

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 –
08/04/1970, 08/11/1970, 09/22/1970

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

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

8/4

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD AUGUST 4, 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---

(Whereupon Governor Reagan read Press Release No. 387.)

Q Governor, did you discuss this ^(highway funds) with the President when you were down there last week?

A No, on this subject we didn't. That's why I've had to get a letter off. We spent most of our time last week discussing some of the welfare problems.

Q Isn't this hand in hand, Governor, with attempting to cool the economy, motivation which you supported recently?

A Yes, but that particular phase of cooling the economy was called off a few months ago. As a matter of fact the President phoned me to tell me that on the following morning they would be announcing the complete release of this at the federal level and we therefore issued a simultaneous statement that we were immediately phasing our \$176 million dollars worth of projects back into the program.

Q Governor, do you have any idea why this money is being held up?

A No, I don't. It is -- I know the first time this occurred in my administration was during the Johnson administration and we lead the fight at the Governor's conference to protest then what was a kind of a budget withholding. This was the type of thing of making a budget appear to be held down by just not spending monies in a given year, and we don't favor this at the state level and we certainly don't favor it at the federal level.

Q Governor, do you think the inflation danger has subsided?

A Well, all I can go by is that the -- those who were staging that fight in Washington -- I don't know, the fight against inflation isn't over, but they cancelled out that phase of it and did it on their

own, no protesting. Those of us who were cooperating with them were going along until they gave us the word and they made the decision that they could now relax in that area.

Q Governor, on the figures you were using, about 19 million from -- down from the same period last year, then 20 million last year the trust fund could have supported, which trust fund are you talking about not being enough money in it and then asking for 200 million dollars? I don't understand the --

A No, we are talking about the allocations that we get back. Our -- California's share of the -- of the gasoline tax for the entire state highway system. It is another one of those instances where California pays in more than we get back, but that was true from the very beginning. But the proportionate allocation that we should get, if they follow the original concept, in which that money was to be distributed back just as our own gasoline tax fund is spent on building highways, we would have gotten that much more and should be getting 19 million dollars more in this quarter,

Q Governor, another topic.

A All right.

Q What comments do you have on President Nixon's remarks concerning the Tate-La Bianca defendants in Los Angeles?

A Well, I think anyone can recognize someone inadvertently making a remark that has implications beyond what they had intended and beyond that I'm going to say nothing because having seen the furor created I certainly don't want to say anything or make any comment that might in any way endanger the progress of justice in that particular trial. So I'm saying nothing.

Q Do you think this remark could have endangered the progress of justice?

A This is like the 11th commandment. I can't say anything without running the risk of adding to the same problem. So I'm not going to say anything.

Q Governor, do you have any comment in general on Cesar Chavez' effort in the Salinas Valley and specifically his call now for a secret ballot so the workers may vote between the teamsters' union and his union?

A Yes, I'm a little puzzled by his sudden conversion to a belief in balloting for the workers now with regard to another union in another area when he has denied this for the people he's been

organizing in the San Joaquin Valley. I personally believe in the right of workers every place to vote on secret -- by secret ballot as to whether they want a union and if so which union and I would make the State Conciliation Service available to help and have urged upon them this kind of balloting -- voting and I just don't think that it is something that you can decide to have for one group and -- in one place and not agree to the rightness of it all over, and I would add this, I think that ~~those~~ same workers having decided on a union have a right to ratify it by secret ballot any contract arrangements their union leaders make with the employers.

Q So this time you are in Cesar Chaves' side, possibly?

A No, no, I'm -- I have to say that I'm a little puzzled at the fact that he can believe in it for one group of people when it suits his purpose while still denying it to his own. I -- I would think much more of him if Mr. Chavez had agreed and would agree to secret balloting for all farm workers. I have respect for the ability of the farm worker and his common sense to make decisions in his own behalf the same as I have for all other workers and I don't think they should be denied something that just through the absense of law, in either the state or federal field, does not prescribe this. All other workers outside of the farm economy are so covered by federal legislation that gives them that right of ballot.

Q Governor, the Board of Directors of the Social Workers Union, they claim to represent more than half of California's social workers, has sent you a letter which I think you've not had time to get yet, quoting the welfare institutions code as saying that your welfare director shall be appointed wholly on the basis of training, demonstrated ability, experience and leadership in organized social welfare administration and they say that Mr. Martin, whom you appointed, does not fit any way, shape or form the stated intent of this law. I wonder if you have a comment on that.

A Well, they also disapproved of a welfare director before Mr. Martin. I think where one of the differences lies is that with a welfare case load that has increased a hundred 13 per cent in the last four years with the percentage of people on welfare in California going up from six per cent of the population to 9.3 per cent of the population that our selection of someone who will also have consideration for the taxpayers and the rest of the citizens is something that they are probably not sympathetic to, but that's the way we are going to

Q Governor, what is your reaction to the court ruling that an alcoholic can receive welfare simply because he is an alcoholic?

A Well, this is like so many other court rulings. I think sometimes they get far afield. The problem of alcoholism is the problem of a tragic disease. It is a disease that afflicts a great many of our citizens and we have tried in California to have programs to try and get at the problem of this disease which for too long a time has not been properly treated, but I don't think that this has offered any particular help in the problem whatsoever, to just simply rule that by not seeking an answer or a cure to that disease someone can then just be supported at the expense of the taxpayers.

Q What would be the expense of the taxpayers if this ruling stands?

A I haven't had time to get an estimate on that from our people.

Q Governor, you say you are going to keep Robert Martin as your director. Have you checked though -- does that mean you have checked the legality of doing this and as far as the language that they are quoting you, that this doesn't preclude Martin's legal appointment as State Welfare Director?

A There seems to have been no objection to it. We have gone ahead and made appointments on the basis of who we thought could handle the job and I don't think that we violated -- that's an opinion we have to make as to whether they are qualified in this field, and if they're meaning that we must turn only to the ranks of social workers for this -- someone of this kind, then heaven help us in trying to solve the problem.

Q Governor, the Lieutenant Governor said over the week-end that if racial problems continue in the prisons it might be necessary to institute segregation in the prisons on a racial basis, the policy in the Department of Corrections. Do you endorse that idea and is that means considered by the administration?

