

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 –
09/30/1969, 11/18/1969, 12/02/1969

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 SEPTEMBER 30, 1969

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: Before we get into the questions, I would like to talk to you today about an epidemic. There will be statements on this issue.

(Whereupon Governor Reagan read Release #557)

Q Governor, is there any way that Operation Intercept could be carried out without -- with a little less inconvenience?

A Well, I don't know just how it could be done. Perhaps some of the inconvenience is necessary to impress on everyone concerned the importance of stopping this.

Q Governor, some people have suggested that our country's attitude towards drugs parallels the country's attitude towards alcohol in the 20's, that people, especially young people, just don't want these laws and are simply not going to obey them.

A Well, what if they decided that they didn't want the law against murder. I don't think the comparison is valid. We know the effect of one. We know what can happen with over-indulgence in alcohol, but we also know and we know the tragedy of the disease called "alcoholism" but in regard to these drugs and what they do, I just don't think there can be any comparison whatsoever. It isn't that you are just -- I myself am opposed to laws that simply protect someone from themselves, but again we get into the area of trying to protect us from each other. And 50 per cent of the crime that is estimate, if not more, is committed in an attempt to finance the narcotic's habit. It is committed by addicts, and this makes it a case of protecting us from each other.

Q Governor, as you are probably aware of, when you talk to young people about this problem they may say, O. K., they accept the danger of hard drugs, but they just can't accept that there is a serious danger for most of them from marijuana and that attitude

may carry over and lessen their belief that hard drugs are dangerous. What is your feeling on marijuana compared to the hard drugs? Do you think the hard drugs should be the real target and perhaps a lessening of the attack on marijuana?

A No, I don't. And I know that it is understandable that the young people feel this way, because they are being indoctrinated that way by any number of adults that should know better. Now, I grant you there is a difference of opinion, there is a certain -- you can find certain medical or scientific claims that marijuana is not harmful or dangerous and that it does come under the same category as something like alcohol, but you can find an equally, and I think a larger body of scientific opinion that this is not true, that to use the technicalities of claiming marijuana isn't addictive is to use a medical technicality that it isn't addictive in the sense that there are no withdrawal pains if you quit. But almost everyone has agreed that it is psychologically addictive much the same thing. I'm not -- I'm not equipped to go into all of the details, but I do know a great body of information that has been collected by those who are concerned, I know that among other things, in practically every country in the world where marijuana has been legitimate, legal for decades and centuries past, those countries are trying to eliminate its use and they can't understand a country like our own even considering for a minute, mainly because they have had centuries to see what it has done to their people, and even if -- even if by some chance that body of scientific opinion should be proven correct, that says it is not harmful, it would seem to me that anyone who has any regard for himself and the physical machinery that he's been endowed with, would say that until the score is in, until it is definite that one side or the other is right in this, you don't take the chance. I've said this is a little bit like coming up to two engineers at the approach to a bridge, and asking their opinion on whether it is safe to go across the bridge, and one says, "No, I think the bridge will collapse, you shouldn't," and the other one says, "I think you can make it." So you decide to take his opinion and you try to go across. I think if there is that much argument about the thing, maybe we better wait till we find out for sure which one of the two engineers is right.

Q Is the statement to increase the number of state narcotic agents or another method of step-up of state employees?

A I can't tell you right now what -- well, maybe Ed can.

ED MEESE: Two years ago there was a quarter of a million dollars just for this purpose. This will be considered in the next budget, too.

A I didn't think we had any plans right now.

Q Governor, the largest single Intercept last year picked up by the border at San Diego, at least, was dangerous drugs -- they picked up more than a million pills, the bulk of which were manufactured by American pharmaceutical firms and shipped to Mexico. Don't you think there is something that can be done to prevent this flow back and forth?

A I think at the Federal level, and I understand there's been great discussion about this and something should. Maybe you'd like to hear some of the figures about Operation Intercept right now. In the first week they picked up 750 pounds of marijuana, 60 pounds of peyote, 4 ounces of heroin, and in just one night, on the 28th of September, they picked up 78 pounds of hashish, 20 ounces of heroin and 440 pounds of marijuana. Now, that 440 pounds would make 316,800 marijuana cigarettes. The operation is, I think -- is succeeding pretty well. I'm sure they are also on the alert for those pills that are coming in, but you are right, that if the origin is in this country, and it is a round trip, this means that nationally we better pay some attention to that problem.

Q Governor, there seems to be general agreement on the need for more research and information on drugs and yet at the end of the session you reduced from 80,000 to 35,000 a bill that was passed nearly unanimously by the Legislature that would expand the U.C. Drug Information Project. Isn't that kind of an action inconsistent with what you are concerned, as you are expressing it here?

A No, I don't think so because in some instances some of these things that had to be done in the budget were because things of that kind were being handled in other areas and there was an area of duplication, and faced with financial need, duplication we couldn't afford. And I can't recall with all of those 1700 bills what was the reason for that reduction, but I have a hunch that

if I went back and checked the notes on it, I would find that it was something to do -- something of this kind, in the duplication.

Q Different subject, Governor?

Q One ~~more~~ on the other one.

A All right.

Q Don't you think -- what do you think if in the light of the fact that the average teenager does not accept your feelings on marijuana, do you think this is an urgent program to find out what the real effect of marijuana is or not? Do you see a need for a crash program, to find out what the effects of marijuana are? Is it habit forming? Is it --

A Well, I think, as I said before, that I'm not equipped right now to recite off to you all that's been done by the great statewide program that we have already under way. But I think we know enough to know -- and in my opinion I'm convinced, and as I said before, I think the greatest body of opinion is that it is a danger, psychologically addictive, is harmful, and is harmful to others in the things that take place while under the influence of it, and I would -- I would suggest that some of you on that should get some of the information that now will be made available. You recall, there was a press conference a couple of weeks ago and we presented a doctor who was a part of our program on this drug problem, and who gave some information. There will be literature if there isn't already, on this and I think you'll find the answers to some of the questions. I think that our young people are being deliberately indoctrinated by some who for whatever reason are continuing to tell them this is like chewing gum or something.

Q Governor, you referred to some countries that are stepping up their marijuana laws because of what you said it was doing to their people. What are some of those countries?

A Well, one of the countries that the doctor told me had expressed their opinion was Nigeria, in which they said, "How anyone --" they said, "We have had hundreds of years to see what this does to our people." They said for any country to deliberately legitimize, or legalize this is just the height of folly, "We want to go the other way."

Q Governor, who do you think is doing --

A Wait.

Q You said that 50 per cent of crime -- of the crime was caused or committed by addicts, to feed their habit. Can you elaborate on that?

A This is the estimate from all our law enforcement agencies, although every time you talk to someone actually on the firing line they tell you they think the estimate is probably low, that maybe it is even higher than that.

Q Who do you think is doing the indoctrination?

A Well, I think all of those -- I think the type of people like a Timothy Leary -- I think those professors and teachers who have occasionally gone into print and have -- urging it and have admitted that on the campus or in the school they urge youngsters to try it and that claiming that it is not harmful and even that it might be beneficial to them. You had your --

Q No.

Q Now, can we change the subject?

Q No, one more. Just to ask if you've ever stated your position on the relation of cigarettes to health and the spread of cigarettes among young people. Have you ever stated your position on that? If so, what is it?

