so -- varied between 63 and 66 as the votes were coming in. And I was just curious enough to find out since so many of you wanted to make inquiries of that kind with some kind of implication behind it that maybe there was resistance. I discovered that what I'd said was true, that where there is an uncontested spot on the ballot people just don't bother to mark it and this has been true of every other one. It's always run around the 60 to 65 per cent mark on Favorite Son delegations in California.

Q It doesn't indicate a lack of unity or support?

A No, I don't think so. It just indicates a lack of -- of going to bother to mark a ballot when they realize that there was no contest.

Q Governor, in our district where the Congressman is running unopposed, he got roughly twice as many votes as you did on the Republican ballot. Would you explain that?

A Well, I can't explain it. I could only tell you what's been typical of unopposed Favorite Son delegations.

Q Governor, a reported candid, objective biography has been written about you by Mr. Boyarski. You've had it a month or so now. Have you had a chance to give us your candid and objective reaction to it?

A I haven't read it and that's an embarrassing question to ask a potential reader in the presence of the author.

SQUIRE: Any more questions, gentlemen? Thank you, Governor.

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD JUNE 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.)

---oOo---

SQUIRE: Any announcements?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: No statements, no.

Q Governor, would you give us your reaction to recent gun control legislation introduced by Win Shoemaker and the general theme of an effort to get gun control into this session?

A Well, as I have said before, I'm in favor of any legislation that will make it more difficult for the wrong person to get a gun. And I'm opposed to any that is -- simply will result in needless harrassment of the legitimate citizen. I won't comment on Mr. Shoemaker's because at the moment it isn't legislation. It is nothing but a press statement and no legislation has been drawn up to my knowledge, so there is no sense in commenting on it until we see what it is and what it contains.

Q Governor, what do you think of the ordinance being considered now by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors registering all firearms within the city?

A Well, this is up to the people of San Francisco what they want to do. I've never myself been convinced and no one has ever shown me a way whereby registration of firearms makes it any more difficult for the illegal possessor of a gun to have one. They find their guns and get them illegally anyway. Here in California, one thing that I've advocated and would advocate is a better enforcement of the gun laws we have. I'm not speaking of law enforcement officers, I'm speaking particularly of the courts. For

June
19

example we have a law that makes the commission of a crime if you have in your possession at the time a gun while you are committing that crime, that the penalty is greater than committing the same crime without a gun. Even though the gun isn't used. As a matter of fact, I would support legislation to increase that. I would like to see a much more severe penalty on the assumption that anyone committing a crime and having a gun in his possession must have in mind the possibility of using that gun. And this is -- I don't know whether it still holds in England, but this for many years was one of the reasons why policemen in England didn't have to carry guns, because the penalty was virtually the same as the penalty for murder, simply to commit a crime carrying a gun. Whether we go that far or not, I'd like to see that stiffened. I am in favor of legislation that will, with regard to mail order sale of guns, that will make people have to comply with our own state laws. So I say we do have some very stringent laws here in the state.

Q Would you find it necessary to veto legislation that required every citizen to register his firearm?

A Well, let me say again you are asking me again something I would or would not do and you know I don't answer those until I see what comes down to the desk.

Q Governor, you said that you don't think that registration in itself will do any good, but would you tell us what harm it would do? If it is possible to do any good at all, wouldn't it be advisable?

A Well, one harm would simply be a needless harrassment of the legitimate citizen. The alleged assassin in the tragedy of two weeks ago was actually in violation of several of our laws with regard to guns and the crime was committed. I only point this out to say that not in any spirit of hysteria, not in any kind of emergency atmosphere, we should approach this subject with the full counsel of law enforcement officers, with those who know best about this. And wherever there are loopholes that will strengthen law enforcement and make it, as I say, more difficult for the psychopath, the mentally incompetent, the criminal and the narcotics addict

and so forth to get a gun, we should strengthen all those and, as I say, I'm in favor right now with greater strength with regard to mail order sale of guns because this is an instance in which you can use the mail order purchase of a gun to violate our own state laws.

Q Governor, wouldn't --

Q Are you suggesting then that it is proper to license persons who wish to possess guns, because that would be one way to ascertain whether or not they are competent.

