

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

---

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

---

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

Folder Title: Press Conference Transcripts –  
03/03/1970, 03/31/1970, 04/14/1970, 04/21/1970

Box: P03

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library  
inventories visit:

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

Contact a reference archivist at:

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

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

3/3/70

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD MARCH 3, 1970

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---

Q GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well, good morning, no visitors up there in the back row or anything today. Fire away.

Q Governor, are you any closer to naming your appointment to the Supreme Court? How long will that be?

A I've heard some meetings -- or had some meetings with the committee on this, they're narrowing lists of prospective appointees down. I don't know that a date has been set for this, for the naming. We still have more meetings to have or to hold.

Q Governor, what is your intention in regard to the vacancy created by the death of Mr. Utt? Do you plan to call a special election or let the regular election process run its course?

A No, I'm sure we will call a special election, and I'm going to set the date for that at the request of people in the local districts after the closing date for filing on March 20. They prefer that way. There is a ~~ex~~ the timing of this is very unusual and you do have the thing of a special election and the fact of the filing date for the primary in which you would have quite a mixup of candidates that might not even enter the -- the special election, but might file and still be -- be candidates for the November election. So anyway this is what the local people would like to do and in order to have one of the two special elections coincide with the primary.

Q In other words, you might call a special the first week in May and then the runoff in June for the --

A Well, I don't know what -- this is what we are contemplating now, is having the first special earlier and then having the runoff coincide with the primary.

Q In other words a candidate in the runoff could also be a candidate for the full term?

A Oh, I think they almost have to, would have to in this one. They have got to -- this is what I mean, you have a situation now of whoever files being a candidate regardless of whether he enters the special.

Q Governor, the Board of Supervisors in Santa Barbara County is looking into the possibility of having student body funds -- using student body funds to pay some of the damages that were done down there last week-end. What do you think of that idea?

A Well, I know this raises the question of what about the students who didn't participate and whose funds would thus be used and they weren't guilty of anything. Actually, the only comment I could make is maybe this opens up the whole subject of a new look at the idea of mandatory fees, because it is quite possible that a number of the students on the campus might not have been happy about their fees being used to pay Kunstler to come out and make a speech. There is -- there is a problem with mandatory fees used in whatever way.

Q Governor, Assemblyman Mulford and Assemblyman MacGillivray asked for a special meeting of the regents to do something about inflammatory speakers. Have you responded to their request?

A Well, my own feeling is that -- yes, they know how I feel. My own feeling is that the meeting right now is unnecessary. There might have been a reason to call this if Kunstler, for example, had kept his dates, but you've seen the example of one school in the University system and one in the state college system had both cancelled his engagement and therefore seems to me that <sup>a</sup>special meeting was unnecessary.

Q Governor, I didn't quite understand your answer about the student body funds. Do you think it is a good idea to use them to pay for those damages or not?

A No, I said the only comment I'd make is I think this gets into the whole area -- certainly there would be an unfairness to the students who minded their own business, who didn't get involved in this, making them pay for the damage that was created by that little bunch of stormtroopers, many of whom were not from the campus, although some were, but I think this brings up again maybe for a closer look, and that we should sit down and take a closer look at the whole question of mandatory fees.

Q Governor, what are the reasons, the motives, the issues that led up to those outbursts, as you see it?

A That led up to what?

Q That led up to those outbursts.

A In Santa Barbara. Well, it is pretty hard to know what are real issues and what are issues, frustrations of students that are appealed to by a group that once had trouble getting the students, appealing to them and -- to arise up and do something and those who are doing the appealing have their own axe to grind. There has been a problem at that campus with the letting go of the professor, but there have been other issues. There's been a ferment there brought about by a small group of students for a couple of years, and it was in this -- and then of course you had the astire on all the campuses that was deliberately inspired by the sentencing of the Chicago 7; they had announced this, that they were going to appeal for demonstrations all over the country when this took place. And it was in this atmosphere that Kunstler came to speak. All I can say about this is there is no issue, not one of them, including the letting go of the professor or the hiring of a professor that can justify or warrant students resorting to violence and destruction of property and endangering of human life or any other body of citizens doing the same thing, and I think it is high time that this country stood back, took a look at itself, at how far we have gone down the road to trying to run government by seeing who can make the loudest noise in the streets. There are normal, reasonable channels for regressive grievances and the last place in the world we should expect this kind of violence is in the academic community. There is no excuse for it.

Q Governor, Mr. Unruh suggested you should have acted quicker in Santa Barbara to forestall violence down there. What is your reaction to that?

A Well, you'll find that the Sheriff thinks that we acted just about as quickly as it was humanly possible to act. And I think-- I think Mr. Unruh knows better, but I think Mr. Unruh just has to find some things to say right at the moment.

Q Governor, you've been saying the last several months, predicting further campus outbursts. With your underground system or however it is that you have determined all of this, did you anticipate any of these outbreaks or this one specifically?

A No, you can't -- you can't anticipate a specific outbreak. I've told you that all the intelligence reports of any kind that we have gotten from variety of sources for several months have indicated a change in tactics that there is no let up in the revolutionary fervor but that they were going to turn more from the confrontation to firebombing, sniping and so forth, guerilla tactics and this seemed to be carried out in Berkeley. There was a kind of reversion to type, though, at Santa Barbara because then we came back into the mass confrontation type of thing, but this is a far cry from having intelligence that at a specific moment and a specific place they were going to plan a demonstration.

Q Governor, along that same line, now there is a United Press International reporter who was held in jail for almost 24 hours and was not allowed to make any telephone calls and subsequently that the charges were dropped and he was released. And we understand that you made an inquiry into this and that do you have any report or do you have any statement to make on this?

A No, I don't as yet. I did make an inquiry, naturally, I want a report on this because, again, no one's civil rights should be violated. On the other hand, war correspondents have to realize that sometime they are going to get --

(Laughter)

A He should be happy he was captured with the good guys.

(Laughter)

Q If we can switch from war to taxes, the CTA finally got its ballot initiative on the ballot and the question is will you campaign vigorously against it and how do you persuade people not to vote for a tax cut?

A Well, because again this is the -- what I referred to as fraud one day, which angered all of the people who introduced this -- I still think it is not a bad choice of words, this is not a tax cut. This holds up the possibility of reducing the property tax by a billion dollars and makes no -- and doesn't say one word about where, however, you are going to get the billion dollars you must get to replace that lost revenue. Yes, I will actively oppose it because I -- I think it is ill-advised and a very foolish proposal and I think that the tax reform proposal that we have before the legislature is the -- is a proper way. We have spelled out what the property tax

reduction will be and we have spelled out where the money will come from to make this possible, and we have also guaranteed that there will be no increase in the total revenues the state is getting by way of our proposal. The other is a snare in delusion.

Q Do you feel it is essential to get -- try and get your program through the legislature before the election in an effort to defeat this proposition on the ballot?

A Even if this wasn't on the ballot, we want ours and we want it as quickly as we can get it.

Q Governor, on another subject.

Q Taxes, one more question.

A Taxes.

Q Governor, have you taken any recent soundings, are you optimistic that your program, which I understand will be formally introduced tomorrow, will go through the legislature this year?

A Yes, I'm reasonably optimistic. I know that that can make a fellow sound like a tightrope walker. What can often happen in the legislature, but I know that in the Assembly the leadership there believes this can move. It is -- first of all, opponents are having a difficult time finding some good legitimate reasons for opposing it.

Q Governor, on taxes, one more. Senator Walter Stern said over the week-end he wasn't too optimistic about your tax program getting through the Senate and he particularly said that he expected only the withholding feature would get by. And I was wondering if that would be acceptable to you to just get a bill through on withholding alone, not tie it into the property tax relief.

A No, it wouldn't be acceptable to me. I want tax reform and I think that -- I think that what he was referring to was that in an election year any time you redistribute taxes you run the risk of one block of voters, a group of voters that thinks perhaps it is being shifted unduly to them will get unhappy and this might be reflected in their conduct at the polls. I don't think he was expressing any personal opposition to this program. I still believe in spite of the fact that it is an election year that this is a risk we have to take. There is a group in California that are being unfairly taxed at the moment and those are the home owners. Now, I grant you that if we were political in the political year the normal thing is to try and take as much tax as you can off the whole spectrum

of voters and apply it to one particular group that you believe is outnumbered in the voting and we, it is true, have done the reverse. We are applying taxes to everyone in an effort to relieve one particular block of voters, and I think the people are intelligent enough to understand this and I am optimistic the legislature is going to bring this program down to us.

Q Governor, are you beginning to get concerned that the State Senate's inability to resolve its own internal leadership programs is reaching a point where you may not get any kind of legislation worthwhile out of the State Senate? Bitterness is increasing and the split is increasing so that you are not going to get any place.

A Well, so far, there again this is an internal matter within the Senate, but so far I have to point out that at no time has our legislative program been involved in this or have there been sides taken on that. In fact, the partisans on all sides of the internal dispute up there have announced their support of this legislative program so I just have to assume that whatever there is going on within the Senate internally is not going to reflect in the manner in which they treat legislation that comes over to them.

Q Governor, it is becoming common practice in California now for candidates for public office and legislators as well to use cover-up names on their campaign income and expenses sheets to mask the real identity of the source of campaign income. For example, a lobby group donates to a campaign, the candidate may say, well, send me a cashier's check and then on their statement they will list the name of a -- on the cashier's check which is a bank teller, not the real source. The Assistant Secretary of State seems to feel this is a violation of the law, but it's never been tested. Do you feel the Attorney General should look into this or the Secretary of State should police this more fully?

A Well, you brought something to me I hadn't heard about or that this was going on. I just confine myself to saying I think it is another reason why the conflict of interest bill that's now before the legislature should be passed and passed just as quickly as possible. I think that a number of things of this kind are tightened up with the full disclosure provisions of that.

Q New subject, Governor. San Francisco General Hospital is threatened by a strike of employees and doctors, what do you think of this as a tactic?



A Well, are we talking about a public hospital there?

Q Yes, sir.