A No, I've been a little self-conscious being a non-smoker. I hear, of course, we are talking about a problem in which we are urging people to protect themselves. I would be -- I'm not one who believes that we should try to ban this by law. I'm not one who believes that we should ban the advertising of this because here we are getting into the area of protecting an individual from himself. I don't think anyone goes out and wrecks an automobile while under the influence of a cigarette. I, myself, believe that it is pretty foolish to smoke them now in the light of medical evidence with regard to the harm that can come from them. But I've often thought that before the government in Washington continues talking about whether to ban advertising, maybe the government ought to review its own position about subsidizing the growing of tobacco, which it still does.

Q Governor, in Operation Intercept it treats a symptom. In your opinion, what are some of the causes why young people turn to marijuana?

A Well, that's a very hard question, I think, to answer. I think part of it is because they are being urged to. I think there is a rebellious thing. I think the same thing that made a kid once upon a time go out behind a barn and sneak a cigarette. I think it is a kind of a rebellion against the establishment as they put it now, that they are striking back at whatever they are told not to do. I don't know that I could go beyond those. After they become psychologically addicted, then of course they are just simply living proof that it is an addictive drug in the sense that it creates a habit.

Q A contention has been made by some that marijuana, like pornography, is attractive because it is illicit. That is one of the reasons why you used the word "rebellion" yourself, that they go after it because it gives them a chance to strike back at whatever authority they are rebelling.

A Well, I know. Now this comes up as to the question of should or shouldn't it be legalized. And I've asked, and I'll ask you, sometimes in discussions of this kind when you envision the possibility of marijuana being legalized, do you envision it as maybe just what it is now, only the people who are doing it, who are smoking it, buying it, can buy it without having to break the law or find some law-breaker from which to obtain it? And most people, that's their reaction, they think well, nothing would be any different except that the person could get it easier. And I think you are being very short-sighted if anyone thinks that. We live in a free economy. The moment that this would be legalized it now becomes a business, and they are going to try to build the market and if marijuana were legalized you've got to envision billboards, television advertisements, companies with great brand names advertising as much as they can to try and create an additional market to convince people they should smoke it, and then competing with each other as to which brand they will buy. And I don't know whether I'm supposed to tell this or not, or whether it's been checked out, but it's been reported to us that already, just in the event that it might be legalized there have been 14 trade names or applications for trade names submitted to the federal government by companies getting ready to go into a high-powered business of selling packages marijuana cigarettes, if it should ever become

legal, and then I think you have the problem if we should turn out to -- that those who claim the evils for it are correct, and I think they are, then you have the problem of trying to undo something that will have been turned on to create millions of users, not just a convenience for the few people today that may want to use it. I don't think we can afford that.

Q I have one -- want to get to another subject, but I think --

A All right.

Q Has your Finance Director made known to you his plans, if he is going to resign or not?

A No, he just checked in for the first time from his vacation. And we haven't had a talk yet. I don't know what decision he's made.

Q Governor, in view of the condition of the Assembly Chamber and also a special you made, I understand is it now definite that there will be no special session on tax reform?

A As a matter of fact, I would have to say now I -- I doubt that there would be. We have proceeded and are proceeding, getting all the input we can on the proposals that we have made, the basic principals of them haven't changed. I think perhaps here and there we have found some -- cleaned up some items that were of concern to some people, found a little better methods still within the framework of the basic principle, and I believe we talked to the legislative leaders, they are willing to go with this as the first item in January, and I think with this we can get this on the ballot, constitutional portions of it and -- that means the whole program, in time for the coming election in '70.

Q You think --

Q You looked a little puzzled when I said the Assembly Chamber.

A That's right, it took me a minute. I understand they are doing some remodeling up there.

Q Right.

A Well --

Q Governor, you mentioned the elections of 1970. Have you reached a decision as to your own political plans yet? If not, when do you foresee that you might reach a decision?

A Well, still no snow on the Sierras. No, I don't know. I haven't -- I haven't -- I'm not prepared to make any statement one

way or the other.

Q Governor --

Q You haven't what, Governor, you haven't made up your mind?

A What?

Q You haven't decided yet what you are going to do?

A Just -- I won't make any comment, I haven't, no.

Q Do you agree with the federal government's decision to drop lawsuits against the automobile companies for failure to put on adequate smog control devices, to do speedy enough research into that field?

A Well, actually if I understand correctly, and I wish at times like this I was a lawyer, this has to do with a past situation with regard to the automobile industry. It involves the federal government alone. It does not preclude California or any county or anyone else from taking any action they may feel is necessary or any action now. And I understand that the consent decree is not anything that will set back or in any way handicap our own program in California and what we are trying to do. Have I correctly summed it up there, Counselor?

ED MEESE: Yes, sir, you ought to be admitted to the bar.

Q Governor, do you think that the State of California should prosecute the automobile companies, the federal government isn't going to do that.

A I don't think there would be any accomplishment. As I say, this is something that took place, as I understand it, prior to 1966. It is not an action that has anything to do with what the automobile companies are doing now and I think that we have in our own hands the ability to do what we want. We have the most stringent requirements, more stringent than the federal government. We made them more stringent in the last session and we can proceed with what we will accept is the kind of an automobile that can be sold in the State of California. And that's up to them to comply.

Q Governor Reagan, what's your reaction to the Army's decision to drop charges against the Green Berets in the murder case in Vietnam?

A Well, I only had time to kind of read the lead in the headline on that this morning. It all reads like a cloak and dagger to me, and I doubt if anyone is going to know the whole story

of that. I think it is cloak and dagger. And I don't have any particular opinion. I wouldn't have any facts upon which to base one.

Q President Nixon has called for the Congress to adopt the recognition of President's _____, if the Senate follows through on what the House has done, would you hope that the California Legislature next year ratifies the direct election?

A This is the direct -- simply direct election which crosses state lines and which just makes a majority decision? I'm opposed to that. No, there are some shortcomings in the electoral college system and maybe some things could be corrected. I would lean more toward a bill such as Mundt has suggested. But I think that to go to just a straight popular election would be the greatest blow to our federal system of sovereign states that has been struck in a long, long time. And I think the source should be the other way, that we should be doing more to strengthen the federal system, create more autonomy on the part of the states, not less.

Q Governor, what's wrong with a straight vote deciding who should be President?

A Because I think it does violate our federal system. We are a federation of sovereign states and it offers no protection for the small state. It means that a little handful of -- of big states with heavy urban populations would decide from here on out who is going to be the President of the United States.

Q Governor, wouldn't California stand to gain more than any other state in such a change?

A Well, it isn't the kind of gain that we want. I don't think a gain is a good gain if it is made at the expense of someone else's rights and I think -- I think we have to -- if we can join in a plot that lessens the effectiveness or the rights of a small state, then we have set the precedent for some day somebody doing it to us, if they decide to do it to us.

Q Governor, there are apparently five different resolutions ready to be presented at the California State Employee's Association statewide meeting next month, which would strike the no-strike provision of their charter, would remove the no-strike clause from their charter. What is your feeling toward this, if it were to be adopted?

A Well, I think in California we have had one of the finest highest type bodies of state employees of any state in the union. They have set very high standards and the standards have been met. I would hate to see that organization pass such a resolution. I do not believe that anyone can justify the right of public employees to strike against the public good. And so far I think California employees have lived up to their own high standard by having such a ban themselves, voluntary ban. This does not mean that I don't think we can find ways and better machinery for meeting their grievances, settling their problems in a spirit of mutual good will and we should and we are investigating whatever we can do in that line. We have been working with them. I would hate to see them though, as I said before, give up that other -- that other position because again there just can be no moral justification for a strike by public employees.

