

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

---

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

---

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

Folder Title: Press Conference Transcripts –  
08/06/1974, 08/27/1974, 09/04/1974, 09/24/1974

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

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



NEWS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD AUGUST 6, 1974

Reported by:

Beverly D. Toms, CSR

(This rough transcript of the Governor's press conference is for the convenience of the News Corps. only. Because of the need to get it to the News Corps. as quickly as possible, no corrections are made and there is no guaranty of absolute accuracy.)

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I have an opening statement here.

Q Have we got copies, Governor?

A Yes, there will be copies available.

(Whereupon Governor Reagan read Press Release No. 442.)

Q Do you think he should resign?

A What? No, I believe that this process should go forward.

I made it clear, I think before -- I always believed that resignation is a way in which the issues, many of them, will remain unresolved. There will be constant speculation and I think the only way is through this judicial process to determine the whole truth.

Q Governor, when you say that he go before the Congress, do you mean make an appearance before the Congress or do you just -- are you just urging the <sup>(Nixon)</sup> impeachment --

A No, go before the Congress and submit himself to questions.

Q Governor, are you now convinced that he ought to be impeached?

A Well, if you use "impeachment" in the course of the process of impeachment, not as so many people erroneously do, conviction, I -- as I have said, I think that process should now go forward. I believe it is the only way that we will obtain the truth.

Q Do you think that he should be impeached? Do you think -- are you now convinced that there is evidence that warrants his impeachment in the house?

A Apparently there is. Those members of the judiciary committee that were opposed said that they -- this, they believe, substantiates one of the articles of impeachment.

Q Governor, what could you do at this point if you were President and in Mr. Nixon's situation?

A Well, I never like to answer those hypothetical questions.

First of all, it is a hypothesis that I do not agree that I would find myself in.

Q Governor, with these latest disclosures, do you think it is possible for the President to effectively govern?

A Well, I think that this process should be done speedily. I don't believe it is a process, you know, that requires months. If it goes before, and the matter is laid out, I think this should -- this should take place in very short order. Now, on the other hand, if there appears to be any difficulty as to whether there is any danger to the government while that process is going on, then there is the 25th amendment, which also adds to the process, in which he could step down and the Vice President would take over while the process is going forward.

Q Governor, you said that you have done your best to follow the progress of the investigation. Could you tell us what that -- what have you done?

A Well, I mean as you know, trying to read the transcript of the tapes, trying to follow the -- the evidence that was presented before ~~the~~ the judiciary committee. I have tried to stay abreast of this.

Q Have you read any of the books? Woodward and Bernstein's book or Magruder's book or any other books?

A No, I haven't read those books yet. I thought sticking to the actual report and the evidence, inasmuch as I could see in the actual tapes or the transcript myself was better than reading someone else's opinion.

Q Governor, are you thinking in terms of a joint session of Congress or --

A No, I was thinking in the impeachment process that's already going forward now. Since the decision of the judiciary committee appearing before the House --

Q That he should --

Q That he should appear before the House?

A That's right.

Q And the House is considering the impeachment articles.

Q When you say go before the Congress immediately --

A Yes.

Q They are not at that point in the impeachment proceeding now where he would go before them immediately.

A Well, I see no reason why the process could not be stepped up

to deal with this as quickly as possible. And I think the people are entitled to that.

Q Governor, have you talked to the President?

A No.

Q Governor, by not calling for the President's resignation, are you implying that you still support him and possibly think he could be found -- or not impeached or found guilty?

A I am staying consistent with the position I've held all along, that resignation is not a proper resolution of the issue. There is a constitutional process provided, one in which all the evidence then becomes available and the people have full knowledge of all of the evidence. Resignation would not provide that.

Q Are you saying then by this statement that you still stand by the President and support him?

A I'm saying by this statement that I'm deeply disturbed by what has been revealed now that we know that not all of the truth has been told or all of the evidence has been presented; that all of the evidence should be presented to all of the people and then the impeachment process based on whatever that truth and that evidence is goes forward.

Q Are you planning to talk to the President?

A No.

Q Have you tried --

Q One of your supporters said yesterday that he felt you were holding back a little bit because you thought that if Ford was to become President your own chances to become President would be much reduced. Would you comment on that?

A Yes, that's<sup>a</sup> pretty ridiculous idea. I have told you and told you all the truth over and over again. I have said that this is no time for anyone to even be considering that possibility because circumstances do change. And -- no, that would -- that's the farthest thing from my mind.

Q Governor, if Gerald Ford becomes President, would you be interested in becoming Vice President?

A No comment.

(Laughter)

Q Governor, if this -- if yesterday's declaration is the worst thing that is disclosed by a full laying out of the evidence by the President, do you think that warrants conviction by the Senate?

A Well, there again you are asking me to prejudge something. I think that what I'm suggesting is no one should make a decision of that kind until all of the truth is told and all of the evidence is there.

Q Governor, when you talk about resorting to the 25th amendment and the President temporarily stepping down, do you mean that -- you don't -- if you go to the 25th amendment, do you consider that -- if that was used would you consider that to be a resignation or just a temporary stepping --

A Well, that's a temporary thing in the event that a President is incapacitated in any way, so that he cannot manage the business. The question was, what -- if the government was in limbo and could not go forward and perform the services it is supposed to perform while this other -- this judging process, impeachment process was going forward, so that's what the 25th amendment is for. That is, in my understanding of it, a temporary step down.

Q Are you urging that the 25th amendment vehicle be used?

A I said that should be used and I'm -- if it developed that the -- that during this process of impeachment the running of the government was in danger.

Q How have your -- not your, the state's dependence or information and assistance or whatever, with the federal government been affected in recent months? Are things getting worse? Is it more difficult to get information or help or whatever you need?

A No, I have to say that that's one thing that speaks well for this system of ours, and I think anyone over here, any of our group could confirm it. No, the business of government has gone on and we have noticed no problems whatsoever with all of the relations that the state has with the federal government.

Q But aren't the governors -- when governors meet, aren't they forever saying that Watergate's got to be concluded because it is paralyzing our relationships with the federal government?

A Well, I don't know -- I haven't heard any of them say it, and I know I couldn't say it because I have to tell you that business is usual, the order of the day.

Q Governor, Senator Carl Curtis of Nebraska this morning said that Watergate was not serious enough to remove the President of the United States, but to bring us a situation where both the President and the Vice President would not have been elected by the American people. And he says that, you know, we'd end up being a banana republic, and



didn't think Watergate was important enough for that. Can you comment on that aspect, that under the 25th amendment, if the President were impeached we'd have a President and Vice President who would not have been elected by the American people. Is Watergate significant enough to bring on that situation?

A Well, that's to be determined in the impeachment process and based on all of the truth, all of the facts and all of the evidence.

Q Well, the syndrome of what we call Watergate, the whole evidence, you know, can that be -- should we consider this factor of the President of the United States and the Vice President being non-elected? You know, should that be taking into consideration in the impeachment process?

A I don't quite know how to answer your question there as to what should be taken into account. I would think that everything including the seriousness of the move that was suggested would be a part of the deliberations.

Q Well, that's what I'm getting at, there is a question between should the President be impeached on legal grounds, if there is evidence of impeachable offenses, that is sufficient for impeachment and removal from office or shall we consider what is supportive, and he himself felt that the ramifications on government and our prestige overseas -- you know, the political implications.

A Well, again I think this is -- this is a legitimate part of the evidence. I think -- the consideration, the determination of what is an impeachable offense and whether it is an offense that warrants the removal from office of a President of the United States, this is part of the consideration. I don't think that anyone there is contemplating just a technicality in finding someone technically guilty of something and then doing this. I suppose this is what was back of the suggestion the other day of censure instead. But that -- that has to be a part of the consideration.

Q Governor --

Q Governor, I'm still not clear on this. Do you think it would be best for the country if the President were to immediately declare himself incapacitated and turn the powers of the Presidency over to Gerald Ford?

A No, I think this is a judgment to be made in Washington as to whether the government -- whether there will be interference in this

process, with the normal routine of government. Things that have to be done. I'm not in a position, I don't think any of us out here can make that decision, but it is there. It is available if that should prove to be true.

Q Governor, since Watergate, has President Nixon ever personally assured you that he is not a participant in any coverup activity?

Why I'm asking you, of course, did the disclosure yesterday indicate to you that the President had lied personally to you about his --

A No, we have never had any discussion of that kind. After all, we don't have many conversations.

Q Governor, when you were at the Republican Governor's Conference last November in Memphis, you and other governors met with the President and at that time he told you that there were no more bombs -- or no more bombshells waiting in the wings. Do you now agree that he's lied to the governors and you?

A I'm trying to remember that -- that meeting and that conversation and what he said. I think he said something that to the best of his knowledge that he didn't know of any, but I don't think he made any flat promise. I think if I recall correctly he indicated at the time that he didn't know for sure that -- what could happen or what might come out.

Q What was disclosed yesterday, of course, Governor, showed that he knew six days after the break-in and yet he told you a year and a half later in Memphis that there were no more bombshells waiting in the wings.

A If you want to term that a lie, it is a lie. I don't know whether it was a lie or whether he made a statement in good faith that he didn't think there were.

Q Can you give us your general assessment at this point of the President's credibility in your mind.

A Well, obviously his credibility has been damaged very seriously by this latest statement. This is why I believe the only answer lies in going before the Congress and the American people and telling the whole truth.

Q Congressman Wiggins was very upset and was very personally hurt yesterday. Do you have any feelings along that now that the President, it is evident, has not been honest with everyone?

