

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 –
02/28/1974, 03/12/1974, 03/19/1974, 03/26/1974

Box: P04

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
inventories visit:

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

Contact a reference archivist at:

reagan.library@nara.gov

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

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD FEBRUARY 28, 1974

Reported by

Beverly D. 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 soon as possible, no corrections are made and there is no guaranty of absolute accuracy.)

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Just seems like yesterday we met.
No opening statement.

Q Governor, the day after Oregon imposed its odd-even number, Governor McCall gave up his Lincoln Continental for an Audi compact. Are you willing to give up your Lincoln Continental for a compact car?

A Well, as I have stated before, things of that kind I've left in the hands of security and there are provisions -- I don't know what his problems are. They are in Oregon. What ours are here, we have limited our driving, to the best of our ability. We have used other cars when it was suitable. And I abide by the fact that there are communications features and security features involved in the use of the vehicles that we take, and I leave that to security.

Q Governor, can you tell us what you are doing with the federal energy office in trying to get a return of the state exempt status on crude oil.

A Well, I'll be in Washington, as you know, next week, on the National Governor's Conference, and we are going to see what we can do there, regarding -- set up appointments about this. I feel as the Controller feels, that this was discriminatory and that we should not be -- come under that limit.

Q Is the state going to sue?

A Oh, I don't know what the action will be. Let's see what we can find out when we sit down to consult.

Q Governor, are you going to endorse Proposition 5, the gas diversion proposition? You have endorsed Proposition 18 in 1970. Will you endorse Proposition 5 this time?

A We have t had a meeting on Proposition 5. I haven't even -- I wouldn't even be able to tell you the details of it right now.

Q What -- how do you feel about gas tax diversion now that we have an energy crisis and a gas shortage?

A On the gas tax diversion?

Q Right.

A Well, I think one of the subjects in that, that has to be studied very thoroughly, is that in this era of rising costs, the gasoline tax is not as it was so often thought of as a great cornucopia from which everyone could get everything they wanted. As a matter of fact there are great restrictions now in our ability to distribute these funds for maintenance and for building necessary building. We are way behind in the Master Plan even for the correcting of danger spots in our highway system simply because of the higher cost of all construction.

Q Governor, did gas stations in the process of drawing up a gas plan, a marketing plan, did gas station dealers refuse to be controlled in terms of their hours and operating days?

A No, no, it is our feeling that -- you know, and I think consistent with our whole approach to matters, that we want the least interference with the private sector and the private marketplace that we can possibly have and do the job that government has to do. And we feel that we can get that kind of cooperation. A program of the kind we proposed, even though it is mandatory, still depends like so many others of our laws, -- depends on the willingness of the people to cooperate. And we believe in the meetings that our people have had with the -- Association of Dealers that they want to cooperate and they want to help alleviate this situation themselves.

Q It seems that there are more controls -- more of the law deals with customer than the gas station owner. Why is that?

A No, no, and some of you seem to have misunderstood a little bit about the -- this whole idea of penalties involved in this plan. If you will check the law you will find that any time that an emergency is invoked and regulations are set out for an emergency, the law requires the penalties which are contained in this one. Now, those penalties, some of you seem to have noticed the top limit that can be imposed and think of that as the regular --

what would take place for any violation. This is a misdemeanor and it is in the law whether the emergency is invoked for this or anything else. And as a misdemeanor it means that it can range from a warning to a dollar to no jail all the way up, if you've got a chronic offender and someone who really is showing criminal intent, to where the Judge would have the Flexibility of going as high as \$500 fine and six months in jail. But that is the maximum. It goes just as a traffic offense, it goes -- it goes all the way down to somebody can just say, "Don't do that again."

Q What would it take in California for the imposition of rationing, and does the State of California have the power by itself to do that?

A I don't know in the present set-up.

ED MEESE: You could under an emergency situation.

A Yes, I suppose that.

MR MEESE: But that has not been contemplated.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Yes, we don't contemplate it. We don't -- we don't favor it. We don't think it would be useful.

It is certainly not going to create an additional pint of gas.

Q What would the circumstances in your opinion have to be before rationing would be necessary?

A I honestly couldn't just sit here now and spin off what would have to take place. I don't know. Maybe if the shortage became so great, the lack of gasoline became so great that you had to restrict driving down to emergency vehicles and so forth, or even perhaps just a minimum of absolutely necessary driving. So far the shortage is not that great.

Q If we will have long lines at service stations, even with the odd-even plan, would you then consider rationing?

A Well, that's a hypothetical question. I want to see what happens with this plan and the places where it is going to work. So far we have heard from enough counties that account for about 51 per cent of the automobiles in California. But I'm not sure that rationing alone, just the fact that you have to have a coupon, is going to -- if they are going to persist in sitting in those lines I don't know, I don't see where just having rationing is going to change that. First of all, the people themselves, according to the polls, have indicated they don't want rationing. By a considerable margin they don't want rationing.

Q Governor, officials in Oregon have said that even though they instituted such an odd-even plan, when their state supply

dropped below 70 per cent people panicked again.

A Yes.

Q They say that California will work only if we can stay above 70 per cent. Do you have assurances that that will be the case?

A Oh, I don't know what the percentage is. We have no indication that there is going to be such a shortage. There was a period when Oregon and some other States in the beginning of this allocation program -- there was an unequal distribution and some states were short-changed. And I think that Oregon was one of those. And the -- it did create a panic situation. I don't think that just going in long lines helped that situation any. It didn't increase the amount of gas they had.

Q Is California expected to stay above 70 per cent in supply?

A Well, we certainly hope so. All the evidence we have now indicates that we will.

Q Governor, your administration is putting the burden on the service station operators for deciding whether a vehicle is in commerce use. Now, isn't that kind of a heavy burden to put on a young man? Rather than you defining what a commercial use is?

A Well, on the other hand, though, when we looked at the -- the contrast, this was one of those things of trying in this limited time to convey or to put together the list of everything that would qualify as commercial. And it just became so cumbersome and had so many possibilities of loopholes there or errors there that we decided it probably made more sense for the man at the pump to -- to know whether it was legitimately a commercial vehicle. Obviously, if the United Parcel pulls in and wants gas, that is a -- that's a commercial vehicle. There may be some borderline cases and there may be some disputes between individuals. We think the percentage of that would be so small that it wasn't worth the cumbersomeness of trying to solve that with a regulation. You had your hand up.

Q I wanted to talk about another subject.

SQUIRE: Are they all done on gas?

Q How about milk?

A I don't think you can get a mile on it.

(Laughter)

Q Governor, you know, the California dairymen are asking for a 16 cent a gallon increase. What do you think of that situation?

A Well, it is not for me to comment. Under the program that's mandated by law here in the State of California, the regulatory program of dairies, there will be hearings and I understand they are taking place today. These hearings are -- there is a board that then hears the reasons for this and makes a recommendation to the Department of Agriculture. And all of this is very carefully prescribed as to the factors that must be proven in order to justify an increase. And so I'd only be guessing. I haven't heard. I don't know what their case is. And a board will hear it and then the decision will be made within the framework and the specifications of the law.

Q They are claiming the board is merely a rubber stamp. They grant increases every time the farmers want them and looking at last year, the --

A Well, they make recommendations, but then we have a Director of the Department of Agriculture and I can assure you he's no rubber stamp. I don't think the Board is, but --

Q Well, he works for you. If he asks you for advice, what will you counsel?

A I'd want to know what it was they told him.

Q Governor, do you think the state has any business fixing price of milk?

A If you want my personal philosophy on this --

Q Well, you are the governor and it is your program.

A My personal philosophy is, of course, I'm a believer in the free marketplace. Now, we know that the dairy industry is regulated and has been for many, many years at the national level and here at the state level. The dairy industry itself wants this, insists that it is necessary. The milk is a kind of utility. If I had my druthers there wouldn't be such a program.

Q Do you think the Governor -- the dairy industry wants this because they can always get a higher price for their milk whenever it is convenient to them?

A No, as a matter of fact you find much the same thing going on with regard to maximums as to minimums. The whole --

and there -- I must say that the dairy industry did have -- there are arguments on their side and when you hear them and hear the legitimacy of the case, they present as to what might happen on a free market of -- waste and extravagance and the possibility of higher prices, they -- they make some sense, too. Philosophically, they have never been able to convince me that we wouldn't be better off on a free marketplace just as right now I think we'd be better off without the wage and price controls that are imposed at the national level.

Q Governor, does this go for liquor, too, which we have minimum prices under Fair Trade?

A Well, right now there is some study going forward on this, on this particular case.

Q How do you stand philosophically on liquor, Governor?

A Well, I think there are some protections that have to be given because if government exists to protect us from each other, in the diversity of selling mechanisms in the liquor industry the possibility does exist for some merchandisers to be able to sell even at a loss until they had driven the others out of business and then have them -- have a kind of monopoly situation. This must be guarded against. Because I think we are talking about the Fair Trade Law, the protection of the mom-and-pop liquor store from the seller who sells a great many other products and could afford to take a loss on one for a period if he wanted to drive out competition. This is what's lead to the Fair Trade laws that we have. But, as I say, I can't go beyond telling you that right now there is legislation being considered and there is study going forward on this whole subject.

Q The loss leaders is true in every field. Why are you certain that philosophically you don't like controls on milk prices but you won't say the same thing on liquor prices?

A No, I said philosophically -- no, I'll still say philosophically I believe in a free market.

Q Governor, do you have any reaction to the latest field poll which shows that two Democrats would beat either of the Republican candidates for Governor at this point?

A Yes, I'll fall back on the line that a poll is only as good as the day it is taken. I don't -- the campaign hasn't gotten under way yet. I think when the candidates have to get out there and face each other in the eyes of the public, then -- then they will be judged by the people on what they advocate and what they

want to do. That is they all tell the truth about what they advocate and what they want to do. For example, I think that when some of the candidates get out there trying to sell themselves on the basis of anti-capital punishment and legalizing marijuana and so forth, some people might take strong positions with regard to that.

Q Governor, a parochial question, the Bay Area Rapid Transit District was up here the other day asking for a two to five year extension for the half cent sales tax that goes on the three BART counties. Now, it was mostly on your insistence in 1969 that the tax was imposed in the first place, rather than a bridge toll to help finance BART. Are you for an extension to help BART, the _____ of the sales tax?