A Well, let me answer the statement as well as the question. I think that what happened was the Lieutenant Governor started speaking about separating those people that are causing the trouble, and the question then came back if this was on a strictly racial basis and as far as I've been able to learn, while this is a possibility and there have been such things in some of the institutions, not only here but in the rest of the country, that I don't believe the report

is that this was strictly that. But the questioning then went back to well, if this was on a racial basis, segregation, and I think he was speaking to the common sense practice that if you've got two gangs of people that are getting in fights, whether it is in a street or in an institution, the most common sense thing to do is to separate them until you can find out what's causing the fights and stop them from occurring.

Q So you would do it on a racial basis if that appeared to be the reason?

A I'd do it on whatever basis and on a temporary basis. I don't think anyone -- any one of us here, I know none of us are committed to the idea of segregation, but if you have two factions, whatever their differences, that are causing trouble and fighting, I think the answer to the problem begins with separating them so that they can't get at each other for a while.

Q Governor, last week you said you would have an investigation into the state prison system. Since then we have had another killing at Soledad and the guards at San Quentin seem to be going through quite a bit of turmoil amongst themselves. Do you think that we should maybe step up this investigation or ask the Attorney General to look at the state prison system?

A No, we have -- we have a procedure for that, a correction -- in the State Corrections Board that is chaired by our Secretary of Human Relations. And from the reports that we have received and reports from Ray Procunier, I don't think that any outside investigation is called for at this time. I think, as I said last week, and as the Warden has said, they're part of what's going on, is just a reflection of the kind of violence that is abroad in the land and is reflected in the type of people that are coming into the institutions and a higher percentage of them, because of our -- our subsidy of probation that has -- most of the less violent types out on probation.

Q Do you have any comment on Assemblyman Willie Brown's report on Soledad?

A Yes, I don't think that it contributed anything to solving this particular problem. It dounds strange, I'm sure, to some of you to come from me, but I don't think that inflammatory type statements is contributed.

Q Governor Reagan, another topic?

A Yes.

Q The Senate today passed out Senator Harmer's bill which would divide the Los Angeles school system into 12 separate districts. What is your opinion of this suggestion and if this isn't the answer, what do you think the answer is for the problems of Los Angeles schools?

A Well, Ray, it is a -- it is a complicated problem. I have been critical of the size of those districts. I have referred several times to a quite respective school study of several years ago that said that school districts that get above 20 to 30 thousand students are getting into a place of diminishing returns. I haven't seen the legislation in its form -- if it comes down, how it will come down. But I'm certainly going to give it serious consideration if it reaches my desk, on this matter.

Q Do you basically favor decentralization?

A Whenever it is possible, yes.

Q Governor, Assemblyman Bagley last week said that he had done the racing industry a favor in exchange for lobby support for your tax bill. Do you approve of that -- those tactics?

A Well, now, he's going to have to speak for himself. The only thing that I can tell you about the -- the racing situation, no connection with tax reform whatsoever. There has been a bill upstairs for sometime that was an omnibus bill, you might say, that would have affected almost every phase of racing. There have been great disagreements within the racing group because of this. The breeders and owners of horses have been quite opposed. I took the position with the racing people who were advocating this bill that was such a large segment of the industry itself opposed, that I thought they should go out and get together and come back in probably in January with a bill that didn't -- that they all could agree upon. Subsequent to that time they came back and there was agreement in the racing industry that the problems, particularly of some of the smaller tracks, the economic problems were such that without waiting they could agree upon additional revenue that was needed by these tracks as well as by the horsemen in purses, and I said if they came back in with a simple revenue bill and left out all of these other things that have caused the controversy in this session that I could look favorably upon that. And that's the only thing that I know about and I've heard the same rumors -- statements that someone is

lobbying on behalf of our tax reform bill, but on the other hand I heard that a great many of the so-called third house representing their clients are on their own, have favored our tax reform bill and have been urging legislators to vote for it and I'd have to agree with them, I think it is a common sense bill.

Q Governor, Jesse Unruh indicated today that you may be more interested in having the Democrats kill your tax reform package than in getting the bill passed. They -- for some political advantage itself. Do you see any advantage politically in this course of action?

A No, I -- if he's meaning the issue of ~~this~~ this in the coming election, no question, ~~this~~ will be an issue and there is no question that I'm going to do everything I can if this bill is defeated to let their constituents know those who defeated this bill and prevented them from getting the property tax relief that they should be getting. But that is not nearly the advantage, and I'll trade anything of that kind over a million times to have this bill passed on behalf of the people. I don't think anything is really worthwhile politically that hurts the people and not passing this bill is going to hurt the people of California.

Q Does that include Senator Clark Bradley, Governor?

A Senator Clark Bradley knows how I feel, yes, it is hard for me to understand how anyone can -- can really legitimately oppose this legislation.

Q You mean you are going to Clark Bradley's district and say he's an enemy on my tax reform bill? You are going to speak in there about that?

A Let me put it this way, anyone who's opposed this is going to have to defend himself on the basis of why he opposed it, because I'm going to continue even in the failure of this -- I'm going to continue to campaign for this kind of tax relief, whether in this session or in the next.

Q Governor, what is the best hope now for the passage of your tax bill in the Senate? Is it the August 18 special election?

A No, I wouldn't -- I wouldn't say that. I think the best hope is just to continue trying to persuade some of the 13 who are presently opposed that they are in truth not serving their constituents by taking this stand.

Q Governor, would you consider calling a special session on tax -- tax matters if it doesn't pass in the regular session?

A I haven't ruled that -- I haven't ruled anything out, let me put it that way, so I won't be writing a lead for you. I haven't ruled out anything, but it is a case of you have to go almost day by day as to what you can do to try and bring this to a head and bring it to a settlement.

Q Governor, Mr. Bagley said that he had mobilized the lobbyists on behalf of the bill, particularly those --

A That what?

Q That he had mobilized some lobbyists on behalf of the bill. You were saying a moment ago that he did not do that on your behalf or you -- that you were not asking the lobbyists to get the bill through.

A I haven't asked any one of that kind to get the bill through.

Q What do you think of the general proposition of getting lobbyists to get the bill --

A Is this very much different than my own public appeals to people to impress on the legislators that they want this tax bill? When you say lobbyists you are talking about people that represent various groups of our citizenry, including the schools and the churches, and labor -- organized labor. I have met with some labor leaders recently and have told them of what I think the advantages of this bill are to the working men and women of the state, and a number of them have expressed an interest in carrying the ball on this and advocating its passage. I'm all for it.

Q But you said legislation had been offered on your behalf in exchange for it.