A Well, I understand Congressman Wiggins' position. He fought very hard before the judiciary committee, and obviously he has found out now that something not even the lawyers presenting the President's



case had known. And it does have a bearing, as he said, on one of the articles of impeachment. And as he has made it plain, his vote would have been different had he had this information.

Q My question is, was his feeling personally, do you take it that way? Do you feel that deeply personally about it?

A Well, I haven't been in that same position as he was. I am personally deeply disturbed, shocked and saddened by what is happening.

Q Do you feel betrayed yourself, though? You have supported the President consistently and now it comes out that six days after this happened he knew some of the details of what was going on, and directed a coverup. Do you feel personally that you have been betrayed, your trust in him has been betrayed?

A Well, this is -- I think too soon to make any such statement. This is why I'm calling for a full disclosure of all of the facts and all of the truth.

Q Governor, I'd like --

Q If the President fails to make a full disclosure recommending -- what do you suggest the Congress should do at that point?

A I think the impeachment process should go forward in an effort to arrive at the truth, the full truth.

Q Governor, aren't you --

Q In light of what happened yesterday, how can you -- how can the Congress believe what the President tells them if they have a meeting?

A Well, I know that's a question that comes up, but now after the disclosure yesterday and with all of the tapes now being made available with nothing held back, he has no place to go but the full truth.

Q But, Governor, don't you think he should have made a full disclosure a year ago? What's the difference, you know? Shouldn't he have been making a full disclosure to Congress and the American public?

A You can call on his own statement for that. He himself has said that he deeply regrets what he has done. He deeply regrets the holding back of this and it shouldn't have been done.

Q Is there any difference in your position on this now than it was a year ago on this?

A I'm not sure I know what you are asking.

Q Well, you know, didn't you say a year ago or a year and a half ago that he should make a full disclosure? Haven't you always said that, that he should tell the people the truth? So what difference is there now? In your position.

A Well, except that a year ago he made a statement that he said == and revealed tapes that he said were the full truth.

Q Governor, I'd like to clarify what you are proposing now.

Is it your feeling now that the House should vote the articles of impeachment so that the case goes to the Senate, where there is a trial, where all the facts do come out?

A This is the process of impeachment, but as a part of that and prior to the House voting that I have suggested and I feel very strongly that the President should go before the House and make available all the information that he has and all of the facts and his reasons for whatever actions he took and submit to all their questions. Then if the House feels that -- that this is supportive of their articles of impeachment, they vote those articles of impeachment and the case goes to the Senate. If there is evidence and the feeling on the part of the Senate that an impeachable offense has been committed, that warrants removal from office, that should take place.

Q But you are not saying -- you are not saying then right now that you feel that the House should vote for the articles of impeachment and send the case to the Senate for trial? Or are you?

A Well, I'd be a little inconsistent if I asked for someone to go and make a full disclosure and submit himself to questions and answers before the House of Representatives and then prejudge and make their decision for them before he had done this.

Q But you said --

Q The President concedes that impeachment by the House is now inevitable. Why not let that take its course and let the President make his appearance before the Senate?

A Well, if that should be the decision, I just feel that the process now -- I would like to see the speediest possible consummation of this process. And it is presently in the House and therefore it was my feeling that he go to the place where the -- where the action is.

Q Would that necessarily be speedier than letting it go to the Senate first?

A Well, certainly the people would have a better understanding and better knowledge of all the facts.

Q Governor --

A Right now.

Q Aren't the tapes better evidence than anything he might say at this point?

A Well, I think they -- I think they go together. I think just to clear a record of a conversation, I think a man is entitled to -- if you are going to interpret it, to present his side of that, his interpretation. I think this all goes together and as I say, the tapes are there for substantiation or repudiation of anything he says.

Q Governor, do you think the withholding of evidence is an impeachable offense?

A What's that?

Q The withholding of evidence is an impeachable offense.

A Well, again, you --

Q Do you personally think that?

A You are continually pressing me for a decision that I think is -- should be made by the House of Representatives. The judiciary committee has already voted that this, they believe, is true. A number of the members who did not think that the evidence that had been presented had warranted that have now said that they would change their vote, that they do believe it is true.

Q What do you think personally, as a citizen, who has been betrayed -- what do you think about the withholding of evidence and what you know about what went on?

A Again, I would like to stay with my statement, I would like to have all of the truth, the full truth, disclosed, to myself as well as to the rest of the people and to the Congress.

Q Governor, what political costs do you think that the congressional offenders will pay in the upcoming election?

A What?

Q What political costs do you think the congressional offenders will pay in the upcoming election? Do you think the Republican party will be devastated?

A Well, it shouldn't be. As a matter of fact, I have felt for a long time that the -- that the coming election should not be based on Watergate at all. And no one that's running for office in the coming election had anything to do with Watergate. Whether they are at statewide offices or congressional offices or whatever. And I think that the coming election should be based on the people's knowledge of the candidates and what they represent, what they stand for and the decisions they are going to make in the years to come that will affect this nation, and -- and their various states. How properly is Watergate an issue in that regard?

How is it going to affect the people of California? First of all, I don't know of anyone who doesn't disapprove of Watergate. I don't know of anyone who doesn't think that the actions were immoral, that they were illegal. The only question that's been at hand for the last two years is how many and who were responsible and involved. Who were guilty and who were innocent of those deeds. The deeds themselves, there is no -- I know of no question about them. Everyone agrees they were wrong. Now maybe -- maybe we should suggest that in the coming election we put a separate box on the ballot, do you approve or disapprove of Watergate, and then let everybody vote. Everybody would disapprove and that would resolve that. But this election, as any election, is far too important for us to be concerned with something that is not pertinent. We are going to select a governor of the State of California. What should be of interest to the People of California is what are the policies that are going to be pursued by the candidates. What will they do or propose for the State of California? Now, how can there -- their opinion on Watergate have a bearing on that?

Q Do you think the coverup of evidence was wrong or just the burglary itself?

A Oh, I think the whole thing. No one can condone breaking and entering.

Q Governor, do you see your statements here this morning, your saying apparently there is evidence to support impeachment -- do you see these statements as backing off from the previous support of President Nixon? Do you see a difference in what you are saying here today and what you said previously?

A No, I have held previously what you are calling a defense -- I have held previously and I still hold, that anyone, be it President or pauper, has the right to presumption of innocence unless and until proven guilty. Now, by his own statements there is additional evidence and I believe the only way to resolve this entire matter is determine the extent of it, the degree of guilty or innocence is through the constitutional process of impeachment.

Q Governor --

Q Governor, I want to get to another subject briefly, but -- it won't take long.

A You have a lot of competition.

Q In reference to the <sup>tapes</sup> ~~stapes~~, governor, don't you think the American people have a doubt about whatever the President says now, no matter what



the subject?

A Yes, but in that kind of a hearing and faced with that kind of a questioning, couldn't that be resolved with the backup evidence of the tapes?

Q But hasn't his tapes revealed yesterday -- admitted that he withheld evidence and if he did that how are the American people going to believe him, no matter what he talks about, be it economics, or foreign relations or what?

A Well, you are suggesting that the very thing that is a part and parcel of any trial, credibility of the people involved and what the jurors, in this case Congressmen and Senators feel about it.

Q Governor, --

Q Governor, you said in your statement until yesterday, until the President released the new transcripts, you were not convinced that evidence of an impeachment offense had been presented in the Congress. Are you now convinced that evidence of an impeachable offense has been presented to the people, to the Congress?

A Well, I am convinced that the only way that issue can be resolved is now by going forward with the process.

Q Governor, is it your hope that -- is it your hope that Congress, the House, would consider a full confession and promise not to do it again as sufficient --

(Laughter)

A I have not written any script for what is going to take place. I don't really know. I just feel that the time has come that if this country is to go forward and the people are to be reassured and their faith restored in their institutions, they are entitled to have all of the facts and all of the truth about this entire matter.

Q Governor Reagan, you are calling on the President to make a full disclosure of all the facts. are you emphasizing all the truth? This would mean you think he is withholding more evidence?

A That remains to be seen. I don't know. But I know the people are going to have to have the feeling, and I want the feeling, that I have heard all of the facts and all of the truth.

Q Governor, you don't have that feeling now, I take it.

A What?

Q You do not have the feeling now that you have all the evidence that's available?

A No, I don't.

Q Governor, if there were a presidential election today, would you vote for Nixon or McGovern, based on what you know?

(Laughter)

A If there were a president -- that's a hypothetical question. I couldn't conceive of myself voting for the philosophy that McGovern represented under any circumstances.

Q Governor, can you tell us about your conversations with Lieutenant Governor Reinecke yesterday?

A Well, now, wait a minute, if we are going to change the subject here I got someone ahead of you.

Q I understand you are going to approve funds for the Warren, Earl, library project, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Governor, do you also approve of renaming the Resources Building for Earl Warren? It's been proposed by Bagley.

A I didn't know anything about it. You are throwing one at me.

Q Governor --

A I don't know what the process is for naming buildings even.

Q He's put in a resolution to do that.

A Well, I certainly wouldn't veto that.

Q Governor, why did you tell the Lieutenant Governor Reinecke yesterday that you were misunderstood last Friday when you answered yes to a question about whether or not he should resign now?