A Well, I have to still stand in my belief that I do not believe that public employees have a right to strike. I don't think you can strike against the people. It again seems to be a part of the same thing I commented on a moment ago, about demonstrations and violence as an answer to solving problems. The man who's known as the Father of the American Federation of Labor probably, the one man that was the greatest labor statesman that we have seen in more than a century, Samuel Gompers, was one who said that a strike means that communications have broken down. And he said a strike is only the last desperate resort when there is nothing else to do. He said, regardless of how small the difference is or the figure that you are discussing you should always fight to keep something for discussion to keep you at the table negotiating. And 25 years in a labor union myself and as an officer of that union, I subscribe to that. I believe that there is a tendency within the labor movement today to simply strike first and then negotiate. I don't believe in that.

Q Another subject.

A Yes.

Q Governor, the industrial accidents have increased in the State of California and there seems to be a hangup going on over the industrial safety division in San Francisco, including your appointee, Jack Hatton, the Assistant to the Chief Vincent White and Mr. Sherman. Is there any plans for changes over there? Are you going to ask them to do anything?

A Well, we have started a drive with regard to industrial accidents and certainly within the state ourselves, we are concerned about the great increase within the state in on-the-job accidents that is several times greater than the industrial accident rate outside. I don't know specifically, this hasn't been brought to my attention yet, as to specific recommendations as to what's going on over there. I'm sure it will be.

Q What kind of contingency plans <sup>(there's)</sup> his the administration making in event Proposition 7 fails to pass?

A Well, I've asked the Finance Department before June to come up with all the plans for not only this but for things like the previous issue that we were talking about that's going to be on the ballot

with regard to the tax program, as to what we would have to do so that we can tell the people of California what choices they have, what we'd be faced with if this happens. And I know Verne Orr recently told some of you that some of the taxes, just offhand, that would have to be increased to meet the problems that would result from this, and this evidently wasn't the way to go because everyone ran out and announced that we were going to increase the sales tax or something, and the people didn't quite understand what we were talking about, but theoretically I think we have to do this. I think we have to be able to say to the people in the event of the failure of the passage of a certain thing on the ballot this would be the result. This is what we would have to do, and there is no question but that Allan Post was right when he said our budgeting at the moment, all of our look-ahead financially is based on the passage of 7. I don't believe there is going to be a drastic change in the bond market between now and June, which would change that thinking. I just tell you here that if there is anyone concerned about the fate of California they should become a missionary on behalf of the passage of Proposition 7.

Q Well, what is going to happen if it doesn't pass?

A Well, I don't have all of those detailed plans as yet. I just -- I've just ordered them put together, what we would do and what we would have to do.

Q Governor, Assemblyman Unruh has made much of the fact that you campaigned in 1966 against campus unrest and yet campus unrest has been much greater during your administration than previously. What is your answer to these charges and how do you explain them?

A Well, I hope that Mr. Unruh has also explained that the Governor of California isn't in 50 states and there has been a great increase in this kind of violence on campus and off throughout all of the 50 states. I think you would also find that back there I warned about this kind of escalation. Now, Mr. Unruh may occasionally stumble over the truth, but he usually gets up and goes on as if nothing had happened. So he's ignored certain other things that I never made any promises of being able to solve this. I was quite critical in '66 and I've been critical in '67, '68, '69 and up to the moment of the administration of the universities where they have been unwilling to meet this head on and to grapple with it and I have repeatedly stated that we are limited to bringing about a restoration of order with

force once disorder breaks out, but that the real solution lies on the campus and until administrators are willing to do what Senator -- or what Chancellor Cheadle did the other day at Santa Barbara and in advance lay down a certain framework of rules and say that anyone who engages in this activity and is seen or apprehended will automatically be separated from the university. We are going to continue to have this kind of trouble. Now, there are encouraging signs that they are beginning to finally see the light as was evidenced down there, as was evidenced in the cancellation of the speeches by Kunstler. But I think there is -- there just is no other way. I criticized then -- I criticized the appeasement tactics that were followed in '65 and '66 in the disturbances that were then breaking out at Berkeley. I am still critical of appeasement and just be hopeful that, as I say, that there is going to be a change of attitude.

Q Governor, what do you think will emerge as the number one issues in -- and the primary issues in the gubernatorial race this year?

A Now, that depends on whose campaign you are looking at. I would think that a Republican campaign would be waged on what we have done and what we have started to do in these three years and whether it is valuable to the people to keep that going. One thing I'm sure of, antique furniture isn't going to be an issue.

(Laughter)

Q In the year of campus disturbances isn't there something else the state can do besides go in with force and restore order, such as when there are issues, it is gouging rents by landlords alleged, police harassment and so on? Isn't there something the police -- that is the state can do, sort of an arbitrator?

A No, once again we get into the area so jealously guarded by the university of academic freedom. Now, the university -- and I think this is true of every campus, does have a housing office and they have people on the campus who set certain rules and rates and so forth and negotiate out with outside landlords for the protection of the students and there is also a grievance center for the student to bring his grievance or protest, if he feels that he's been treated unfairly by anyone in the field of housing. Now, this has been true at Santa Barbara. I have to suspect at Santa Barbara now -- I'm not going to say that there aren't landlords that are probably trying to

get around certain regulations and rules, I'm sure there must be, nothing bats a hundred per cent, but I think also you have to assume that the same thing has been going on at Santa Barbara and the Isla Vista area as has been going on over in Berkeley, trying to create an issue in Berkeley, they are drumming it up as a rent strike, that type of thing, among the street people and hope they can also involve some students. But there is due process and there is an agency now set up and has been for years on the campus to meet these problems.

SQUIRE: Any more questions?

Q Governor, will you be formally announcing your political plans a week from today?

A Tune in.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.

---oO---

3/31/70

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD MARCH 31, 1970

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, no opening statement. Just good morning, so --

Q Governor, has there been any resolution to the question of the line authority of the Chancellor of the State College system and the local state college presidents? I'm thinking of Dumke's decision to fire a professor at San Jose State and going over the head of the local San Jose State President. Has there been any resolution to that question?

A Well, this was one of the discussions, as you were told the other day at the Trustee's meeting, that I myself have felt for a long time that in the changeover from just a group of independent teachers colleges to a state college system there never have been a clear delineation of authority with regard to the Chancellor's office and the individual Presidents, and the audit committee of the Trustees now has this under study and in with the Chancellor's office and the Presidents are going to attempt to lay down this line similar to what we have in the University where we haven't had that same kind of overlapping of friction.

Q Governor @-

A Well, right here and then you.

Q Governor, in view of your reception on some college campuses on your recent tour what's your feeling now about Proposition 1, the Health Bond issue on the June ballot? Will you support it or support it actively, or -- this is the one that would provide bond funds for the increase in size of medical schools and various campuses.

A Yes, I know the proposition and I've talked to the leaders of the committee for this. There is no question about the need for expansion and enlargement of the medical facilities in our -- facilities

in our medical schools. We are not producing the doctors here to -- to actually keep up with loss by attrition. We are going down instead of up, the number of doctors that we have in California. I hope that the people will make a difference here and not emotionally get so aroused by such demonstrations as Santa Barbara that they just kind of take an act of vengeance because there is a need for this, but this was one of the things I said that a Regents with regard to the more stringent rules that are now imposed with regard to disorder, that the University has a responsibility, too. They have got to prove to the people of California that they share their concern and that they are going to take action to see that these demonstrations are brought to a halt. I hope it will. Of course, again, they have to tie it to Proposition 7. It isn't going to do any good to pass Proposition 1 without Proposition 7 and have a bond issue approved and not be able to sell the bonds.

Now, wait a minute, Sid first and then you.

Q Governor, the Senate Transportation Committee --

SQUIRE: Let's finish on this one subject. Any more questions on this one subject?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Is yours on this subject?

Q It is on Proposition 7.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Is that close enough? O. K., go ahead. Then we will come back to Sid.

(Laughter)

Q Well, no, it is about legislation, about the two-thirds vote for raising taxes.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: All right, Sid.

Q I was going to -- Governor, the Senate Transportation Committee yesterday for the first time approved a constitutional amendment and bills which would divert gas tax money to rapid transit and smog research. What is your reaction to this action?

A Well, I haven't seen the -- what they did. My own reaction has been that we in the administration have said that we would favor permitting local communities any one of several courses, to do what they wanted to do with their share of the tax -- funds, or permission as we have already one or two examples for local community to impose either a sales tax or a sales tax on gas or a gas tax of their own

in their community for rapid transit. But I recognize the logic statewide of using gas tax funds with regard to smog, because I think here again this is a proper use of a tax, just as the gasoline tax supports highway building and maintenance of highways, well, I think that the automobiles creating the smog, there is a responsibility for the users to contribute by way of that tax. I've never objected to that.

Q Are you in favor of diverting this one cent for smog research but not for rapid transit, is that correct?

A Well, as I say, I don't know what it was that they passed. I have felt -- I have felt that the local communities faced with rapid transit problems should be allowed revenue sources, be able to raise revenue even up to and including imposition of taxes on the gasoline tax. I have not favored a general use of the statewide gasoline tax for local projects of that kind.

Q Governor, if you should get a bill which diverts -- specifically diverts gasoline tax to rapid transit, would you veto such a bill?

A Well, now you are asking me a question you know that I never answer. I'm not -- I won't answer veto or sign until a bill gets to my desk, not when it is just up there in an embryo stage.

Q Well, Governor, you already said though that it would be all right with you to allow local governments to use their share of the gas tax.

A We have stated that publicly and we have done that already.

Q That's what this bill does.

Q Governor, several weeks ago you said regarding mass transit that it should be developed for the sake of those who for one reason or another cannot provide their own transportation, and that kind of philosophy would mean there wouldn't be very many cars removed by a mass transit system.