A Here again, I'm going to see what the case is and what form the legislation takes. Yes, I -- as a matter of fact, was pretty advocate this was about the only way we could go, the last time, rather than opening up the bridge tolls which were instituted for the purpose of paying off the bonds. And that previous request would have required refinancing some of those bonds at the time -- at a time when the bond market was not good and when we would come out -- come out paying higher interest if we had to refinance than we are presently paying. So this was the answer. The people in an area want this thing, then we gave them the privilege of having -- of imposing a tax in their area to pay for it.

Q Governor, sometime ago Jesse Unruh was quoted as saying that the true Republican nominee for the Gubernatorial -- in the Gubernatorial race hasn't yet emerged. There may yet be another one. Do you think there is any possibility of -- of someone else coming into this race and taking along a --

A No, I don't know. Maybe he was still one of those last hope souls who was still thinking that I was playing some kind of a game. I don't know what his thinking was. You'd have to ask him.

Q Governor, how do you explain the fact that despite your own neutrality just about all of your so-called kitchen cabinet, your major finance supporters have gone for Flournoy and none, as far as I know, has actually come out for Reinecke?

A Well, I don't know that that -- that's true and I know that a great many people haven't been heard from. I don't think the ranks have -- have filled up already within the party for -- for both candidates. I know that there are many people that

still are trying to make up their minds on this, and I can't tell you. I only know that I -- took my position and I went to the trouble of informing everyone who had ever been closely associated with me and whose name I often refer to when you speak of them as my supporters, that I was going to be absolutely neutral, but that I thought that they should conduct themselves as party members and go whichever way -- whatever way they wanted to go and participate in the party activities and the only string that I still held on anyone that I try to hold on all the party members is that when the primary is over they will all be united behind the nominee.

Q In fact, Governor, haven't some of your supporters said that they prefer to squirrel away their money in case you decide to run for President?

A Well, I can't believe there is anyone left who thinks that. I don't think there is, no, because --

Q That thinks what, that you'll run for President or they squirrel their money away?

A I thought you meant -- squirrel it away, so that I might suddenly change my mind and become a candidate.

Q Right.

A I don't think anybody is going anything of that kind. That would be a lot of squirreling.

Q Governor, one question, do you think that Lieutenant Governor Reinecke made a tactful error in his approach to the tax special prosecutor in the ITT affair? Do you think he would have been wiser to just ignore the situation in the hopes --

A Well, the situation wasn't going to ignore him, and rightly or wrongly no one will ever know in a thing of that kind. I know he is confident of his innocence and non-involvement and he's watched this thing drag on and drag on and he wants a resolution of it. And I think anyone of us in the same position would want the same thing.

Q Do you think he's wise to ask for his lie detector test -- what's your feeling on that? How do you think -- do you think that would satisfy the public of what?

A I don't know, but I think it certainly shows his own confidence in his innocence.

Q How about your confidence in his innocence?

A As I told you the other day, I haven't seen any -- any evidence of any wrongdoing on his part. I've always found him very moral and -- very upright man.

Q There are two bills in the legislature that will change the date of the primary in California, shortening the time between the primary and general election. If that -- either of those bills got to your desk would you sign them?

A Well, you know I never comment on sign or veto any specific legislation until I actually see it there on the desk, but again in theory I have many times said that if everyone is concerned about the cost of campaigning one of the best ways rather than a limitation on how much someone can spend would be to shorten the period of campaigning. And it is true, you set up a campaign organization and acquire headquarters and so forth throughout the state for a primary in June, and then theoretically the main campaign doesn't get under way till Labor Day, but we all know that that campaign organization and those expenses go on from June right straight through the summer until the big campaign gets under way, and I have often myself said, why don't we have the primary and literally go from there with the momentum still going right into the -- the two months of campaigning for the general election.

Q Do you think a shorter campaign time would help incumbents more than the challenger?

A Oh, I -- I can't see where it -- where it necessarily would, no. Because there is no -- you know, the -- your challengers in the primary there, they are appealing to the people then and making themselves known.

Q Governor, as you know, next Tuesday there is a special Congressional election down in Ventura County. Would you expect this election to be a national indicator as far as confidence in the administration? Another Watergate test, as some of the other Congressional elections have been described?

A No, I don't think so. And I'd hate to think so. I don't know just exactly how the -- what the issues have been that are on the -- in the campaign so far. Of course it is -- it is a primary and unless someone gets 50 per cent of the vote, in which case the special election will be over. I don't really know in this -- at this time what they have been campaigning on.

Q Are you involved in any regard in that election?

A What?

Q Are you going down in the election to help Lagomarsino?

A No.

Q You are staying out of it?

A I didn't stay out of it, you go where you are asked.

Q Governor, the food distribution program began again in Oakland today and it seemed that there were long lines and a lot of people again. Would you in any way say that -- that no one took your advice the other day on aiding and abetting lawlessness?

A Oh, I didn't -- I didn't really expect that a lot of people faced with free food were going to rush out and say, "We won't do it because the Governor doesn't want us to." I expressed an opinion, what they are doing. Now, from here on, and I'm not retreating from anything I said the other day, I stated a position then, but again I have to ask all of your indulgence on refraining from comment or discussion on this case as it goes on and it is still as sensitive as it ever was, and the main -- the main idea is to get that young ^(Hearst) girl back safely.

Q Do you think in light of the sensitivity you talked about it may have been wise not to say anything the other day?

A No, as a matter of fact, quite the contrary.

Q Governor, do you think those long lines indicate there are many hungry people in California as the SLA contends?

A No, I just think there is a characteristic on the part of the people that they love something for nothing. That's why so many give-away shows are popular.

Q Governor, did you ever make a report to the President about your trip to Australia and Singapore?

A I have not had a chance to make in any depth a report to him in person. But to the various agencies and departments that would be concerned, I have reported.

Q What, in essence, did you conclude?

A Well, there were -- there were specifics, a number of specifics of -- that I learned with regard to our overseas trade, Singapore and Djakarta, suggestions that business community made that -- that could speed things up, perhaps increase our export business, this sort of thing. And so I brought those messages back.

Q Governor, our administration was in support of a bill by Senator Lagomarsino that would have replaced the exclusionary rule. At the end of the 30 -- at the end of January, when the 1973 legislation died, he made a tactical move on the last day of the session to amend the bill, it went out to print, and it came back and it died. I just wonder whether this indicates you are giving up the push or support of replacing the exclusionary rule.

A Not at all, it indicates that we are still faced with a majority in control of the legislature who is resistant to passing any anti-crime bills.

Q Governor, can we go back to the food distribution program. You were asked if you thought those long lines meant that there were many people in this state who were hungry and needed food and you said no.

A No.

Q What does that -- could we --

A No.

Q -- try that answer again.

A No, I said -- I said again I thought it revealed that there were a lot of people who will always enjoy getting something for nothing and I think that's true of all of us, it is a trade of human nature. We have, I think, as fine a welfare system at the governmental level as there is in the world today, here in California. Substantial increases have been made in the grants to the people in that system. Eligibility is easy to determine. If someone is in need. At the local level there is -- there is a welfare system called "County General Relief" in which anyone simply on the claim of hunger can go in and be taken care of immediately. In addition to that we have a number of private programs as we have always had in this country that nationwide spend billions of dollars a year on this. Now the actual figures would seem to belie that. I'm not going to say that there isn't poverty here and there that somehow gets overlooked for one reason or another. Someone that is in exceptional need and their problem has not been resolved. We know that's true, and I'm not going to say that the people ~~are~~ on welfare are living the same life that everyone else is living. But I think this country has proven that it is doing up to virtually the limits of its ability to meet this problem. But the figures indicate that more than 95 per cent of all the people in the United States have at least the minimum daily nutritional input guaranteed

to keep up energy and health and so forth. 50 per cent of the people in this country have the gas and electric appliances in their homes. 80 per cent of them have television. I don't know whether that's good or bad. I didn't mean that.

(Laughter)

A But poverty is a kind of a comparative thing and I think in our country we have come to rule that poverty is not as it is in the rest of the world, based on an inability to provide food and shelter and clothing to sustain life, which is the general definition of poverty. Here in this country we have set a limit and said we base -- we call you poverty anything below a certain proportion of the general standard of living. Now, how many countries in the world could someone with an automobile and a T. V. set and an electric range and refrigerator be classed as poor? But -- they are by our standards and we want to raise them up.

Q Governor, earlier you said that when some of these candidates start talking about favor -- being against capital punishment and favoring legalization of marijuana the voters won't think very much of them. On the marijuana thing, who are you referring to?

A I'm -- I'm just referring to candidates who have recently taken stands and said that they would support or even introduce legislation--

Q Do you have any specifically in mind?

A I have some specifically in mind. But I'll remain non-partisan for the moment.

Q Governor, these are Democrats, I assume, right?

A Yeah.

(Laughter)

Q Governor, with regard to the death penalty, Senator Wedworth put a bill across the desk yesterday, I believe, that provides for mandatory death penalty in the event of kidnapping, where it is not provided for in the current law. The bill contains an urgency clause. Do you think that that might be a sensitive subject in the sense that it might jeopardize the Hearst case?

A Oh, would you --

ED MEESE: It wouldn't apply to the Hearst case anyway.

A No, it wouldn't.

Q If she's still being held --

A See, the crime was committed before, it is just the same as the death penalty legislation, we now have crimes that were committed before that was put into operation.

Q If she's still being held by the kidnappers at the time that that bill should become operative and it reached your desk during that period^{and}/it was signed, my understanding is it would not be retroactive.

A I'm a layman, I've got to ask my lawyer there.

ED MEESE: See the bill when it gets on the desk.

A That's a typical lawyer's answer, too.

Q Governor, last week you offered a compromise on a proposal for development centers for disabled children that was -- gave virtually everything that had been proposed in a bill you vetoed last year. Why did you reverse your policy on that particular proposal?

A Well, among other reasons, because last year when we vetoed it, we were making a study of this entire situation. And now we know more than we did last year.

SQUIRE: Got any more questions?

Q Just one. Governor, have you ~~made any~~ change yet in your Riverside County property? I know you had it on the market for a year or more. Has it actually been sold or anything?

A Are you offering to buy, because I'm willing to sell.

Q I'll talk to you later.

A O. K. No, it is still there and it's unsold as yet, but it is on the market.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.

---OOO---

3/12

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD MARCH 12, 1974

Reported by

Beverly D. Toms, CSR

(This 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, no corrections are made and there is no guaranty of absolute accuracy.)

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Good morning.

Q Governor, long lines of cars still persist in Santa Clara and some other major counties and one of the reasons that local people think this is, is that one, service stations are not allowed by federal regulations to make appointments to sell gasoline. And, two, the hours are not staggered. Now, my question is, would you ask the federal government to repeal their ban on gasoline sales by appointment, and number two, would you give Santa Clara County and other counties who are asking it, the authority to mandate business hours if voluntary staggering fails?