A Well, that would be one way, but let me just say in that connection we have a method now with hand guns with regard to the checking the delay from the time of purchase until the gun is delivered, five days. I would favor lengthening that period because I have heard here's an instance where I've heard from law enforcement itself that five days is often not enough time. I've also been informed by some gun dealers that they have made the delivery at the end of the five day period and then received after that period information that the individual should not have had the gun. So if the period is 10 days -- 15 days, I would take law enforcement's word on what the period should be, and then we should lengthen it.

Q In view of the fact that you favor some gun controls and Assemblyman Shoemaker seems to favor others, do you plan to have your administration plan to sponsor any amendments to a bill that would incorporate the suggestions that you want for gun controls?

A We have discussed no plans of any kind. There is so much legislation suggested and proposed that we are waiting to see what happens.

Q Governor, do you feel this current drive for controls of guns and other weapons is an erosion of the people's right to bear arms?

A No. One concern I have with it right now is that in a kind of emotionalism, not that, as I say, no hesitancy on my part for anything that will improve the situation, but I think in the emotionalism there is a

tendency to overlook a great many other things that should be done with regard to law enforcement in this land. Legislation, such as the bill that is now -- the Crime bill that is now on the president's desk and that I believe should be signed. It is a crime bill that with regard to voluntary confessions -- that would nullify the Miranda decision which has been a great factor in making it more difficult to convict a criminal. It also contains a feature regarding block grants from the Federal government to aid in law enforcement at the state and local level. I just would hate to see us concentrate on just one facet of this problem, at the same time that we don't get a number of other things that should be done.

Q Governor, would you favor extending to rifles and shotguns existing handgun restrictions in the state of California?

A Yes, without any features of registration. I wouldn't see any reason why there should not be a period there to make sure that the individual is -- is a proper person. A legitimate citizen, in other words, entitled to make the purchase.

Q Governor, do you see anything in the laws or the courts in California that are going to make prosecution of the alleged assassin difficult?

A Oh, I'd rather let a lawyer answer that. I haven't kept track of all of the things that have been said and the -- I know something of the controversy about whether the case has been prejudiced by some of the statements made at the -- particularly around the time of the crime. But I'm -- I'm not legally qualified to comment on that.

Q What I really had in mind, you made some comments about the problems being with the courts, with the way they are pursuing or interpreting the laws. Do you -- do you see anything here that should be corrected or are you satisfied that we can handle this situation just as you feel we can handle the gun controls with our present laws?

A Well, I don't -- as I say again, I don't know of any specifics that would come under some of the recent

Supreme Court decisions. The ones that seem to have caused the most problem with law enforcement have had to deal with confessions, and to date there's been no talk of such a thing in this case.

Q Change the subject?

A All right.

Q No.

A Well, wait a minute.

Q What do you think of the idea of licensing individual gun owners?

A I'm willing to investigate anything, to find out how, as I say, the proper control against the wrong person and yet at the same time not have undue harrassment of the -- of the legitimate citizen, and I haven't looked at that enough, but I'm certainly willing to look at it.

Q Change the subject.

Q I have one more, just borderline, governor.

A All right.

Q I've been asked by my editors to ask you if you could explain^{to}/what you were referring in your speech in Indiana when you were talking about the assassination generally, and so forth. You said, "In this week of tragedy six policemen in Chicago have been killed in the line of duty." Chicago police department tells apparently that they had no policemen killed in -- were you referring to some mass assassination of policemen?

A No, no, as a matter of fact I just have to -- just have to plead a typo error there. Actually I came out -- I got this information out of a newspaper story.

Q Oh.

A And what the story should have read was that assaulted, and in the haste of the speech that my usual way was being put together right up to the minute of departure, I went ahead and said the wrong thing. Yesterday I happened to use this same incident and the same discussion in the speech in San Francisco and corrected that. I can tell you though that the number was that many at least within the

nation in that same week.

Q My one gun control question, Governor. The Crime Statistics Bureau say the one use of guns in California, statistics in the realm of 65 per cent of people killed by guns were all friends or all in domestic relations and only 17 per cent are criminal elements. Do you think there should be something on gun controls for keeping them out of the hands of hotheads?

A Well, I think again anything that we look at with regard to anything we can determine about--the same as we do with regard to drivers license, about who should drive a car, should be considered. But I'd like to also point out in the crime of passion -- are we to assume that the crime of passion would never take place if there wasn't a gun available? There are other weapons and many times the other weapons are used in crimes. As a matter of fact, they probably outnumber guns in their use.