A I said that I thought that the first and primary need of rapid transit, that's right, should be for those people who require public transportation. This is basic. They certainly should not be denied mobility because they don't own or drive a car. But beyond that point I think the point in -- we are speaking of my remarks which were very brief over in the conference that had been called. What I was trying to express was my belief that you cannot bring about rapid transit by planned congestion. That you meet the problem



as it exists, but you don't set out deliberately to say, "We will create the need for rapid transit by refusing to build highways for the people that are providing their own mobility, their own automobiles." Now, some people have advocated this necessity, see, let's stop the highway building and force people into rapid transit. As I say, this is government planning congestion to bring about something that government is determined is in the people's interests and the point I was trying to make was that I think the automobile, whatever faults and problems, such as smog, must be corrected; that the automobile has given man the greatest individual freedom of mobility that he has ever had, and it would be a step backward to suddenly deny man this because we are concerned ~~about~~ the problems that still remain to be solved.

Q Governor, do you mean by that, and by saying that mass transit is only for those who can't afford their own transportation, that you object to the idea of mass transit on a regional basis to solve a commuter problem?

A No, I said that the first premise of rapid transit is to recognize first of all that you need it for a certain proportion of your population. You start with that. Now, I'm not denying at all that the carrying on in the local community or regional community such as BART, this idea of it, but you don't at the same time say, not only will we create it, but we will ~~create~~ an even greater need for it by denying those people who prefer to drive their own cars the highways upon which to drive them.

Q Is there some way to coordinate the construction of mass transit with highway construction?

A Well, I think it should be a plan of -- this is why we have an over-all transportation commission or task force now is to review the whole problem of transportation, not only within the state, in and out of the state, and between our cities and within our cities, to find a whole master plan that will meet all the needs of our people and this includes those who drive cars as well as those who would prefer the other.

Q Well, though, Governor, wouldn't it be an easier attempt to remove the automobile from the congested area, from a smog and congested standpoint, be a criterion for rapid transit?

A Well, I don't exactly understand.

Q Not deny the people the use of the automobile, but to provide rapid transit to remove much of the automobile into the --

from the congested areas?

A Well, now, when you say that, let's take a look at the situation on the Oakland Bay Bridge. In the rush hours approximately 50 per cent of the people using the Oakland Bay Bridge are doing so in rapid transit, they are using buses, public transportation. Now, all I'm trying to point out, once again, is you -- you have a balanced transportation plan. You meet the needs of the people and the desires of the people. I think that's the function of government, to be a convenience for the people, not the other way around. And you don't do this by deciding in government that people shouldn't drive their cars so you are going to create deliberately congestion by refusing to build needed bridges and highways.

Q Well, Governor, if the public transportation takes 50 per cent of the traffic on that bridge, they also create about say 10 per cent of the congestion. The big congestion, it seems to me, is in the automobile, the private automobile, not the mass transit.

A Well, I'm not -- I'm not denying that. But people evidently prefer this. We once, as I have said before, we had a pretty good rapid transit system in Los Angeles, it was called the Big Red Cars and they disappeared simply because people didn't ride in them. People preferred, even in the congestion, driving their own cars on the highways.

Q Governor, what do you think then of the idea of doubling the toll on a bridge with the purpose of trying to economically force people out of automobiles and into some kind of public transportation?

A I know some economists have suggested that we should use more of the private enterprise rules that, like if you have a theatre hit that's a smash, you double the prices because the traffic will bear this. And so they have suggested that we are going at it wrong by lowering the tolls as we have on almost all of the bridges in these last three years. This administration has been here, we have sizably reduced them and some people have suggested that in a rush hour we should increase the tolls on the basis of supply and demand, that more people want to use it so you make it costlier for them to use it at that rush hour and try to spread it out or deny them the use. I'm not sure that this is -- in fact I don't think that government again should be in the position of forcing people into something when the people have evidenced and shown their own desire to do it a

different way.

Q Governor, if the state is building freeways because people want them presumably, is the state then in competition with local governments that you say ought to be allowed to build rapid transit? Aren't they in a tenable position of competition then?

A Well, no, I think you find the local community is still made up of the same citizens of the state and they express their need and desire for a program of this kind, with these freeways. Again, it comes down to what I said before about our commission, that you have to have a commission as we have now that looks at the whole transportation need of the state and the whole problem as a coordinated thing without that idea of competition between one kind of transportation or another.

Q Governor, what would be the difference between using state -- general state gasoline tax fund to build a freeway through the heart of Los Angeles and using the same general tax fund to build a rapid transit system through?

A Well, because the state's use of its own gasoline share of the gasoline tax funds as a part from that that is designated for county roads and city streets, is based on a formula for population, those who are paying in the tax and is based on a statewide transportation system or highway and freeway system, and built within that formula, within that plan, the people have an opportunity to register their dissent or their approval if that plan gets out of way and unnaturally favors one community as against another.

Q But, Governor, don't sections of that plan, like in Los Angeles, meet regional needs, really, of commuters, rather than statewide primarily such as a regional mass transit system would do?

A Well, I think it shouldn't get out of proportion to the amount of people that are using it. In other words, theoretically the highway system is supposed to be with the division based on population so that the tax-paying segment does not get more than its share than it is paying in. Now, the controversy that raises in the legislature every once in a while is the belief that some of the rural areas are getting more than their share. The defense of the rural area is that the highways that are built there are built also for through traffic, people from the cities who are using these as transportation from one city to another, one locality to another. They are not just

highways being built for people who live in that particular county or area.

Q Another subject?

Q I've another question --

Q Another subject.

Q Governor, when you say that people want to use their own cars, don't want to use the mass transit, are we in a position now where it appears clearer and clearer that there isn't any more room for their own cars and that the environment, the air, can't take any more of the -- that's discharged by the automobiles into it, what do you do then?

A Well, if you are going to tie this to smog you've got to separate the two between room and smog. Smog is a problem that's got to be solved within the fuel source and the combustion engine as to whether it can be made non-contributed to smog or whether we are going to have to look for another power source. I think every indication, every evidence is today that the combustion engine is going to be able to lick this problem. I anticipate breakthroughs, not only in fuel, but in the engine itself -- as a matter of fact I think the engine probably on next year's car is going to come very close to meeting the standards that we ourselves have set for a few years ahead. Room, congestion, yes, this will create the desire itself, but this is why rapid transit decisions, I think, largely are made within the community itself. This is why we are ready to let them vote the source of revenue within the community, but I don't see why -- why we should propose that the people in Modoc County should help the people in Los Angeles get to work on time. That's a Los Angeles problem. It is a regional problem, when I say Los Angeles, of that area, people principally who will use it.

Q Governor, aren't all these standards for -- ~~emission~~ standards for gasoline engines based on the theory that there will also be some control on the unlimited production and use of automobiles in this country?

A Yes, I don't think anyone is tied down to the idea that some day we are going to ration them or restrict the numbers of them. The idea is to produce a clean enough motor so that in great numbers or as the numbers continue to increase the way they have they will not be a contributor to air pollution. And there is every reason to believe that this can be accomplished.

Q Another subject.

A Well, now if we are going to be to another subject, we have got a first bidder down here.

Q Governor, the action by the State Water Quality Control Board cracking down on pollution in San Francisco Bay is drawing quite a bit of fire from the cities involved, sanitary districts, contractors. Mayor Alioto is scheduled to speak before the board this coming Thursday. Do you now see any reason or any need for the board to pull in its horns or modify its tough standard in view of this opposition?

A Well, I understand that the Board -- that's its responsibility is -- this battle against pollution and there is no question that the Board is not engaged in or does not want to engage in stopping normal progress or building or interfering with any one segment. There is more than the construction industry, just the sewer connection to private liability buildings that has to do with pollution. By the same token the Board is concerned that as we set out on a fight and are going to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to cure -- to end pollution that we don't go on carelessly increasing it at the very time that we are trying to decrease it. Now, I -- I think that there will be agreement, I think that there -- there have been steps made already that -- over in San Francisco, steps that could have been taken before as a result of the Board's action are now going to be taken and I think then as we see this kind of progress that the building, construction, can go on.

Q Are you saying then that you favor the Board pulling in its horns that its mission has been accomplished now?

A No, no, and I'd rather refer you to the Board. That's their function and I -- I actually haven't seen --

Q You put out a very strong statement the same day the Board acted, that's why I thought you might want to comment on it.

A Well, I have commented. I think that progress has been made. I understand some announcements have been made of steps that are going to be taken, particularly in the Bay area and I think that some -- because I can understand the economic necessity of going ahead with -- but no one has said they couldn't build, they said they couldn't connect to the sewers.

(Laughter)

Q Another subject?

A Yes, now wait a minute --

Q Governor, yesterday the Controller's office reported that the state has spent \$466 million at this point more than it's taken in. What is the projection for the end of the fiscal year or are steps being taken now to balance? (budget)

A Well, this is -- this is our low point. This is the cash flow problem that cracked the concrete around my feet. In-- we are right at the depth of it preceding the April 15 income tax day, when we have every year of the great borrowing that must take place. The problem that caused me to change one of my cherished views was the fact that this period now, the borrowing, has become so great because of the increased reliance on the income tax that we must level out and have a better flow of income through the period basically from, oh, about December to April 15. If our tax reform program is passed, it is even going to be -- this cash flow problem is going to be increased because in this period now before April 15 we will have to give the money to the local governments that we will be collecting for schools and for welfare, for county and government and for local school districts. So there is nothing unusual in this except that as we ourselves pointed out here in that press conference on the tax reform program, that -- we pointed out that the problem of borrowing -- interfund borrowing is becoming greater than the amount of funds from which we have to borrow. This year it is even exaggerated by the hundred million dollars that we are lending to the water program to keep it in operation. So the answer to this whole problem is pass the tax reform program and we will cure our cash flow problem at the same time.

Q Without the passage of the program will the books balance?

PAUL BECK: The Controller's report said that it would.

A Yes.

Q Governor, you are meeting shortly with Norton Simon. What will you tell him that your position is as far as the primary for the U. S. Senate goes?