A Well, let me just say, and here's one where I can update all of you a little bit, we have -- just before I came in here, received the latest report from some counties, particularly in southern California, but including over in Santa Clara, City of San Jose, and with the exception of one community in southern California all of the reports are that this morning the lines are much shorter or virtually non-existent and that the situation is vastly improved. But in answer to your other questions, let me just -- I can't treat with them specifically, let me just tell you that we are trying to put together a meeting before the week is out with local representatives from the nine counties who -- all of which have -- have asked for this plan. And this is to discuss with them anything we might possibly do or any changes that might possibly be made to get their input and their ideas as to things that might be done to improve it. Again, I want to remind you that this is a plan that we have put into effect at the counties' request, to attempt to deal with this problem. It has only been in effect a short time, and it is a plan that is intended to be run under local autonomy. Now, some counties have -- well,

they have varied among them in the manner in which they have worked with the retailers, the gasoline retailers. And some have problems that others don't have, but as of this morning the picture looked extremely bright from all of them. But we are going to have that meeting and see if there are things of this kind, anything additional that we can do.

Q Just to make sure I understand, Governor, if the counties cannot get together with the service station operators and develop staggered hours on a voluntary basis, would you make business hours mandatory?

A Well, again, as I say, these are things that we want to wait until we have this meeting with them and see what we can do. We have tried to the best of your ability to -- to minimize any interference with the private market and to do what we can do with the least amount of dictation.

Q Specifically, are staggered business hours -- mandatory business hour requirements for service stations under consideration?

A I have -- I couldn't answer that and tell you that they are because we actually -- we just simply have been getting the reports in from this. We now want to meet with them. I think there would be some question as to whether under the -- under the emergency act that is used to -- to implement this plan that we would have such authority.

Q Governor, when you were in Washington last week did you request an increase to California's gas allocation?

A Did we what?

Q Did you personally request an increase for California's gas allocation? It's been -- several Congressmen criticized California's allocation as being below the national average.

A Well, there seems to be a little misunderstanding. Now, if I heard correctly when I was in Washington, the plan as it was explained to the governors in session was, one that -- that sounded fine and fair to me. It reassured me on one point, and that was the original plan which was based on a proportion percentage of the 1972 gas use in each area did not previously take into account the difference in states with regard to growth. That some states that remained static in population and the number of automobiles getting a percentage, the same percentage of 1972's gasoline that, say, California was getting where there's been a vast increase in the number of automobiles, would be unfair. But we were told that recently this has been recognized and while I don't know whether

the actual gas on hand yet has been changed as a result of it, that the allocation is based on 1972 adjusted upward for the increase in the number of automobiles. And on that basis it would be fair to California and as fair as any other state is getting. Now, it could be that some of these Congressmen are talking about the original allocation plan which had not taken into account the increase in cars.

Q Would it be -- but the State of California, why are gas stations still closing? Why can't you get gas any where you want it now?

A Well, there is no question that all of the acts and the allocation is the sharing of a shortage. There is no one that can -- say that any of these plans has increased the amount of gasoline by as much as one pint. We are going to have about 85 per cent of what we considered a normal use of gasoline in 1972. Now, this means that everyone is going to have to -- if you take that 85 -- 86 per cent, something, it comes out about that figure -- if you take that and make the adjustment for the emergency vehicles which must have a hundred per cent of what they had previously, this as we figure reduces down to where the rest of the people are going to have to cut their driving or their mileage down to about 80 per cent of what they had then. This means that the conservation measures of individuals having to cut out unnecessary driving, carpooling, all of these things will have to continue. But there is nothing in this system that eliminates the fact that we have less gasoline to share among ourselves than we had before.

Q Governor, you mentioned that all areas except one that you polled this morning seemed to be improved. What was that one area?

A I -- it's no secret, Pasadena, I think, reported that they had long lines this morning.

Q Reports that I heard this morning, that is that there were long lines in San Francisco, did you specifically get that?

A Well, as I say, we did not have reports in -- but I think in San Francisco right at the moment you have a rather abnormal situation.

ED MEESE: But they are not in the plan.

Q Have you checked and is it a fact that California's March Allocation is 85 per cent of the 1972 amount on hand, plus the growth factor? Are we in fact getting this increased amount?

A As I said before, this is not the plan that has been adopted back there. Some days past. I can't tell you that -- in an operation as big as this is, nationwide, I can't tell you that that has yet been reflected in how many gallons of gas are in the oil station tanks. I don't know. I don't know the -- or have we had a report on whether the actual delivery has matched that, but that is the intention and that's going to be the allocation method.

Q In view of the seriousness of this, why can't you be -- find out whether we are getting what we are supposed to be getting?

A Well, have we got an answer for that question there?

(Brewer)
VOICE: Yes, we know we have 752 million gallons. The additional to make up for the growth in vehicle registration so far is by way of press release -- we haven't seen any hard paper on how this is actually going to be accomplished, but we hope to in the next day or two.

Q Another subject.

Q New subject. Governor, have you had any communication with Mayor Alioto about the state taking any action in the ^(SF)city strike, specifically with -- in regard to the --

A I personally have not been in touch with him. I know that the Water Quality Control Board as of this morning has asked the Attorney General to take action. We are concerned about the health problem particularly with the sewage that's being dumped into the Bay.

Q Is there possibly a contingency plan where state employees might go in and run those sewage plants if that were --

A Well, nine counties around the Bay, as I understand it, are monitoring the water quality there with regard to the health -- from the health standpoint. And if this becomes a threat to health and they don't do something about it, well --

Q What can you do?

A What?

Q What can you do?

A Well, we will just have to simply move in and take -- take over with regard to the --

Q Governor, does that mean the National Guard or what?

A We haven't -- I don't think we have gotten down to details

of that yet as to how actually we would -- we would do this, but we do know that it is our authority -- if local authorities do not or allow a health threat in an area and one that could spread to other areas not involved, such as San Francisco dumping the sewage, and this affecting the other surrounding counties and areas, the state has the authority to move --

Q Governor, do you have any suggestions for ending that strike situation in San Francisco?

A I've had a suggestion for a long time. I think it is time for the people in this country to recognize and for governments to recognize the feeling of the people that public employees must not be allowed to strike. There is no way that you can condone strikes by public opponent -- public employees. They do not have the same situation that private employees do in private industries. Government cannot go out of business.

Q How would you like to enforce that, Governor?

A Well, I think in this instance you'd refuse to sit down and negotiate any of the grievances of the people as long as they are out on strike. If it passes five days without them reporting for work, you start rehiring.

Q Governor, there was apparently a court action in San Francisco this _____ with an end to the strike and suggesting arrest of the people that have the picket lines. Have you heard about that?

A No.

Q Superior Court ruling apparently.

A Well --

Q If that's true, what's your response to that -- your feeling about it?

A Well, the law is the law. There is a present law. Right now the law says that public employees can't strike. And I remember a few years ago in riots and disturbances where we were making the point all across the country and editorializing to the effect that people cannot be selective in the laws that they will obey and the laws they will disobey. Here's a law that's being disobeyed. It should be enforced.

Q Governor, are you saying that in -- were you saying that the Mayor ought not to sit down with the striking employees in San Francisco now?

A I was asked for my own opininn -- personal opinion as to how you would resolve this issue and I don't think you negotiate while they continue to strike. Here in Sacramento a coupée of years ago when we had a similar situation, if you will recall, the settlement came after they returned to work.

Q Governor, would you apply this to all government employees or just emergency services or health services when they affect the standards of living of people?

A All public employees. And if you go back down through the years you will find people of great divergent political views, such as from Cal Coolidge to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, are all on record as having made quite firm and eloquent statements -- I don't think anyone's statement has perhaps topped President Roosevelt's statement to the effect that society cannot tolerate and cannot allow a strike on the part of public employees.

Q Is that an indication that if you -- another collective bargaining with strike bill like Moretti or Moscone put in last year came to your desk you wouldn't look on it favorably?

A Well, you know that I do not comment on specific legislation before it gets there.

(Laughter)

A Which I won't do.

Q Governor, what reaction have you had to that botulism remark?

Q Let me ask another question on this other --

A Wait a minute, we got another question on the strike.

Q Who are you dealing with in these nine counties?

ED MEESE: Health Officers.

A That's the Health Officers.

ED MEESE: Through the State Department of Public Health.

A Through the State Department of Health.

Q Before we get off that, Governor, what--specifically what has your Board asked the Attorney General to do? What action?

ED MEESE: It sought an injunction to stop flow of sewage into the Bay and to the City to carry out its responsibility to operate the sewer system so that won't happen.

Q The Governor's office has asked that?

ED MEESE: No, the State Water Resources Control Board.

Q And to compel -- the writ to compel the City to operate that --

A The sewage plants. Now, is yours still on this or are we going --

Q I just want to ask a question here. Just as a point of clarification, at what point do you think the state should go into San Francisco and operate the sewage plant or whatever? At what point -- what information would you have to have to make that decision?

A Well, if the monitoring of the waters in the Bay indicate that there is a health threat to the people surrounding the bay, in those areas, and nothing is done at any other level, then the state has no other choice. The state has to go in and protect the health of the people and we will do it.

Q Would you limit it just to the sewage plants or would you -- or would you consider running the municipal railroad or other services?

A Well, right at the moment the only problem -- I don't know what our authority would be there. I know that in this instance the responsibility for the health of the people is the -- is the matter in which -- that we are dealing with and where the law is explicit.

(botulism statement)
Now, you asked about that. I've commented on that before. In a completely private gathering I made a rather ludicrous statement which was simply intended not to be taken seriously, nor did anyone there take it seriously to express my frustration with this long-standing *(Hearst)* tragedy. And if this offended anyone I apologize. I'm sorry for it. It was never intended, as I say, to get outside and one individual found it necessary to call a reporter and I think you all know my position and how -- how much I have refrained from any comment on this because of the sensitivity of the matter and because of the need to protect her and to hopefully get her back, safe and sound, to her family. So I have no further comments to make on -- on any of this, and I think that that responsibility regarding such comments extends to all of us.

Q Governor, what difference does it make whether it got out or not, you are still making the comment before other people and you are representing the people of California there.

A No, I said in a -- in a completely private gathering. And --

Q Why does that make it right as opposed to not letting it get out?

A I didn't say that it made it right. I wish I hadn't said it.