A Well, now, that is not true, if that was said, because I've just told you completely the story of any legislation that has to do with racing, that I was unwilling to see any legislation in view of the two year ago increase in racing days -- to see any great omnibus program of changing the whole structure of the racing game in California at this time.

Q A moment ago you said that lobbyists have supported this legislation possibly because it is common -- it is a common sense bill. Do you think that's the only reason then?

A Well, you'd have to ask them what their reasons were. I can't see, as I said before -- I find it very difficult to understand anyone who has an opposition to it. I have heard a great many reasons advanced for the negative votes and I've heard a great many distortions of fact in those reasons, and I think this is pretty good evidence that the case against the tax bill is really lacking when they have to turn to distortions and inaccuracies and even outright falsehoods about the present tax bill, in order to justify the not voting for it.

Q Well, Governor, still to follow that up, though, you said that you didn't endorse the racing legislation, but Mr. Bagley, however, did work for that. Now, do you condone that practice?

A Well, condone what practice?

Q The practice of him working -- in exchange proposition with lobbyists.

A Well, I have told you the position of how a piece of legislation came into existence regarding one industry. I didn't talk to any lobbyists and I didn't tie it to any vote for anything else. And I don't know what else has gone on in that regard and I have not bargained and I don't make deals. Maybe if I did we'd have a tax program.

Q Governor, have you thought of going on statewide television to correct some of the misunderstandings, perhaps, and increase the public support for your tax program?

A Yes. As a matter of fact I was on a couple of interview programs down in Los Angeles over the week-end and explained this program.

Q Governor, have you seen anything that gives -- makes you any more encouraged than you would be a week ago at this time when the -- the Democrats and Clark Bradley first blocked it? Have you seen any softening in the opposition? In their opposition?

A No, and of course over the week-end it would be pretty hard, you can just kind of live and hope that maybe getting home and meeting the people on the street that some of them might have gotten different viewpoints.

Q Governor, I'd like to go to another subject.

Q Same subject, please.

A Same subject.

Q Governor, aren't you worried, though, if you tell Clark

Bradley's voters about what he did on tax reform you are throwing the 11th commandment out the window? Is that a dead issue?

A No, the 11th commandment isn't a dead issue, but I think the legislator and the governor can agree to a different piece of legislation. I will say this, when I was remarking about distortions and so forth, I will say that Clark has a legitimate -- in his mind, difference of opinion about the right of shifting a tax burden to the broader base to relieve one section -- segment of the taxpayers, namely the property owners, and he feels very strongly about this. He has not to my knowledge distorted the situation nor has he gone out and tried to pretend that there was some other kind of tax reform program that he favored. He just does not believe that -- as much as I do, that the property tax owner is entitled to some relief. That he is a segment of the taxpayer who is being presumed upon.

Q Governor, can you tell us what distortions have been made and who has been making them? Who has been telling falsehoods?

A Yes, I think the charge that our tax bill, for example, the general charge that our tax bill benefits those of higher income more than it does the lower income and by actual figure as compared to the tax bill that the opposition put up in contrast to this several weeks ago, ours actually increases the tax burden for the upper income levels far more, and there is in many instances benefits the upper brackets at the same time that it penalizes the lower bracket and even takes into the income tax paying people who are presently not paying an income tax. Our greatest relief comes from about the \$7,000 bracket through to about \$20,000 income. This is where the greatest amount of tax break comes which I think is the overwhelming majority of the people of California. As you get up into the upper brackets there is an actual tax increase for those individuals in our program as it is laid out. Now, in the -- in the \$1500 flat exemption property tax as against our combination of exemption of a thousand plus 20 per cent, you will find that before there is benefits anyone above ours their house has to be worth less than \$10,000; that from \$10,000 value of the house on up our program is more beneficial.

Q Governor, have you any word from any Board of Supervisors in support of your program? Particular ~~Boards~~, I'm thinking of.

A Yes, we have a number of letters from Supervisors.

Q Can you tell me what counties?

A Oh, Squire, I can't remember right now because I've also been getting a great many letters from county supervisors on the welfare program and I haven't -- I can't sort them out right now.

Q Governor, can we go to another subject?

Q Same subject. One more.

A All right.

Q Governor, then you have not ruled out personally campaigning in the districts of these Senators or -- and going on statewide television? Those are both possibilities?

A Yup.

Q That you are considering.

A Yup.

Q Senator Danielson has been critical of the Williamson Act provisions in your tax program which would have the state pay a share of the county's subsidy to open space lands which owners would promise not to subdivide. He says that in Kern County there would be about a million dollars tax break and that the large land owners who are getting a benefit under that program now include several large oil companies. Do you think your program should be providing a tax break for such large commercial operations rather than the farmer whom the Williamson Act was originally aimed at?

A When you set out to protect open lands and when you set out to see if you can't find some way that land will be taxed on its use rather than on its potential subdivision value, there is no question but that there can be some people benefited that were not your primary purpose. But what's the greatest advantage? In order to prevent a few from getting what you consider is an unnecessary break do you then rule that none of the other people can be benefited? Particularly at a time when it protects -- and the preservation of open lands is one of great environmental concern as well as the fairness to the taxpayer. And the present custom that is driving so much of our open range as well as our agricultural land into suburban sprawl, urban development, is this fact that once a subdivision appears everything for several miles around stops being classified as farm land and suddenly is taxed on the basis of how much it would be worth if it became a subdivision. Now, much of that land the farmer really wants to farm and he wants to stay there and keep it as open land. And the Williamson Act was pretty well

thought out to give him some kind of a tax break each time so long as he contracted each year for ten years ahead. And this, I think, is a -- is a pretty good curb on just the speculator.

Q But in Kern County only 13 per cent of the land in the last study was classified as prime agricultural land.

A Well, there is a different rate for land that is not prime agricultural land. Simply open or grazing land. Now, I'm speaking of one farm that I know about, for example, that in a dozen years went from \$800 tax to \$23,000 tax, and that land couldn't produce more than about a \$2,000 hay crop.

Q Is that your own ranch?

A What

Q Is that your own ranch?

A I'm not saying.

Q Very shortly, if Marty will let me on the taxes -- at what point -- how long will you hold out for the 27th vote?

A The day that we know that we can't get it, there is no change. But we haven't -- we haven't given up yet. Every morning I walk into the book shop -- book store -- I mean my library, I shouldn't say book store, and stand for a moment of silence in front of the book on Patton.

(Laughter)

Q Governor, another subject. Do you know about the problem the California fishermen have been having with Russian trawlers?