Q Governor, those people are yelling out there, yelling for you. They are so-called poor people, and they want to meet with you. Will you meet with them once you leave here?

A No, I have no plans to. I'm willing and available and have been to meet with any of our citizens on these problems. I have been going out of my way and going into the communities, in the urban areas to meet on these problems as well as the rural areas. I do not believe that this kind of demonstration serves any useful purpose because the intent of this administration is to do everything it can to alleviate and to possibly eliminate poverty, to provide jobs for those people in the state who should have them and who want them and I think our record speaks for itself in that regard. I have gone out of my way to get suggestions. They can make an appointment with me any time to sit down and discuss any suggestions they have, make any inquiries as to our plans, any proposals for legislation, things that would help in the problem. But -- and as a matter of fact anticipating such a thing this morning thereon my schedule was cleared in such a way that they

could, and they made no effort to try and see me.

Q Right there we had a press conference earlier. They said they had been in your office to try to see you. Is that true or not?

A That is not true. I understand that some simply came into the outer office there, introduced themselves. No mention was made of seeing me whatsoever. But they wouldn't --

Q How are you going to get around seeing them?

A What?

Q How are you going to get around seeing them? There is no back door here that I know of.

(Laughter)

A Would you believe walking with my eyes shut?

(Laughter)

Q Governor, another subject. Do you have any comment on the Supreme Court ruling on the discrimination matter?

A No. As a matter of fact we are waiting for the Supreme Court decision. You are speaking of the housing bill?

Q Right.

A We are waiting for that decision to come out, and then we will meet with the Attorney General, and with our real estate commissioner to see how that affects us, but until we get the decision --

Q Governor, let me -- the passage of the budget by the Assembly, I'd like to get your reaction -- out of that house and into a conference committee in regard to the \$9 million dollar cut made in the University of California Research and Extension budget.

A Well, it is hard for me to believe that that proposed cut in the Agricultural Extension and Research budget, \$9 million dollars was made seriously and did not represent some kind of a -- a political horse trading, and I am confident that it will be restored. Certainly hopeful that it will be restored in the conference committee. It would be a terrible blow to the number one industry of this

state to have this happen. It would strike a blow at the -- at the very things that have made agriculture as great as it is in California. There is no state compared to us. We have 200-- we produce 250 products. We supply 40 per cent of the vegetables for the whole United States and 98 per cent of our agriculture is out on the free market, supply and demand, with no government subsidy or controls. And part of this has been due to the research, to the great extension service which is a model for the whole nation, and as I say, I just can't believe that anyone was serious.

Q Governor, in regard to that, earlier in your administration you set up a special group to look into 130 acre limitation should be able to resolve that problem.

A It is 160 acre limitation and we have sent to our delegation in Congress, we have sent a recommendation that does not call for the outright cancellation, because we think that's trying for the impossible, but it has called for a phasing up and stepping up to 640 acres. And this of course will require legislative action at the national level, as well received by a great many of our Congressmen in Washington and so we can only just push now by persuasion from this level.

Q Governor at this late hour what are the prospects for property tax relief?

A Well, thanks to the Speaker of the Assembly they are not very bright. I think this has been a betrayal of the people. I believe that the two methods we suggested first was a direct repayment to the individual property taxpayer on his bill. This was refused last year and again this year. The proposal of returning it to the counties by way of a half cent of sales tax has been made impossible down to this date. We are still seeking ways that we can get this money back to the people, even if it is not directly in property tax relief. They are entitled to it. They were promised and they have been betrayed on a purely partisan political act.

Q Governor, what -- why is it the Speaker of the Assembly's fault when the bill has already passed the Assembly

and is hung up in the Finance Committee?

A Because the Speaker knows very well that he put amendments on this bill that made it completely impossible and unacceptable.

Q But those amendments have been taken out, Governor.

A And we passed the deadline and it is before a committee that will not now release it.

Q Governor, I'd like to ask a national political question. Do you think the Pueblo will become a campaign issue?

A Well, I don't think an issue, in a place where somebody is going to run for office on the basis of get the Pueblo back, but I would say it fits in and is a part and parcel of the -- what should be the Republican crusade with regard to the lack of leadership, the national level, here in America today. And I don't know of anyone in America, I haven't run into anyone on all of my travels that doesn't feel a great sense of humiliation about this and a feeling that some -- we have let down our young men in an intolerable fashion.