Q Why did you make the comment in the first place even though it was private?

A Because these people in this private gathering, many of them from California, interested in what's going on here, were asking for information on the situation. Were asking about the matter of the people that were taking the food, they heard of the disturbances, they heard of the attitude at the beginning on the part of some of the people getting it and I just made a statement expressing my own frustration about this -- this whole situation and the inability to resolve it and to get this young girl back.

And --

Q Governor, yesterday Randolph Hearst said he would like to see Little and Ramiro be given free live T. V. time to make some sort of a statement. If the various legal authorities involved approve this sort of action, this course of action, would you encourage it?

A It doesn't -- there isn't any way that I can comment on that or that I need to comment on that. As I have said before, Mr. Hearst -- I endorse Mr. Hearst's efforts and I'm quite sure that anyone in his position is going to do anything he can that he hopes will return his daughter safely and I have no criticism or disapproval of what he's trying to do. The jurisdiction with regard to these two men and that particular incident rests with the authorities in the county and the Superior Court Judge. He's not in our jurisdiction at all.

Q You couldn't prevent such a televised news conference yourself?

A No, nor could I approve it.

Q Governor, on the public strike situation, the more public strikes there are and the more successful they are, if indeed this one should turn out this way, that would tend to encourage even more public strikes. Is there any plan that you may have that -- that would bring this to a head in an effort to stop -- stop this?

A Well, we have been working long and hard here in our own

state relations with our employees on plans and methods for -- for treating with grievances. For understanding what it is that -- are their problems and what they would like to have resolved. I think that we worked out some -- much improved machinery, methods of doing this. And this, I think, is a responsibility of any level of government. I do not mean to say when they can't strike that this doesn't preclude us from doing everything possible to establish a forum whereby the workers and management in government can get together to work out solutions to whatever problems there may be. And I don't say that we have arrived at the perfect solution ourselves here in the state. We have vastly improved that, we continue to work, we continue to be open to ideas that will improve that. But this is done within the framework of a law that says public -- that recognizes that public employees cannot strike.

Q Would you approve of, say, the concept of binding arbitration?

A Binding arbitration in regard to government gets you into a philosophical field. You have to recognize that the employees are employees of the people. And the representatives of the people are chosen at the ballot box. Now, how do those representatives elected by the people find anyone else who has a higher authority or a higher ability to represent the people such as an arbitration board? And I -- I think when you get into this you find out that it sounds easy and it is -- is one of those simple sounding solutions but what arbitration board not elected by the people can make a ruling that actually may affect the economy of the people? That might mandate on the people tax increases? Things of this kind are the responsibility of the elected officials of government. And therefore I think when you sit down to deal this way you have the highest level of arbitration that's possible.

Q Governor, is the state going to go into San Francisco even if Mayor Alioto and the Board of Supervisors doesn't ask for your help?

A Well, as I said before, we are not going in to San Francisco at all on just some mandate that we dream up on our own. The matter of public health is a state responsibility. And if it is necessary to go in from that standpoint you don't have any choice in it.

Q Suppose they feel that -- the state going in may injure their tries to end the strike. How would you feel about that?

A Let me refer you to my lawyer.

ED MEESE: Every effort will be made to work through the local officials first. And beyond that it would only be an extreme emergency threatening the public health and safety that would require any further act.

Q What did you say, Ed, I don't understand that. Would you tell me again, only in the extreme emergencies would you go, is that what you said?

ED MEESE: I said every effort would be made to work with and through the local authorities. And I can't imagine that if the health and safety of the Bay area was threatened to the extent that you suggest that the Mayor and the other city officials there would not carry out their responsibilities.

Q On whose authority, Governor, would you feel that there was an emergency public health situation? Where would that decision be made?

A That would have to be, -- I imagine that would be pretty technical and that would be on the findings of the -- of the Water Quality in the bay. What this sewage and the bacteria level that had been brought up to and so forth, the -- they'd quarantine the beaches and so forth. That would be, I might say, medical or actual statistical findings and then experts in that field would rule whether this constituted a threat to the health of the people living in that area.

Q Governor, do you think it is advisable to wait until there is extreme health emergency at the rate of 100 million gallons a day of raw sewage --

A We are not waiting. Water Quality -- Resources Board has taken the action already or has asked the action of the Attorney General already on that matter.

Q Yes, but you said you personally would not act unless it was an extreme health emergency, right?

A Well, no, I think what Ed was answering in my behalf there was the fact that we are working through the local officials on this. But the Water Quality Board does have the authority to take the -- to ask for the legal action they have asked for. And that is not waiting until it is declared a health menace, but we know, for example, that the counties -- the nine counties around the Bay are monitoring and watching this. And we are in

touch with them and our own health officials. Now, what I said was in the uniquely case that if this reached a point of a threat to the health and those local government entities did not take action, then we'd have no choice but to take action for them. I cannot foresee those health authorities not taking action. I'm sure they would.

Q Governor, what fundamental options are available to you as Governor that is in the action you've suggested?

A Well, I would think the taking over and the manning of the sewage plants.

Q By the National Guard?

A I -- we haven't made any decision or any discussion of that yet.

Q What would you have to send in if you didn't send the Guard?

A What's that?

Q Who would you have to send in to do this if you didn't have the Guard?

ED MEESE: Under the Emergency Services Act, Governor, you have the responsibility to take over all local officials and all state officials that might help in solving this. So there are a whole variety of options, none of which I think we ought to discuss hypothetically until we decide on one.

Q Does that mean local employees under state jurisdiction?

ED MEESE: He could take over local employees, a whole variety of options.

Q Does that require an act of declaration of emergency?

Q We are on to something else. What's your reaction to the critique of--the architectural critique of the L. A. Times regarding your new residence? He says it is a form of self satire.

A Well, I read his article, and I was re -- well, I discovered anew why for forty years they haven't been able to get a governor's residence. I don't know of anything that causes more controversy than the plans for a house. Everyone has his own idea as to what the house should look like. Now, an architectural form was selected in the manner prescribed by law, by a committee within the state -- of government. It was selected from, as I understand it, about 70 applicants, architectural firms. There is a manual that has been put together over a number of years,

things that must be taken into consideration in the construction of a governor's residence. This architectural firm was given the go-ahead on plans within that particular -- or the framework of that manual. Now, they have come forth with a plan, the second plan that they came up with. The legislature put into the budget language that I would have to have a -- an approval myself of those plans. It is absolutely untrue that this -- that this represents our personal tastes or what we would build for ourselves; as a matter of fact it does not. But we tried to give input to the architects only on the basis of having lived in this situation, knowing some of the problems, knowing it firsthand and memory as to what's involved in official use of the home as well as personal use. That that was the basis of our input. And out has come a residence that contrasts to what many have said is not as grandiloquent as previously planned. It doesn't even have the floor space of the old residence that now is a museum piece over here. It is a residence, using the term "mansion" is -- is very inappropriate. It is a family residence which also recognizes the occasional needs for official entertaining and so forth.

Q What's your reaction, Governor, to the statement in that same article that it is like a thoroughbred race horse pulling a beer wagon?

A I don't know what motivates the man. I guess architects disagree among themselves, but I don't think there is any plan at all that could ever be found that would please everyone. Certainly the last one under my predecessor that was approved failed to please a great many people.

Q Governor, one more question about the energy situation. Lieutenant Governor Reinecke said this morning that instead of criticizing the petroleum industry that the American people ought to be grateful to the oil companies for handling the crisis the way they did, because, after all, nobody froze to death. Or words to that effect. Would you agree with that?

A That they would what? I didn't hear --

Q The American people should be grateful to the oil companies for the way they handled the oil crisis. Fuel crisis, because in his words, "Nobody froze to death."

A Well, I think it has all in all turned out very well. We know that one of the priorities had to do with -- through the winter

months of middle distillates, heating oil, and for industrial use to keep us from having factories and industries close down, to minimize the amount of unemployment, and I think that it's been reasonably successful. I don't think anyone feels today like being an apologist for any particular industry. But I do think that too many people in public life have been seeking a -- a whipping boy in this energy crisis and it is very easy to center on the oil companies and say, "Oh, they must -- they must be to blame." And yet the record indicates that the oil companies, number one, were at the most active in trying to warn us over recent years that this was coming. Number two, the so-called vast increase in profits were far less than they were for a number of other industries in this country. That the oil companies from 1958 up through 1972 were having a constant decline in the percentage of return on their investment. And their increase in profits has not been out of line with what has happened to them and the prices that they are having to pay for the import of foreign crude and I think that the -- if anything, once again I say that if there is anything that could be done they might have done an even better job with less government interference. Not only now, but in the past. And I still myself have a corner of my mind that would like to see what would happen if we would turn the marketplace loose on this instead of trying to regiment it.

Q Governor, what part or responsibility does the state have in the -- in the case of an accident in a nuclear powerplant? Do you know that?

A No, I don't honestly know the -- what the situation would be. I can turn for some legal help here again and find out just what our responsibility is.

ED MEESE: Our responsibility is to supplement local officials in handling what -- any health or safety hazards that might come that the local people aren't able to handle.

A I thought he was referring to what we may have with regard to setting standards, but those, I believe, belong to the Atomic Energy Commission.

ED MEESE: Atomic Energy Commission.

A The Energy Commission has the sole responsibility, nationwide, for setting the standards for safety in terms of atomic type projects.

Q Governor, what did you personally do last week in Washington with respect to the imposition of crude oil price controls on California and other states, in trying to have the federal energy office rescind that decision?

A Well, I arranged for a meeting between Mr. Simon and Hugh Flournoy whose immediate jurisdiction this came under and they had that meeting and we were turned down in our request.

Q Governor, --

Q That was all?

MR. ED MEESE: There is a public hearing today, Governor.

A That's right, there is a public hearing. It is going to take place and we will have representatives there.

Q Governor, while you were away --

A Wait a minute. Wait a minute.

Q You refer to the marketplace, do you think that price ceilings should be lifted from gasoline?

A Well, I happen to be a believer in the economic theory that the price and wage controls never have been successful and this goes all the way back to your Emperor Diocletian of Rome, and while there might be an immediate upsurge in price it would show very shortly the marketplace would take over and this would be reduced. And we have got classic examples in our own history of when the prices started to skyrocket for the whalers off New England for whale oil, and suddenly we discovered kerosene and pretty soon the price of whale oil was back down lower than it had ever been. And I believe in our market system -- and I think that when government sets out to regulate you run a great risk of a whole row of dominoes, suddenly way down the line you find a domino tip over that you never intended to affect.