Q Governor Reagan, there seems to be some question whether or not California table grapes are being marketed with residues of dangerous pesticides on them. Under that circumstance do you think a state investigation would be worthwhile and justified?

A Well, there is an investigation -- there is a continuing investigation. Our State Agricultural Department checks all of our farm products constantly for dangerous pesticides or sprays of any kind, anything would be harmful. And I think the whole thing has been blown up on one statement made to the Congressional Committee, and I think as of this morning it is clear once and for all that this was a spurious charge, whether deliberate or whether through ignorance. Four pounds of grapes out of more than 800 million pounds of grapes that were raised in California, were found to have a substance called aldrin on them in one market some place in the east. Now, the truth is aldrin is not used on grapes in California. It is possible that an error was made at the laboratory because it is also true that sulphur and aldrin do show up almost identical in a test of the kind that was made. And possibly it was this kind of laboratory error, possibly. You can't rule out completely the possibility of shenanigans in this. But there have been checks made in about 70 areas throughout the country and no other undue material of this kind, pesticide or spray of any kind, was found on any of the grapes. But we do have that continuing check in our own Department of Agriculture and haven't found any.

Q When you talk about shenanigans, are you talking about Cesar Chavez and his United Farm Workers?

A I'm only saying that it was a representative of that group who bought the 4 pounds of grapes, took them to a laboratory. Now, one of two things is possible. What other explanation could there be for 4 pounds of grapes out of 800 million pounds turning up with this material on them? Other than that legitimately and honestly they made a mistake in the laboratory and the individual who bought the grapes in good faith made his statement. It could either be that or the only other explanation is something was done to the grapes. Because, as a matter of fact, to have the amount of aldrin on those four pounds of grapes would have required an almost impossible spraying of a vineyard to accomplish that kind of residue on the grapes.

Q Governor, yesterday you told the League of California Cities that \$633 million dollars had been rebated to the taxpayers, over the past two years. And you attributed this to your economies in government. Isn't that a rather generous attribution?

A No, it will be at the end of this year, not the past two years. The estimated amount is 401 million this year. I think there is -- in the past there's been a certain percentage of revenues that came in in excess of expenditures. But at the same time if you will recall, every dollar of those excess revenues was earmarked at least three or four times over by some legislators who had programs they wanted adopted to spend that money. A number of instances that these were vetoed and a number of instances they couldn't get them past the legislature. But the bulk of it has to be a reduction in the cost of government for one thing and a holding down of an increase in the size of government, and I think that could be fairly described as economy.

Q Governor, if these savings and economies of government are working like this, why did you say a couple of weeks ago that the public might be faced with a tax increase either next year or the following fiscal year.

A Yes, I know, because we have to look ahead, and we have to look at the course that a couple of -- of departments are taking or a couple of government programs that we can't control without some major changes in the law, and even some changes in the federal

and a couple of these are increasing at a rate much faster than the normal increase in our revenues and so far we have been able to keep up because of economies of this kind. But the one principal one is welfare. Welfare two years ago was supporting 7.3 per cent of the population of California. Today it is supporting 8.1 per cent of the population, and in just a few months there has been a \$50 million dollar increase in the monthly outgo of welfare due to various changes, due to decisions such as the Supreme Court's decision with regard to residency requirements. It is here and it is also in the field of education that the cost is increasing several times, in some instances as much as the normal increase we expect in revenues. So, looking ahead, we found that in spite of our efforts the lines are going to cross up here at a certain point. And I'm here to tell you now I don't want anyone to get the idea I'm predicting a tax increase. As long as I have anything to do with it we are not going to let those lines cross. I don't care what has to happen. We are not going to ask the people of this state for more money.

Q Would your tax reform package, if it passes, preclude that?

A I think that the tax reform package -- or the tax reform program, if passed, would help in particularly one field, in education. In that we know that sales and income taxes do increase with the expanding economy. They are far more elastic than is the property tax, and by making a large portion of education financed by those two taxes instead of property tax, we'd have a better chance of keeping up with the expansion and the growth of that. But there are other things that have to happen. We have got to stop the great inflation rate. This is one of the things that's eating us up, as I think I stated to you sometime ago. If we hadn't increased anything in the budget at all, added any new programs, expanded anything, we'd have virtually as big a budget as we have right now simply on the basis of inflation.

Q Governor, Assemblyman Alan Sieroty says January, since you gave him control of PUC, appointee's utility rates have skyrocketed by slightly over 30 billion dollars. And he's contrasting this with a reduction of utility rates in the years of 1961 and '68, by some \$81 billion dollars. How do you defend this apparent continuing climb in utility rates?

A Well, for one thing I can tell you that I never had a word with anyone on the Utility Commission as to how they do their job. Or what they should find. They are free to make their findings on the basis of their own staff work and dealing with the utilities, but I would also call to your attention that there has been complaints nationwide lately that in the area of utilities, a number of utilities have been falling behind and are unable -- and this isn't a complaint from the utilities, it is a complaint from governmental bodies. Congress, as a matter of fact, just recently said that apparently they are falling behind in their ability to expand and keep pace with the increasing population and the increasing demand for service. And it could very well be that past practices are recognized perhaps by today's utility commissions as having led to the place that some of our utilities are not able to plow back into the company the funds, they don't have them available to plow back into expand and meet the expanding need and if that's true, then the Utilities Commission has made decisions to allow them to get funds for expansion.

MR. RODDA: Thank you, Governor.

---oOo---

11/18

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD NOVEMBER 18, 1969

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: Well --

Q Governor, the teachers and the supervisors are sponsoring a \$900 million dollar property tax relief program that they intend to put on the ballot in June. How does that affect your own tax reform program that you will have before the Legislature?

A Well, it is not going to have any affect as far as whether we are going ahead or not is concerned because I think that initiative member -- or that initiative proposal, if you analyze it, is a fraud. The only property tax relief at all that they are proposing is a \$250 increase in the exemption for ^{the} property taxpayer. In reality that bill is an almost billion dollars or 900 million dollar increase in taxes for the people of California. And our own proposal is one in which we call for redistribution of the taxes and a taking some of the burden off the property taxpayer. In fact, cutting it in two. But the end result being no additional revenue for state and local government, and to present this as property tax reform on the part of those who are -- only the initiative is, again I use the word, a fraud on the people because actually they are going to get this increase and there is no assurance that other than the \$250 property tax exemption that there will be any relief for the property taxpayer.

Q You don't have any faith in the school boards and supervisors reducing the property tax rate commensurately?

A I have more faith in history and it's just been never done. 1933 when the sales tax was passed, that's what the sales tax was for, that they were then going to reduce the property tax and as we know today, everybody who's paying property tax, it didn't happen.

Q Governor, you just said no additional revenue for local

government. Were you saying there is -- under your plan there is no additional revenue for local government or --

A No, well, this is going to be up to them. ^(property) Our tax plan is not going to be one that results in the plan itself increasing the total revenue for state and local government. Now, there are other property taxes, local government has complete power, but to do what they want to do with them or what their voters would allow them to do. We have proposed in ours an actual percentage reduction that will cut the residential property tax in half and then to protect that and keep it from just automatically going right back up, as far as the school tax is concerned, our proposal is that this be in the hands of the people themselves in each district, that they would be the only ones who could vote an increase in the school property tax.