A It wasn't a case of being misunderstood. And I'm sorry it was put that way. I pointed out to him and remind all of you, that when I was asked, having just received the verdict from the Attorney General's office, about the problems facing the state, and the Lieutenant Governor Reinecke's present situation, I said that until I talked to him and found out what his own problems were and what word he had from his lawyers, I wanted to understand his situation, because the law is very plain, that the process involves his not being liable here at the state level until sentence is passed, and a conviction is thus recorded. So I made that qualification. I said that on the basis of the Attorney General's concerns for the -- for the good of the state and the convenience of the state, yes, resignation seemed to be in order. Was in order. But I did make that qualification to those newspaper people who were asking me in Los Angeles, that I still wanted -- saying that was still -- and called to their



attention that I still had to meet with the Lieutenant Governor here. Now the Lieutenant Governor told me yesterday of the post-trial motions that his attorneys are making and of their optimism with regard to one or more of those which would conceivably result in a reversal of the verdict. Now, if that takes place, then he certainly -- I have no right to ask him to step down which is an irretrievable movement. This isn't a temporary thing, to have him step down, if that possibility remains. But he assured me that before the -- well, in the next few weeks, before the end of the month, undoubtedly there will be resolution of those and he will know and that he has no intention of holding office if those post-trial motions are -- fail.

Q Are you saying that you no longer have any concern about problems that may be created for the state by --

A Oh, yes, I do have those concerns. But, on the other hand, he has -- he has the problem that involves the possibility of a reversal of this verdict in which he is then not a convicted felon and I think that has to be considered.

Q Well, Governor, which do you think should take precedent? Which consideration should be given top priority?

A Well, it doesn't make much difference what I feel about it. I have no legal authority in this matter other than to advise and counsel. I pointed out to him the problems that accompany -- accrue to the state. He made it plain that he does not believe in these few weeks before he gets a decision on this that there is going to be any action required of him in any way that would -- could lead to some of these problems.

Q Governor, what is your intention during this period, are you planning to stay and sit tight in California, are you going to pursue some travels?

A I tell you, I'm reviewing my plans and my schedule right now.

Q You haven't decided whether you will go or not?

A No, I'm -- as I say, I'm reviewing it.

Q Isn't that kind of tough on the people putting together the fund raiser in Kings County?

A I know, and being an old performer I feel very deeply about that. I've never -- I've never held with those who lightly -- fail to show up for a -- for a commitment.

Q Governor, how have both the President's situation and the Lieutenant Governor's situation affected California's government?

A Well, I see no -- no effect other than the obvious effect of the

Lieutenant Governor possibly having to step down from office by the end of the month. And then under necessity we will appoint another Lieutenant Governor. No, government is going forward, and as I say, in our dealings with Washington, with the various agencies, there has been no change whatsoever. Government has gone on.

Q But if the President is impeached or if he resigns, what kind of effect do you think California would feel?

A Well, again, I think that the government is -- government of ours goes along. It proceeds and it goes through elections and then presidents stepping down and other presidents being inaugurated and there -- I have never noticed in the time I've been here there's been any lapse in governmental activity or any cessation of activity. Sometimes, in the event of a new president, you might have to wait while a cabinet secretary is appointed, but even there most of the business is fairly routine and you deal with the permanent employees. That's the whole basis of Civil Service, the ongoing permanency of the structure of government.

Q Have you had any conversations with Senator Harmer about the possibility of him requesting --

A I have not met Senator Harmer at all, nor have I talked to him on the phone.

(Laughter)

Q What is your position about speculation that he would be your likely choice?

A Well, I think he's one, but I'm not going to speculate now, you know, on that one, fellows. I've never -- I've never speculated on even an appointment to staff or cabinet, because I don't think it is fair to any of the people who might be considered. So I won't speculate on that. Obviously he is a candidate to be considered.

Q If the Lieutenant Governor's post-trial motions are not concluded, they are not finished by the end of the month, what will you recommend to him then? If they are still somewhat hanging in abeyance by August 30.

A Here again, I'll have to look over here to the legal lights for a little advice. I don't believe there is any of those that can conceivably delay the August 30th date of sentencing, could they?

ED MEESE: Not that we know of now.

Q So once he's sentenced, regardless of appeals, he --

A Yes, this does not apply to appeals. In appeals -- once he's sentenced, that's it. Our constitution is very clear. But what we are

talking about is post-trial motions that might be ruled upon favorable prior to August 30th, that could throw out the last trial.

Q           Regardless of the Lieutenant Governor's position, if he's sentenced on August 30th you will move to fill the vacancy?

A           That's right, yes.

Q           Governor, will the Lieutenant Governor Reinecke participate in any cabinet meetings during this month?

A           That's up to him. I don't know.

Q           Is he welcome to attend?

A           Yes.

Q           You are not -- as far as any activities in -- connected with your office, you are not freezing him out of any?

A           No, no.

Q           Governor, you said you had not had any discussions at all with Senator Harmer about an appointment.

A           No.

Q           We were given to believe last week that you had.

A           Well, I know, and this was in error, and it was a legitimate error, someone in the press section thought that I had talked to him about it. I had not.

Q           Governor, when the Lieutenant Governor Harmer was in Washington being questioned --

(Laughter)

Q           Can I have a transcript back.

A           Yes, I appreciate that we have already won office and it's going to make the campaign a lot easier.

Q           When Mr. Reinecke was before the Senate Judiciary Committee he was questioned about whether he had had conversations with Mr. Mitchell. Now -- and his tact now is that, well, I thought they were talking about face-to-face conversations. But isn't it a fact that he did know -- everybody had to know what information the committee was seeking, they are trying to establish because of Mr. Mitchell knowing about the ITT offer and everybody had to have known that. What do you think of a person in high public office who did not contribute the information he knew was being sought, whether or not the question was asked exactly or not? He knew what information they wanted. And he withheld that information. Now, what do you think about a man given a public trust who does something like that?

A           Well, now, you are talking about the very issue of the trial

itself, and I'm not going to speak to that. I have said, and I have -- and I happen to believe that the Lieutenant Governor from all I've known him --

Q Excuse me, I'm not talking about the trial itself, I'm talking about the semantics and legal technicalities involved, whether or not he-- conceding that he may have thought they were talking about face-to-face conversations rather than telephone conversations, he did know that they wanted to find out whether John Mitchell knew about the ITT convention offer. Mr. Reinecke had personal knowledge that Mr. Mitchell did know about the offer before the ITT anti-Trust case was settled, but he did not contribute that information.

A Well, it is -- you are talking about the very basis --

Q I'm talking about the moral -- the morality of the matter.

A You are talking about the basis of the trial. On the other hand, as he himself testified, he was -- he was reminded by legal advisers when he got there that as a witness you don't volunteer anything, you answer the specific question that is asked. And as he himself said, he had flown all night and given this extensive briefing, he was sent into this -- into this hearing. On the moral question, I just have to say, to my knowledge, over the years of Ed Reinecke, he's a deeply religious man, he is a very moral man and I cannot conceive in my mind that Ed Reinecke would consciously do anything dishonest or immoral.

Q Then you don't accept the jury's verdict, is that it?

A I didn't say that. I said that he would consciously do anything immoral..

Q Well, the jury was ruling whether he did it wilfully, that was the point they ruled on, they found he did do it willfully.

A All right, this is what they have ruled, and this is what is tied in due process, and is being determined now. And I'm not going to comment further on that. I've said what my personal opinion of a man who's that I've known for some years is. If the conviction is upheld, and the law takes its course, there is no question about what happens. But I'm not going to comment and speculate here on what should have been in his mind or was in his mind at the time.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.

---oOo---

8/27



NEWS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD AUGUST 27, 1974

Reported by

Beverly D. Toms, CSR

(This rough transcript of the Governor's press conference is furnished for the convenience of the Capitol Press Corps. Because of the need to get it to the Press Corps. as rapidly as possible, no corrections are made and there is no guaranty of absolute accuracy.)

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well, good morning.

Q Governor, are you going to sign the bill allowing the Democrats to get out of having their state convention this year? It is on your desk.

A I haven't even -- you've thrown one at me here, I haven't even seen it or had an opportunity to look at it. I just -- I got in by plane, I didn't know they passed such a bill, so I can't comment. Wait till I see it.

Q Governor, can you comment on President Ford's statement that he may be leaning on the question of amnesty, to the draft evaders?

A Yes, I think it is -- I think there is a great question as to exactly what it was he ad libbed in that speech. And what he was sounding out on. I'm not sure myself that he was using the proper word "amnesty" or whether he was talking clemency after someone came back and went through the judicial process. My position remains unchanged and I think the national position should be. But there never has been nor should there be such a thing as simply a blanket amnesty in which everyone is totally forgiven and returned. I think that anyone who wants to come back and go through our judicial process, then I think compassion based on the individual situation for each individual and compassion -- clemency for them, perhaps finding some way of their paying their debt other than jail sentence, -- this I think all of us could -- could look at because that is in our tradition. Lincoln, for example, gave deserters amnesty at the Civil War time on provision that they came back and served out their enlistment, and they served without pay. There have been other situations the same. But I think that they broke the law. And I do not believe that we should establish a precedent for just a blanket forgetting



of that particularly when you have so many who are not hesitant at all to declare that they have no regret whatsoever about it. They don't feel they did anything wrong in choosing the laws they would break, and that they simply want the country to recognize them as somehow being in the moral right.

Q Governor, isn't that inconsistent with your statement about President Nixon--

A No.

Q -- not being prosecuted?

A No, no, I think justice is an individual thing in each case. We are talking about punishment fitting the crime, and as I have said before, I think in this instance it seems the majority of the people feel the same way. I believe that in this instance the punishment certainly is more than adequate for the crime.

Q What punishment is that, Governor?

A What?

Q What punishment are you talking about?

A In the --

Q For the President.

A In the resignation of the President.

Q He lost his job, a lot of people lose jobs.

A Well, I hardly think that you say this is just losing a job.

Q Governor, you mentioned that in the case of those people that left the country, draft-dodgers, etcetera, that compassion ought to be considered after they have gone through the judicial process. Don't you think that compassion could be considered for former President Nixon after he had gone through the judicial process?