A My position would be what it's always been in the primary, Senator Murphy knows that. I remain neutral in the primary, but I will certainly let every candidate know that I expect them to abide by the 11th Commandment, and I will expect the other candidates in

that race, as all other races, to do what Senator Murphy has already announced he intends to do and that is state that he will support whoever is the winner of the primary. Now, any Republican candidate in a primary who is unwilling to abide by those provisions, then I think he doesn't have any real demand on neutrality by anyone.

Q If a candidate in a Republican primary violates the 11th Commandment and goes on to win that primary, would your regard for him as far as the general election be affected at all?

A Well, I certainly wouldn't have a gleam of tender affection in my eye when I looked at him. I think that before that time, without waiting for the election, I think that the party and I would join the party in having something to say to a candidate that did violate the 11th Commandment.

Q Governor, if Mr. Simon raises what he feels is a legitimate objection about the Technicolor issue would you \_\_\_\_\_ Senator Murphy?

A Yes, because I don't think it is a legitimate complaint. I think that's been cleared up, it should be, to everyone's satisfaction.

Q But the candidate might not think it has been cleared up. It is a questionable propriety on Senator Murphy's part that might be alleged. Doesn't the 11th Commandment then block public review of this? I mean isn't the function of a candidate to call attention to what he thinks is an impropriety?

A No, I think that I've always believed that in a primary you run on what you expect to do, what your philosophy is, how you would conduct the office if you were in, and you do not necessarily have to run against another candidate who may turn out to be the party candidate or nominee after the primary. The 11th Commandment specifically states you -- well, interpreted, not strictly saying, interprets that you do not say things that the opposition could then use against a fellow party member if he becomes the nominee. I think you can depend on the opposition from the other party to bring out for public view anything disparaging.

Q Governor, I wanted to ask you maybe even a little more than you have already amplified just how broadly you interpret the 11th Commandment. Do you mean that an opposing candidate in the Republican party, say, running against an incumbent Republican, should not be critical of the conduct of office at all, should not be critical



of perhaps philosophies expressed by the office holder or --

A Well, I think that comes out if he affirmatively expresses what is his philosophy. I've only had one primary experience of my own and I campaigned in that way. And I think there is no reason -- I interpret the 11th Commandment to mean that you do not provide ammunition for the other party in the election to follow -- provide them with ammunition they can use against your party's candidate.

Q Governor, if Mr. Simon does bring up the Technicolor issue and if, as you said, that in a Republican primary the candidate is unwilling to abide by the 11th Commandment and that violates the 11th Commandment, would you then support Murphy?

A Well, there are a couple of other candidates in there. Let's just put it this way, I wouldn't support the candidate who does the violating, I'd still remain neutral where the others were concerned.

Q Governor, another topic. Governor, on the Technicolor issue, you said you were satisfied with Senator Murphy's reply, but he did not go into the one aspect regarding the fact that half of his apartment is paid by Technicolor. Now, do you think there is any question -- anything wrong with that?

A Well, this was also -- this was also brought before the Council and the Chairman of the Ethics Committee in the Senate. It is my understanding, you'd have to ask him about the details, but it is my understanding that this is an apartment that actually was not his but was theirs and that it is frequently used by company personnel when they are in the Capitol. That he -- he has a bedroom in it and the use of it, for which he pays what has been determined to be a fair share of the rent based on his use of it as against their company use of it.

Q Another subject, Governor.

A All right.

Q During your campaign swing two weeks ago through Tulare County, a Bert Dennis, Chairman of the Spring Round-up with Ronald Reagan put out a release describing your schedule. At the bottom: Note to press, radio and T. V.; Governor Reagan requests that tapes of any television coverage he provided to his office by sending them to Peter Johns, 503 D Street, San Rafael. May I infer that your campaign people are hoping that the newsmedia will help you with



your publicity?

A           You know, based on past experience with all your apologies to present company, I think that would be a pretty vain hope. I know -- and I don't understand that at all. Does anyone know what that's all about?

Q           I never heard of it.

A           I never heard of it.

Q           Can I get an answer on this in the future?

MR. BECK: I think you ought to ask him.

A           Ask him or ask some of the campaign organizations. I don't know anything about it or what he might have been referring to.

Q           This was put out in your name. Do you disapprove of this type of request?

A           I don't even understand what he has in mind. You've never heard me ask you for any tapes or anything of that kind. I don't -- I really don't know what he's doing. I'd have to say that I just never have heard of any such example, so you can ask him some questions. I think I'm going to ask some, too.

Q           Governor, have you made any decision yet on the date for a special election to fill the seat of Mr. --

A           Yes, I -- I made the announcement yet but I've determined to ask for both the Congressional special elections to occur simultaneously, the preliminaries occur with the June primary date which would then make the runoff if needed occur toward the end of June, about June 30. I had thought for a while of having the first one and having a runoff coincide with the June primary, but the people in the areas felt that they would rather do it the other way, so --

Q           The special primary then would be concurrent with the regular primary?

A           With the regular primary, yes.

Q           Governor, the Los Angeles teachers appealed to you to intervene in some way to prevent a strike in Los Angeles; do you plan to do so and otherwise what do you think can be done by your office in an effort to head off this -- this strike in Los Angeles?

A           Well, I've heard that I have -- that a request has been made for a meeting with a representative of the teachers' union. So far I haven't received that request. I have only heard about it. But

I would think that-- I'm willing to do anything I can, but this is a local matter. These are matters in local school boards. There is a limit to how far I can inject myself in this kind of a dispute. However, if there is anything that all of the parties concerned think I can do I'd be very happy to be of help. But this I think requires more than just meeting with the representative of one group. If I'm to have such a meeting I think that it should be with all the interested parties as well as the representatives of other teachers groups who do not feel that they are represented by this particular union.

Q Governor, you would not close the door then to a meeting with them in an effort to head off a strike if your efforts are --

A No, if all of them agree, that they would like to talk to me about it.

Q Governor, on another subject, when do you plan to fill the vacancy created by the death of Frank Jordan, after the primary or before the primary?

A Well, it is, I feel, a little early and precipitant now to announce any plans. I think this is -- in the next few days I would have an announcement on what we are going to do.

Q Governor, when do you plan to fill the vacancy on the State Supreme Court?

A On the State Supreme Court we are trying -- this has really been a search and if I seem overly cautious on this with regard to making the announcement it is just because there seems to be a national trend that tends to make a fellow cautious.

Q Is it true, though, Governor, that the list has been narrowed to about five or six people?

A Yes, I could -- I could say that. But I --

Q Judge Carswell on the list?

(Laughter)

A What?

Q Judge Carswell on the list?

A (Laughter), No, I figure he's still on another game.

Q Is there a legislator on the list, Governor?

A Not to my knowledge, no.

Q Governor, the incoming Director of Health, Care services has announced that there is a projected 15 to 20 million dollar deficit

or there will be by July 1, to the program -- Medi-Cal program.

Are we going to go through the same thing we went through a couple of years now ago -- two years? First of all, why is the budget in -- and estimate off so far and second of all, is it possible in three months to make up 15 to 20 million dollars?

A Well, yes, I think so, in answer to the last part of your question there. Actually, 15 or 20 million dollars in relation to the whole amount we are talking about is not as far off as it might seem, it is a lot of money but it is a terribly small percentage of it. But in the budget for the present year we did factor in inflation. We are victims of what everyone else has been a victim of. The inflation rate, as you know, for this year began to run away, and it was higher than anyone had anticipated, but also number two, there has been -- we underestimated, as everyone did, the welfare load, the increase that has come about largely due to the Supreme Court decision on doing away with our residency requirements. Now, every time we add to the welfare rolls we add to the Medi-Cal rolls also. And this has gotten out of hand. I told you several times this is the reason for our study and research into some way to get a handle on welfare and why we are asking for some legislation now to enable us to control this better. But the Director is issuing a press statement on some of the plans that he has for catching up with this and he's -- in these next few months, and I'd rather just turn you over to his press release on this and what he intends to do.

Q Governor, excuse me, back to the court appointment, are you holding up the selection of a Supreme Court Justice to decide what happens to Carswell, in case Nixon might pick somebody else?

A No, no, not at all. We're trying very hard, and I would have hoped by now we could have had one, although within the last week I was gratified to learn that the Supreme Court of the State was functioning very well without that appointment, but --

Q But it is not tied into the National situation?

A No, not at all. We have -- some people have been under consideration suddenly have been lost to us by health reasons.

Q Governor, did you selcome the State Supreme Court knocking down the Unruh Act even though you signed it?

A Yes.

Q Isn't that kind of contradictory?

A No, because I told you I signed it reluctantly because of some provisions in there that I thought were needed, but I also said that I signed it with the expectation that the legislature through my talks with the legislative leadership would come up immediately as they did in this last January with a new conflict of interest bill to cure the defects of the other one. Now, the urgency measure that was required or that made a two-thirds vote required was delaying us dangerously close to the April 6 date, and local governments up and down this state were faced with mass resignations to say nothing of state boards and commissions and employees that were getting ready to resign because of the invasion of privacy that was inherent in the -- in the Unruh bill. And so I was pleased when this decision was made that now takes the time pressure off us and we can now proceed in an orderly manner in this session for a proper conflict of interest bill that will meet the criteria established by the Court decision.

Q Well, you would have had that situation if you would have vetoed the Unruh bill, you would have had that whole year to work it out if you felt that way about the bill. You could have vetoed it yourself and gotten that time.

A No, I felt and maybe it was a mistake -- I've wondered myself now whether I just shouldn't have taken it on -- there were parts of it that there were legitimate conflict of interest provisions, and it was a part of the bill that I myself criticized as an invasion of privacy and let's just say I was apparently over-confident as to the -- our ability to correct that before great harm was done.

Q With the time pressure off, are you confident that you will issue such a proper conflict bill out of the legislature this year?

A Yes, I think there will be.

Q Governor, have you formed any kind of preliminary position on the Peripheral Canal?

A No, we just had another input yesterday and a hearing on some of the opposition to the -- to the canal. We have had several cabinet meetings on this and I think very shortly we will be -- we will be announcing a decision on it.

Q Governor, are you aware of any of your supporters, particularly your financial supporters, going over to Mayor Yorty in the primary campaign?