Q What about -- specifically about gasoline price controls now?

A Well, again, as I have said, all history indicates that while there might be a temporary dislocation and a temporary upsurge of prices in the long run the prices usually come back down to something less than those prescribed by the -- by the controls.

Q Then you would --

A I would like to see the removal of wage and price controls by government.

Q Governor, while you were away Lieutenant Governor Reinecke made some comments on a radio station that he -- I think the word he said, "He winced at your tuition action." Your imposition of tuition on the university, and he indicates disagreement with you. Has he ever expressed that view to you personally?

A Well, there has never been any attempt on my part or on his to find ourselves in total agreement on every issue and every facet that comes along, whether it is involved with the Board of Regents or anything else in government. Now, the Regents never were unanimous about tuition. I happen to believe in it. On the other hand, if I -- in what I have heard, I haven't had a chance to talk with him about this, but from what I've heard he was also remarking mainly about the use of tuition for capital projects on the campus. Now all of us were most reluctant in giving the university permission to do that. But this followed the first time that a university bond issue for capital construction had ever been voted down in California. And you will recall a few years ago that was voted down. The university had some things that had to be done. So reluctantly we gave them permission to use this. But it was the feeling of most of us, and certainly my own feeling, that as quickly as possible tuition should be used to improve, if possible, the education that those who were paying the tuition were receiving.

Q Any more questions?

Q Yes, just one. Governor, in view of the controversy over President Nixon's income taxes, is there anything specific that you've done or advised your accountants this year to make certain that there is nothing in your returns that might some day prove embarrassment to you?

A Well, I've had somebody, of course, doing my returns for a great many years, through all the motion picture industry and presently. And they have never had any instruction from me other than that I should pay everything that I legitimately owe. And that I've never had anyone representing me who ever had any inclination to try and devise some way to get around the law. And I have always paid all the income tax that I owed. And I believe that that's probably also true of the President. I'm sure that he did not have anything to do with making out his own returns. I'm sure that the deduction that has caused so much talk, that he himself has asked now to have judged by Congressional committee, the

deduction of an appraised value on his papers, which has been taken by every President as long as there's been an income tax, which was taken by the preceding Governor here, which has been taken by Vice Presidents in the past -- I'm quite sure that he believed that was a legitimate deduction but he himself said he wanted a Congressional committee to look at it and if they said it wasn't a legitimate deduction then he wanted to be told how much tax he owed.

Q Governor, may I be sure I understand the logistics of the San Francisco ^{strike} situation. Aside from court actions or injunctions which seemed to have been ignored so far, is there any action the state can take without there first being a state of emergency declared? Does that have to come before you can do anything with the health problem or anything like that?

A No, I think it comes down to where the state -- where we would believe that we on the state level were involved with protecting the health and safety of the people. If you recall, sometime ago there was a strike in another city that involved law enforcement and we said that a city of several hundred thousand people could not be left without protection. And we -- we made provision for some protection.

Q So you don't have to have requests of local agencies to do that?

A Not if in our mind the health and safety of the people of California are in danger.

Q Governor, if I can get back to the gas station situation for just a second, one of the Supervisors in San Francisco is suggesting that gasoline sales be limited by county, suggesting that many of the people who buy gas, for example, in San Francisco are people who are working in San Francisco but living in other places. And as a result we have very long lines, especially long lines in San Francisco. Therefore only people who live in San Francisco should be allowed to buy gasoline in San Francisco, and the same rule might apply in other counties. I'd like to get your reaction to that.

A Well, I think that this -- I don't know whether this was ever studied or looked at by anyone, but I think that we'd be getting into a field that would be almost impossible to enforce, that would be terribly complicated and I think it must even out because I don't know of any of us that just stay in one county. And what do you do if you have a necessity to drive up through the valley, you go through several counties, and you can't turn around and go back home to fill up your gas tank. I just think that the -- it isn't -- it doesn't affect the over-all quotas of gasoline that much.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.

3/19

PRESS CONFERENCE OF RONALD REAGAN

HELD MARCH 19, 1974

Reported by

Beverly D. Toms

(This rough transcript of the Governor's press conference is provided 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, no corrections are made and there is no guaranty of absolute accuracy.)

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: One of our aircraft is missing.

Q Governor, what's your comment on Senator Buckley's request that the President resign?

A Well, I'm in disagreement with it, of course.

Q Governor, do you think this might indicate that the President's support among Republican conservatives might be troubled at this point?

A I can't answer what the reaction is going to be. I just disagree with it and I disagree with the premise upon which it is based, that the President is unable to govern. I think all of the evidence is to the contrary, including the fact that we are now going to get some oil from the Middle East.

Q Why do you think Senator Buckley would do that?

A I don't know, I have no idea.

Q You would say the President should not resign?

A That's right. I happen to believe in the system and the _____ principle. This is now being studied by a Congressional committee under the constitution provisions that cover such things. And the case involving others is in the court. And I think that the presumption of innocence is assured to everyone, and that we await the outcome of both the committee, the congressional action and the court.

Q Governor, do you think Judge Sirica should have turned over that White House document to the House Committee?

A I'm not a lawyer. All I know is that the President's lawyer said it was all right with him, but it is the defense lawyers of the men who are on trial who seem to be protesting it. And that's a decision for a court to make, not me.

Q Tell me, do you generally agree with Senator Buckley, why are you going different ways this time?

A Well, I'm not going any way other than what I have gone. He decided to take a little curve in the road, that's up to him. I'm not sure that we have always agreed on all things. We are friends and generally it is true that our philosophy has been the same. I am in disagreement with him on this.

Q He's regarded as a man of high principle.

A I hope I am.

Q Governor, have you thought in your mind of any circumstances under which you thought that the President should resign, say if it reached the trial in the Senate that it would disrupt the country for a prolonged period of time?

A Well, no, there is a constitutional provision with regard to this. If -- the House of Representatives believes there is an impeachable offense, then the trial goes before the Senate. That has been done once before in the history of this country and it didn't destroy the country and that's the way the constitution said it should be done. I think there is something far more disruptive in establishing a precedent if we ever should do so, that by pressure alone a President can be forced to resign.

Q Governor, do you believe that President Nixon has committed any impeachable offenses?

A It isn't a case of where I believe or not believe. This is what the committee is attempting to determine. So far such constitutional authorities as Senator Sam Irvin has said, that there has been no evidence that there has been an impeachable offense.

Q What do you believe, Governor, for the record?

A I don't think there has been. No, but I'm a layman.

Q Who do you think should define an impeachable offense?

A Who?

Q Who do you think should define an impeachable offense, the committee or the White House?

A Well, I think it is rather clear in the constitution.

Q There seems to be some difference, though, between interpretation provided by the White House and the committee.

A Well, how would you do that, lawyer?

ED MEESE: Well, the Supreme Court has the responsibility of interpreting the constitution.

A I assume ultimately they should.

Q Another subject, Governor.

A Wait, wait, there is one back there.

Q Another subject.

A He's on another subject. Well, I'll take him and then come back to you.

Q Governor, can you tell us, please, why you reappointed Katherine Hearst to the Board of Regents?

A Yes, I never intended to do otherwise. Katherine Hearst has been on the Board of Regents long before I became Governor. She was appointed by a previous governor. She has been one of the most faithful and one of the hardest working and best members of the Board of Regents that I've been able to observe in all these years. And it is a very fine Board of Regents. So I asked her to accept reappointment.

Q Were you trying to send a message to the Symbionese Liberation Army in light of the situation involving Patricia Hearst?

A As a matter of fact, I was very self-conscious of this, of having to call her to ask her to accept the appointment. It would have been much easier without them around. No, I wasn't sending a message to anyone. I have known -- because I have known the termination dates of regents and I have known that when the time came which was March 1, that I was going to want to reappoint her and I've known that ever since I've been in this term of office.

Q Governor, your administration has been negotiating with Assemblyman Charles Warren on the Energy Commission bill for over a month now and no results. What's the problem with that bill? What do you want in it?

A Well, it is a very -- it is a very complex bill and there are some -- some differences and there are some agreements and we are continuing to negotiate and we are getting down to certain points that I'd rather not get into the specifics of what those points are, but there are things that we feel the bill should do or should not do, and he feels the same way as the author, and it's been a measure of good will on the part of both sides in these negotiations.

Q Are you hopeful of a reconciliation of compromise that can produce a bill this year?

A Yes, and I think we all are.

Q Will you sign a bill that has surcharge in it for research?

A You know me, on bills I don't talk about them on what I'll sign or veto in advance.

Q Different subject.

A Yes.

Q Governor, can you give us a straight story on whether the state is getting an extra allocation of gasoline this month? There have been conflicting reports.

A Yes, there -- yes, it is, and there seems to have been a little slip-up in communications. I don't know how to understand it, from whence it came, but apparently the percentage figure that was given to us is the percentage of increase we were going to get reflecting the increased number of automobiles in California over the '72 period, was based on a different figure than we had assumed. When we translated the percentage figure into gallons it came out at 46 million. It actually comes out to almost 42 million. So it is a slight difference, but we will be getting 779 million gallons of gasoline and this represents an increase of 41.8 million. And the -- evidently they were using a different case figure for computing the percentage increase we were being allotted than we were.

Q Right, the 48.9 or 8 million, that's the extra?

A No.

ED MEESE: You are getting 41.8.

A 41.8. We had thought -- our first announcement, we simply took the percentage and we think our mathematics were right, but we were working from a different base as to what the percentage increase that we were told by telegram that we were going to get. And our figures came out at 46 million and then we found out that they were evidently using a different base for our March allotment and it comes out at 41.8.

Q Right. Now, it's been proposed, Governor, that that 41.8 be allocated to the major growth counties, Los Angeles, Orange, Contra Costa, Santa Clara, San Francisco, instead of out to the cow counties. Do you have any views on that?

A Well, the regulations are such that -- that we don't have that authority. All we have is the -- is the three percent that is allowed for state discretion with regard to emergencies. The regulations in Washington still -- they have the allocation and we don't have that.

Q When will the additional gas be in the gas pumps?

ED MEESE: They are in there now.

A It is there now.

ED MEESE: It's been delivered all month, it is part of the total allotment.

A It will be delivered throughout the month.

Q There seems to be another disagreement. Mr. ^{Bruce} ~~Brewer~~'s interpretation of the telegram that this was over and above the previously announced March allocation, and the Federal Energy office said no, that it wasn't. That that was included in the March allocation that had already been announced.