A Well, I think to a certain extent he's been through a process. The process provided by the Constitution. But when I speak about these and the individual situation, yes, there is the -- you could have a young man that came back who did what he did on a moral conviction and he now wants to be reinstituted in this country, citizenship, and he's willing to come in and admit that he broke a law and you take this into consideration. On the other hand, you may have a man that literally deserted under fire and left his comrades on either side of him while he took off. I think this is a -- this would be a different situation.

Q Governor, have you made any effort to contact Mr. Nixon since he's been back in California?

A I have had a brief telephone conversation with him, yes. I thought it was proper, welcoming him back to California.

Q When was that?

A It was a few days ago.

Q How did he seem to you?

A What?

Q How did he <sup>(Nixon)</sup> seem, his frame of mind.

A Fine, he seemed to be fine, yes.

Q Did he give any indication to you when he might come out of his self-imposed seclusion?

A No, no, there wasn't any talk of anything like that. Or his plans or anything of the kind. It was just --

Q What did you talk about?

A Purely a courteous call, and courtesy call.

Q Are you making any plans to visit him?

A No, I have no plans at the moment.

Q Governor, while you were in the east this last week-end you dropped a hint that if the Republican party moves too far away from your philosophy that you might look with favor on a third party effort. Do you think that now that is your only chance at the presidency in 1976, and do you see that happening?

A No, I didn't do that exactly. A specific question was asked, if it came down to a question of being loyal to a party or loyal to my own philosophy, which would prevail, and I said obviously being loyal to my own beliefs and my own philosophy. The tone of my remarks, I think, that led to that question and the remarks that I gave publicly was my reiteration that this administration, I think, and the government in Washington is bound by a mandate of the people given in the 1972 election, the biggest majority ever given, voted I believe on the basis of the great philosophical difference that was so clean cut, that was laid out for us. More so than in any election that I can recall. And the people made it very clear the direction they wanted their government to take. And I don't believe that we should forget that mandate or that we should allow those in government to forget.

Q Well --

A That's what I was speaking of.

Q Do you have some reason to believe that this new administration is or has some -- do you have some indication that they are moving away from this mandate?

A No, I didn't say anything of the kind. I just cited the mandate and believed that the American people should be firm in this.

Q Well, Governor, some conservatives are somewhat upset that that may be happening, pointing toward the President's statement of the draft, the appointment of -- nomination of Governor Rockefeller. Do you share that concern? I mean are these --

A No, there have been other things and some Congressmen that I know who are closer to the scene and who I think believe, from conversations with people in the White House as to views on upcoming legislation, feel that way. My own feeling is that this <sup>(Ford)</sup> administration should have all our support. This administration should be given very opportunity to do the job that has to be done. But I see nothing wrong with this reminder that they should have the support of the people, also the knowledge that the people want this mandate carried out. Nothing has changed that.

Q Governor, are you sympathetic to the position of the California segment of Young Americans for Freedom in which they said the other day that they would do their best to prevent Rockefeller from being on the ticket in '76?

A Well, here again, I think anyone starts talking about '76, you wait and see what the record of the administration is.

Q Does that include --

A I seem to be the only person here that's been trying to say that '76, we ought to wait for a long time before anybody decides anything about 1976.

Q So you can't at this point endorse a Ford-Rockefeller ticket in '76, you want to wait and see?

A No, I didn't say that.

(Laughter.)

A I said what's going to happen in '76 depends on what the situation is.

Q Because the Conservatives are disappointed about the appointment of Nelson Rockefeller for Vice-President, do you think that nominates you more of a leading spokesman of the Conservative party?

A Well, you'd have -- you'd have to ask those people in the

Republican party how they feel or whether they want a leader or not. I'm speaking my mind and what I believe is -- and has been maintained in the polls is the basic philosophy of a majority of the American people. Incidentally, let me just add to your question here. Make one thing perfectly clear.

(Laughter)

A I would think that all of us would hope and pray that this <sup>(Ford)</sup> administration in the next two years will be so successful that there will be no question about 1976. Because if an administration in Washington isn't successful the load falls on all of us.

Q Does it change in any way your political aspirations for the future?

A No. If you say political aspirations, no, my plans remain what they always were. I intend starting in January to speak out on the issues that -- about which I feel strongly and express my views and to travel the mashed-potato circuit, and that remains unchanged.

Q Governor, do you have a list of invitations after January of '76 over the country?

A No, no, we haven't made any plans as yet.

Q Do you have any concern at all about Rockefeller's selection as a Vice-President?

A No. The President selected him. And evidently selected him with the belief that he could be helpful to him in his administration. As I said before, I hope that turns out to be correct. No question that Nelson Rockefeller and I at times have differed, but we have had a very cordial and friendly relationship as governors.

Q Governor, have you resolved how you'll finance going on the mashed-potato circuit next year? What you are going to be doing? How you'll earn a living?

A No, but usually the mashed-potato circuit at very minimum usually takes care of itself. I've had quite a number of years experience on that and they usually provide expenses.

Q Governor, when you said you would think that all of us would hope and pray that this administration would be so successful that there would be no question about '76, are you saying that you hope that President Ford will do a good job and if he does you assume that he'll <sup>(Ford)</sup> be the nominee and that you will support him?

A That will be fine with me.

Q Governor, unless something happens back in Washington in three days, your -- Mr. Reinecke will step down as Lieutenant Governor. Have you given any thought yet to a successor?

A No, I'm not going to speculate on that. And it is no longer a three-day situation. The judge as of just a moment ago -- now don't all rush for the telephones, has called and said that he himself feels that a complete review is necessary, and he has postponed until October 1 any decision while he makes that review.

Q Doesn't that now prolong the situation we have had now for the last couple months where there is a question every time you go out of the state as to who legally is in charge of the state?

A Well, on the other hand, we are talking about a man and his right to the judicial process. And if the judge who presided over the trial and who is to pass sentence has himself now recognized that there may be some question as to whether this man is guilty or not, the place that he is going to take the next two months plus a few days to review the entire proceedings at the last trial, then I think that resolves the situation between now and October 1.

Q Well, how does it resolve -- I mean aren't we still in the course -- if the judicial decision -- or if the verdict is upheld and even on October 3rd Mr. Reinecke is sentenced, then any of his actions between the time he was convicted and the time he's sentenced and steps down, if that's what happened, are still subject to the same question they have been this last month.

A I don't think so.

MR. MEESE: No. There is no question about this situation. There is no conviction until sentence is passed. The law is clear. And therefore he remains the Lieutenant Governor until such time of conviction, at which time there is a forfeiture. And there's never been any legal question about this.

Q Yeah, but the Attorney General suggested he step down, some way -- he said someone could file a suit that he's not a hundred per cent sure of it, that could be overthrown in --

ED MEESE: He's a hundred per cent sure of it, anyone could file a suit any time they want.

Q Why do you suggest that Reinecke step down anyway?



ED MEESE: To remove even that possibility. Anybody can file a suit, but the law is clear.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I think at that time it seemed to be only a few weeks and it looks as if it would be cut and dry. The Attorney General -- I found myself having to say yes, it would be more convenient for the state. But under the situation now, where the judge himself has expressed his concern about this, I see no problem whatsoever.

Q Governor, if someone on your staff was in that situation, someone on your staff had been convicted of a felony by a jury, but is awaiting sentencing, would -- what would you do in that case? Would you let him stay on your staff until the sentencing is done?

A Now you are asking a hypothetical question. Without being able to go into each individual circumstance, and all, there is a far greater difference between someone who has been appointed by me at my pleasure and who can be discontinued at my pleasure and someone who was elected by the people of the State of California. And to a constitutional office. Now, we've had instances where even without waiting for a trial to be held, but simply because I felt that even the appearance of wrongdoing or the bad judgment could shake the people's confidence, and I have asked them to resign. It would depend on each individual case, and what we were talking about. I can't give a blanket answer as to what I would do. I think the record of our administration, the record of what we have done in the one or two minor instances, where there might be a problem, is clear.

Q Well, Governor, as you say, that you expressed some concern about the Lieutenant Governor remaining in office before sentencing, and now you say, "I see no problem whatsoever." Well, what has come along within that period of a month or six weeks to have changed your mind?

A The very fact that in regard -- with respect to a post-trial motion, which we didn't even know about at the time that the Attorney General made those statements. And as I say, what we have both said, was it would be simpler for the state, yes, and we were talking about a few days. Now the post-trial motion has been made and the judge has handed down a decision, in one sense, that certainly indicates that there is still -- must be innocence until proven guilty. I think it is an entirely different situation.

Q Governor, how did you find out about the Judge's decision?



A Just found out by a call this morning.

Q Did the judge call you or did someone in Washington --

A No, the Lieutenant Governor called me because he knew I was coming in here to a press conference.

Q What did Mr. Reinecke say to you?

A What?

Q What did he say to you?

A He just simply relayed to me that the -- his attorneys had had about this call from the judge/this delay, and I said, "Is this now public information?" And he said, "Yes."

Q Did you discuss anything else?

A Nope. Because I was on my way in here.

Q Has he attended any of your cabinet meetings since the jury came in?

A Yes.

Q And you expect him to continue to?

A Yes, when he's not busy on some other duties.

Q You are satisfied then that there is no conflict or no possibility of conflict in the remaining -- in Mr. Reinecke remaining in his office and acting as Governor during any of your absences?

A No, the Constitution of California is very clear on that matter. And I also think that if you look back over the record of several years that record is very clear on that matter.

Q Governor, if that's the case, then why do you set up this special hot line when you've been gone out of state lately and why have you given us bulletins saying that -- well, "I'm going to be gone for so many hours and there will be a special plane standing by or whatever, to get me back in case I have to get here."