A So far all that I have had is literally and overwhelming and enthusiastic report to the contrary, that they are all staying in camp.

SQUIRE: Any more questions? Thank you, Governor.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: There is one more question here.

Let me just say on that, once the decision was made and once we had the package, I've discovered around this place, I don't know how it was built but I have discovered there are no secrets. And I'd rather tell the story than -- in fact, we didn't completely.

Q And can we round out the story, Governor, by having someone explain what is meant on item 7 on this table, savings from interaction

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Let's have Verne explain interaction.

VERNE ORR: Interaction occurs for example when you reduce the property tax, the man who is paying his income tax has a smaller tax to deduct as a deduction and pays a little higher income tax because he doesn't have as much of a deduction and there are other interactions like that.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.

---oOo---



PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD APRIL 14, 1970

Reported by

Beverly Toms, CSR

(This rough transcript of the Governor's press conference is furnished to the members of the Capital 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: No opening statement other than good morning or good afternoon.

Q Governor, when you announced the appointment of Justice Wright you said you hoped you would look for a man who would return the state judiciary to a higher degree of integrity or higher position of integrity. Can you tell us which members of the judiciary have acted to lower the integrity of the state courts?

A Well, now, I don't remember exactly my phraseology. I know that I spoke about judiciary restraint and our desire to return it to judicial restraint. There is no secret that I have been critical of decisions in the past of the court, and my belief that the state Supreme Court has at times in the past, the same as the United States Supreme Court, tended to legislate rather than to simply interpret the law. And this was all a part considered in the factors in choosing Judge Wright.

Q Well, I wonder if you can justify your use of the word "integrity". That's something else than simply arriving at a decision that you may disagree with.

A Well, no, I think when you are talking about those decisions and when someone is not interpreting the law, but is going beyond it, I think the word is proper.

Q Governor, Julian <sup>Nava</sup> Nova (phonetics) said today while you were campaigning in 1966 you promised that you would work for a 50 per cent state contribution to schools. In view of the Los Angeles teachers' strike, can you tell us are you working for that and whether or not you still think it is a desirable goal.

A I said in 1966 that I thought that that was a desirable goal, would try to work toward it. The same time, I didn't realize

how difficult it was to keep up with local spending. We have increased very sizably the contributions from state government to public education. We haven't been able to keep up with the sky-rocketing increase in property tax and the school property tax to do this. Now, this isn't unusual. The whole idea of the state achieving 50 per cent, the closest we ever came since World War II was in about 1953 when it was 57 and a half. From that point on it's continued steadily to go down. By 1961-62 it was below 40 per cent and in spite of the increases of the state in its subvention to the schools it's continued to go down to where today it is about 36 per cent. But at the same time, in the three years we have been here we have increased our subvention to the schools in an amount greater than the combined increase in average daily attendance and the inflation factor, and we haven't been able to keep up with them. So it isn't a case of not wanting to, it is -- as a matter of fact, last year the tax reform program which I introduced and for which I could not get support, would have taken 80 per cent of the cost of education from local government and put it in the hands of the state.

Q Is there anything that you can do now, do you think, to alleviate the conditions which have caused the strike?

A No, I think that this is an issue between the school board and the one faction of teachers down there. I am gratified by the fact that more than half of the teachers are continuing to go to work, and I don't think there is any area in which the state can involve itself.

Q Governor, do you think this fact, the teachers striking, will have any effect on the children themselves about obeying the rules and regulations? Public employees are not necessarily supposed to strike.

A Well, I think that those teachers who are teaching are a far better example for the young people to follow than the ones who are striking. As I say, I just -- I don't believe in public employees being allowed to strike, and now there is a restraining order and I would think the teachers would have in mind that they should be setting a proper example and operate within the law rather than giving an example or a demonstration of defying the law.

Q Governor, what do you think the teachers should do in order to try to get their demands?



A Well, at the moment there is no way for them to strike without being -- without striking against the children, which is what they are doing. They were unable to present a case that could win the support of the people of their community, including the parents of the children going to school, when a vote was 3 to 1 against the tax override they requested. I would think that they would start a campaign, if they legitimately have a case, requiring more money to improve the quality of education, -- I would think that they would review their -- their failure to convince the people and set out to try and convince them and I don't think they are going to do it with this kind of an action.

Q Mr. Basie (phonetics) indicated today he thinks that the Los Angeles school district is much too large, it is unwieldy and top-heavy with administrators. What do you think about proposals to break up the district and make it small?

A Well, I happen to be one whose -- I made it plain, I oppose the program of the Speaker of the Assembly some years ago, who was embarked on a program of forcing unification of school districts to reduce the number in the state, make them larger. I thought that was a trend away from local control when it should be a trend toward it. And I know that there have been studies of the ideal size of a school district that have indicated that when you get beyond about 20,000 pupils in a district you begin to lose efficiency and you have an increased cost factor, just the same as in almost any other institution, a hospital or single school or anything else. There is a breaking point beyond which if you continue to grow you get less efficiency, not more.

Q But would you advocate the breaking up of the unified school district, particularly in Los Angeles.

A Well, you are talking again about a local problem, but I think it is something the people there should be looking at.

Q Governor, the financial problems of the Los Angeles district appear at least to be symptomatic of many school districts throughout the state. What do you see as the long term solution to the -- to the financial support problems faced by schools? Just convince taxpayers, is that all, or --

A Well, there are many people, and I think there were some people who expressed this and some of the leaders in the fight against

the proposed increase in taxes in the Los Angeles school district, people who believe that -- that the schools have not been getting all the good out of the dollars they are getting, and that they perhaps embark on a study that would reveal ways to conserve those dollars, make better use of them, and whether this is true or not, this would depend on the kind of research or study would determine the truth of this charge, but many people do believe it.

Q Do you, Governor?

A I have always believed that anything to do with government as we proved here with our citizens Task forces, has a tendency to get hidebound and to not keep up with some of the -- on some of the lessons that are learned in private undertakings that could improve efficiencies. And I think that the odds are this is true.

Q Governor, you've turned down the idea of a tax increase to provide instant <sup>(school)</sup> funding for Los Angeles. What do you think of the idea voiced of using \$17 million dollars of revenue from leftover revenue from last year in the budget surplus to restore programs for Los Angeles for the coming year?

A Well, you can't just from the state level, you can't just aid Los Angeles, you'll find this problem is prevalent throughout the state, in a number of other threatened districts. Los Angeles, as a matter of fact, if you started trying to take some action to help the entire state, Los Angeles' share on comparison with other districts' problems would be relatively small out of that 17 million. Los Angeles does not rank as one of the poor school districts.

Q Governor, if your tax reform program is enacted, what would it do to help Los Angeles school districts?

A Well, two things that would help, I think, not only Los Angeles school districts, but all school districts, not immediately other than in the equalization formula, but providing of sources of revenue that are more elastic and that tend to grow more proportionately with inflation. The growth of the economy, rather than relying as solely as they do on the property tax would be of help to education. They'd have a source of revenue that each year would have a built-in increase without going back and changing the tax rates as they have to do in the property tax situation.

The other thing, of course, would be the equalization formula which would take, I guess, about 60 million dollars and make

it available for distribution throughout most of the schools. About 80 per cent of the school districts.

Q Governor, by saying that this particular situation is a local problem are you indicating that you think there is nothing at all that the state can do to immediately alleviate the situation?

A I don't think there is a single thing that the state can do to alleviate the situation. I don't know what it would be. I don't see, as I said to some of them, some of the teachers came to see me, I don't see how you can possibly intervene at the state level in this controversy between the Los Angeles school board and the dissident group of teachers, the striking group of teachers, without violating all the fundamental rules of local autonomy. You can't have it both ways. You can't ask for local autonomy until there is trouble and then ask big brother to step in and do something about it. And the second thing is the state could not pass a state tax to aid one school district without going into the -- to all the districts. And again, as I said before, I don't believe anyone has shown evidence that the state at this point should be increasing the tax on the people. They themselves have voted to the contrary.

Q Some of the teachers or the leaders of the union have said that they are really striking against the state. What do you think of that statement by them?

A They are really striking against the children and they ought to review their consciences and figure that out.

Q Governor, if this dragged on, say for months, and their children were losing an education, don't you think there is -- isn't there some point where you, as Governor, with the prestige of your office or with the powers of your office, could or should step in and do something to see the children get an education? After all, doesn't the state have a stake because they pay a large share of that amount of money.

A I have said if there is any place where we actually can be of help and requested, of course, we will do anything we can to be of help, within our ability. We are not just denying them, moving out, but I --

Q Have you had a request from the south to get in the act?

A No, we have had no such request and I think you are presenting a hypothetical case. Today there are more teachers going

back in the classroom than there were yesterday and there is a majority, more than half of the teachers have ruled not to strike. And now you have a court order telling the rest that they can't, and I think now it is between the school board and the -- and those who have been conducting the strike. But the strike actually should be over if they obey the court order.

Q Do you think Mayor Yorty has failed to show lack of local leadership by not bringing both sides together?

A Oh, no, you'd have to ask him about that. I don't know what he's -- he's done about that.

Q Governor, there -- on your tax reform there are reports that the program is running in trouble already and that you may be forced to make some concessions to get it passed. Have you discussed this with Mr. Bagley?

A So far I haven't seen any evidence that it is running in trouble -- into any trouble, and so far I haven't seen any proposals for changes to it that are any improvement. It is a legislative matter, it is up there for the legislative process now and if they can come up in that process with any improvements over what we submitted, I'll be delighted.

Q Governor, some of the teachers say they are going to ignore the court order because they think it is unconstitutional. Do you see anything different between that choice and Governor Kirk's actions in Florida?

A Oh, don't get me into commenting on that, I don't know exactly what has been going on down there.

Q Well, the court order is being ignored, it's that item.

A I don't think it should be.

Q Can we go into something else or on that same subject?

Q On another subject.

A Well, him and then you, all right.