A Yes.

Q Have you become involved or do you have any information -- to be called in that?

A No, it seems to me that this is a federal problem. I know our own fish and game department has kept ~~some~~ track on this and issued some reports. It seemed to minimize the threat that some people feel is there, but I'm afraid -- I'm afraid this one is going to be Washington's problem.

Q Governor, your Riverside County campaign chairman and attorney has admitted transmitting \$6500 in cashier's checks to the primary election campaigns of three county supervisors, who later voted for a zoning change requested by the corporation making the donation. Now, are you going to ask that chairman to resign or not in your campaign? *(conflict of interest)*

A Well, that's going to depend on what comes out of this. I've heard that. I don't know any of the -- that any of the facts have been established. So far we are talking about a charge that's been made. I do sincerely hope that there is no wrong doing there, but if there is then he'll -- you bet.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.

11/8

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD AUGUST 11, 1970

(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.)

---oOa---

Q Before we get to the big picture I would like to ask you about the Native Daughters of the Golden West in Redding angry at you because you got a couple of paintings of theirs they say belongs in the Shasta Historial Museum. They have written you a letter. Do you plan to return these paintings?

A What paintings and where are they?

Q They are in the Mansion. Two paintings by Frederick Schafer and Manuel Leutz. All we know is that Mrs. Reagan got them and they want them back.

A I think there is a painting of Yosemite out here in the reception room. Most of these paintings were loaned. There are a few actually belonging to the State which were purchased from galleries, but most of them are on loan from various art galleries or museums. If, by some error, we have something that belongs somewhere else they are welcome to have it back and I will have to look into it.

Q The presiding judge of the Superior Court in San Francisco said he was thinking about changing the location of the trial from San Francisco to San Quentin. If this goes through it will be the second change. In the light of all that has happened ^{/what} do you think about conducting the trial in the penitentiary?

A I would rather look to the whole problem and say that we have already contacted the Chief Justice and he has, in turn, been in touch with all the presiding judges about soliciting from them their views and getting together for whatever might be necessary with regard to courtroom decorum. The type of thing we have seen, to try to disrupt the court with this kind of violence---to make sure this cannot happen again we have been in touch with the Youth Authority and the Correctional people to urge them to meet not only with the law enforcement but with the presiding judges to see what they can work out in events of this kind to ensure that a tragedy cannot occur again.

Q What do you think about the possibility of holding it within San Quentin.

A I would rather wait until I hear back from them. I know there are many things to look into, for example there are many judges who have ruled out firearms on the part of law enforcement officers in their courtrooms. This may have to be reviewed. We have to review the Mulford Act and see if there are any additions with regard to bringing weapons into public buildings. The law now says "Only a loaded gun". We are looking into this. I am saying that I am not going to make a comment until I get the word back from the judiciary about this.

Q Do you believe there was a conspiracy in connection with Soledad and the shootings on Friday?

A I wouldn't be able to hazard a decision on that.

Q Would you ask the Attorney General to look into the prison system?

A We are looking at this from every angle to see if there is any place where changes or tightening up can be made to see that it doesn't happen again.

Q What do you think of the concept of allowing the Trustees to establish criteria to designate California State Colleges as Universities?

A This is a very complicated problem. In Illinois they are all /under a technical definition termed Universities. Many of our colleges do not qualify as Universities. There are some that do. This was supposed to be the Coordinating Council's plan for higher education to make sure it was not unnecessary duplication of effort in the area of research in granting a graduate degree. We know that the cost for instruction for a graduate degree is several times what it is for the undergraduate. There should not be an unnecessary proliferation of this. I cannot claim a closed mind on this. I would be opposed to simply blanketwise saying that the whole college system has the title of University. We do have a problem of those that actually are unqualified. Somehow there has been an attempt to downgrade the title College as if, somehow, this is inferior to the title University. I do not believe that. I think it is a very respected term. I think a college in its own area can claim all the academic stature the University can.

Q Can you say it meets the state's needs as it is?

A I have an open mind in taking a look and reviewing the state colleges who have attained University status.

Q Could you comment on this morning's economic conference?

A I haven't been into the economic conference so far this morning. I am going in after this press conference. This is a follow-up on a meeting I had with a number of industrial leaders some time ago and they are economists. They are professionals in this field and can carry on where we left off in that other meeting with whatever cooperation the state can give, with whatever we can do in keeping with the private sector looking ahead and planning ahead, particularly in this time of economic slump. I think it is a temporary dislocation. The original meeting was held long before this slump started, in anticipation of this possibility coming up in connection with the anti-inflation fight. The results of this morning's meeting and reports will be given to me. The main think~~ing~~ is to find out how we can cooperate with the private sector.

Q Phil Watson of Los Angeles County says the tax reform measure would be a financial disaster in that county.

A I think that is a little over-reaction there. We recognize there are some mechanical problems and the delays in getting it passed has added to them. This will result, if it is passed, in reduction of the homeowners' tax taking place in the spring installment, instead of in the first one. It will mean a notice in the first tax bill that comes out this fall to pay only the installment. We have made \$2 million available to help the counties. I don't see this as a great catastrophe. It is a simple matter of getting the tax increases into operation and then making provision as quickly as possible to turn back to the people the tax relief.

Q He has made such an issue of pointing out these problems.

A He has a big county there and we do have problems but they are mechanical difficulties which can be overcome and we can make this work.

Q Compromises on the tax reform program have failed over the weekend. Are you giving up on getting it as part of the regular session or is a special session becoming more likely?

A I haven't ruled out anything with regard to trying or giving up as yet on this as to possible amendments. I am not disturbed about that because, frankly, I think this program was ~~working~~ worked on so long and so many things considered I do not see the need for any amendments or compromises. I think it is a good bill and while I am willing to look at any suggestion it is difficult for me to think, and I have not seen any suggestion yet that changes the basic concept of the bill, only weakens it and I think it should be passed.

Q Are you in a position to offer amendments in order to make this deadline?

A No, nor will I.

Q What is wrong with Bradley's analysis?

A It is not one that imposes unfairly on the lowest earners. It is indeed a tax shift and he borrowed the phrase from me. I have been calling it that for over a year. It was never intended to be a tax reduction or increase. He made a great point as if, somehow, this was a deception to the people, that tax reform should mean tax reduction. Tax reduction comes from reforming government not the system of taxation and he also made what I think was the weakest case. We have, for the first time in history, by expenditure controls in an effort to prevent the property tax from coming back up. He doesn't ~~want~~ ^{/object to} those controls but he doesn't want it passed because he says some day a legislator can come in and vote out those controls. If that is going to be the approach to legislation, why another legislator can come in next year and turn something down or change it. If you believe in something, you pass it, and continue to keep it the way it is.