A Because there were so many who seemed to be so terribly concerned.

Q That's all?

A That's right.

Q You, yourself, are not concerned?

A I was not. And this is what I mean about the record of the past several years. He has been -- he has filled the duties of Lieutenant Governor, I believe, extremely well, and by comparison better than some I -- in my memory.

Q Governor, are you going to continue those precautions if your plans take you out of the state between now and October 1?

A Well, --

ED MEESE: We always have.

A Yes, we always have. That's what I was just going to say. This is not -- we simply emphasized something that has always been true. And this has been true from the first day I was in office when Bob Finch was Lieutenant Governor, and true since Lieutenant Governor Reinecke has been, and I imagine that I felt so strongly about this remembering a situation in Los Angeles when the Governor was in Greece, and nothing happened while Watts was burning down.

Q Was that the Lieutenant Governor you were referring to?

A No, I didn't -- no, sir, I'm -- you are not going to get an answer to that one, George.

Q Was it Bob Finch or Glen Anderson?

A Well, neither Bob Finch nor I were holding offices when Watts was burning down. We were just straight civilians.

Q Can we go on to another subject?

Q Well, I wanted to ask one more question about the presidency. Governor, if President Ford decides to become -- or declares his intention to become a candidate for the nomination and seems to have the support of the majority of the Republican party, can you conceive under any circumstances under which you might become a <sup>(presidential)</sup> candidate? Regardless of what aspirations you might have.

A No, because it has nothing to do with my aspirations. And what you are saying is what I have already -- what I've already stated. What's important, I think, in Washington is what is done, not who does it. And I feel very strongly, as I have said, about the mandate that has been given by the people and if the majority of the Republican party felt that mandate was being carried out, I'd probably be one of that majority.

Q Governor, on another subject, when you were running for Governor eight years ago you charged Democratic Governor Brown with, "appointing hack cronies and defeated candidates to positions of high responsibility." How does that jive with your recent appointments of a defeated Republican assemblyman to the Adult Authority and also one of your former press aides to the Adult Authority, neither of whom has any particular experience in correctional systems or law enforcement?

A No, and I think that the -- I think that the record of the thousands of appointments that I have made in these several years speaks for itself. This does not mean that everyone who has served in government is automatically precluded from continuing to serve in government. But I think if you will look at the total record and if you will look at the type of individual who was picked for departmental assignment and for cabinet positions over these years, they did not necessarily reflect someone who was being rewarded for their party service. As a matter of fact, we went out -- we combed the state of California, we had the help of a citizen's committee to find the kind of people who could come in and we thought lift the level of appointments. And I think we have done it. As a matter of fact, my colleagues, Democrat and Republican, made no secret of the fact that they think that California has found the highest level of people willing to serve in government of any state they know, and they have asked us how we did it.

Q Well, Governor, along the same line, what special qualifications or expertise do either one of these men have for that sensitive board? *(Adm. Auth.)*

A Well, you could ask that about almost any appointee. I was confident that they could handle this.

Q What's different? That's the question. Certainly Governor Brown would say the same thing if he were asked in 1966 why he made certain appointments.

A I think the answer lies in numbers. And proportions. And I'll -- if you look at the record of performance, and I say in these eight years the performance of this administration has been rather outstanding.

Q Governor, is that an adequate answer for someone for -- for a prisoner who is coming up for parole, to be told the answer is in numbers? He's wondering about the individuals who are going to be dealing with his fate.

A Well, let's look at the record of -- in that particular area up until now.

Q Are you saying this is something different, that now that you have been appointing qualitative people up to now, and now you have gone back to the -- I forget Marty's phrase, but political cronies, hacks and defeated office holders?

A No, no, I haven't. But here and there there is an individual--

for example, when some individual who is personally known to me, and I could judge his performance by service in some other area of government, I had confidence and made the appointment.

Q Governor, did a citizen's committee have a role in these selections?

A We have a process that -- yes, that involves a great deal of checking throughout the state on every kind of appointment. I don't think there is a time that we just sit up here and make one by ourselves. Just as we do -- and have a formalized system for the appointment of judges, that we follow. And you could talk to Ned Hutchinson about this and find out the procedure, but it involves a great deal of checking. Now --

Q It is not a committee as such, it is not a state body, a man who will sit down and consider the qualifications of your possible appointments?

A Well, you could ask Ned Hutchinson about how this is done. And he could tell you. But I can tell you that the screening is very thorough. But now we have made -- I made appointments to County Supervisor positions of two legislators and they seem to have been upheld by the vote of the people in both of those instances. It doesn't rule out that every one who has served in government and served on the legislature should automatically be cancelled out of any considerations. Sometimes you find that there is great value there that we can continue to give to the people of California.

Q Governor, can you tell us what qualifications and background Rudy Garcia --

A What?

Q What are the qualifications and background for Rudy Garcia's appointment to the Adult Authority?

A Well, could you tell me what particular qualifications and experience or whatever it might be that anyone should have? You have confidence in the human being's ability to judge.

Q Governor, you also promised to take judges out of politics and 80 per cent of your appointments have been Republicans over the past eight years.

A Over the previous eight years there weren't any Democrats left.  
(Laughter)



Q Haven't you just about exhausted all the Republicans?

A What?

Q Haven't you just about exhausted all the Republicans?

A The funny thing is that does not have a consideration.

Our system of appointing judges has been to take every individual who wants to nominate himself, who wants to be proposed by someone else, and all of those names go through a screening process, of a committee consisting of the judiciary, of the local bar, of their fellow citizens and of the State Board of Governors, 15 of the 16 members of which are Democrats, and when that spread sheet comes back to me with their ratings we pick from the top of the list those with the best rating. And I will challenge anyone here when it comes to judicial appointments, you go out and check with the legal profession of California from top to bottom, and they will tell you there has never been eight years of better selection of judges or better quality of judges than has been selected by this administration.

Q And the 80 per cent Republicans is just coincidental then?

A Yes.

Q Even though Republicans are like thirty-five per cent of registered voters?

A That's right.

Q Governor, are you concerned that the Rules Committee may hold up some of your appointments, though, and not pass them along?

A I have been concerned, yes. I think there is a rather unusual game that's been played -- is being played. I was encouraged when they finally passed some of them through. There is a gigantic backlog up there. But -- and I think this is again by acts -- some individuals trying to change the Constitution.

Q Governor, Assemblyman Wood, what has he done as a legislator not known for his correctional legislation to distinguish himself to be appointed to the Adult Authority? He's known as a rural legislator, mostly interested in agriculture.

A Yes, but you also know him as a man, you know his abilities. He -- before that he had experience in local government in his own area. You are talking about a man who is going to sit there and pass judgment on a human being on the basis of the man's conduct and so forth, as to whether he can be trusted to go back out on the street.

VOICE: Gentlemen, for the record, Wood was not defeated.

He was reapportioned out of office.

Q Retired.

SQUIRE: Any more questions? Thank you, Governor.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Oh, there was one, Squire -- could I -- there was one that had his hand up when that interruption came.

Q Governor, can I change the subject? It was reported to U. S. News and World Reports that you are a top choice for Vice President, however you insisted that President Ford agree to step aside in 1976. The President is reported to have said, "No deal." Can you comment on that?

A You got to be kidding. I haven't read the magazine.

Q Have you been in touch with the White House?

A No, I have had not a word with President Ford since he was Vice President Ford and sat beside me at lunch in the Republican convention in San Jose. No, there was no such thing. I never felt that I was in consideration. There has never been any such contact made and this is absolutely invented out of hole cloth, and I'm surprised -- you said it was United States News and World Report?

Q U. S. News and World Report.

A I could have thought some publications that might have -- I can't understand them.

Q Governor, is there any reason you haven't talked -- turning that around, is there any reason you haven't talked to President Ford?

A I just haven't had anything to say. I guess he hasn't had any reason to call me.

(Laughter)

---oOo---



9/4

NEWS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD SEPTEMBER 4, 1974

Reported by

Beverly D. Toms, CSR

(This rough transcript of the Governor's news conference is furnished to the members of the Capitol News 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.)

---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I have a statement. Last Saturday the legislature made -- oops. I look better in the dark anyway.

(Laughter)

Q Thank you, Governor.

A You bet. Wait till he turns on his Brownie. All set?

Q Wait a minute, you got some copies coming along.

A Yes. Yes, the copies are coming out there.

(Whereupon Governor Reagan read News Release No. 502.)

Q Do you think that the two year session is a failure or just the members involved in it?

A Well, a two year sessin has grown out of the full-time legislature that was -- I myself supported the idea back in '66, and I suggested that both of these, I think should be -- now that they have had an opportunity to work, I think should be reviewed as I have suggested by a Blue Ribbon Citizens Committee to determine if this is the effective way to go.

Q Governor, do you see any redeeming social value in a two-year session?

A Well, on the basis of that one time it does not seem to have changed anything.

Q One of the arguments that Charlie Warren mentioned is, if it hadn't been for a two-year session he wouldn't have been able to get through an Energy Conservation Bill, in that sense he thinks it is healthy.

I just wonder if you looked at both sides of the coin.

A I have seen in these several years -- I've seen them come back with a revised version of a bill and reintroduce it in the very next session, if it is something they really want and we need, we manage to do that.

Q Governor, what are your impressions of the gubernatorial campaign

so far?

Q Can we stick on this?

Q I'm sorry.

Q Governor, I assume you mean the governor -- the next governor should appoint a Blue Ribbon Commission, is that what you are talking about?