Q Prior to your speech in Fresno last week there was a demonstration, but this time not by students, it was my Mexican-Americans of various ages representing a large segment of the population in the valley. Do you plan any particular campaign strategy in light of recent court rulings to win over the Spanish speaking vote?

A Oh, well, I'm going to do my best to win the support of

that community as well as every other group of citizens in our state. I've long been an opponent of segregating people and trying to put them over as -- for so many years as our opponents did, into voting blocks and try to find particular things to appeal to them. I think they have the same concerns, the same interests and I think the responsible people in the Americans of Mexican descent know the strides that we have made in this administration and the things we have done to try and alleviate some of their special problems. I challenge that the group who were throwing rocks through windows in Fresno are representative of the Spanish speaking community in California. I don't think they represent them at all. I think the vast bulk of that community has some legitimate problems and can even call them grievances and we have been trying to meet them for sometime past and I think they are responsible and I think those citizens want to do things in an orderly manner. And I don't think they claim them as representatives. Oh, wait a minute, I said I'd recognize him.

Q This sort of ties in, regarding the controversy stirred by your blood bath statement. Your critics have suggested you have a double standard. You criticize certain militants when they make violent sounding statements, but you excused your own remark as a figure of speech. And one democratic Assemblyman has suggested you be arrested for inciting to riot. What is your general reaction to that kind of criticism?

A My general reaction is much ado about nothing. The figure of speech became a balloon that was inflated with the hot air of campaign oratory, took off and the last I saw it disappeared over the horizon. I don't think it can ever be wafted back again.

Q Well, where do you draw the line between someone <sup>who</sup> says, we ought to kill the president, and then he says that's a figure of speech, I didn't really mean it.

A No, I don't think there is exactly a comparison. I was talking about administrators who must meet their moment of truth and stand firm and answering a -- this question from the floor and I think there is -- this has been explained and as I say, I don't think anyone can blow it up into anything else.

Q How is your mail running on the subject, Governor?

A How is the mail running on the subject. I haven't gotten

an actual mail count, but I know that a great many people have been slapping me on the back. They didn't think it was a wrong figure of speech at all to describe the situation. Now --

Q Governor, excuse me, do you mean people -- people who accept a literal interpretation of that are slapping you on the back? Would you explain that, please.

A No, I think there are people who agree it was a figure of speech and didn't think it was inappropriate. We were talking about a small dissident group in the campus that has made it plain now that they are not, as they pretended for sometime over the last few years -- not concerned with legitimate student grievances, they are revolutionaries and they must be resisted.

Q What do you mean the administrators ought to do with them?

A What?

Q What do you mean the administrators ought to do with that group?

A Well, to those who were present I was answering a question that was framed in the context of how could the public be more helpful to me in this situation that is disturbing the campuses and I suggested that they could be more helpful perhaps to administrators who understandably through the years never having been -- never having had to deal with violence, have been faced with it and that for a time they temporized, perhaps, beyond the point in which they should temporize, hoping that these people would react to reasonable debate. And that they have -- we have passed that point, the time now is for these administrators to recognize the nature of the controversy and to stand firm. Now get you.

Q Are they finished with that?

Q I have another question on that subject. Some people have thought that what you were talking about was the possibility of a confrontation occurring between protestors and people reacting to protestors, whether they be businessmen or whatever. Along those lines are you concerned about such a confrontation and is that the context in which it means?

A No, it was exactly as has been explained many times. You see, too many of you took your stories by way of the interpretation of a candidate, another candidate, not me. And it lost something in the translation, or added something.

Q Governor, would you use that same figure of speech again?  
(Laughter)

A No, I'll try to give you fellows another problem to write about next time out. I think we have milked that one for all we can.

Q Oh a different subject, Governor, would you favor or oppose amending the fair employment practices code to prohibit jobs discrimination on the basis of a person's sex?

A Would I favor or oppose --

Q Amending the FEPC code to prohibit job discrimination on the basis of a person's sex?

A Oh, I think there is a -- as I said before, I think there is a reasonable road there, and a road for review of what perhaps are still some antiquated provisions, work provisions, pay provisions and so forth between the sexes. On the other hand, I think there is a rule of reason. I think there -- as I said before, I think the Los Angeles Rams ought to be able to advertise for a tackle and specify he be male. And I don't think that would be discrimination. But I think there is some room. I think we still probably have some -- some regulations against overtime for female employees that no longer in today's modern technology apply, that were born in a day when the work was physically tiring and heavy and this is the reason for them, and now it doesn't apply any longer, and I think changes of that kind -- it is just a case of modernizing ~~it~~ and bringing it up to date.

Q Governor, with reference to the Mills bill appropriated in the Senate, do you approve or disapprove of the principle of the State Highway Commission to decide where gas state tax funds would be spent?

A Well, this particular Highway Commission I would have every confidence there would be little change in policy and there would certainly be no loss -- unwarranted loss to any part of the state, but again we are dealing with a problem of the Highway Commissions go on and on and they change in personnel and membership down through the years. I don't -- I don't like to talk, as you know, about legislation that's still up there and still going and that might be considerably different when it gets to my desk, but I would feel that -- that any section of the state is entitled to have some assurance that at least -- that there would be at least a minimum guarantee to that --

to that section of the state for its need and I could foresee that happening.

Q What do you think of the principle of lowering the guarantee for northern California now? Say from 45 to 40 per cent?

A I one day expressed my own view, which I think perhaps is a compromise situation. When the state population does change needs change, but there is another factor that within a strict formula, finance formula, unnecessarily ties the hands of the highway builders and therefore I've suggested what if we had some kind of division as we have now, but not of the total amount and then left an amount up to the discretion of a board in which it could be allocated on the basis perhaps of accident -- the accident rate, that we could eliminate wherever they might be in the state, use a certain portion of the funds to eliminate those spots that are still causing an undue number of accidents and fatalities.

Q Well, Governor, don't you have that now, a certain 30 per cent ~~that's~~ going to free?

A I don't think so, by knowledge, no. I think it is a straight split.

Q They are spending 23 million dollars a year on accidents and improvements.

A Yes, but I think it still has to be within the formula. In other words, I'm saying suppose you had to go beyond a formula in one area of the state where the -- I don't know of any county that doesn't have a couple of death curves in it that have been named "death curve" or "suicide stretch" of highway or something, and maybe there should be some provision to simply assign some priorities on that basis.

A I think the funds you are talking about are still within the formula.

Q What would you base minimum percentages on, north versus south? What sort of figures would you like to see, the minimum --

A Oh, I'd rather leave that to the -- I wouldn't -- when I say leave it to those people who know best, not only mileage but the population, the traffic load. Where the dividing line should be, I don't know. I would think that basically population has a great deal to do with it, but I think also traffic load has a great deal to do.



Q Would the Highway Commission be the best place to determine those figures?

A Well, I think -- with the Highway Department, with the facts and figures, probably the Highway Patrol would be involved also and they would certainly be involved on this matter of accident stretches and so forth.

Q Would you be willing to sign legislation changing the formula if it did not include this third fund giving the commission discretion?

A You know, I don't talk about hypothetical.

Q I'm not talking about a specific bill, just in general.

A Let's wait until it comes down and see what is --

Q Governor, on another subject, the Legislative Council has issued an opinion indicating that they oppose -- your welfare is unconstitutional, the one which would limit paying a person that came into the state out of state, limit them to the amount of welfare benefits they were getting in the other state if California was higher. Now, in view of that opinion would you kind of drop that request?

A No, not at all because that's one man's opinion and at the same time we have a new Supreme Court decision about the state's right to determine welfare amounts that has led a number of people to believe that that Supreme Court decision made our request constitutional. But I just don't think that an opinion in advance could determine that if someone wanted to challenge this after it was put into operation, then it would find it sway through the courts and get a ruling specifically on that measure. But I believe it is constitutional, particularly since the last Supreme Court decision on --

Q Do you have any written opinion from your people to that effect?

A No. It is worth a try.

Q Didn't the Supreme Court decision say that the state could determine the amount of an individual grant but couldn't differentiate between two people who were ostensibly in the same class?

A Well, now, you may know something I don't know. I only know there have been a great deal of editorial comments in some of your papers to the effect that in their belief the Supreme Court

decision did make our proposals constitutional. So I haven't read it in detail, the entire case, I don't know.

Q Your Director of Social Welfare, I think, is an attorney. Did he give you any opinion in conversations stating whether that provision would be constitutional or not? Did he express any --

A No, this was a decision that was made in our cabinet and everyone had a chance to put any input -- there was a -- at the time we made the decision there was a feeling it would be challenged.

Q What if someone moved to California from a state who paid higher welfare rate?

A In the bill that's provided we pay either our state rate or theirs; whichever is the lower.

PAUL BECK: Governor, the department does feel that the bill is constitutional.

Q The legislator who has a bill, his office says that that provision is not in it, to pay the higher bill. Do you want it to be in it, would you favor --

A I thought that we had decided that.

MR. MEESE: It is the lower.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Pay the lower. Pay our state or their state, whichever is the lower, yes.

MR. MEESE: Lower rate.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: And who says that we don't have --

Q I misunderstood your last answer. I thought you indicated it would be the higher rate.

A Oh, no, no. No, we are already doing that. Someone else?

SQUIRE: Any more questions? Thank you, Governor.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Oh, I just recognized him.

Q Governor, in San Francisco the ban has temporarily been lifted on the building ban for San Francisco, enforced by the Water Quality Control Board. Now, both sides seem to have a pretty good case there and it is kind of a difficult thing to resolve. How do you think it should be resolved?

A Well, the Regional Quality Control Board have loosened the ban on certain -- with certain restrictions on construction. We don't want to impose any hardship-- economic hardship on any

community but at the same time we do feel that we have to get at the problem and get at it now instead of stalling on pollution and it is kind of time to separate the sheep from the goats, and find out whether we mean all these things that people have been saying about environment or do we just mean it for somebody else, and we want to keep on polluting the bay. We will make any reasonable -- I think where the Regional Quality Control Board has made a reasonable concession to avoid unnecessary hardship, but did not -- we didn't retreat in any way from our position of demanding that we start action to clean up the Bay.