Q Governor, is your plan then in pretty final shape?

A Well, our -- well, when you say in final shape, our plan is -- we have continued to refine and to study and to try to find improvements, but we are also in consultation with the legislative leadership and the hearings they have been having, and this recent study and we intend to get together with them, if they found some -- some improvements, some better ways, we are in complete agreement on the basic fundamental, that the property taxpayer must have relief, that there must be a better method found in school financing. And we will very shortly be in consultation with them now that they have the result of their hearings.

Q Governor, you were in that same agreement, however, at the beginning of the last session.

A No, there were a couple of other items injected there that seemed to clutter things up, if you will remember that -- where we were in disagreement, and apparently now they have discussed a number of alternatives and those same elements don't seem to be present.

Q Governor Reagan, with reference to schools, two subcommittees -- two Assembly subcommittees are meeting in Los Angeles tomorrow to look into why 10,000 students were turned away from our State Colleges. Has your office looked into this situation and what have you found?

A Well, I think some statements have appeared lately, one from the university and I believe -- I won't swear to this, but also from the State College system, that clarified the situation somewhat, that it is nothing different than has been known for the last several years, that when one campus reaches its capacity and this has been true, as I say, for a number of years, they refer them to other campuses, but that there has been no actual cutback in enrollment or the number of students that they can take and the university itself has said that no one has actually been turned away from the university system and I think this is true of the college system. That the confusion comes from things like this fiasco out at Sacramento State where they had the young people out sleeping in sleeping bags and I'd like to call something to your attention on that. For years now Sacramento State has had a definite limit based on its capacity and it's been up to that limit for a great many years long before we ever got here, so every year there was a time when they have applications that exceed the number of enrollments they can take. And strangely enough three semesters ago they changed their procedure and instead of taking the applicants as the applications came in and notifying the rest that they were not going to be accepted, they'd have to go to another school, another one of the state colleges, they suddenly evolved this system of sleeping out in the campus to be first in line, like tickets for the Rose Bowl and created this -- this strange appearance of something new having taken place on the campus. Nothing new has taken place at all, nor has anyone in the college system proposed an enlargement of Sacramento State or to build it up. Eventually now, in the Master Plan, it calls for it going to better than 20,000, instead of the 10 or 11,000, but no proposal has been made as yet to enlarge that campus. So it is just one of the schools that is up to capacity and then they refer them to other state colleges.

Q Where does this 10,000 figure come from?

A Well, I think this figure must come from -- well, there are two things. It comes from students that are turned down in one campus without -- without a follow-up to see if they then went to another campus when they were referred to another State college. It also comes from the fact that the young people today make several applications. For example, in the larger scene, if you take it

nationally, you could find out that hundreds of thousands of students are apparently turned away from colleges in this country when it just isn't true. But the student applies to four or five colleges. Now, those -- he gets one. The other four reveal him as someone that they turned down, and therefore he was refused admittance, and if you total up all the figures you are counting a lot of individuals several times over.

Q Has your office investigated to find out the extent of this sort of thing? I mean how many students were involved in that or is this one student, the way you look at it, who has been turned away?

A I think -- it is a shame that Alex didn't come in here. I think we already have all of the facts and figures on this and I'm sure if you call in Alex Sherriffs or John Kehoe, they can give you the figures on this, but as the president of the university explained and most of you carried it in your papers the other day, there has been no turn away nor will there be at the university level, that it has been the same procedure of referring from the campuses that are full to campuses that still have capacity.

Q Governor, I inferred from your statement about the three semesters ago Sacramento State changed their policy with respect to admissions, that -- do you regard this as some attempt on the part of the administration out there to embarrass you personally?

A I didn't say anything of the kind. I just said they just changed the procedure and I think to do something now that involves kids in sleeping bags out on the campus when they can do it by a six cent stamp on a letter, I don't understand the reason for doing it. There have been a lot of things about higher education that you suggested I don't understand.

Q It wasn't the administration that proposed the sleeping bags, are they the ones that proposed mail and then the lottery system that they use?

A I only know that previously they took the applications that were in and took as many as they could take and notified the rest they weren't accepted. And I don't know how to explain the fact that now when it gets down to the last several hundred applications for the opening of a semester or a quarter that suddenly the students have to show up in person and stand in line.

Q Well, Governor, I thought they said that all applications would be considered equally, that they would be drawn through some sort of system so that those who applied early had the same chance as anyone else.

A Well, this is perhaps the change then that --

Q And they urged the people not to come and stand in line because it wouldn't do them any good. Each person would have an equal basis under the drawing system.

A Well, whatever the system is, it is changing.

Q Under the same general topic, how do you account for the lack of campus violence both here in California and elsewhere in the nation?

A Well, depends on what you term violence. If you -- all of you will recall earlier in this -- well, late in the summer when we were speculating on what might happen in the fall, I said that there was indication that some of the more militant, some of the more violent had been discussing throughout the summer turning to more guerilla type activities. The occasional bombing and so forth. We have seen evidence, not in the campus so much, but in New York City of that last week. But I also think that there is an awakening of the so-called silent majority. I think a great many students have decided that they are the ones that are being victimized by the militants in their own midst, and I think there is more of an effort on the part of them to participate and make their wants known.

Q Governor, you've been on both sides of the camera, do you have any comment on Spiro Agnew's taking on the networks?

A Well, I thought that the Vice President made a very valid point in a request for fairness. I would remind you that before he ever made such a speech, a matter of a couple of weeks before, I think, in actual timing, that T. V. Guide carried quite an impressive article in which they quoted the heads of the news bureaus of the major networks about the fact that they themselves had discovered that their news coverage and their editorializing was biased and that they were getting this impression from the viewers themselves. And the mail to the networks and the T. V. outlets since the Vice President's speech would indicate that the viewers themselves do believe that. I would think that the -- someone ought to believe that someone is telling them something.

Q Governor, do you share the same criticism or feel the same criticism toward the press in California that the Nixon administration seems to have about the national press?

A Well, are you talking about the press or are we still on the subject --

Q I'm talking about Mr. Agnew.

A -- the television coverage.

Q That and also criticized the written press, too, I believe in the U. S. News and World Report.

A Let's talk about what Mr. Agnew observed. I would have to say this, you here at the working level, no, no criticism. You get your story and you get your facts and you take your film and you send it in. But I doubt if there is any one of you here that would want to deny that once it reached the news bureau certain things take place in the editing and many times what appears on the air is not the way you reported it. I think you do a fine job, of coverage, of sending in the answers to your questions, and of sending in all the facts and all the material that -- on whatever incident it is you are covering. But you know that right here in this capitol you, yourselves, have participated in one or two examples of this, and some of -- we could start with the swearing in at midnight three years ago out in the rotunda. And a remark I made about -- to the Senator Murphy, that he and I were once again on the late late show. And I think all of you who were present and those of you who were turning the cameras on, you sent in the film of the Senator kind of doubled over laughing at the remark, he enjoyed it. Now, how do you expect a network that deliberately edited out the shot of him laughing and substituted a shot of him with a scowl on his face, and then told the audience bluntly that the Senator wasn't amused by my remark, and implied nationwide that he and I were at odds with each other -- now, that wasn't your fault, you covered the news and you sent it in, but you know, it is just like -- I've got the same complaint. You started a question with how do I feel having been on both sides of the camera. The same way I felt when I was -- when I was back in Hollywood, when what I thought was a pretty good piece of country acting on my part turned up on the cutting room floor.