A However this is determined, it is obviously too late in the -- too late for me, and --

Q Why, but this is not the first time --

A Whether this would be a governor's appointment or whether this should be from the legislature itself, because again we have the separation of powers. So --

Q Governor, what's your questions about the full-time legislature concept? You said that should be reviewed, too.

A Well, as I said, the -- nothing seems to have -- it doesn't seem to have the improvements that we were supposed to have from the time when legislators were citizens who came up here to do the state's business and then return to their own businesses and professions. And I would suggest that the commission should take a look and see whether we have improved the situation or not.

Q Do you think the situation could be improved ever simply by changing the machinery or is there something else beyond that?

A Well, it is worth taking a look at. As I say, there have been many fine legislators and have themselves expressed concern in the last few years with the way things are going, and I've heard this from both sides of the aisle.

Q Governor, along with that full-time legislature, bigger salaries, do you think that should be reviewed, too?

A Well, I've suggested a -- I wouldn't like to stand here and suggest to the committee what the committee should come up with or resolve. I think the entire picture of representative government in California should possibly be reviewed by this -- by such a committee.

Q Would the governor appoint the committee?

A I just answered that, I'm not sure. It is a separation of powers. I haven't thought as to who should -- as to whether the governor should.

Q It seems it might be contradictory. You are talking about being isolated in Sacramento, but yet you want them to go on a full week. Did you mean if they went on a full week they wouldn't have to be here

so many months, there could be more months at home?

A Was it ~~that~~ Hugh Burns<sup>who</sup> said that air conditioning in the Capitol destroyed the legislature?

(Laughter)

Q Governor, you've experienced similar end of session bills in previous years, how come you are just now recommending some sort of a Blue Ribbon Task Force<sup>to</sup> study this problem?

A Well, you start first of all with a matter of the separation of powers that you try to observe. But the second thing is, first we went to the full-time and we have -- each time you give it a chance to work, and then we went to the two-year, and we've had a chance to see it work and the same thing has resulted. We passed about -- throughout the whole year they passed out about roughly 600 bills. In the last week they have passed out more than a thousand.

Q Do you know how many you have waiting?

A What's that?

Q How many bills you have down there waiting for you to sign now?

A It will be something more than a thousand.

Q Governor, you say it cost \$52 million a year to run the legislature. How wasteful do you think that body is of the public's money?

A Well, here again there is no way to know because there is -- one of you, I think, recently received an answer to that question when you asked for some accounting of one of the body's spending and were told that it was no one's business but their own.

Q Governor, you have the constitutional authority to trim the legislature's budget, why haven't you exercised it?

A Well, very practical considerations. First of all, there is the separation of powers. Second of all, however, there is the matter of what would happen to any governor who attempted by budgeting to blue pencil when obviously all it would take is a two-thirds vote of the legislature to override that veto, and then open up the whole retaliatory thing, the contest, in which they could get even by deleting the executive branch budget and there isn't anything you can do about that because you can't override their veto, when you are in this spot. Whatever they take out cannot be put back in.

Q Couldn't you veto some of these pension bills that have been coming down and been signed? The ones that cause a lot of controversy now?

A Well, as I say, again this -- in the separation of powers I've tried to observe that.

Q Are you saying that you actually feared retaliatory action by the legislature if you tampered with their -- with their private programs?

A Oh, I think this is what practically you are talking about. If you try to use your budget authority between the various branches.

Q Governor, you have a thousand bills before you, will you be able to take care of those before you leave the state?

A Well, we are going to be working at them. We have <sup>2 30-</sup> ~~130~~ day period --

ED MEESE: <sup>September</sup> December 30.

A -- in which to deal with these bills. A great many of them I'm sure aren't going to take too much time for these. There are many of them minor and technical word bills and those one-word change bills and so forth. But I think that -- I understand your question, Squire. I'll sign or veto anything that has to be signed or vetoed.

Q Governor, specifically are you inclined to sign the bill which rolls back the smog device program for 1966-70 automobiles outside the L. A. air <sup>basin</sup> ~~base~~?

A Well, now, don't ask me to comment -- start commenting on any one of those thousands yet, because they have just come down. They will all go through the usual process with the cabinet and staff. And I'd rather not get into that. If I start trying to comment or guess on one of them before we have seen it or studied it, I could be here for a thousand of them.

Q The reason I ask you that is that during recent visits to Riverside you did state you favored such legislation.

A Yes. Now we are talking about a general thing as against a specific piece of legislation. I have to also say that in Riverside some of the statements that I made in the informal discussion down there the other day have not been interpreted -- my legislative intent was misinterpreted.

Q So you are saying you are inclined to sign the Holmdahl Bill, is that right, is that what you are saying?

A I'm saying I'm not commenting on specific bills.

(Laughter)

Q Would you say when are you going to take some action on it? In the next few days? Because they are meeting on the 11th.



A Yes, this is one I think must immediately be taken up, because there are decisions that have to be made as Mr. Simmons has pointed out already. Members of the press.

Q Governor, does the fact that the Holmdahl <sup>(Smoag)</sup> Bill leaves out the South Coast ~~Air base~~ <sup>Basin</sup> pose a problem for you? Do you have some question about the state setting off the South Coast ~~Air base~~ <sup>Basin</sup> from enforcement of this program?

A No, I think it mentioned about what I said in Riverside, is that you have to recognize the South Coast ~~Air base~~ <sup>Basin</sup> differs very drastically from Modoc County, or Nevada County or some of the other counties and their problems. And this has been one of the problems that I have thought we should be paying more attention to, is statewide cures for what is a problem peculiar to one area.

Q Well, Governor, speaking of -- new subject? Speaking of Modoc County, they say as Modoc County goes, so goes the state. Have you talked to people up there? Are they voting for Flournoy or Brown up there?

A Well, I don't know, the first thing that anyone did to me when I got there at the fairground was to pin a Flournoy button on me, which I hadn't brought myself, being a non-political trip. I don't know how Modoc County is going to go.

Q So you think they are going to go for Flournoy, is that what you are saying?

A They seem enthusiastic.

Q What are your impressions of the race so far?

A Of course I believe he's the best qualified man for this job, there is no question about that. You can accuse me of partisanship on that, if you want to, but I think in the campaign so far that his opponent has had difficulty making up his mind, whether he really is running against Hugh Flournoy. I think for a while he was running against me, but then just the other day, over Labor Day it seemed like he was running against Herbert Hoover. As soon as he settles on an opponent we will be able to get a better judgment of how he's campaigning.

Q He says you are wasting public money by not -- with your freeze on the building of state -- state office buildings. Wasting \$21 million dollars by renting building space. What is your response?

A I think there is a point at which you can go overboard in renting. I think there is another point, however that you should figure, when

the state builds it takes land off the tax base at the local level of government, off the property tax base. And there are some economics involved there in both renting and government building, and which I don't think that it is necessary that the state should build every single space that it needs to occupy. I think this could be wasteful. I do think that, yes -- I think there is some building to be done. But I don't --

Q You agree with Mr. Brown?

A What?

Q You agree with Mr. Brown?

A Never.

(Laughter)

A We differ in a matter of degrees.

Q What's altered your opinion now about the need for a total freeze on state building, state office building?

VERNE ORR: Governor, two years ago we put thirty million dollars in for legislature building. They haven't started yet. That would remove a great deal of the rental space in Cali-- in Sacramento. We added to it this year.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Yes, we haven't had such a freeze. As a matter of fact, we asked the legislature for the use of some money for building both north and south earlier this year, and were refused. As a matter of fact, we wanted, if I recall it was the oil revenues that we had wanted.

VERNE ORR: We asked for an L. A. building and they took that out of the budget.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Yes, the new state building there, because the old building doesn't meet the earthquake standards.

Q Governor, there is a study of building space needs in state government that's being done by General Services. It was due last November, and has apparently been held up in General Services, has not yet been released. When will that be made available?

A I wish I knew.

VERNE ORR: I don't know, either. I see the draft of it, but I don't know when it will be ready for release.

Q Governor, the Department of Water Resources came out with its environmental impact report on the Peripheral Canal this morning. What is your position on whether the canal should or should not be built?

A Well, I happen to be one who's always favored the canal and I favor it from an environmental standpoint, actually, because the present system of pumping out of the delta in my mind is harmful to the environment. It has reversed the stream flow in certain streams, the pumping. Streams that were spawning streams for fish, for trout, for salmon, and Fish and Game can account that in some of those streams because of the confusion of the fish, which is supposed to swim upstream to its spawning ground, and suddenly finds itself swimming downstream because that flow has been reversed by a pump, they just don't spawn. They turn around and go the other way. And I believe with proper protection for the quality of water in the delta this can be achieved very easily. That this is the easiest and the best way to move the water past the delta.

Q Governor, had there not been the hassle in the Senate over your appointees, do you think this news conference would have dealt with this today? What I'm trying to say, are you critical because of the hassle or had you thought of this before?

A No, as a matter of fact, I even questioned for a time whether I should even leave that paragraph in this statement today for fear that just that, someone might make that assumption. No, I think that it was an unprecedented action. I don't recall it being done before. It certainly has never been done to me before in these several years, and I don't -- in my memory have any knowledge of it ever happening to any other governor, but no, I think that the spectacle of more than a thousand bills being passed in sessions that run through the night, that run continuously for hours in which it is obvious that no one can even read the bills, with amendments being offered that weren't even read -- this happened last year, or I mean the last <sup>(legislative)</sup> session before the two year session began. If you will remember then, in one all night session they passed down several hundred bills, including hundreds of millions of dollars of spending. The stories that have come out of this last session, of men who were voted on roll call votes and at midnight they discover they hadn't been there since morning -- the device of the roll call vote, the automatic roll call voting, of taking that vote on a non-controversial measure and then simply taking number after number of a bill up and asking for permission to record the same roll call vote on it, many individuals not being there and not understanding what the bill was about, I just think that it is not the way to do business for the state of California. Maybe they could start one improvement by

reversing it, you know. Do the thousand bills in the rest of the year, and 600 in the last session.