Q Let them down in negotiations or in the actions right afterwards?

A In the actions right afterward.

Q Governor, I'd like to get back to the property tax for just a second. What is your office doing in any attempt to try to -- what specifically are you doing in a try to attempt to get some property tax relief? There still apparently is time to get that done.

A I'd rather not talk in specifics right now because we are in just a discussion stage, looking at some of the legislation that is still up there in the mill and looking at a variety of ways whereby we can return this money to the people. They were promised that it would -- they would get it back.

Q Will returning it to the people in the form of letting a sales tax drop by half a penny, would this be acceptable if property tax itself failed?

A Well, to me this is the kind of a yo-yo business,

if we do that. First of all, this would be the last analysis, of course, they just wouldn't have collected it. But it also would throw the entire revenue estimates out of balance because the half a cent of sales tax amounts to more than the \$155 million dollars. It amounts to more by some \$40 million. So we would suddenly have a loss of \$40 million dollars in revenue. But also we have a group putting together legislation for the next session, dealing with -- with the total subject of tax reform, and as far as anyone has studied, we have to assume that sales tax must bear a large share of this burden in tax reforms; a broader based tax than some of the more narrow based taxes to reduce it, and then come back a year later and suggest putting it back up again, this just doesn't make much sense.

Q Does that suggest that you are considering that perhaps the sales tax would have to go up beyond the 5 cents it now is?

A I didn't say that at all, but I'm sure that it would, that it would be inherent in any tax reform that is aimed at correcting some of the inequities; I'm quite sure that it would go at least to where it is.

Q Governor, your property tax relief bill may come up Tuesday in Senate Finance. Senator Miller said it probably would. Are you taking any steps to convince members of that committee to vote that bill to the floor?

A Well, I -- there is no question about where I stand on it.

Q Governor, are you contacting individual members of the committee or are you just letting them make their own decision on their own -- their own consciences?

A No, as a matter of fact I hadn't -- I had just learned now the schedule when this is coming up.

Q Governor, as it stands now the Assembly version of the budget is about \$21 million dollars larger than the one that you sent upstairs. . . If that \$21 million dollars extra is still in it when it comes down to your desk, is it fair to say that you will probably do some major blue pencilling?

A Well, so far in the budget discussions it seems

that this budget as it has been passed along has not been realized to the expectation of revenues, and all I can tell you is when it comes to my desk I will then have to consider it on that basis and the budget will have to fit the expected revenues, and I'll take whatever action is necessary to make it do that.

Q Governor, while I think -- I think the consensus is general that there is horse trading involved in this agriculture research and extension division fund for the University, there apparently seems to be some serious effort to keep in the budget this 7.4 million dollar reduction thing to try to force the Board of Regents to rescind their fee increase. Do you have any new comments on that? I know you commented on it when it was first put in there.

A Well, yes, at least one member of the Board of Regents did everything he could to kill that increased charge at the Regents meeting, and failing in that, to designate some uses for it with regard to a student aid, and it seems to be a slight inconsistency now in claiming that that money must all be used for expenses covered by the general fund when the whole purpose was to make more aid available to needy students. And it is a -- I think again here that there are some political gun and games going on with this money.

Q Well, Governor, the Speaker says that you don't have any plan -- not the Speaker, but Shoemaker says that you don't have any plan to use this money for student aid, that you don't have any definite definitive proposal up, that you don't, the Regents don't, nobody has, until he sees the proposal. Have you made a proposal?

A They know also this is under consideration by the University and the Regents now, and they know in the discussions and in the passage of this, a rough proposal was made, for the uses of this money that did involve more than half of it going for student aid, for scholarships, for needy students.

Q This year?

A Yes.

Q This fiscal year?

A Yes.

Q Governor, there seems to be a development out in the hall now. The people who were in charge of the demonstration out there say that they intend to stay there until they can see you and that they are prepared to go to jail. Now, what directives do you have to the State Police Officers and so forth?

A Well, you catch me with that question up here. Wait till I've had time to case the situation and find out what's going on. But I think that this would be an indication that this is again one of the coercive type demonstrations that is not aimed at really accomplishing anything.

SQUIRE: Anything more, fellows? Thank you,
Governor.

---oO---