A Well, depending on when they announced their findings and when we announced ours. The total is now going to be -- at least we are all agreed on this, the total is now going to be 779 million gallons. The original allocation was somewhere around ^{odd} 40 million gallons less than that.

Q Governor, on that subject of fuel, but a different angle on that, John Merlo, a Democratic candidate for Lieutenant Governor suggested that you cancel your jet plane contract using the National Emergency clause, and in that way save fuel that's being used by the jet plane.

A What would I --

ED MEESE: This is some obscure candidate who has this suggestion.

(Laughter)

A But I mean what is the -- what is he suggesting?

Q Your leased airplane.

A Yes.

Q Which is a two-year lease.

A Yeah.

Q He is suggesting that you exercise a clause in there which permits you to cancel the lease in event of a national emergency and national emergency being the gas -- gas, fuel shortage.

A Well, that leased jet comes under the heading of General Aviation and general aviation's allocation of airplane fuel is something like about one per cent of all aviation fuel uses. And yet it applies to planes that service 70 per cent of the airports of the United States where there are no -- where there is no commercial travel. And I don't see that there would be anything in the line of a savings in use doing that? But, again, the original reason for the leasing of that jet which is used by other departments also was apart of security measures. And I don't have any control over that.

Q Governor, how far will the lifting of the Arab oil embargo go to alleviating the problem in California?

A Well, this is one of the points that I think all of us together have a responsibility to make. And I hope we will all do. It is going to increase, of course. We are going to have -- it is going to alleviate some of the problem. But the energy situation and the energy shortage existed before the Arabs shut off the oil. And what we should emphasize is this does not mean that everyone can go back to their wasteful ways. We are still going to have to observe some conservation measures. But now I'm going to wait for somebody ~~hwer~~ here to correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe that the resumption of Arab oil can add about 17 per cent nationwide to the U. S. oil supply.

Q How about California?

A Well, California would share in the same allocation proportion that we do now, in that. So I suppose that if it came out that -- that would mean that we'd get 17 per cent more than we are presently getting.

Q Governor, a legislative committee last week predicted that the kind of Paris kidnapping was like the Hearst kidnapping, and would be repeated with public figures and people of importance. The question is, do you feel any increased apprehension and is your security changed because of this situation?

A I never comment on the security. I have not seen any changes and --

Q How about the state?

A I just go on about my daily life and you can't live every day worrying about something like that. So I don't.

Q How about your family? Any apprehension there, your son, your wife?

A Well, I think that's an apprehension, that any man in this position lives with every day of his life.

Q But I mean has Mrs. Reagan expressed any increased fear because of this?

A No.

Q Governor, the service stations do not seem to be following your request to stay open on Sundays. Are you going to renew that request?

A Oh, yes, you are -- I'm happy to bring you up to date on things. Yes, when we first instituted the plan in those counties where the plan -- where they asked for the plan, we had proposed that they ration their gasoline on a seven-day a week basis and encouraged them to stay open. Now, we realize that, of course, the national government, in conservation met -- asked for Sunday closings as a means of saving. But instituting the odd and even day we recognize that we had to encourage this other. This did not -- they didn't open on Sundays in the numbers that we had hoped and we had the right after the week-end long lines in spite of our odd-even plan. We met recently with representatives from local governments of those counties that have the plan. And as a result of this I personally have asked the major oil companies which operate a small percentage of the stations -- most people don't realize that much more than 90 per cent of the stations are independent. But I asked the major oil companies if those that they operated -- if they would open them on Sundays. There has been a great cooperation on their part. A number of them were open last Sunday. There will be a greater number open next Sunday. And we have also extended the invitation or the request to the Association of Independent Dealers. So there will be several hundred additional stations open throughout the state next Sunday.

Q Governor, in line with that, what's your response to Mr. Younger's proposal that oil companies get out of the retail business?

A Well, I just gave the figures here. I don't know just in -- how he means or in what extent he means that. But as I have said, well over 90 per cent of all the oil stations are independent. Independently owned. I don't care what sign is up outside, they have a lease arrangement and a contract for purchasing of major oil wholesale. But there are only a few hundred -- a small percentage, I should say, I don't know the exact number --

but a small percentage, less than ten per cent of the stations that are actually operated by the major oil companies.

Q But it seems that many of those contracts with the independents during the fuel shortage have been a problem.

Q The companies -- the fuel stations really haven't been independent of the company?

A No, we have done some looking into that and we found out that most of those companies -- most of those leases only assure that they will take a certain percentage of their oil, or their product from the leasing company. They are free to go out on their own.

Q Governor, the Attorney General also recommended that pipelines be placed under regulation of the Public Utilities Commission. Where do you stand on that?

A I haven't seen what it is that he recommended, and I'd want to study it myself. I'd also want to find out what the PUC's reaction was to that. I -- personally I think there is a difference between private enterprise situation such as an industry such as the oil industry, and the utility monopolies which, of course, must be regulated by a commission, a Public Utility Commission. And I question the advisability of -- of putting private enterprise under that commission.

Q You don't consider fuel a public utility then?

A It is not in the monopoly sense that a utility is.

Q So how about in and of itself to the degree that so many people depend on using it, you don't think it is a public utility?

A Well, again, as I say, we -- we either believe in a free enterprise system, we believe in federal -- government regulations, not federal government -- government regulations to insure protection for the consumer. But we do not place private enterprise under government control and regimentation. We do with the utilities on the basis that they, by their very nature, do have a monopoly situation. And therefore to protect the public from monopoly we regulate them.

Q Do you -- you seem to be, then, in opposition to both of the Attorney General's recommendations so far.

A Well, I don't really know what -- what it is he's recommending.

Q We knew about two weeks ago.

A Well, I would have to see what they were and I would also want to get the reaction of the Public Utility Commission.

Q Governor, what he's recommending is that the major oil companies sell their wholly owned gas stations.

A Well, if they did this would be a very small number. As I say, it is less than ten per cent, or as low as three per cent of the stations.

Q Is that idea-- does that -- is that idea offensive to your sense of free enterprise?

A Well, I've never given it -- I've never given it much thought. As I say, hardly ^{owning} --/anywhere from ten down to three per cent of the stations hardly constitutes a monopoly, and I can't see there is a great threat to the independent stations.

Q Governor, there was a story over the week-end suggesting that you have delivered an unprecedented bonanza to the utility companies, rates under you in the five year studies have increased \$813 million. Under former governors they have all gone down. What's your reaction to that?

A I won't define my reaction. I'll just simply say that a one-time somewhat dissident employee staff member of the Public Utilities Commission brought that before the Senate Committee here in the Capitol quite sometime ago and hoped they would adopt it as a report. They did not, they rejected it, but it was leaked at that time, about a year ago, as something of a Senate Committee report which it was not. And then it has just turned up recently in another newspaper as something brand new and factual on the situation. The plain truth of the matter is, and get these points very carefully, Number one, utility services in the State of California rank the highest in the nation. Number two, utility rates in the State of California are the lowest of all the 25 major cities in the United States. We rank among the lowest -- in the lowest. Number three, earnings of utilities in California are lower than in the rest of the country. Now, with all of this the utilities have managed to keep up -- back through these recent years, in the expansion, the growth in California, to enlarge the facilities to meet our needs. It has only been recently that we have pointed out the energy crisis and all that California might come to the day of brownouts, as we have seen them in the east, and in other parts of the country, power failures and so forth,

long delays in the installation of telephones. But we don't have any of those things. Now, I don't know what more you could ask than --of the Public Utilities Commission than to provide the people with the best service at the lowest rates, and the companies are having the lowest rate of return, the lowest profits.

Q Governor, that same story suggests, for example, that your stance is that the companies themselves should set depreciation expense. Whereas traditionally the commission itself would scrutinize that. Is that your feeling?

A Well, I don't know -- I don't issue orders to the Public Utilities Commission and I don't get on the phone and tell them what I want them to do or ask favors of them in any way. I am responsible for them and they have been doing their job. And I haven't been that careful about all the points that this man made. As I say, this is a-- I don't find it a factual report. And I find it something that was rejected once by the Senate Committee upstairs. And I haven't taken it up point by point with the Utilities Commission. I only know what I've said to you about the utilities situation in California, and the advantages that the people of California have because of that.

Q Governor, yesterday the owners of private mental health facilities were here in the Capitol, to say --complain about the fact that they haven't had rate increases for the last six years. Today the Senate Select Committee on State Hospitals also said those local programs are badly underfunded. Is not in fact this transfer of the mentally ill and the mentally retarded to local areas bogging down because of that? Should the state do something to provide more money for these local health programs?

A This is possible. I don't know, I haven't had a discussion on that as yet or this particular situation. I only know that the program is not bogging down. I do know that in the past, as the Landerman-Petris-Short Bill has been implemented there were counties that moved a little too fast in some instances. We found out, for example, that in this, that the state did not have authority with regard to licensing and regulation of some of these. We have been taking steps in that direction and they are continuing to take steps to give us that authority. But basically it is a very sound program. Any time you get one foot across the border from the State of California you discover that the rest of the

United States recognizes mental health care in California is the leader of the nation, if not the world. And they come here to find out how we are making it work. Now, originally the Landerman-Petris-Short bill called for state funding of 75 per cent of the subsidy of the county mental health care local -- clinics and hospitals. We found that many of them were operating with only a 50 per cent subsidy. That the state wasn't keeping its end of the bargain. We are funding them now at 90 per cent of support. And there may be, as you make a movement of this kind, there may still be some inequities and there obviously are some places that need correcting and bringing up to date. I know in one county, Los Angeles County, the latest figures I have were that there were about 1400 such institutions, that a thousand of them were providing a better service than we have ever provided in the state hospitals. About another 200 of them are equal to the state hospitals and there were a couple of hundred that we were after and that we're working on to -- to bring up to standard. So you are going to have situations of that kind. But it is not through neglect or it is not through any failure of the program, as such. It is a -- it is a fine program and we have increased the budgets -- the budget for that sort of thing from around \$40 million to \$300 million. So the State is -- is obviously -- this is an indication of our intention to make the program work. If there is still something that is needed to be done, we will do it.

Q Some members of the committee, Governor, suggested that there needs to be a reversal of the trend. That your administration has established with mental hospitals. And that there could quite possible be a doubling of the entire budget, considerable amount of money -- more money spent. Do you agree with that?