Q On state buildings, do you expect to be doing some groundbreaking for the mansion soon?

A I hope so.

Q Is there any time of the week, two weeks or a month or two months?

A I don't know.

VERNE ORR: Bids are due in September 24, is their expectation, and soon after that they will be able to award the bid and they will start construction, hopefully, I guess, might break ground the first week in October.

Q Governor, will you try to accelerate the mansion construction in light of Jerry Brown's comments that he won't live there and might turn it into a children's home or something?

A Well, I know that he's concerned and I suppose it is because the house that we planned to build there is too small for him. He prefers to go back and live in the one that's 4,000 square feet bigger than the one that's presently being built. But having no family or anything, I thought that 12,000 square feet of floor space ought to be enough for him out there. He might learn to love it out there in the fresh air. I am hopeful that we don't have that problem at all because I hope that come January he'll be providing his own domicile some place and someone else will be --

Q Governor, what's going to happen to the residence here you are now renting or being rented for you?

A I suppose that the owners of it will put it up for sale.

Q Do you think they will make it available to the next Governor during the interim, before the mansion --

A You'll have to ask them, and the legislature. It is between them and the legislature. I must say we have enjoyed it very much and enjoyed living there. And it was a contrast with the other place.

Q Back to the Blue Ribbon Citizen's Task Force, I'm just not sure how something like that would operate. You have admitted that you have got a fear of retaliation if you take some action in trimming legislative expenditures. If a task force is appointed by the legislature, won't it be just a -- in effect, a white wash of legislative activities? How

can you get something out that will actually have a meaningful effect on the legislature?

A Well, on this basis -- look, you are jumping to some conclusions. Maybe \$52 million dollars is a proper amount for a legislature. I don't know. I put in here this is an indication of the growth of what has happened in the efforts going to full time, that going to the two-year session and all, and all I'm saying now is since the problems that we were told these moves would solve are still with us, that maybe it is time to take a look. The Blue Ribbon Commission might decide that you could still have this session and find ways to alleviate the problems. I'm quite sure that some of this last-minute rush would have been unnecessary if the leadership of the majority party had really led the way they should. For example, there are scores and scores of bills, hundreds of bills that are technical bills that literally change one word in the law. It seems to me that author's pride, for a legislator to have his name on a bill, that many of these could have been committee bills. The whole committee process earlier in the year, the witnesses being brought up here to -- for an open hearing on a committee bill, and then finally one or two committee members in attendance and then it being put over and so forth -- I just think that we can start --

Q Any more questions?

Q Yes, Squire, just one. Governor, have you communicated with President Ford since your last press conference with us in which you remarked about amnesty and some other subjects of national interest?

A No, I've had no direct communication -- Oh, I've -- I've addressed one or two letters to the President, but on specific routine state matters that require his attention.

Q Mr. Flournoy said that -- or his staff people said he is going to fly to New York to try to see some of Mr. Rockefeller's financial backers, to get some money for his campaign. Do you plan to try and raise money for Flournoy outside of California?

A No, I'm committed for all the campaigning I'm going to do, and outside of the state I will be campaigning for Congressional, Senate and Gubernatorial candidates that have been determined in advance by the Republican Governor's Conference, by the Congressional and the Senate campaign committees.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.



Q Just one, have you received any word what former Senator Kuchel is going to get from the Ford administration? Position.

A Well, no, I thought it was published, though, at one point.

Q There was a report he was going to become Ambassador to the United Nations, but that's not official.

A That's all that I know, is what I've read.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.

---OOO---

9/24

NEWS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD SEPTEMBER 24, 1974

Reported by:

Beverly D. Toms, CSR

(This rough transcript of the Governor's press conference is furnished to the members of the News Corps. for their convenience only. Because of the need to get it to the News Corps. as quickly as possible, no corrections are made and there is no guaranty of absolute accuracy.)

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I have a statement, opening statement.

(Whereupon Governor Reagan read News Release No. 531.)

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Because of this particular issue I brought Assemblyman McLennan here with me, and I have to say I hope the people of California recognize that it was Assemblyman McLennan by authoring -- not only authoring the bill, but keeping this issue alive on behalf of the people. I think that he's responsible now for at least the possibility of resolving this issue once and for all. So I have him here with me for any questions that you might have about the particular legislation.

Q Dr. McLennan, you are in a very tough race for re-election because of the reapportionment. Do you think that the Democratic leadership is going to let you carry that bill and are you going to insist on it?

ASSEMBLYMAN McLENNAN: Oh, I will certainly endeavor in every way possible to carry the <sup>(pension)</sup> bill. I expect there would be some obstructive tactics used to try to get it away from me. But I want it for the benefit of the people of the State of California. I'm not doing it for any personal glory of any kind, I just --

Q So you have no pride of authorship -- Assemblyman Gonzalves would carry it, that wouldn't bother you?

ASSEMBLYMAN McLENNAN: Well, it would be a little bit upsetting. I'd carried it this long and then it would be turned over to my opponent. But this is not the -- the most urgent thing on my mind anyway, right at this time.

Q Thank you.

Q Governor Reagan, if the Democratic leadership decides to convene and then adjourn and not meet again until Monday so as to observe the high holy days, would you have any objection to that?

A (By Governor Reagan) Well, there isn't anything that I could do about it. That is their prerogative, they can do that. The only point that I've made, having had three opportunities to deal with this in the last session and being able to send down to my desk 1184 bills in ten days, I don't see that there would be any reason or justification for not treating with this on Wednesday and getting home in plenty of time for the beginning of the high holy days.

Q Governor, are you being critical of the Democratic leadership for having passed the bill originally or having failed to repeal it once the bonanza features of it became apparent?

A I'm critical of them for not having repealed it once we knew the extent of it and what the problem was.

Q Governor, can you clarify again what you thought the amendments to this procedure were a few years ago?

A Yes, the original bill when it was passed in '66 was a bill -- at that time we'd had the one-man one-vote decision and it was mainly aimed at the Senate. And suddenly men, by this change, this court decision in Washington, suddenly have their careers and their entire districts just simply pulled out from under them and it seemed like a fair bill at the time. Then a few years ago, in '71, this was augmented and changed. I don't think that any one of us saw -- first of all, I start from the standpoint of in the separation of powers, of usually having to the legislature those matters that are purely theirs. But in signing it I don't think that any of us -- and I don't charge that the legislature really envisioned the manner in which it -- now it develops it can be used.

Q What manner is that you are talking about?

A Well, the fact that without any regard to reapportionment, that in a reapportionment year anyone can quit or decide to run for another office and whatever he does, and walk away with his full pension beginning at whatever age.

Q You say it is being abused and interpreted too loosely?

A No, I'm afraid that we found out that this is what the bill actually said.

Q Governor, you didn't see that when you signed it then?

A No.

Q Governor, in 1971 Frank Lanterman carried a bill which extended these early bonus benefits and it was very clearly debated in the

legislature at that time.

A Well, the bill was passed and, as I say, I've observed the separation of powers of the legislature. I haven't intervened in their particular affairs.

Q Governor, why did you call a special session fifteen minutes after the legislature called a special session?

A Well, I didn't know that the legislature was -- had called one in fifteen minutes. I had had the leadership, the Democratic leadership contacted as to whether it would be worthwhile to call a special session. I was aware of the public sentiment in agreement with it. But there was no point in calling them back when they had refused three times to deal with this during the last session, if they were going to do the same thing. So I was informed by them it would be an exercise in futility. They had no intention of doing anything about it and it would be useless to call them back into special session.

Now, the public pressure built -- thanks to Assemblyman McLennan, and built to the place that the word was brought to me that the Democrats were ready now to go into special session, but the talk at the time that I called the session was that they were discussing, well, going into a session sometime down the line in the next few weeks. I felt that the people feeling as they did, deserved better than that and, as I say, it is something that could be settled in an hour, they could be here and on their way home in the same afternoon. And I called the meeting for Wednesday, which is the soonest I thought we could.

Q Governor, for just years, and previous Governors, too, you sat idly by while the legislature did funny things with their own operating budget, trebled it, probably. Spent a lot of that money for increased campaign activities by their staff. Took junkets without filing meaningful reports. Did all kinds of things. And you've observed a hands off policy. What's so difference about this?

A Well, I don't think that's exactly a fair description. I have spoken out and been quite critical of a great many things that the legislature does in running its affairs upstairs.

Q Yeah, but you had -- you know, with your blue pencil, you had the opportunity to focus public attention squarely on it, make them justify some of the things that they did.

A And as I said the other day in here, I was well aware also of



the limitations of power in the separations of power that the Executive branch could be treated with obstructionism at the same time that you attempted to use the budget with regard to the legislative affairs. While I could take out what they put into the budget, I could not put back anything they have taken out. And when you are hanging under literally a blackmail threat of what they could do simply by wiping out whole areas of staff, whole sections of the executive branch, and there wouldn't be any recourse under this setup of being the governor of the minority party while they are the majority party in the legislature. No, I -- I recognize the realities.

Q Governor, do you think that a retiring legislator, you know, prior to the age of 60, is entitled to any compensation for the -- for his service and the risk he takes? Anything at all?

A That what?

Q Do you think that a retiring legislator prior to the age of 60 is entitled to any compensation for the risk he takes or for the service he renders?