Q Is it a valid point that the controls originally in the program have substantially ^{weakened} ~~weakened~~?

A Substantially weakened only to the point that about 13 breaks out of 44 with regard to tax overrides in particular cases where hardship would result. I don't think this is a weakening. That is a way that substantial property tax relief is given and a very substantial guarantee is given on protection against its coming back up. The other place where I think there was a distortion simply by inference was to say that this is a bill that passes to one segment of the taxpayers for the relief of one other segment. This was almost to infer that the homeowner is not going to be subject to the tax bill which is a tax increase. They too are going to pay all the increased sales taxes. What we are talking about is switching ~~an~~ an unfair burden from one segment of the taxpayers to a tax that is overall and covers the entire spectrum. I think this is fair and not unfair. It is unfair to let one section of the people go on paying ~~an~~ an unfair tax burden.

Q In your charge of other opponents ^{/distortion by}, are you now including Senator Bradley? I assumed you meant Democrats.

A I have to say now that Senator Bradley's presentation to UROC was not founded on fact and not a fair presentation.

Q Have you any comment on the action of the Board of Directors of UROC in endorsing Senator Bradley's opposition to ^{the} tax reform plan.

A I am bothered, of course. They heard one interpretation of the tax reform program that was distorted and not based on fact and took their action without attempting to find out the answer to it.

Q What is the welfare situation now that you have given up on the \$10 million? Have you changed your position on what you want to do?

A We are going ahead with the program that is designed to see if we cannot, once and for all, get a handle on this runaway unfair situation. We are reviewing totally every state regulation, every administrative procedure open to us and everything that might require a state legislation and are doing the same thing with regard to federal regulations with the intention of taking it up with Washington. It has to be solved. We cannot go on supporting it in its present form. It is a mess.

/Senate Committee killed the proposal

Q ~~xxxx killed~~ to take lead out of gasoline. Is ~~the~~ defeat of the bill a setback in the effort to control smog?

A The controversy, as I understand it, is the procedure whereby we get to the leadless while preserving leaded gasoline for those cars who cannot do without it. It is a phase-out program. I am one who believes we should get this done as quickly as possible, not running anyone off the road on this. I think the recommendations that came out of the conference are the recommendations that could reduce this lead content, the swiftest and with the least dislocation. I don't believe we have to have as many varieties of gasoline. The automotive industry in Detroit has announced they are now going to reduce high octane required down to 91 percent.

Q Are you willing to rely on the industry to get the lead out?

A No. Our legislature must take into account what they can accomplish. I am opposed to a program that would maintain the tanks of leaded gasoline and then at a premium price offer a lead-free gasoline and hope that people will pay the premium price and voluntarily get that gasoline.

Q This would not have occurred if this bill had passed. Are you saying this is a setback?

A I am saying I have not had an opportunity to look into what was not passed. I am not as well informed as you as to what happened yesterday.

Q Can you say whether or not you supported the bill?

A At this moment I do not know what bill we are talking about.

Q There is a story on the formation of the Golden Circle Club by John Wayne at a cost of \$3000 to \$5000 to join. Legislators have been invited to join and lobbyists. The story says you endorse this.

A My only comment is that I couldn't afford to join and I don't know anything about it. I will have to look into it and see what Duke is doing.

Q The Assembly yesterday passed a bill by Bagley that would tax all race horses a flat fee regardless of champions or nags. Is this an equitable means of taxation?

A The poor horse raisers have a problem to deal with and that is that nags eat just as much as the good ones. If we want to encourage the horse breeding industry in California I think there are some problems with regard to property tax that we have to face. If you compare the tax on a million dollar stallion in Kentucky to the tax here in California, it is easy to see why horses leave California and go to live in Kentucky. I believe in incentive taxation. I believe the industry gives hundreds of people employment in our state, but I don't know the bill he introduced, but I must say the poor horse raisers started in a losing business in the beginning. He has to love horse flesh a lot to do what he does.

Q Do you still have horses yourself?

A I own a couple of riding horses. I have gotten rid of all the breeding stock. I bred race horses for the market and sold them.

Q Back to smog. You endorsed the idea of using motor vehicle funds for smog research. Cologne has a bill on the floor ready for action by the Senate. Are you supporting the bill?

A I would have to look and see what the bill is. We are advocating the use of that special license fee if that bill passed for that sort of thing. I recognize that smog caused by automobiles this is the same as highway maintenance, ^{/in my book.} This is a legitimate use of the tax money. I would have to look at the bill. Theoretically or in principle I cannot oppose that idea.

Q Earlier this year you were taking a hopeful look at the smog situation, that it was improved in many aspects. In view of what has happened in Los Angeles this year, are you reassessing your position?

A Well, ^{now} I think we are way ahead of most states in this and where California sits in the cities of highest pollution, we aren't even in the first ten. Maybe we would be No. 1 if it was who talks about it. Some time ago, if you recall, our smog control board and the weather people said that Los Angeles particularly was going to have more extreme problems this year and that was in weather prognostication.

Due to unusual meteorological conditions,
Not increase in actual smog. The truth is that we are back to about
the 1960 level of smog. We have actually improved that much in spite of
the increased number of automobiles. It is hard for someone in the
actual smog area to believe this as he looks up at the sky and wipes
his eyes and it is true we have turned the corner and there is a decline
largely due to the restrictions ^{on} ~~by~~ all automobiles, and as the newer ones
replace the older ones on the road. This will be very marked before
this decade is over and I believe there are some signs of breakthroughs
to ^{/speed} ~~speed~~ up our timetable. Our biggest improvement by law is ^{/slated} ~~expected~~
for 1974 and I believe before then we will achieve some standards in
advance.

Q How do you define smog going back to 1960?

A I cannot say I know accurately how this estimate was based but one
of the principal offenders was hydrocarbons. This also includes carbon
monoxide and I believe it is based on the sum total of pollutants into
the air. I have seen the chart which shows that in 1966 the corner,
and we started back down.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.

PAUL: We will be a little late with the transcript today
because we didn't have a reporter.

#

9/22

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD SEPTEMBER 22, 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: I just have a short opening statement here.

(Whereupon Governor Reagan Press Release No. 502)

Q What about a special session on welfare, Governor?