Q Then you do feel, Governor, there is a certain amount of

bias being exhibited by the national networks.

A Why the national network heads themselves said that in the T. V. Guide article and I have no reason to think that they'd be dishonest in talking about themselves.

(Laughter)

Q What network was that, Governor?

A Which one?

Q Which network cut this?

PAUL BECK: CBS.

A I think this was CBS, yes.

Q Do you have any examples of the prews in this regard, Governor?

A What?

Q Any examples of the press coverage in this regard?

A Oh, I -- I think in the whole field of what is now termed as objective reporting, the writer's attitude and sometimes the re-writer's attitude is reflected in the article.

Q Can you name any?

A Editorializing, I may disagree with the columnist and editorialist. I agree with his right to do what he's doing.

Q Can you name any specific news incident **that** you've had, as you have with the television?

A No, and I wish that I hadn't had to get into specifics to illustrate the other point. No, I think -- give me time and I want to sit down with a scrapbook, I'm quite sure that I could find another. Yes, I remarked about one -- as a matter of fact, I'll give you a specific. I remarked about one the other day, yesterday at the Environmental Council. Fellows, I know I've never said, "If you've seen one redwood you've seen them all," but it continues to be quoted and -- or attributed to me with a quotation, with quote, quotation remarks around it to this day. It's even been the subject of cartoons.

Q What did you say, Governor

A Some of my best friends are redwoods.

(Laughter)

Q Change of subject. Governor, the local papers carried a picture of a skier up in Squaw Valley the other day, indicating snow underneath, a change that might induce you to make any statement about next year?

A No, I think there is -- there is so much to do here in

the job and with the legislature coming back and the absolute necessity for one thing of the tax reform, that we mentioned, that I think this is a time to tend to the job and not think about politics.

Q Governor, former Governor Brown says he plans to write a book about you. He says your administration needs some dissecting. Do you have any comment on that?

A No, I tell you, I'll wait until I see the picture version and I'm terribly concerned about who's going to play the title role. If it's Mickey Rooney, he's not tall enough.

Q Governor -- when do you think you will have something to say about your candidacy or lack of it?

A Well, there comes a date pretty soon in the spring when you -- you have to say one way or the other with regard to filing and --

Q Not until the last possible minute then, is that what you are saying?

A I think -- I think I'm going to have enough to do without bothering about that, yes. Now, wait a minute, there was one here and then --

Q Governor, now that we have almost reached the moon twice, do you think the federal government should spend more money on problems of cities and compacting the space program?

A I'm not qualified to know whether the values received from the space program warrant what's being spent. I think it is again just as it is in our administration here on state problems, it is a matter of priorities. It doesn't necessarily mean that if you reduced one that the money would then be used for something else. If something else is right now the higher priority it should get more money. If something is of a low enough priority to be dropped, it does not necessarily mean that the money should be spent. We hear a great deal of talk about spending on urban -- on the urban problems, on city problems. But a vast majority of your people are living in the cities. Who outside of the cities is supposed to help with this? I think the cities' problems largely are going to have to be solved by themselves. By what right do we ask someone living out in South Succotash, Wisconsin, to help solve the traffic problem in New York City? And if we are going to have it from city to city, and they say that every city has the problems, how do you get money

from the people in Chicago to help in New York if you have to turn around the next month and get money from the people in New York to solve the problem in Chicago.

Q Governor, not as a potential candidate for Governor, but as a private citizen interested in seeing the Republicans continue in office of Governor after next year, which of the Democrats most prominently mentioned do you think a Republican nominee might most easily defeat?

(Laughter)

A No, I wouldn't want to -- I wouldn't want to answer that one. I've always been the kind of fellow that says the other team is tough and our quarterback has a sprained ankle, but we have the will and the determination to win. We are going to do our best. I wouldn't and I don't even know who all -- I know there are a couple of them that are pretty vocal right now, but I'm not sure that they have named all the possibilities. They may have some fellows under the grandstand that they are going to run out at the last minute.

Q Just out of those couple that are pretty vocal right now, which do you think would be the toughest to defeat?

A The way they have been going I wondered whether they'd be running as a team.

(Laughter)

A No, I wouldn't say.

Q Governor, how do you feel about the request by the National Guard after money on federal grant would become sort of a clearing house for intelligence --

A First of all, I think there's been a certain exaggeration of what actually happened there. The Council on Criminal Justice which is chaired by the Attorney General, has been dealing with the problem, studying the problem, the need for more intelligence and a number of organizations, including the Guard, submitted proposals and of course _____ wanted -- felt that he was the best qualified to do it. My own feeling is that this properly belongs in the hands of law enforcement, and I'm sure that the Council on Criminal Justice will make a decision on this. As a matter of fact, I don't think it is any longer in issue. I think the Guard itself recognizes this. But it was just one of a number of proposals made to solve a

problem that nationwide law enforcement has been talking about the need for more intelligence, more coordinated intelligence in the whole field, particularly in the area of disturbances.

Q Do you think the Attorney General's effort to coordinate intelligence have been inadequate in any way?

A No, I think that as far as our own state -- well, now, don't let me be in the position of criticizing the law experts on that council. If they themselves feel improvements could be made, I don't know, I only know that I think we have perhaps been better than most states in the coordination between local government and the state agencies, up to and including the Guard, with regard to this and with regard to being able to move cooperatively to the scene of any action when we were needed. Now, the Council feels and they must have felt there could be improvements or there would not have been suggestions that -- or requests for proposals. Now, we found, actually, a little hitch in our own setup here in that normally and I don't think this would happen again, this proposal was made without coming through our normal channels in the cabinet here to get a policy decision, just went directly to the Council.

Q Governor, Mayor --

Q Governor, would it have gone through the normal channels would you try to stop it?

A Well, as I say, my own reaction I -- you are asking me to comment on something without having heard whatever proposals they might have made, but my own reaction is that this properly belongs in the hands of law enforcement agencies.

Q Mayor Alioto said yesterday there should be a state law against someone standing up in the audience advocating assassination of a President, as David Hilliard did in San Francisco State. Would you support such a bill?

A Let me turn to my legal advisor. I read that this morning and I meant to ask you earlier this morning, isn't there something in the nature of a law on -- with regard to advocating this the same as inciting to riot?

ED MEESE: I think there is actually a law against specifically soliciting or encouraging anyone to commit a crime, including murder or assassination. I think you get on the particular factual situation a question of whether or not this is just an

abstract statement or this is specifically intended to incite action. And so I think that this is a pretty complex legal problem rather than just saying there ought to be a law.

A As a matter of fact, the complexity of it can be illustrated by the Dan Siegel case right now, the president of the student body at Berkeley who made the quite inflammatory and emotional speech that preceded the People's Park riot and you will recall he is charged and this is the contention that is trying to be established, did he just -- was the crowd just inflamed on its own spontaneously because of his remarks or did he deliberately -- is he responsible for sending them down the street.

Q Do you think it should be tightened up then, the law?

A Let's get another legal view here.