A Well, very frankly, I think there's been a great deal of misinformation put out by CSEA who objected to the entire philosophy of this because they wanted more state hospitals and bigger state hospitals and more state employees without this being turned back to the local level. And frankly I repeat, a great deal of misinformation has been put out of CSEA headquarters. And frankly it is a disservice to the people, it causes great worry and concern and fear among the families of people who are patients

in these hospitals. What I'd like to call to your attention, the fact that even my predecessor, before our administration came in, had reduced the population in the mental -- the hospitals for the mentally ill from over 37,000 down to 26,000. Now, it has gone from 26,000 under us down to 7,000. But it has gone with that increased -- in our administration that increased subsidy to these local mental health care centers. But the people experienced in the field, the people who are responsible for the policies of helping the mentally ill and trying to restore them to a useful life, endorse totally this concept of smaller more personalized treatment centers close to home where some patients can become outpatients and even hold jobs and live reasonably normal lives. Now, admittedly you couldn't have had that without some of the developments in recent years in the tranquilizers and methods of treatment. Maybe in earlier time -- you can't blame our parents and say, well, they had snake pits in their day. In that day they didn't have the same knowledge and the same means of treatment that we have. But we are curing mentally ill and we are helping mentally ill to live more normal lives with this system.

Q Governor, the same committee this morning seemed to indicate that they felt they would get support from your administration in increasing funds at the community level. Not in the state hospital, in fact Senator Behr mentioned it might be a necessity to double fund.

A Well, as I say, we know that there are some -- some counties move too fast and we know that there have to be some adjustments. We are doing it constantly. It isn't something that just was discovered. I gave you the figures on one county, Los Angeles County, and what we have been trying to do there with the 200 out of 1400 that we believe are below the standard. They should be --

Q He seemed to be indicating something very dramatic, like double funding of the community level clinics rather than the state hospital improvements. Is that too dramatic?

A You are going to have to let me sit down and see exactly what it is they are proposing and what the problem is.

Q Governor, specifically they are talking about funding the L.P.S. program. Increasing the funds for it. Are you willing to support some augmentation of L.P.S. funding in this budget year?

A Well, I haven't seen the figures. Seen what they are recommending and it is going to be -- to depend an awful lot, the budget's already made up, on what's available to us.

Q Governor, an official in the State Department of Health told me yesterday that one way -- one thing that should be done is build in an automatic cost-of-living increase for these local facilities, the rate -- the rates they receive. As the case in certain welfare categories. Do you think that would be a good idea?

A Well, I want to study it. I really would want to study that.

Q Governor, another subject. There was a report in the Washington paper this week that Casper Weinberger has joined the inner circle of your advisors who are planning your 1976 Presidential campaign. Can you confirm that or confirm the existence of such a group?

A No, there is nothing to confirm, and that was Evanston and Novack column, and all that we have had the same fine relationship that we have always had, with Casper Weinberger. And his assurance in regard to the welfare programs and the talk of new programs that we will be updated and continually briefed on what it is that's being proposed in Washington.

Q Are you aware of any one that any of your friends may have retained for the 1974 equivalent of F. Clifton White to wander around the country and see what the response to your -- potential Reagan candidacy might be?

A No, no one has done that and no one could under present election laws, because they'd have to report that as a campaign activity and whatever was spent. And no, there is nothing of that kind being done.

Q Are you saying that there are no political committees now in existence collecting funds or making -- maneuvering with regard to any political ambitions you might have in the future?

A For me?

Q Yes.

A I am saying that exactly as you just put it.

Q Governor, do you -- could you clarify your remark of last week that the new governor's residence did not represent your personal taste in view of the fact that you approved the plans for it?

been planned with the architects. This was in response to a charge that had been made that Nancy and myself had sought to impose on the State of California what we ourselves would have chosen as a house for ourselves to live in. And I said no, if these had been our architects and we were building a home with that money we personally would have -- might have had other ideas. Would have had other ideas, I'm sure. But our function was to give an input to the architects regarding the problems that we are dealing with firsthand and have dealt with over these last several years, with regard to what is required of you in entertainment, our own family problems, the possibility that there will be governors in the future with small children and so forth. And this was-- this was the input that we provided. Plus the decision that had been made earlier and seemed to have general agreement that keeping the home within the Spanish style was -- would give it a longevity, would not be something that would go out of style the next day, that would be in keeping with the history of California. Now, the architects were delighted with that particular approach anyway and that was the approach they had brought to us, in the Spanish style contemporized, not totally going back and embracing the classic old style, but modernizing up to meet the requirements of today. And we gave that input. But I was simply refuting the charge of one man who seems to feel that somehow we were dictating that this be built as if we were going to live in it. We are not going to live in it at all, it isn't going to be finished by the time we are gone.

Q But does it reflect your personal taste for a governor's residence; if you were going to serve another term wouldn't you like to live in such a residence?

A Oh, I think anyone would like to live in such a residence. I think it is a beautiful home and I think that it also recognizes the added problems of entertainment and has made provision for them, but without going lavishly into providing ballrooms and that sort of thing. You know, it is a very funny thing, but one of the first -- and when Nancy came up here to meet with Mrs. Brown about the old residence, one of the first things that Mrs. Brown said to her was, she said, "Anything that you may want to do and start to do with regard to providing a new residence for governors of California, count me in, I'd like to help." Now, the architects also consulted Mrs. Brown and consulted Mrs. Knight. As well as

us, about this res~~ol~~ution.

SQUIRE: Any more questions?

Q Governor, now that the San Francisco strike is over, are you happy with the way it was handled and settled?

A I'm glad it is over. As I said before, it was an illegal strike and I think it should be recognized as such.

SQUIRE: There is one back here.

Q Governor, yesterday when you were talking to the students there was a question regarding the media and you said one of the '1 things that bothered you, that the other side wasn't always told. Would you favor, like Florida's Right to Reply, wherein if a public official is criticized in print he gets to reply in print soon thereafter?

A What law is that?

Q It is called the Right to Reply.

A Oh, no. Not -- not necessarily. I don't think that's an answer. And I thought that I -- knowing some of you were present, I thought I tempered any criticism I might have. I said to the young people that in this day, when they are being beset by a flood of information from every source, more than any generation perhaps in history, that they should recognize that very often some of that is misinformation and they have to really work at it and go out of their way to make sure they have both sides of issues and understand completely what the situation is in all of the things they are hearing.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.

---oOo---

3/26

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD MARCH 26, 1974

Reported By.

Beverly D. Toms

(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 there are no corrections made and there is no guaranty of absolute accuracy.)

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I almost cancelled this this morning to stay with the kids out in the hall there. It's been a long walk getting through.

Q Governor, do you favor returning the state speed limit to 65 miles an hour?

A Well, I think that the -- that this was one of the conservation measures that were instituted because of the energy shortage and I feel that it probably or possibly will be one of the earliest to go when we can relax somewhat. But I don't think that we have come to the point where we can relax any of the conservation measures. Even though we are now going to get an increased supply of oil from the Arab nations they did not with their embargo cause the energy shortage. There was an energy shortage, there is an energy shortage, even with them producing and selling at full capacity. So I think that our conservation of oil and gas is going to be with us for sometime. I do think that that probably would be one of the first to go when we can relax.

Q Governor, do you have any hard evidence to show that -- that the limit is in fact saving gasoline when the indications are that very few people are observing the speed limit anyway?

A Well, we don't think that very few are. I know there are exceptional cases, and there is impatience with it. I know that the Highway Patrol has increased by a solid percentage the number of tickets they are giving for speed violations. And it is a little frustrating to them. At the same time there is some pluses from it. Whether that or the reduced number of cars, we have a reduction in accidents and fatalities on the highways. Maybe a lot of people are better natured now and they are not pushing the pedal to the floor all the time. But the evidence is to the savings, there just can't help but be. I don't know whether

our Energy Council an pinpoint any exact percentage, that would be difficult to do. How much of it is attributed to people that have eliminated wasteful driving, we should continue to eliminate that -- but it is a fact that when you get out on the stretch where you can go there is no question about the increased mileage that an automobile gets. Now, obviously that 55 mile limit doesn't do anything about the very wasteful around-town driving where sto-and-go driving increases consumption of gas. But out on the freeway we do know -- I know instances of the span between Los Angeles and -- and Palm Springs where people have found and with larger cars, that they have saved as much as three and a half gallons of gas over the previous use on just the one trip down.

Q Governor, the speed limit bill --

Q You wouldn't be in favor of abolishing it yet, eliminating the 55 miles an hour?

A No, I said I think this would be one of the earlier things to go, but I don't think we should give up any of the conservation ____ as yet, go back to our wasteful ways.

Q Governor, the speed limit bill you signed reduced the limit for an eighteen month period.

A Yeah.

Q Do you see the prospect of lifting that lower limit before that eighteen months is up?

A I wouldn't want to make a prediction. I honestly don't know. I think we are going to have to see what happens, how much savings we are making and when the additional oil begins coming, what the situation is.

Q Governor, do you think the speed limit has created a disregard for traffic laws as the California Highway Commissioner said?

A No, traffic laws as we know and the violation of them has always been with us. There are always those who find some reason or excuse or just desire to violate them in one way or the other, whether it is fudging on a stop sign or going beyond the speed limit. I think there is some indication that even those who are violating them are violating them at a lower rate of speed. Their comparative speed to the 55, those who are observing the 55 mile limit is not as great as when they are speeding above those who are going 65 miles an hour. I realize that to many people the speed limit that is enforced for conservation measures to save gas

probably doesn't seem as serious to them as the speed limit that is based on protection of life and limb.

Q Governor, the Gallup Poll says that county chairmen favor you ahead of all other possible Republicans for the ^(Presidential) nomination.

Only once in twenty years, Mr. Gallup says, have they not picked who the -- the person who wound up to be the nominee. Now, what do you attribute your success in that?

(Laughter)

A I haven't any answer to that. All I can say is that I'm aware of that poll and you bask in the warmth of approval by your fellow men. But nothing has changed the situation or what I've told you before on my position. It is far too early for that to be even anything that's thought about or -- or anyone has to make a decision about it. So I look in the mirror and I -- and I console or I ease myself out of that warmth with the recognition that a poll is only as good as the day it is taken.

Q Do you believe, Mr. Ford when he says -- Vice President Ford, when he says he's going to be through with public office in 1977?

A Well, I know that this is very consistent with what he's been saying for sometime and it is a matter of family -- personal relationships that he -- this is a pledge to his family and I see no reason to doubt him.

Q Well, Governor, considering the poll, the county chairmen, and the statement by the Vice President, does this come close to your concept of the office seeking the man?

A Well, I would say that it would be -- make more of an impression if it were about a year and a half or two years from now. And as I have said before, the difference is this is a long time to go and therefore while, as I say, this is pleasant and -- to think that there are people that think that highly of you, you don't make any decisions based on that.