A Special session on welfare. No, I don't think we are ready. We had one package of welfare bills which failed, as you know of passage. We just wouldn't be prepared with what I think is a total reform that is necessary and I think that we can present it in the next session in January.

Q Governor, ^{what}/do you think of Senator Schrade's proposal to take the vote away from welfare recipients?

A Well, that -- I doubt if the people would hold with it. I suppose that was based on the normal practice in so many clubs and unions and that sort of thing where a member loses his voting privileges if he is a delinquent in his dues. But I doubt that the people would hold still for anything of that kind in this country.

Q What is your own view, Governor, on that? Would you personally favor such a thing or not?

A Well, I would favor -- No, I would favor recognizing our responsibility to the truly needy and the aged and disabled, as I have so often said, and then correcting what I have described as legal fraud, those people who beyond need are a burden on the taxpayer. Lacks due to the regulations that have come down to us principally from the federal government.

Q But you wouldn't deprive them of the vote?

No.

Q Why do you think he'd make a suggestion like that?

A Well, I think perhaps Jack was calling attention to the -- how far we strayed from the original purpose of welfare, and how much

it is being abuse and what a threat it is. I suppose you could call that kind of like Nick Petris' bill about outlawing the automobile.

Q Governor, you signed Assembly Bill 981, a so-called law and order bill, which would allow local agencies to eject unruly people from meetings, including members of the press considered to be contributing to the disturbance. Why did you sign that bill?

A Well, I signed it because, first of all, I don't think it was any bill that was aimed at the press at all, and I doubt if there is any local community in its council meeting or any other meeting that would stand up and bar the press. But there have been instances and there are certain particular areas in mind where there has been an organized program of harassment to prevent a local board, such as a City Council, from actually conducting its meeting and some participants in there now have been representatives of the new element that has come to join all of you, the underground press. And I think it was because of this that they simply included the right to eject an individual who might be participating in this disruption. But I certainly don't believe and I -- I was very careful about that bill because I knew there was great concern, and I-- I feel that all the safeguards are in it. Now, if in some instance local government or any other government agency should take advantage of this bill in some way as to shut the public out by barring the press, then I think in January I would join with anyone in making a correction to see that couldn't happen.

Q Which examples were you referring to? Which underground press, in which meetings?

A No, we have had some reports from some communities, particularly where there has been a history of violence, such as in Berkeley, where Council meetings have been disrupted on evidently a planned basis. Not just a sudden disruption in which if you arrest the individuals for unruly or disorderly conduct that you solve the problem; that this is a planned thing where as fast as one is ejected another takes his place, and they just make it impossible for hours on end to conduct the legitimate business.

Q But if your example is Berkeley, which underground media are you referring to?

A Well, I'm speaking generally of elements of an underground press and I suppose those that seem to be part and parcel of the kind

of radical revolutionary movement and therefore they are part and parcel of the efforts to disrupt ~~orderly~~ government.

Q Governor, in trying to restore your cut in ~~the~~ highway patrol --

Q Wait a minute.

SQUIRE: Stay on this subject. Finish the other subject there first.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: We will come back.

Q Governor, one of the provisions in that bill sort of opens it up for local interpretation or for a value judgment of an interpretation of a credited press. Now, by virtue of being _____ the underground is "a credited press." What if these things begin to move out of hand and there is a criterion set up that is not palatable to the press itself?

A Well, as I said before that's pretty hard to envision a local government that could penalize its own local press coverage. I doubt if they ever would try. But as I also said, that if anyone did so far stretch things as to try and shut out the public interests by barring the press, I'd be the first one in January to -- to say, "Let's correct that and make sure that can't happen."

Q Do you recognize the underground press at all?

A I don't know enough about them to know one thing or the other. I was only citing that as some of -- some of what has taken place that prompted that particular portion of the bill. But I do not believe anyone can interpret that bill, and I read it very carefully, as being a threat to the press or in any way aimed at curbing the press in its coverage of governmental activity.

Q I defer to Mr. Cozen (phonetics)

Q Thank you. In trying to override your cut in the highway patrol pay raise, Jess Unruh said today that in reducing that it demonstrated that you are only giving lip service to law enforcement. What is your response?

A Well, my response is that there was nothing I hated more than having to veto this bill. I realize that there have been rather incomplete accounts of this. First of all, the highway patrol, I'll take second to no one in my praise of what they mean. I think it is one of the finest bodies of its kind to be found in the nation, if not in the world. Their record speaks for itself. It is -- when I met with them a few months ago about this particular bill, I pointed out that -- ~~number one~~, this impression that has been

widely given last night on television by some of the representatives who were talking, that they were getting a three per cent increase, ignored the five per cent across the board increase that all employees got. They are getting an eight per cent increase in comparison to the five per cent increase for other employees. It was just a plain case of -- of a balance that we couldn't do it, but when we met with them a few months ago they knew of this. They knew that -- as a matter of fact, the first proposal for three per cent came to me as something that they perhaps, if I was willing to go as high as three per cent because there was great pressure from other departments in areas to not grant any at all above the normal five, and it -- it was suggested to me that the three per cent--they might be willing to reduce their bill to three per cent. I agreed to three per cent and even though they wouldn't reduce their bill I informed them as much as two months ago and it is kind of shocking to me to discover now that the rank and file were not told of this by their leadership and that -- that they have known all this time that I was going to agree to a three per cent increase over and above the five. A total eight per cent increase. Now I've just heard that the Board of Directors of the Association, however, God bless them, they have voted that there will certainly be no slowdowns or strike sanctions or anything of the kind because of this, and I think it reflects that they know that we would like to do all that we could for them.

Q Governor, it was pointed out during the debate by Mr. Unruh and others that this money comes not from the general fund but from the motor vehicle registration fund which Mr. Unruh said there is 73 million dollars in that fund and there is no fiscal crisis and that that money unless -- if it doesn't go for these salaries will go into building more highways.

A This is -- is it true that theirs comes out of a special fund, but it is also true that there is a matter of trying to maintain a certain balance. Just a couple of years ago we passed what I think gives them one of the finest retirement systems comparable to anything or better than anything that can be found any place in the country, and certainly in the state. This was an indication that our effort to do what we can -- if you asked me my personal feelings about it, I'll tell you I don't think there is enough money to pay them for the great job that they are doing, and this goes for a number of our other law enforcement agencies also.

Q Governor: when you say "they" who d you mean "they"?