VOICE: We have talked about it with the U. S. Attorney this morning and he's had some comments made to him and he's done some research since yesterday, the statement was made, and it is his feeling, that the code section^{is}/applicable to what Mr. Hilliard said in San Francisco, but it hasn't been used since the last -- since the early 1900's and so there is some question about its continued validity, but there is the law which he feels is applicable.

Q Which U. S. Attorney?

(VOICE) Simonelli, here in Sacramento.

Q If that's the case, Governor, do you think they should prosecute if it is applicable?

A Well, again, that's a decision for them to make. You've just heard the legal views here and if -- there seems to be some action in this regard and some study into what's going on. As a citizen, I'll tell you this, and I'm sure all of us are concerned, I think there is something wrong with how far we have drifted into this whole atmosphere of violence when people do stand up now and whether it is a President or anyone else, openly talk about having someone killed. This is a -- I don't think this is the type of atmosphere that we were raised in in this country, most of us, and I don't think it is an improvement over what we knew in an earlier time.

Q Back to the military department. You said there that you had -- you think the Guard recognizes that perhaps there is a feeling against it or -- have you got any indication that the Guard is going to drop that application for federal funds?

A I think they are.

ED MEESE: It was just a proposal, and I think there is some question of whether law enforcement assistance funds would even be used for a proposal under the National Guard. This is all strictly in a discussion stage, but it is doubtful at this stage of the game whether they will go any further with it. The Chairman of the Council is the Attorney General and he's already spoken of his own opposition to such a thing.

Q Governor, on the -- that you explained the statewide uniform code for prefab houses and things like that. Is there any particular reason why there is not one union representative in the contract for contractors?

A No, and as a matter of fact, you said--this hadn't even occurred to me one way or another.

Q They are all City Councilmen and County Supervisors and contractors and builders and architects, but there aren't any labor or construction members.

A Well, I think that's because the subject they have got to solve is not one of union-management requirements, it is one of restrictions in community building codes, laws, as to whether you can have prefab or the type of structure and so forth. So we've got people involved in that field to do this. You'd be surprised if you went around the state and find out -- take the differences, the variances in building codes in all of our communities, and it is going to do us no good to try to encourage a prefabrication industry if most of the towns in the state have technicalities which would make it impossible for them to erect those homes in any of the communities, so this isn't a case that would actually be involved with labor and management. I'm quite sure as this industry gets under way you will then find that labor and very properly so, will move in as to what must be the working conditions, rates of pay and so forth for their craftsmen who will be obviously working in this field.

Q Last year or earlier this year you said that you were going to wait and get Congress in 1969 to see if they would do something on farm-labor legislation. They have not done anything, I don't believe. So I was wondering if you were planning anything on the state level or going to back any bills on the state level in 1970.

A I just have to tell you that so far we haven't gotten

into anything on that. What the situation is. As a matter of fact, almost a hundred per cent of our time has been -- is being spent in the cabinet these days on the budget, the new budgeting procedure. So I just -- I just have to plead not having gone into that matter.

Q Governor, four U. C. Davis students, including two former Marines, wrote you last week complaining about the administration there. They say it tacitly approved anti-war demonstrations on the campus, but last week ignored Veteran's Day, and they have demanded a public official apology. Are you going to take any action on their letter?

A Well, you say they did this last week. Well, this in the normal channels of the mail, and coming through the whole shop, hasn't reached my desk, but I would be -- I'm very interested to hear that there is such a letter on the way. And believe me, I think it is a subject that should be discussed at the Regents level on this subject, and it again comes back to the question I answered earlier that this is an indication that there are students, the so-called silent majority, who are standing up and being counted, and my own position on the moratorium was that this was a matter of personal decision and certainly no professor had a right to impose his thinking on the moratorium on his class by shutting the class doors and denying classroom instruction to those who might not be sympathetic to it. And I think that it is significant and an indication of some of the things that have been wrong on the campus. And that they would pick and chose between the things in which they would tacitly approve. Now, I don't -- they have made the charge. The first thing would be to establish whether this was true at Davis or not.

VOICE: Thank you, Governor.
---oOo---

12/2

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD DECEMBER 2, 1969

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: Well, a bright spring day -- fall day. No opening statement.

Q Governor, yesterday the Coordinating Council recommended or suggested a tuition for the university and state colleges but they suggested it be collected as a flat fee. Now, at the last Regents meeting you seemed to be opting for the earn, learn and reimburse theory. Will you accept just a flat fee increase at the university and state college?

A Well, I'm gratified that they -- they took the action and in recognizing the need for this and the validity of having a tuition, but I wish -- I'm concerned that those with the most expertise in the field, the educators themselves, have not more seriously looked at this problem, the double problem, --the problem of the needy student who needs help in going to school; the problem of financing higher education nationwide, to see if we couldn't evolve something new, and I have suggested as an idea, it would seem to me that there would be some area in there for state underwriting loans not only for a tuition, but for other expenses for students, and a repayment on the principle that getting an education is actually improving a capital asset -- it is a capital improvement and thus like a capital improvement should be paid back over the lifetime of the improvement, which would mean the earning years of the student after he got out of school and I still think there is a wide open field there. I'm not qualified to provide the answers in that field, but I think that they could find some way in which they could meet these two problems with other than just a flat tuition. But then maybe this is a first step. Maybe having recognized the need for it we can proceed to

something more meaningful.

Q Are you saying, Governor, that while you want tuition you are not very happy with any of the specific plans yet for tuition?

A I just don't think that there's been enough exploration given to alternatives to what has always been the standard idea of just simply assessing a charge. I know that there was a -- they expressed the need as we all have that if this is imposed then steps must be taken to insure that no student will find himself deprived of an education because of inability to meet the charge.

Q What soundings on this subject did you get from the students yesterday evening?

A As a matter of fact that subject didn't come up in all of the discussion.

Q Governor, now have you proposed this idea of state underwriting these loans -- I believe this is a new concept, you haven't spoken of it before. Is there some formal plan going on underway or --

A No, no, Bill, I -- at the last Regents meeting in this whole discussion I simply voiced a number of these ideas and this approach of it being a capital improvement, hoping that the people there and the people in education would see the possibilities and turn their attention to this because they're certainly the best qualified to come up with such an answer. And I -- I explained several times in the discussion that this was not a plan or not -- it was nothing more than trying to open some doors and suggest paths for exploration.

Q On another topic, Governor, are you sympathetic at all with the Indian effort on Alcatraz to claim that island for themselves?

A Well, this is really a Federal problem now. I think that the young people there aren't really trying to solve anything about Alcatraz Island. I think they are trying to focus attention on what they feel are the neglected problems of the Indian people in the nation at large, and in that regard I am in sympathy with the problems of the Indians that I don't think have ever been properly met. We've taken -- I would have to say that their occupation if it is for the purpose of getting attention, is not

necessary as far as the state administration is concerned because we have taken a number of steps trying as far as we can to meet some of these problems in California. But I can't be in sympathy with that kind of action. This is similar to most demonstrations which are trying to solve problems by demonstration rather than by actually getting down and sitting down at the table to solve them.

Q Are you sympathetic to making Alcatraz an Indian Cultural center or some sort of center for Indians? Have you got a good idea for Alcatraz?

A There are a number of things that have been suggested. I think it is time for the federal government and I know Wally Hickel has said that he wants to do this, to finally sit down with all the people involved, which would be the bay area communities as well as the federal government and review all the potentials to make sure that whatever is done with Alcatraz is to the best interest of the most people. And I -- I haven't got an opinion on -- of all the ideas that were suggested which one is proper.