Q Which court order would you hope would be held up?

A Well, one that will let us clean up the Bay.

---oOo---



PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD APRIL 21, 1970

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, say, I understand congratulations are in order for Ed. Salzman (phonetics). I'm sorry that I've got a little sinus trouble here, I won't be in the market for his free cigar. The father of a son, new born son. Congratulations.

I have a statement here to open.

(Whereupon Release No. 213 was read.)

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Conclusion of statement and questions and answers?

Q Governor, Senator Harmer said this morning his joint committee on reorganization of large urban school districts is going to recommend an overhaul of the Los Angeles system and also increased aid to schools. He also said your education advisor had sat in on these meetings, that you are supposedly in sympathy with that recommendation. Now, my question is, where is that money going to come from?

A Well, as the standpoint -- from the standpoint of money right now Senator Harmer himself admits that there is no finding on this as yet, no determination. That will be a problem we'd have to see when the entire recommendation comes in. What I'm in sympathy with, I think he knows this, is this study to see whether these large single unified school districts at the level, for example, of Los Angeles, are efficient and are making the best use of the money on hand. But there is no finding as yet as to what financial repercussions there might be in anything they recommend.

Q If that committee, Governor, recommends that more money be raised for public schools would you support that recommendation?

A Well, then, this I think is something that -- that the whole matter of school financing or increased school financing I

think is something then that brought before the public as to what the result would be, the knowledge if we have it, that that -- that there is a real need that would counter that feeling on the part of so many people that the schools are not making the best use of the money they have, then I think you could discuss such legislation as would be required in that atmosphere and with that knowledge and the public themselves would be involved and make their own feelings known as they do on major legislation. Up till now I think we have been sort of operating in a vacuum. All we have is a school disturbance no matter how much we have tried to augment educational funds. We have the charge coming back we need more. And I think the public understandably has come to a point of saying, wait a minute, we want some more definite answers as to this whole program, where it is going, what it is costing, whether the demands are legitimate.

Q Governor, yesterday some Democrats tried to put school money into your tax bill or they tried to juggle it around so it would provide \$388 million dollars more for schools. Are you opposed to any amendments to your tax program to that effect?

A Well, the tax program is up before the legislature for legislative process. I expect amendments or changes that may come in that process, that's what it is all about, why it is there and why there are hearings. I think anything that improves the bill-- here again I have to say that the proposal the other day of the committee, as I understand it, was one that simply would have negated the very purpose of tax reform. We have said that the prime purpose of tax reform is to take as much of the burden as we can off the back of the home owner, the property taxpayer who is the one person in California who at the moment is paying an unjust and unfair share of the total taxes. Their proposal was to simply go forward with tax reform which meant the tax increases that have been suggested to bring about relief for the home owner, and cancel out the relief for the home owner to keep the property tax at its present unconscionable level and use that to increase school aid. And I think it was a ridiculous proposal. I think it is proper that it was turned down, and again, I say I think school financing does not necessarily have to be a part of a tax reform program that is supposed to restructure the tax gathering setup of state and local government, the redistribution on an equitable and fair basis of those taxes.

Now, if you want to come to the point of needing additional money you treat that within this new framework of more equitable taxes with the public's full knowledge of what it is you are proposing and as I say with major legislation, with some reading as to whether the public agrees or disagrees with the need for that increased financing.

Q Assemblyman Moretti made the point that the only way to get school support was in that tax bill, that the administration would oppose a second front on taxes as Bagley seemed to --

A I have no closed mind on that at all, and Mr. Moretti is completely wrong. Mr. Moretti, in other words, and others, with a yen for some particular type of program -- the last time when we tried to get a tax reform program off the ground last year and this year with this one, have thought too often of using tax reform as a gimmick whereby they could almost hold up their particular program as the prize for tax reform. But they -- they took the very body out of the tax reform program. All that -- all the tax reform program meant after his amendment, it would have simply meant that we were increasing a number of taxes with no comparable decrease in the property tax burden and this is the purpose of tax reform.

Q Governor, a number of Los Angeles legislators, including some Republicans, have indicated that they think you should make some effort to stop the <sup>teachers</sup> strike in Los Angeles, either by sending a mediator to decide what the issues are or see whether the State can do anything about it, using the prestige of your office in some other way. With the strike in the second week, have you given any further thought to that?

A This is a little bit like the -- the racetrack business a little earlier. I spent 25 years as a labor union negotiator and I know this, that if you were in a position to be of any help from the outside, you stand ready, as I have, to do anything I can to help in this regard. But you don't go barging in sticking your nose into a contest between two groups neither of which have expressed any interest in having you do this.

Q Governor, I'm going to go back to the tax reform bill. What is your reaction to the deletion from the bill of your proposed state school property tax to equalize the wealth between the richer and the poorer school districts?

A Well, he again this is an issue that for a number of years people have tried to solve this problem of inequality in school districts, and I'm sympathetic to this. This is why it was included in this tax reform program. It was included in the last one, the one we tried last year, so obviously my own intentions are well known. On the other hand, if there are people upstairs -- it isn't actually an integral part of tax reform, the simple restructuring of the program. If there are people who would rather treat that as a separate legislative matter I won't protest about that. The tax reform program goes forward without that as being one subject and then take up this other, but again as I say, I think the problem of inequality in school districts must be solved and therefore as separate legislation I would be in favor of a -- of a proposal that would meet this problem.

Q You would not insist on it or make an effort to try to restore it as it moves along into this particular bill?

A Well, I had hoped that it would be accepted and go forward with it. If, on the other hand, this feature alone, which as I say is not actually an integral part of the program, if that feature alone could be the reason for eliminating this potential for property tax relief, then I have to accept its being taken out and being treated as a separate piece of legislation.

Q Do you share the concern of some legislators that this tax reform program if enacted will dry up some of the potential for future new school funding?

A That our tax reform would dry it up?

Q Yes.

A No, I don't believe so. I think that -- in the first place, I don't think anyone has properly estimated the annual increase of revenue that the schools could count on from having a more elastic source for so much of it instead of depending almost as totally as they do upon the -- on the property tax, particularly the home owner's tax. No, I don't think that it does at all. And I think that -- I think that the educational lobby, so-called, presenting its case on its own and not trying to ride piggyback on something else -- I have faith in the legislative process and in the people of California. I think the people of California know that a higher price must be paid for -- for the education they want for their children. I think that they will react accordingly. I think right now, as I said before, there is a great feeling on the part of



many of them that they don't have the information they need to make that decision.

Q Governor Reagan, another topic. What --

Q Another question --

Q What has been brought to your knowledge about the possibility of a policeman that fired the fatal shot in Isla Vista? What is your reaction to the developments this past week-end?

A Well, as to the tragedy that took place with regard to this young man, the investigation is going forward as to what could have caused his death. As a matter of fact, the bullet is now here in the State -- in the Attorney General's office. The investigation is going forward there. I'm sure that a determination will be made as to the responsibility for this. The actual -- where <sup>did</sup> the bullet come from. I shouldn't have used the word "responsibility" because the responsibility lies with those who persist in this kind of violent action and who believe that in our system today they must turn to this. I'd like to remind you that this young man -- this great tragedy of a fine young man is not the first. There have been two students murdered on the UCLA campus in the course of an organizational meeting at mid-afternoon. There was a maintenance man who was blown up by a bomb and killed on the Santa Barbara campus, and God only knows how many men might have been -- and women might have been killed had he not found the bomb and picked it up before the faculty center was opened. There was the young man that was killed in the People's Park episode. There have been on other than university campuses, on an independent college and on a state college campus two other young people maimed and blinded by bombs. There have been any number of bombs that have been discovered in time or that were faulty and did not go off that could have caused scores of deaths and the plain truth is this is a revolutionary process and program that is going on. It's not only aimed at the bank in Isla Vista, but a number of other institutions that they consider part of the establishment, now we have to face its progress to the place where the campus itself is a target. I believe the majority of people involved in the disturbances at Berkeley this last time, and at Isla Vista and the leadership probably doesn't come from the campus at all. They have their allies on the campus, both faculty and student. But they also -- this is the so-called street people, the

revolutionaries th have announced their intention to bring down this system of ours and destroy it, and I talked yesterday to the father of Kevin Moran, a fine young man this was, what a tribute to a -- his parents and the manner in which he was raised, and the fact that he was trying as an individual to do something about this violence. If his death is not to be totally in vain, I hope that this will bring some sober reflection and some common sense to the so-called silent majority of students, faculty and administrators to where they themselves at the campus level will ~~not~~<sup>now</sup> take a stand and say this is the end, no more attending rallies, no more even supporting with expression of sympathy those who have resorted to this kind of violence. It isn't very important where the bullet came from, the bullet was brought about and the bullet was sent on its way several years ago when a certain element in our society decided they could take the law into their own hands and every person that's aided and abetted them is equally guilty and responsible for this as well as the other deaths.

Q Governor, as you see it, do the events of last week constitute a blood bath, end quote?

A No, and I don't believe even those who have in a cheap demagogic manner tried to blow up a figure of speech that was used in the presence of school administrators and other adults interested in this problem into some kind of a campaign issue, I won't even charge that they by blowing it up had anything to do with what's taken place. These events were scheduled, these things, there is no question, are part of what -- the ongoing process, and I would suggest this, is there anyone in view of the record that I've just recited, the first bombings, the murders, is there anyone that is going to suggest that we haven't been subjected to a blood bath for these last three or four years? About five years all total. I think we have.

Q How do you suggest that they begin to --

A Well, I just gave you --

Q You did call at the Regents meeting for stronger measures. You used the term "stronger measures." Do you think stronger measures are in order?

A No, we have -- we have given certain implements now that the Regents passed, and certain provisions to the administrators.

They were invoked immediately at Berkeley. Some of your own papers have editorialized to the effect that the administrators were better able to cope with this as a result of those measures, but what I just said a moment ago, I think also there has to come a time in which the student body which is the vast majority not participating in this must recognize they have a responsibility, just staying out of a riot isn't enough. I think those organizations that have participated in these things, those individuals must simply be cut off from communication with the rest of the student body and from the faculty. They must make it plain that they have no allegiance, no sympathy whatsoever for these people.