A I guess I'm talking about the highway patrol.

Q I mean the lobbyists of highway patrol or leaders or whom?

A I'm talking about the association representatives and their legislative representatives who met with me on this bill a couple of months ago.

Q The same people who had the press conference yesterday?

A What? Yes.

Q What sort of balance are you taking about, Governor, a fiscal balance or a balance in equity, in salaries?

A A balance in equity and a balance in what you can do for one section of employees where you were restricted as to what you could do for the rest of our employees because they were out of the general fund; that simply because of the financing coming out of a special fund put one section of employees totally out of line, it just didn't seem fair.

Q Governor, do you agree and support the concept of denying the college and university faculty members any salary increase this year?

A This was a legislative decision, as you know. We had put in for a recommendation across the board for five per cent increase. The legislature made it very plain that they would not approve that.

Q Can we go back to welfare, Governor?

A What?

Q Can we go back to welfare, again?

A Yes, all right.

Q Could you explain why you signed the bill, the Townsend bill giving this pass-on of federal monies to the old age people who have been on the _____ if your administration takes a negative position on raising the cost of living increases for a _____, that is 950,000 children of the AFDC program.

A Well, no, this so-called pass-on was the federal government's decision about allowing an exemption -- well, our own bill was to allow an exemption, seven dollars and a half, in outside income that was exempt from being computed before paying our old age assistance program. Now, I recognized and I hesitated for a while, because it does create a difference between those people who have an outside income and those people who are totally dependent on our grant. At the same time we have with previous bills been moving toward a

leveling up of the aid to the disabled, the aid to the blind, and the aid to the aged. And I finally felt that this just wasn't being equitable, that even though it did leave this one bracket -- this division in the aid to the elderly, that we should do it. I think that they need -- I don't think we are paying enough in those categories yet as I have said many times in here, what they need in the face of inflation, and cost of living. We are doing the best we can. We are leading the nation in that category. But I think we would all like to see a day when we could have our welfare program so in hand that we would have the means to provide a better living for all of those people and here was an opportunity at least for some.

Q But did you say that --

PAUL BECK: Governor, if I could interject for a minute, the Duffy Bill would have raised the payments to the AFDC and we supported that bill, as you know.

Q But the administration's position is -- according to the hearing examiner is negative.

A What is?

Q Is negative.

A To what?

Q It is a negative position, you said that -- in your brief you said that you felt the legislative process was sufficient. That was the Congressional intent, that was what the Attorney General's opinion was.

MR. MEESE: He's mixing --

Q Entirely --

A I don't quite understand.

MR. MEESE: He's mixing two concepts, Governor.

A I'm not sure I understand what you are getting at.

Q Governor, where is the money coming -- going to come from to pay for this 7 and a half dollar pass-on?

A Well, we are asking that about a lot of things that have to do with welfare right now, as to where the money is coming from, and so far we are still desperately working, hoping that we can correct the things in the program to make it available by eliminating the expenses that we shouldn't have in that area.

Q Governor, can you explain why you signed the \$7.50 this year after vetoing it the prior year?

A Well, once again, I don't think it is the same thing. The

prior year this program -- well, I'm confused, I'm going to say left out someone or it put someone in here and I'm going to ask Ed here to give me a hand. 1700 bills has been too many for me.

MR. MEESE: The prior year it passed on a Social Security increase.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: That's right.

MR. MEESE: Which we had already compensated for by an increase in the cost of living of state welfare, whereas this year there is no pass-on per ~~say~~ ^{se}, it merely allows a \$7.50 per month exemption of outside income from any source. Annuities, pensions, outside pensions or anything else, so this is a big difference between the bill this year and previous years.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I have to -- remember that our old age assistance which goes along with the others has a built-in cost of living increase. When the federal government puts one in with Social Security also we could again be giving a double cost of living increase to those people who get both grants. I was stymied there for a minute and I'm going to have to beg your indulgence on that. 960 bills came down in the last week of the legislature and I have not only been signing a bulk of them, but vetoing some 70 odd and I just drew a blank there.

Q Governor, can you be a little more specific about where the money is going to come from, where this pass-on -- you said it would come from areas that we shouldn't have -- expenses shouldn't be there.

A We are -- as I have told you before, we are trying and have been for some time and we are continuing in an effort involving changes in our own regulations and hopefully getting permission for changes in the federal regulations to eliminate abuses that I have been talking about for the past several months, but particularly for the last few weeks, the abuses in welfare that have made this a back-breaking cost that the state can no longer afford and I don't think the country can afford. Now, I don't know how successful we are going to be, but until we make our all-out effort on that we are going to find out how successful we can be.

Q If you are not successful in light of all the monies bills you did sign, do you foresee a deficit at the end of this fiscal year?

A We are working on -- we have the threat hanging over us, as you well know. This was -- this was announced even before the budget was passed, announced that, yes, welfare and Medi-Cal both

are running ahead of our estimates in the budget. So this is the threat that has us working even if it wasn't for this particular change in expense.

Q Governor, why did you veto Senator Harmer's bill which would establish the study in the decentralizing of Los Angeles' school system?

A Well, Ray, this was a bill that apparently those people who were affected, as evidenced by the fact that about 19 out of the 24 legislators from that particular school district, were all opposed. It was simply forcing on a district something that apparently the district did not want and his original plan which started out, and which he could not get passed, was a plan to actually decentralize that district. He then changed to a study, but the study was a study of the study because it was literally -- the bill would have caused a study of the -- of the little study, the little company study that had already been made and it just seemed to me that there was no point in this legislation. The whole school district is itself now going to experiment with a program of decentralization and we ourselves, as I told you, have a group working on the whole program of education and educational finance. So that was the reason.

Q Governor, going back to welfare for a minute --

Q One other question on that. Did you tell Senator Harmer on Sunday that you would call him before you vetoed that bill?

A Senator Harmer asked me -- we talked and I -- he called some things to my attention. I told him I would go back into the file and study those again. I couldn't find anything to change my mind and if you really want to know the whole sorry story of that, he said to me that he hoped he would hear from me, whatever my decision was, without having to read it in the papers. And I told him he would, and that night with the rest of the veto messages ahead of me, one of the members of the staff said he'd make that call. This was on a Sunday. And he called me to get the number. And I went through every wastebasket in the house and everything else and I couldn't find the slip of paper on which I had his number, and on a Sunday we couldn't get his phone number. The next morning the message went up, same staff member tried to reach him, getting him at nine o'clock in the morning, was unable to get him on the phone until 2:30 in the afternoon. We did make every effort, it was just an error. I still haven't found that piece of paper.