Q Governor, what agencies does the state have for dealing with Indian problems? The Commission of Indian Affairs has gone out of existence.

A Well, I just happen to have a memorandum in my pocket on this particular subject. We've developed California's first Indian Legal Aid program. The first Indian Health Services program. We have encouraged payment by the federal government of the 29 million dollar disbursement to California Indians that was approved by Congress several years ago. We developed through the state OEO office first Intratribal Council and there are presently 36 of the 70 tribes are now involved in this statewide Indian Coordinating program. We have recently requested Health, Education and Welfare in Washington to reinstate the federal Indian Health Services program. And Bob Keyes in the Community Relations staff ^{has} have been assigned a key role in liaison with the California Indian community and state government. Now, all of these things are going forward and why I happen to have this is because of the very fact that this thing that's going on, I wanted to know how we are progressing and what we are doing in this field.

Q Are there Indians serving on the administrative body of all these programs?

A I'd have to check up on that and check with Bob Keyes as to what we are doing. I know I would be surprised if they aren't because this was one of our views that everybody has had also, sort of boards and commissions about the Indians and we thought there ought to be some of the Indians.

Q A different subject. Governor, you had this advisory committee to make recommendations on what to do about the Redwood State Parks. Have you had a report from them and what is your inclination at this point?

A No, we haven't had the report back on this. I haven't. It might be over in Ike Livermore's department for evaluation, but this is the very complicated problem of the use of these lands and the involvement of our own State Parks, and how you would make an arrangement. You can't just suddenly hang a different shingle on a State Park in the area as much as this land has been contributed by donors to the State, but we are anxious to finally evolve -- the truth is they cannot have a fine National Park unless they incorporate some of our State Parks. Now, as you know, my own approach to this has been first to explore what possible trades we can make to get other federally held property, federally owned property for recreational and park use here in our state.

Q A different topic. The House Banking Committee in Los Angeles took considerable testimony from housing people in California, that the industry is in serious condition. Do you share that point of view and what do you think can be done about it?

A Well, the housing industry has been in a slump nationwide for quite sometime, and in California -- this was one of the moves that the President made when he asked all of us to defer some of our construction in other projects because the inflation rate in the construction industry is several times higher than normal inflation rate, and it is because there has been such a concentration on great construction projects not involving housing that there is a great shortage -- not only of money, but of personnel over in the housing industry. And if you will note what the President asked was a deferment of projects other than that to see if we couldn't simply by deferring in those other areas, channel some of the construction personnel, construction companies, and machinery back into housing. I don't think the picture is quite as dark

as some of the witnesses testified here. Here in California there's been a slight improvement in it. But a whole combination of things, the difficulty in getting money, the high interest rates, there is no question but that the single home -- single unit is way down from what it should be. Another thing that I think might be a stimulant, that I'm very hopeful about, I think the breakthrough into the idea of assembly-line construction of homes may be the answer to the one area where we haven't caught up with the rest of our technology. We are still building homes the way they have been built from the beginning of time. And the result is that while inflation has increased the price, the quality, if anything, you could say, has actually gone down as to being able to afford size and quality construction and I think that maybe a great answer might be in the utilization of the assembly-line technique. We have made that breakthrough here with the recent legislation in California.

Q Aside from the deferment of projects, is there anything else that can be done to help the industry?

A The housing industry. Well, actually I haven't given any thought to stop gap measures. I think that the main thing that could be done right at the moment, in addition to these others, the assembly-line idea -- the main thing that could be done is to continue, all of us in cooperation, on the stemming of inflation because unless you do that we are not going to solve any of the problems. It has reached a rate at the beginning of the year -- well, sometime last year, inflation reached a rate that is well on the way to carrying money in a basket and that's why I'm in complete sympathy with all the efforts that are being made to cool inflation.

Q Governor, on another topic. Some people look on the Pinkville massacre as an example of how the war in Vietnam is brutalizing the United States. How do you look upon that whole event?

A Well, first of all, if it should develop in the trials that are going to be that this -- it did in truth take place, I don't think anyone could condone that. On the other hand, I think anyone has to realistically accept that in war and in the heat of

combat these things have happened as long as there have been wars. I think there has been a failure to note that we are probably the only country that I know of at the moment that has consistently looked with abhorrence on this to such an extent that even in the midst of a conflict we will take action to punish those people who have gone that far. There are countries in the world who accept this including our enemy, as a normal part of warfare and do it deliberately, not just in the heat of combat or because some individuals get out of line. I would like to comment at this time I won't go beyond this, because I am in complete sympathy with the requests that have been made by everyone involved, that the comment and the press interviews of prospective witnesses stop before they do make it impossible in a trial legally to do justice and to find out what actually went on. And I'm amazed at the -- the way we have continued to ignore the pleas in this behalf, to continue to conduct the trial right out now in the public instead of where it should be tried. We have been informed there will be a trial. I think now we should respect the wishes of those who are going to be conducting that trial when they have begged that we not endanger what they are trying to do.

Q Does that make a case for government control over the press in a situation like that, do you think?

A No, I don't think so. I think all we are -- all I'm suggesting is that I think the same thing applies as applied sometime ago in a noted -- in the arrest of an assassin here in our own state when a local official of a city was taken over the coals by the same press because of some remarks they considered injudicial that he had made about the suspect. And they said that he endangered arriving at a just decision by the remarks. Well, the same thing holds true with this. There comes a time once the case is launched, when under our judicial process we can make it difficult to achieve justice.

Q Governor, do you think that the story of the massacre or alleged massacre would have come out without the press reporting on it?

A I don't know, and I know this, Bill, don't -- if you want to get me on that side, I still agree with Thomas Jefferson. He had to -- said if you had something -- some quote, I can't give it accurately -- to the effect, if you had to get along without public

officials or without a free press, he would chose to get along without public officials and keep the free press. No, there are many instances and one of the great services carried forward by the press is the bringing to the attention of the people and the forcing of action in some cases, such as this. No, I have no quarrel with that at all.

Q Governor, back to the original question. We have always held ourselves -- we, as a nation, have always held ourselves above this kind of action and now we find the possibility that we are (inaudible) doing the same thing that occurred in ----- and things that we have held in scorn in previous wars. Are we changing or what is this?

A No, I don't think we are, and I don't think you'll find anyone in America who doesn't look with abhorrence on this that took place. Again, I'm only saying you can't go farther than this, a trial is going to be held. Now, if it develops that this did take place then also at the trial will be developed, was this with the knowledge of someone in official capacity to either approve or disapprove it. Was this at a level in which it was a unit that had just lost scores of men, that in the heat of combat did what, as I say, has been done by men I guess on both sides in wars, as long as wars have gone on. This will all come out at a trial. But I don't think there is anyone in America who would hold still for this country fighting a war even with the North Vietnamese, on the terms that the North Vietnamese fight it. They have made cruelty and terror and the killing of innocent civilians a part of their official policy. You only have to go back a few years to before the outright involvement of American troops to recall the almost daily stories of the bombing of schoolrooms and motion picture theaters and playgrounds by the Viet Cong terrorists as a part of their campaign. Now, there is the difference between what can almost be called crimes of passion by individuals or groups and an official policy of the enemy. And no one in this country subscribes to that. This is, I think, in many people's minds, why we are engaged with this enemy is because two philosophies are at issue. Ours and that other kind of lack of humanity. Now, what we are talking about, if this did indeed take place, we are literally talking about the same thing: that happens when, in the past, we have had a lynch mob get under way and no one approved it

nor was it ever official policy or a part of our philosophy.