Q Governor, five weeks ago, shortly after the first Isla Vista disturbance and the subsequent jailing of a U. S. Press International Reporter, you indicated ~~to~~ your staff had undertaken a probe of that issue. It's been five weeks and there's been no word. Over the week-end at a conference a Los Angeles Bureau chief of UPI made quite an issue of this and suggested -- indicated that he had not been able in the five weeks to be able to talk to Ed Meese about it. I wonder if you have a report on that, if you are preparing one or what the situation is.

A I don't know, I could refer you to Paul or someone else, I've been told that actually there wasn't anything for -- for us at the State level involved here or any State case, but also that the man who was arrested, according to any -- the information I received, made no effort to identify himself as press once he was taken by the police and once that he was in the police station. Now --

PAUL BECK: That's basically correct. I think we -- our looking into it determined that the State was not involved and so we referred it to the local authorities.

Q Governor, how did you talk with Kevin's father, by telephone?

A Yes.

Q Governor, you've indicated today and before that the first line of defense against this campus disorders, you feel, were maybe the administrators, the people who run the campuses. Yet you also say, though, that you thought the majority of those who participated in the Isla Vista and Berkeley disturbances recently were not students. How does that square?

A Well, that's right, except in every instance they have, as I said, their allies on the campus and they -- I grant you there is a certain responsibility when it comes to the so-called people -- the street people who are a part of this, then I guess that's law enforcement's problem and responsibility. It becomes increasingly difficult when the rallying and the rallies or the staging areas are the campuses and there are students and student organizations who inevitably align themselves with these groups. Now, the university will take care of its shop, I think law enforcement will take care of the other.

Q Governor, do you think you may have done as much as you can do to find out why these young people are acting in this fashion? What motivates them? Is there more you can know about that?

A Well, I -- I've done an awful lot of study and trying to find out myself all these things that are involved. I've said repeatedly and I say again, that I think the students -- the bulk of the students have a great many legitimate problems. They are not revolutionary by nature. Their problems in many instances have to do with the educational process, the impersonality of the university. Many things in which they do not believe that the curriculum and customs have kept up with the changing times, inability to see teachers or to have a personal and human contact, but so far all of the effort at meeting problems seemingly is on the level of dealing with the revolutionaries who have made it plain now that they are not interested in solving these problems. They have said they are interested in destruction, destruction of the system and that includes the university, as well as the entire governmental system, the economic system of this country. I don't think there is any relationship. I think in the past they made some efforts and they went through a long phase in which the revolutionaries pretended that their goals were the goals of the students, whether it was the food in the cafeteria or the grading system, and so they were able to lure a great many students into going along with them. And so they charged the first barricade. And now I think the students have discovered that having reached that barricade those they were following, those they were going with, had other goals and other targets far beyond and they had no intention of doing anything about solving the problems of food in the cafeteria or hours in the dormitory or anything else. And now I think it is time that the students

have the intelligence that we have been crediting them with, if they are the new generation and the best informed generation of all time, then they better be informed enough to know that they have been following some pretty disreputable pied-pipers and they'd better make up their mind to preserve the university and then perhaps we can get about the business of solving their very legitimate and real problems.

Q Governor, the Berkeley police officials reported a large number of high school and junior high participating in the last week's trouble on the campus and around the campus. And the radicals take credit for radicalizing a large number of young people in the high schools and junior highs.

A That's right, and why should any of you be surprised about this or any of us be surprised? If I recall, and again I find myself in the unhappy role of an I-told-you-so, I think it's been almost two years that I stood right there in this same press conference and said that the SDS had announced in its convention a new policy of turning to radicalize the high school and junior high school levels because they believed at that particular age they could get them to be even more irresponsible and as a consequence more vicious than those who were a little older at the college age. Now, they have -- now they have done exactly what they told us they were going to do, and we continue with hindsight to look back and sometimes those who try to warn have to undergo being held up to view as alarmists and finding people under the bed, and so forth. Well, we found them under the bed, they have come out from under the bed.

Q Governor, your statement seems to imply that you can't go about solving the students' legitimate problems until all this revolution is met and is taken care of. Isn't something being done now on campus to solve some of these problems?

A One of the common complaints that I get from a number of students is that they just can't get -- they don't get the time and the same attention paid to their problems because there is so much time and effort being spent now in trying to react to and find an answer to the problem of the dissidents. I suppose it comes under the theory of the squeaky wheel. This is what's tempted, I'm sure -- some of the kids think, well if breaking windows is the way to get attention, let's break a window.

Q Governor, that information was available two years ago, and

now apparently -- those people apparently were successful in the efforts they announced they would undertake two years ago. Doesn't that indicate that between now and then the establishment hasn't counter-acted in an appropriate or at least adequate manner?

A Well, it would indicate that there are a lot of people with their heads in the sand and as I have indicated before, philosophically there has been a tendency, particularly in the academic community, to be somewhat sympathetic to -- or the philosophy of those who are now exposed as revolutionary. A case -- let me just give you another reminder, I told you -- also told you that the SDS in its convention two years ago again announced that their members were to continue to urge other young people to avoid the draft, but that they themselves should accept military service so that they could subvert the military forces from within. Now, keep your eyes open if you want to or not to see whether they are succeeding in that, but they also made that decision two years ago.

Q Governor, with respect to the boy who was shot in Santa Barbara, you said a moment ago it is not important where the bullet came from, but isn't there some responsibility on the part of authorities to see that this sort of thing doesn't --

A Well, now, wait a minute, I'm sorry, you must realize -- here we go figure of speech again. I'm sure you must realize that no one says that you write off the individual who held the gun, who pulled the trigger, whether it was deliberate, whether he was aiming, whether it was accidental. That investigation is going forward without any setup whatsoever. I thought I made that clear when I told you that it is in the hands of the Attorney General right now as well as the local law enforcement pursuing their own investigation. Of course you want to find that answer, and if there is guilt, deliberate shooting, then you -- then you follow the proper course. But what I was pointing out is this was inevitable. This, as well as the other deaths, were inevitable the day that you started recognizing the right of someone to turn to violence, to use weapons against other people.

Q Governor, another subject.

Q No, not yet.

Q One more -- no, I've got a question.

A Here and there. (Indicating)

Q Did you speak with anyone else, Mrs. Moran and what -- what did Mr. Moran say to you? Did he have any advice for other students or parents?

A No, no, Mr. -- I simply called to express sympathy of Mrs. Reagan and myself and I thought on behalf of a great many other people for the tragedy that happened. Mr. Moran -- well, what can you say? What does happen other than a -- he spoke with appreciation of a warmth of so many people who have called at this time and the -- the great bond of sympathy that they feel with so many who have made it evidence how -- how they feel about this tragedy. And he spoke, of course, of this is his oldest son and his pride in him, and the example that he was for their other children.

Q Senator Schmitz says that the -- William Kunstler and five of the so-called Chicago 7 have been invited to the Irvine campus this coming Sunday. I'm unclear as to who invited them, but I wondered if you know about it and if you have some comment on it.

A Well, normally these invitations come from student group by way of their regular process for student groups having -- and organizations having a right to bring speakers to the campus within certain regulations as to time and place and manner and so forth. I suppose that Irvine is justified on the basis that Irvine has been free of disturbances and riots and so forth and they evidently are confident that they can -- that they won't have a followup or have violence as a result of this. It is a difficult thing for an administrator to know whether he could precipitate violence by the action of denying them as happened at the University of Illinois or by letting them. My own feeling is that where there is or has been disturbance where -- as for example at Santa Barbara, there I think it is a situation in which you are justified in saying no, this is what we meant by the new rules, that you invoke the right to deny inflammatory type speakers from coming. It gets complicated when another campus is involved in which they apparently have been able to remain free of such activity. I would like to suggest to the student bodies, though, that are asking for these type of speakers, that they review their own thinking. It isn't so much whether the students are able to hear them or not. I think what's involved is how far do you go in degrading a university by inviting people to the



campus as speakers, lending the prestige of the university name to those people when they are literally freaks in a sideshow and they have not one justification from an educational standpoint for being invited to the campus. And it is about time that the kids recognize they have got a responsibility for the name of the school as well as just taking some -- some day with all the demands for rights I think it would be wonderful if someone would stand up and demand their responsibilities.

Q Governor, you used the word "inevitability" and earlier you invoked the silent majority stand firm. Do you have any apprehension or fear or worry that the silent majority will not -- will do more than stand firm, will take a couple of steps forward?

A No, and we have seen this example. I know the inevitable answer, you could have used the word again, you could say, well, what about what has just happened, the tragedy that's happened. No, I'm talking about recognizing the revolutionaries for what they are, and supporting the school in an effort to have organizations where they have repeatedly been involved, as the SDS has at Berkeley, in the disorder, participants in the helping bring it about, urging them that these organizations be declared illegal on the campus, that they support not protest, that they don't accept this as somehow an invasion of their rights as students, that they take a responsibility to note attend the rally just out of curiosity or stand and add to the crowd to see what's going on, that they make it known to individuals and organizations ~~on~~ their campuses that they just don't -- they are not going to be any part of this at all, in a sense separate themselves.

Q You sided off. I asked do you anticipate or fear any uprising from the silent majority?

A No, and I'm not suggesting this. I'm not suggesting that they become vigilantes any more than I'm suggesting that the citizenry as a whole become vigilantes.

Q The Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department would like to see the results of the Attorney General televised before a

Coroner's inquest. Would you like to see that?

A Well, I don't know what the timing is on this. We are talking about an investigation that involves ballistics, for one thing. Sometimes it isn't as simple as they make it look on Perry Mason. Sometimes a ballistic test takes -- well, in the case of the assassination of John F. Kennedy it was 30 days, I believe, before they had the final ballistic test clearly identifying the bullet as coming from that weapon.

VOICE: Thank you, Governor.

---oOo---