Q Governor, if you were going that well in the polls or better at the beginning of the 1976 primaries, or a few months before, would that persuade you to be a candidate?

A Well, I'll let you know then or before. I told you that there -- I'll make a decision when and if I think circumstances in warrant it. And making such one you'll be the first to know.

Q Governor, do you think your travels around the country have helped bring you up in the polls?

A Oh, I don't think they have been that widespread. They have naturally -- haven't been that -- that much. I've been in several states but one town in a state; speaking to one group of people in a banquet hardly can be compared to going through the state and campaigning.

Q Governor, does your trips around the country -- do they interfere with your governing the state in any way?

A No, and if they did I wouldn't go. As a matter of fact, I turned down far more invitations than those I accepted. As I have said before, usually most of the time those invitations are tied to a trip that I have to make anyway. A legitimate trip and then on the way in and on the way back I do some -- I accept such invitations as I can, and as would fit the -- the trip. But actually if I were not interested in doing the job I'm doing I could be gone every day and I imagine that's true of most people in public office. Evidently there are more -- more opportunities to speak than there are speakers and I've known even before I was a governor that you may -- if you said yes to everyone of them you could be out on the speaking circuit all of the time.

Q It's been suggested that you are getting bored with the governorship.

A Yes, I understand there's been such a suggestion. It is absolutely untrue. As a matter of fact, I can't remember a day when I'm ever awakened bored, in the morning. I look forward to every day and I have found this the most challenging and exciting thing I've ever done in my life. It still has that challenge and that excitement and there are several things that I want to get done before my term is up. And anyone who thinks that just hasn't been paying very much attention.

Q What do you want to get done before your term is over?

A Oh, there are some things-- the recommendations of our task force on criminal justice, that we want to get done in the field of law enforcement. There are still some things that I would like to get done with regard to the taxation, recommendations that I made in the State of the State address. We are reviewing now and studying the results of the task force on what might -- if anything can be done about eliminating duplication in all the local government and special districts that we have in the state. All of these things, very vital.

Q Governor can you tell us what -- tell us the truth about the sales tax increase? Is it possible to put it off till June 1?

A Well, I think we would be taking a terrible risk if we did. As you remember, there was a great controversy. I had suggested that perhaps for the longer span, so that we wouldn't have the prices yo-yoing back and forth, that maybe that one cent should have been a half a cent for a year instead of one cent for six months. The legislature elected to make it one penny for six months. Now, this did not mean we could cut the tax by that amount. We cut it by replacing it with \$300 some million dollars of the ~~time~~^{one}-time surplus. That was a manner of rebating \$320 million surplus of last year to the taxpayers. Now, the one penny that goes back on and the one penny that we have -- that we have had off for six months is the penny that is already spent. It is committed to that extra reduction the homeowner gets in his property tax. That's the penny of sales tax that subsidizes a reduction in the homeowner's tax and renter relief. So it isn't a case of -- that it is a million and a half dollars that we -- a week or a day, whatever it is, that we don't -- a day, I guess -- that we don't need. It is -- it is already committed, to this property tax relief fund. And it has to go up. Now, the -- to speculate at this particular time with the energy crisis that has increased unemployment and so forth -- to speculate and guess at whether we can break even if we continue to think of a surplus in advance would not be wise. Right now we have only envisioned about a \$27 million leeway between a balanced and an unbalanced budget at the end of the fiscal year. Now if we are lucky and there is a turn in the economy we can have more than that, but if are unlucky and we guessed wrong, \$27 million in a \$9.8 million -- billion dollar budget is just a -- a speck on the glass.

Q So if the Dills bill -- would roll it back too much, does land on your desk by some chance you'll veto it?

A Well, you know I never like to comment on anything of that kind. But as it stands now I think that fiscal responsibility would dictate that I couldn't sign it. If the situation changes between now and then, if it ever gets to the desk, we will look at it very seriously in light of the situation as we know it at that time.

Q Governor, the Department of Transportation is considering allowing trucks an excess ~~ten~~ per cent weight to save gas. Would you agree or approve of the Department of Transportation doing that?

A Well, I know a study is going forth. I haven't seen it yet, but what this is about is to try and ease the problem for trucking lines that because of the lowered speed limit now find that they are lowering the speed limit to save gas, but they -- it takes longer to make the trip and the delivery and they therefore may have to add -- add trips. And this is what it is all about, is trying to ease their problem to give them temporarily, at least, the right to carry a heavier load.

Q Would you agree with that in light of the fact the legislature has repeatedly turned that down on a safety basis?

A We ourselves have turned it down on a safety basis, but I'd like to -- I haven't seen the study of the Department of Transportation yet. I'll look at that.

Q Governor, the trucking speed limit has always been 55 miles an hour. They haven't lowered it for trucks.

A I know, they were supposed to have their trucks set at the greatest efficiency for that matter also, but then why were all of the truckers -- in fact some of them, the independent truckers, even striking^{and} among their many demands was the imposition of this 55 mile speed limit on the -- evidently they haven't been going 55 miles an hour.

Q If they are breaking the law do you have much sympathy for them?

A I have no sympathy for lawbreakers.

Q Does that include truckers in this case?

A That includes anybody.

Q Governor, at the California Republicans Assembly over the week-end, which endorsed Lieutenant Governor Reinecke, there was some talk that some of your supporters were working for a no-endorsement. Is that -- whether or not -- in other words, they were hoping that the Assembly would not endorse anybody.

A When you say "my supporters" -- maybe people that have supported me. I can assure you that there are people who have supported me in the past -- my past two campaigns who are -- have chosen a variety of candidates to support in this primary and at my urging, because I have told all of them that I am neutral, but they are free to go whatever way they want to go and whatever

or no endorsement, I don't know, but I'm quite sure that it goes on in every election.

Q Well, Governor, then your people had no part in the kind of strategy of endorsement --

A What?

Q Your people had no part in part of the strategy down there, trying to have no endorsements?

A When you say "my people" --

Q I mean the people out of your administration.

A No, no, because I've issued orders to the administration and to all of our people here that even though it seems like an invasion of their private rights, I'm afraid that they are going to have to be neutral, too.

Q Governor, if it looks like it is going to be a really bloody primary between Flounoy and Reinecke, to wreck the Republican party's chances of winning, would you then step in to endorse one or the other?

A Well I don't think that will be necessary. You got two men who are personal friends, you've got two men who have already shown up at fund raisers for legislative candidates together. Co-sponsored them, you might say. They both pledged to observe the 10th commandment, and both have pledged that they will support the other if the other should be the victor in the primary. So I just don't anticipate any problem of that kind.

Q Governor, the United States Supreme Court ruled this morning that it is unconstitutional to keep a candidate off a ballot solely on the basis of a filing fee. And that an alternative must be provided for indigent people. Do you agree with that philosophy?

A Well, I haven't seen the decision or the ruling, but I don't think anybody should be denied the right to run for office because of a lack of a filing fee, so I suppose I'd have to say that anyone who wants to, maybe -- there should be some provision.

Q Would you sign a bill if it crossed your desk to that effect?

A I don't know, you know, you asked me and I made an answer

on this thing, or maybe I made the same answer that almost anyone makes off their head, because we do -- we don't want anyone denied their democratic rights. I have to say I haven't given any study to the matter or the philosophy behind a filing fee. I suppose it was originally conceived to ensure that serious contenders would be the only ones who would -- would make an effort to run. I'd like to study this and find out just what's back of this and --

Q How about signatures as a statement of seriousness and support?

A Well, that might be something to look at. There might be some way around it. I think this is -- as I say, I just -- it isn't something that I've studied or thought about before and I'd like to -- there must be some way -- on one hand I don't want to see someone who legitimately wants to run denied the right to run because of the lack of a filing fee. On the other hand, if there is a -- if this came into being to prevent abuse of -- of this and maybe there is a substitute of the kind you suggested.

Q Governor, have you had a chance to study in detail those two recommendations by the Attorney General regarding the oil industry, the ones we talked about last week? You said you didn't really have a chance to study them.

A Two recommendations of last week?

Q Regarding Mr. Younger suggested the oil -- the big petroleum companies should divest themselves of retail gasoline stations.

A No, I actually haven't. I remember that as I answered you at the time that they -- they actually owned less than ten per cent of the outlets. We found that out when we asked them to open their stations on Sunday and all of them cooperated and we found that they don't make a very big dent. I think most people are confused and think that because the sign up there on the oil station's in the name of a -- of a particular brand of oil or gas that they are company owned. More than ninety per cent are not. They are independent. And I haven't had a chance to look into that or even to talk to our Energy Council about it.

Q Governor, the State Bar over the weekend, Board of Governors, recommended that the State Commission on additional appointments be enlarged and revised, to avoid future hassles like your appointment over Justice Clark. Have you given that any consideration?

A Well, as you recall I asked for a constitutional change with regard to the appointment of judges and was unable to get it when I first became Governor. We have employed a voluntary system that has taken the appointment of judges out of politics and has used not only the State Bar board, the local bar, the judiciary and committees of laymen to ensure that we get men on quality and not on some political basis, and the system has worked very well. Now, maybe they are thinking of -- ahead of what they want to do if somebody else is governor, as somebody else is going to be, but so far the system has been working very well.

Q You don't see any need for change?

A Well I haven't actually seen all that they have recommended here. I'd like to see that. I think there is a caution, also, that you don't want to go too far in, then giving some particular group a power that-- that the governor himself has given up voluntarily.

SQUIRE: Any more questions?

Q Governor, the San Francisco teachers' strike has been going on now for some three weeks. What is your reaction to that situation and can you say that you have any authority -- does the state have any authority to do something about it?

A No, I don't know of any authority that we have to do anything about it. But I can only repeat what I've said before. I do not believe that public -- public employees have the right to strike. As a matter of fact, it is illegal. It is against the law. And I find that -- it very disturbing that teachers who are instructing our young people then set an example of choosing those laws that they will obey and which laws they will break.

Q Governor, you have a luncheon scheduled for tomorrow over at Ellis' Restaurant. Have you decided how you are going to get from here to there? Today, excuse me. Today.

A Today. Well, I'm going to come out of my office and I'm going to go out the side door and I'm going to walk across the street and I'm going to walk into the restaurant.

Q There is a picket line out there, Governor.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.

A You are talking about the UPI picket line? Well, that's a picket line for UPI. The fact that they are in the same building that a restaurant is in -- the restaurant isn't being struck. I'm going to the restaurant.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.

---OOO---