A Well, I think that -- first of all, you know, we have a very generous pension plan. As a matter of fact, it is extremely generous with regard to the employees contribution. And this plan would be unchanged. There is only one facet of it that would be changed and this is the early retirement provision. I saw the justice at the time of the whole one-man one-vote change when that took place. I didn't have any particular quarrel with that. But I believe that now as we envision this beyond that point going on to cover just every contingency, no, I think that there is no justification for this.

Q Do you think it is justified to maintain early retirement for legislators who are in fact affected by reapportionment in the future?

A Well, Bob, would you like to answer what your bill does about that?

ASSEMBLYMAN McLENNAN: Yes, I see no justification for a guarantee just because of reapportionment taking place any more than a freeway coming by and changing the route of traffic for a man running a filling station. I think this is the risks you take when you become elected to office. If you get defeated, regardless of reapportionment, I think this is one of the risks you take in serving the public.

Q Governor, you said that you felt it was justified ten years ago.

Why is it not justified now?

A Well, I thought it was justified ten years ago does not mean necessarily that I could foresee what would happen and how it went. It seemed a logical and a fair thing at the time. I, as a matter of fact, wasn't a part of government at that time. I didn't have any particular quarrel with it. Now we have seen this extension of it. The place, where as I say, they can just choose to quit or be defeated in the normal process of election and they now want protection against even that, the hazard of being defeated when they run for office. This could mean that someone who is voted out of office because he has been incompetent and so forth is rewarded for that for the rest of his life. I can see a great many things that perhaps we did not see in 1966.

ASSEMBLYMAN McLENNAN: I might add just one thing there, that the salary of the legislators at that time was \$6,000 a year when this was voted in '65. And it is a little different than getting \$19,000 that -- what they are getting now. So I think the circumstances were quite different as the Governor has mentioned.

Q Governor, there's some talk that legislation may be proposed to reduce the pension benefit but not eliminate it totally. Will you accept legislation if that were the only bill that came to you that would reduce the pension benefit but not eliminate it totally?

A Well, now, you are asking me to comment on hypothetical legislation that might come down and I'd rather not give a hypothetical answer. I'd have to wait and see what it was they did.

Q Governor, Mr. Brown and others have said that there is in effect a contract between members and the state, and that it would be plain illegal to abort that contract. Or one provision of that contract. Do you have legal advice that it can be done?

A I have better legal advice than the Secretary of State.

Q On this issue?

A On all issues.

(Laughter)

Q Are you saying it is legal then? Governor, are you saying it would be legal to do so?

A I'll refer to my legal advisers.

ED MEESE: I'll refer to Mr. McLennan.

ASSEMBLYMAN McLENNAN: Well, we anticipated this, of course, and we got a direct opinion from George Murphy himself, who wrote an

opinion by -- with his own research that we were completely on legal constitutional grounds in our efforts to rescind this program.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: That George Murphy being the Legislative Counsel.

Q You say -- did you really expect the legislature can dispose of this question in a matter of a couple of hours? What do you mean by a couple of hours, two -- three, what?

A I mean a couple of hours. That gives them time to say hello to each other and tell the latest story they have heard while they are home and everything else. I figure that any legislature could send down to my desk more than a thousand bills in four days, they didn't give a couple of hours to each one of those; they couldn't have, there aren't that many hours -- so I figure they shouldn't have any trouble at all in passing one bill, at say, the same relative speed.

Q The bill would still have to go out to print, apparently, through the normal committee process. Public Employees and Retirement Committee is still in the process of being reconstituted.

A I still stand on it, that this bill that has been before them, this bill that has had committee hearing, this bill that has moved through the branches of the legislature, that they have had several opportunities to do it, there is no reason in the world why they cannot be on their way home after having voted on this <sup>(pension)</sup> bill.

Q Governor, it is possible that the legislature could call itself -- reconvene itself and consider other legislation. Would you say now flatly that you will not sign any legislation that may conceivably pass in a general session?

A No, I didn't say that. And I realize they have that power. They always have had that power. They can do that at any time they want to. I would think that it might strike the people strange, the expense of an added session, having rushed through the flood of legislation they did in order to meet the adjournment deadline and get out of here, that they now would come back and add to the taxpayer's woes by taking up business after the end of a two-year session. Business that very easily could have been handled. It is significant that they passed 1184 bills in ten days and only passed 500 and some bills in all of the rest of the two-year session.

Q Governor, some of the Democratic leadership seems to think that your decision to jump into this thing and call a special session on this

one topic is designed to help Hugh Flournoy. Would you comment?

A No, it was designed for one thing only. Every once in a while, fortunately, in this administration of mine, we have had the support of the people on something. There would have been no welfare reforms if the people -- public opinion had not forced them on a hostile legislature -- hostile legislative leadership that in the beginning refused to allow me to even present those proposals to them. The same thing has been true although it too longer in property tax reforms. The same thing was true with regard to implementing capital punishment and a number of things of that kind. And here again we've had the people making it unmistakably plain how they feel. Now I didn't wait necessarily for that. As I said, I asked -- had our people ask the legislative leadership would there be any useful purpose served in my calling a special session. I was ready to and wanted to and the only reason I held back was when I was informed by the majority, and I can't do anything about that majority vote, that no, they would take no useful action in such a session. Then, however, when they themselves felt the pressure of public opinion and moved -- indicated they were going to come back and deal with this <sup>(pension)</sup> problem, I then, to expedite it and get it called as quickly as possible, called the special session myself.

Q Well, it is a fact, isn't it, that Mr. Flournoy would benefit from it all, as it stands now, being --

A Well, I don't know in what way he would benefit. Of course he agrees with me, but then I think -- and he agrees with Assemblyman McLennan, but I think also every right-thinking person does. As a matter of fact, let me make one thing plain, this is not a blanket indictment of Democrats, per ~~say~~, because I have also had communication from individual Democratic legislators within the last few days begging me to call the special session, and disagreeing totally with their leadership.

Q Who, Governor?

A What?

Q Which Democratic legislators have contacted you?

A I'm not going to use their names, who communicated with me, and cause them problems with their peers on the Democratic side in the future.

Q You won't reveal your sources then?

A What?



(Laughter)

A Well, one is a co-author of this legislation, Wadie Deddeh. I don't think there is any question about how he feels and I don't think he'd mind my saying so.

Q May I ask Mr. McLennan, rules have to be waived to have this thing heard without the thirty-day waiting period. Does that require 54 votes in the Assembly? Did you check that out?

ASSEMBLYMAN McLENNAN: Yes, in fact the vote on the bill will require 54 votes because it is an urgency bill.

Q But to have it heard in the first place without -- or to waive the rules, isn't -- doesn't that require unanimous consent?

ASSEMBLYMAN McLENNAN: No, not unanimous consent. I think it is just a two-thirds -- a majority in the Rules Committee would have to vote on the waiving the rules, I'm sure, and then if the rules were waived in the Rules Committee we could hear it immediately in the Retirement Committee, and then have a floor vote on it within a very short time. It would require 54 votes in the Assembly.

Q Governor, Speaker McCarthy has intimated you would like the legislature out of town when you do your end of -- rather your deadline vetoing. Any truth to that suspicion?

A Well, he's part right. I find that a certain calm settles over the Capitol when they are out of town at any time. I have something the feeling a teacher must have when the students have all fled out the door at vacation time. But, no, I'm well aware of the fact that they could bring themselves back in any session and if they feel strongly enough they will do it. And I'm also well aware that in my calling a special session they can recess that session and then meet again in general session. So I think he would just -- he was just giving voice to the political season.

Q Governor, you said some legislators had contacted you about your calling a special session and many legislators were telling us they received a lot of heat from their constituents. Had many people written you or called you, constituents, voters, complaining about it? Have you received much mail on that?

A Yes, as a matter of fact, we have had more mail than on any other single issue in this two-year session. A flood of mail.

Q How many letters, Governor? Estimate.

A Well, just in the last few days I know that it's topped a



thousand.

Q How much mail have you had, Dr. McLennan?

ASSEMBLYMAN McLENNAN: We stopped counting a couple weeks ago after 2500 letters came to our office individually. This was in addition to petitions signed by hundreds of people and also calls to -- over the telephone coming to my -- both my district office and to this office. And I might say that at least 90 per cent of all the questions and conversation in any of my appearances has been in regards to this <sup>(pension)</sup> program that we've been endeavoring to repeal.

Q How do you feel about this, doctor? You are a freshman Assemblyman. You admitted sometime earlier that you didn't know very much about the parliamentary maneuvering that are involved in something like this. Do you feel like David slaying Goliath?

McLENNAN: I've had a crash course in parliamentary procedure in the last two months, I would say, and I've learned more, I'd say, in this time than I have for many, many months and years in other subjects. But it's been a very revealing thing that the power of the news media and the power of the people's wishes can make such a dramatic change that would completely -- the door slammed so dramatically in our face that every attempt up here during the session, and when the people became riled up enough about a subject they got in contact with their legislators and now we have had a reversal of the interest, certainly, to the extent that we'll have a chance to vote on it and the people can know how their -- their representatives will be voting, so --

Q Do you feel it is a personal victory for you?

ASSEMBLYMAN McLENNAN: Well, I -- I really don't. I don't take any great credit. I think it's -- I've got a staff and an office personnel, and I've got an organization in my campaign down there that won't quit and I have to give most of the credit to them, plus the news media. I take no personal credit for it.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I can give you some personal credit. I think that he may refer to himself as a freshman, but I think he stopped being a freshman when you learn how much can be done not by shedding light but by raising the heat level. And he sure raised the heat level in the legislature.

VOICE: Thank you, Governor.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Thank you.

---oOo---