Q Are you still looking for it?

Q To get back to welfare, you mentioned -- well, you'd been

mentinining welfare abuses. Have you read in the paper the story of the doctors, the hundreds or several thousands of doctors who haven't been reporting their Medi-care fees in their income tax returns? Do you have any comment on that type of abuse?

A Yes, if they are getting away with it, certainly. I think -- and I think the Internal Revenue people will catch them. I must admit that there was a half way temptation for a minute to try and figure out how they did it. I think along about April a lot of us have been tempted that way. But I'm -- I'm hard put to understand how anyone could.

Q Governor, I want to make something clear on the Townsend Bill, are you saying at this point you don't know where that money is going to come from and if you can't find it it could put the budget into deficit?

A No, no, no. We -- while it is true that the budget was passed with the expectation not of this -- as I have told you before, we have a -- we have a deficit position -- a threatened deficit position in the whole area of welfare as was announced some months ago which we are working on that right now.

Q Governor, this morning Senator Stevens expressed a great deal of unhappiness about your holding of the veto messages until, as he put it, quarter to twelve Sunday. Said that came close to flouting the constitution. Can you comment on that?

A Yes, I've got an answer for Senator Stevens or any of the rest of them up there, if they will run their business a little better than to send 960 bills down in the last week.

Q Governor, you indicated -- you said that you would fight the question of conforming to federal welfare laws to the point of secession. Could you either explain how you intend to accomplish that or tell us what other means your administration is considering to deal with that problem?

A Well, some of the gentlemen, I'm sure, were here covering the campaign trail where I made that remark to an audience, and I'm quite sure that they would be the first to agree it was a facetious remark.

Q Could you tell us what other means -

A California might be able to secede, but I don't think the nation could afford it. No, we -- we have lawyers representing us, the Attorney General's office are furnishing evidence back.

We don't believe we are out of conformity. We never have believed we are out of conformity. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has told us we don't have to pay another dime to be in conformity. It is a little confusing, frankly. And since we are one of the highest paying states in that particular area, it is -- it is hard for us to understand what conformity would mean. So we are -- we are continuing and naturally we shall oppose and appeal the judicial decision.

Q But you don't think it would cost California any money even if you lose it, is that what you've been told, right, Governor?

A I'm most optimistic that it isn't going to.

Q Do you think the passage of the President's family assistance program is going to open the door to further paperwork or legal fraud as you have called it.

A Well, I'm opposed to the program. I was not opposed to the President's original concept which I thought was one that was aimed at taking away the choice between being on welfare or working for the able-bodied. I think that the bill and as I have said repeatedly, that the bill as it finally made its way through the House of Representatives, came out with the preservation of a great deal of what is wrong with welfare now and simply expanded and added to it, it just became a bigger -- threatened to become a bigger mess than what we already have and so we applied the bill as it came through the Congress to our own situation here in the state and found that it just increased our welfare problem. And we made that information available to Washington and to some of our fellow governors. All of our fellow governors.

Q How did it increase the problem?

A Well, because the -- many of the things that are wrong now were still built in. The incentives to work were no greater than they are now. There was not a hard and fast, as there was originally set out to be a hard and fast choice that the person either had to take work training or work or get off welfare. And all of these have been modified down to the same loopholes still exist and it just becomes bigger.

Q Accepting your statement that the state is not in conformity with the federal law, what is the state planning to say to Judge Zerpoli, when it next meets as to whether the state is planning to bring itself to conformity?

A I haven't read all the briefs or the evidence that is going to be presented now in the state's position. I'm sure you could get that from the men that are representing us.

Q I have tried without success.

A Well, there's lawyers for you then. That's why I haven't been getting any information.

Q Governor, do you think the people of California would be better served if veto sessions were abolished?

A Oh, there is a great deal of talk of that going upstairs. I think that the legislative process -- Bob Monagan has been trying and has suggested some various reforms that should be cleaned up. I think that there is a second look due with regard to reform because I -- I don't think that there really was a reform over the recent decade when it was supposed to be. It just went from about a four million dollar annual legislative burden to about a twenty million dollar bureaucratic maze.

Q Governor, I have another question on welfare. When did ~~NEW~~ say you didn't have to spend another dime to get conformity?

A In the meetings prior to the hearing out here.

Q This was after the Duffy bill was killed in the senate?

A No, while the Duffy bill was still up there.

Q Well, was their remark on the contention that the Duffy bill would pass?

A No, uh-uh.

Q Governor, regarding -- in reference to the legislature as a bureaucratic maze, do you have some complaints about the way they are operating up there, generally speaking?

A Just 960 bills in one week.

Q Is that your main complaint, just the last -- the rush of the last week?

A No, I think that there are -- I think there are some changes that are needed and I think most of the legislators talk about them. I try to keep my nose out of their affairs, and I think that's proper. But I think that such things as the fact that the budget, for example, could be held up past the June 30th date, and there seems to be no provision built in the law here, this great flood of bills that does come down here at the end of a session, the questioning now about the value of this -- of the veto session, these are the things that, as I understand it, a number of the veteran legislators are talking about

upstairs, and as I say the Speaker has already made it plain that he has been proposing some ideas that he thinks would amount to legislative reform, and I think there is evidence that it is needed.

Q On the specific question of the veto session, do you favor elimination thereof?

A Well, I know that at the time when it was passed it seemed to be an answer to a -- to an executive office practice of pocket vetoes and so forth with which I was in disagreement. I think if you are going to veto a bill you should be prepared to tell why you are vetoing it and I subscribe to that. Maybe this particular method in this session is not the answer.

Q Another subject.

Q One more on the veto session. Were there no veto session this year, would you have taken the same action in signing and vetoing bills that you have just taken?

A I have a kind of a feeling -- I've never gone along with the idea of letting them become law without the signature or vetoing them but unwilling to state why you vetoed them. I think the people have a right and the legislators have a right to know that you either put your name on it for them or you explain why you wouldn't put your name on it.

Q In other words, you sign no bills out of fear that your veto would have been overridden?

A No, no.

Q Jess Unruh recently released a poll that shows he's gained some four points on you since the last California poll. He seems to be closing the gap. Is this going to change your approach to your re-election campaign?

A Well, I haven't planned to make any house calls, if that's what you mean.

SQUIRE: Any more questions?

(Laughter)

---oOo---