Q You pointed back to history saying that, you know, as far as the wars have gone back. Do you think wars will ever end, yes or no?

A What

Q Do you think wars will ever end?

A Well, the prophecies in the Bible say yes, we will come to a millenium, a thousand years of peace. I'm sure, I've never lost faith in man's upward climb. I think that, however, that those today who for example are advocating a unilateral disarmament and withdrawl by this country are being very naive because there are still barbarians in the world and they have made it very plain they are there, and what we should re-evaluate, I think, in this country, is our commitment to civilization and to the defense of a philosophy that **advanced farther** in this land than any place in the world of the brotherhood of man, but we will get no place if we simply assume that having achieved it or tried to achieve it here it is enough for us to sit back and let the jungle close in again.

Q Can we come back to California?

A I'd like to very much.

(Laughter)

Q Is it your inclination at the moment to grant the extradition of Bobby Seal to Connecticut?

A Well, that hearing isn't until next week. And here again I don't think I should comment in advance of the hearing. They haven't presented their case yet for why they don't want him extradited, so I'll wait till the hearing takes place.

Q Governor, what's your opinion of the draft lottery, the federal draft lottery?

A Well, I think it is a step in the right direction. As you know, I'm one who believes that once combat is actually ended and you are not in a conflict, I believe in a volunteer army. I think, in the elimination of the draft. The President expressed the same view. There may be holes in this, but I think it is an improvement over what we presently have. Anything that shortens down the uncertainty for a man and gives him a definite knowledge that he either will or will not be called within a certain specified time is going to be a great improvement.

Q Governor, on another subject. You met yesterday with

Senator Cologne over -- he wanted to get a firm commitment from you regarding starting construction of Perris Dam, Riverside County, by the middle of next year, and Senator Cologne said after the meeting he hoped to get an affirmative response from you within two weeks. Can you comment on that?

A Well, our greatest problem of course has to do with next June and the election with regard to the bonds, the financing of the whole water project. There are still other alternatives that we are exploring. There is no question that the Perris Reservoir and the line leading to it is at the very end of the water project for the delivery to the south of water. On the other hand, the water can be delivered to the south without that reservoir although it was always an integral part of the system. I want to see it completed and I want to see the Perris Reservoir built, but we are all sitting here now with this problem of financing the entire project. We are sitting here with two problems. First of all, the selling of the bonds which were authorized and second, finding the additional funds because there is no question that the people of California were deceived into believing that the original one and three-quarter million dollars bond issue would build the entire water project and these that let them believe that knew otherwise. They knew that the project even then without the escalation in costs we have had due to inflation -- that they were a half a billion dollars short in the amount of bonding that was needed, but they were fearful that the people wouldn't pass any bigger bond issue and that the whole project would go down the drain. So when I say deceived, let me put it this way, that perhaps they were not actually told, they were allowed to believe that one and three-quarter billion dollars would pay for the project. Now, these are the two things that we must meet. Number one, the present bonds, the selling of them and this requires the passage by the people of the increased interest rate and the second is getting the additional money. But I want you to know that I told Senator Cologne this, that I am, and as far as humanly possible, committed to the building of the Perris Reservoir.

Q Just one follow-up question. Governor, when do you think

you will be in a position to know either way whether you can proceed?
Would this have to wait till next year or would you know sooner?

A Well, I would hope that we would be able to say before the June election.

Q Before the June election.

A We must decide whether and what effect that might have on it. I would hope we would be able to say yes, pass those bonds on this or this interest rate change and this would be one of the results. And this is why I've urged Bill Gianelli to step up our own studies of this whole thing so that we can come before the people honestly before that issue is on the June ballot and tell them what the result will be.

Q You won't know within two weeks, though, as Cologne indicates?

A I don't know just what it was he could have been referring to on that. I don't think you could have a certainty of this in two weeks.

Q Governor, Mr. Unruh is having the press into his home this week. I wonder if you are planning any similar holiday entertaining.

(Laughter)

A No, I figure that come the holidays everyone wants to be with their own family and so I haven't planned anything of the kind.

Q Will you be sending along a good luck telegram to Jesse?

A No, like everyone else I'll just be sitting with baited breath.

Q Governor, once in a while rumors pop up that you may run for the Senate next year. Are you prepared now to say that you won't run for anything but Governor if you do run for anything?

A If I run for anything, I won't run for anything but Governor. No, we have got a fine Senator in Senator Murphy. He's running, he's a candidate and I'm going to do everything I can to see that he's returned to Washington regardless of what I do myself. No.

Q How about if he drops out?

A What?

Q How about if he drops out?

A Well, I don't think he's going to. I don't think there

is -- he's assured me that he isn't. That's something that cannot be foreseen now in the line of an accident that should bring that about, that still won't change my ideas about it.

Q What was the basis for your opinion that the monthly moratorium day activities were actually planned behind the Iron Curtain?

A Well, now, my assertion if you will -- were present, was a question, I said shouldn't some of those who were sincerely interested in peace and who marched sincerely in the parade ask some very pertinent questions and I said, shouldn't they ask if meetings were not held in East Berlin at the peace conference last year with regard to this; some meetings here in this country, one that's been reported in Cleveland; if a meeting was not held between the first and the second moratoriums; a meeting was not held in which one of our own advisors in previous dealings for the government met with a group of Congressmen who had supported the first moratorium and urged them to not be involved in the second because the leadership was more interested in the Viet Cong victory; I suggested ~~thome~~ be asked for because in various segments of the press these meetings have been mentioned and in most cases they have quoted individuals, leaders involved in the moratorium, quoted them as to statements they had made pledging their support to the Viet Cong in those meetings, and since that time a column by Evans and Novak has reported quite extensively on some and now has added a meeting in Stockholm that, as he said, took place, and another meeting in Hanoi, and they quoted American leaders participating in the mobilization, quoting statements they had made with regard to those meetings. I'm still asking the question. I think it would be very interesting to pin this down and run some up and find out, and there might be a challenge for a free press to find out.

Q Governor, in order to bring a halt to the ^(Vietnam) war, do you still believe that we should be doing such things as bombing the harbor at Haiphong and that type of action or do you think we are following the proper course?

A I have to say in my own opinion that I think we are approaching a day with the breakdown of negotiations in Paris. I think it's obvious that the enemy has not met any one of our attempts to build a bridge leading toward peace. And I think that the time

is fast coming when this country is going to have to review its options.

Q Do you think the administration feels this way? They indicate that this is not the course they are going to take at all.

A I'd be very surprised if you analyze some of the paragraphs of the President's November 3rd speech -- I thought there were indications in there that he was saying to the enemy, if they analyzed it, that we are not going on endlessly talking and allowing our men to be killed.

Q Governor, by reviewing our options, you mean continued bombing or stepped up bombing?

A This would be up to those who have access to the information and what the proper options would be. But I think they would be options that would be quite the opposite of continuing to invite the enemy to talk for peace when the enemy has refused to cooperate so far.

VOICE: Thank you, Governor.

---oOo---