

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: Speeches - Governor Ronald Reagan, 1967
[04/02/1967-06/19/1967]

Box: P17

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

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

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

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

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

To the Senate and the Assembly of the Legislature of California:

AN ACTION PROGRAM FOR THE STATE PARK SYSTEM

To assure the people of California that a sound and planned approach is utilized in meeting their park and recreation needs now and in the future, the following steps will be instituted as soon as possible.

(1) Reorganization - Legislation will be presented to the Legislature which will provide for the amalgamation of the Park Commission and the Recreation Commission into one nine-member commission that can represent effectively the public's interest in parks and recreation in California, developing policy and advising the director of Parks and Recreation on the total recreational needs of the people of California. A strong commission of dedicated laymen is the best assurance that the public has of having its wishes translated into action. Legislation will also be presented that will provide for the reorganization of the Department of Parks and Recreation so that the department may be streamlined into an organization which will be able to provide fast, efficient service to the public.

(2) Planning - The director of the Department of Parks and Recreation will be asked immediately to commence the development of a State Park System Master Plan which will clearly define the state's responsibility in the field of parks and recreation. Such a plan will enable other agencies to relate and proceed with their planning efforts so that the park and recreation needs of cities, counties, and regions may be met and coordinated with the efforts of the state. The Master Plan will be developed, not only to meet the physical and developmental needs of the State Park System to the year 1990, but also to establish guidelines and standards for a comprehensive, statewide recreation policy. The plan will be kept up to date by an annual review and up-dating of its goals and objectives. It will be the basis for all program budgeting and land acquisition and for the development of the State Park System and will be published regularly so that it represents the current thinking of the Department of Parks and Recreation. This will enable all interested groups, the legislators, and the general public to know the acquisition and developmental plans of the department.

Through this planning effort and by the collection, compilation and dissemination of recreation-oriented data, the state will be fulfilling its proper role in providing information, cooperation and coordination to all governmental and private agencies that are trying to meet the recreational demands resulting from increased leisure time. In order to facilitate the above procedures, we will call together planners and officials of all levels of government as soon as possible to discuss and develop a fair division of responsibility among all agencies concerned with supplying recreation and parks, protecting scenery, history and open space. Such action will be aimed at providing a sound basis for approaching the development of the State Park System Master Plan.

(3) Remaining Bond Funds - To insure that the remaining bond funds for state acquisition and development are spent wisely and in the areas of greatest need, a thorough re-examination of all proposals not at this time committed, will be made to assure that each project meets the standards and criteria established for acquisition of units to be added to the State Park System. During this study, bond fund expenditures for the State Park System will be temporarily deferred except for those acquisitions of critical land of unquestionable quality. Funds saved through this reappraisal, plus the remaining unspent balance of the state park bond funds will be prudently spent as quickly as possible to meet the most urgent and pressing recreational needs of the state, creating whole projects that can be developed quickly without further land acquisition or delay.

(4) Public Information - Every citizen of this state shares equally in the ownership of California's State Park System. Every Californian shares the right to be kept informed regarding that park system. I am, therefore, asking the director to develop and implement, within the existing departmental structure, an effective program of public information to assure:

--That the citizens of California are advised where and how their state park dollars are being invested; and,

--That the people of California are kept currently aware of the opportunities available to them in their total State Park System.

(5) Increasing Appreciation and Understanding of History and Natural Values of the State Park System - Seventy percent of the people living in California today reside in our metropolitan centers.

In order that they can have a fuller appreciation and understanding of the exciting history of this state, the department will be encouraged to utilize its historical parks and monuments to interpret, in an interesting way, the history of this state. Likewise, a more aggressive interpretive program will be encouraged so that the park system visitors will have a fuller understanding of each area and, thereby, find greater pleasure and enjoyment, plus a better picture of the conservation and resource problems of this state. Such a program will add educational dimension to the State Park System's basic patterns of overnight camping and day use.

(6) Development - Emphasis must be placed upon development of existing units and creating a priority program of development that will open to the public, as quickly as possible, units of the system that will meet immediate needs.

(7) Private Assistance -- Many facilities in a state park can be developed through long-term concession contracts which will finance the work; thereby saving the taxpayer this cost. The department will be asked to encourage this form of development, not only to save tax money, but also to speed up development in the State Park System. The director will also be asked to explore ways of encouraging broader use of private lands for recreation purposes. Such a plan will release some of the pressure being placed upon the State Park System for more and more land acquisition and development.

(8) A Plan for Reduction in Cost of Development and Operation - The director will be asked immediately to investigate ways to reduce the high cost of facilities through the adjustment of standards to meet the varying needs of people and the particular conditions of each unit and by streamlining all procedures so that costly delays in operation and development are avoided.

(9) Redwoods - So that the major redwood communities, including the superlative primeval redwoods in the unique redwood forests of northern California will be preserved for posterity, a team of experts are giving this problem accelerated study. A redwood master plan, defining once and for all the redwood parks in this region, will be our goal. This will permit government and private interests to go about their respective jobs without further harassment. If we are to preserve and enjoy the redwood forests, as well as obtain the greatest benefit from this lumber resource, it is essential that government and the private sector work in close cooperation so that the conservation,

recreation and economic needs of the state are fully protected and the redwood forests are wisely managed.

(10) Inventory - There is a need to review the inventory of the park units in the State Park System to determine if there are units within the system that do not meet the standards and criteria for state parks, recreation areas or historical sites. If there are such units, I will ask the director to determine if these units can be exchanged for more suitable land or made available to local park and recreation departments, thereby removing the operating cost of these units from the State Parks and Recreation budget. The director will also be asked to review all land in California which is under the control of the Federal Bureau of Land Management to determine whether some of this land might not be transferred to the State Park System to meet future recreational needs, minimizing the amount of land that will have to be purchased and taken off the tax rolls to satisfy future recreational demands.

(11) Develop a More Realistic User Fee Schedule - The director will be asked to make an analysis of the entire revenue structure of the State Park System in order to increase the percentage of operating cost covered by revenue. Any new fee system should be related to the services the system is required to provide. Standards must be developed for determining to what extent use should be paid for by user fees rather than from the General Fund. Special services for certain groups and individuals which are not available to the general public should be eliminated as quickly as possible.

(12) Reservations - The director will be asked to develop a fair and equitable reservation system that makes it possible for people to reserve camping areas.

(3) Dogs in Parks - Many campers visiting the State Park System of California are turned away upset and disturbed, instead of experiencing pleasant and enjoyable times, because they have a family pet with them which prevents them from camping overnight under present rules. Our national parks and other state parks provide campers with pets special areas and I have asked the director of our State Park System to review this subject to see if we cannot solve this vexing problem.

RONALD REAGAN
Governor

#

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Contact: Lyn Nofziger
445-4571 4.6.67

IMMEDIATE RELEASE

To the Senate and the Assembly of the Legislature of California:

I am today asking for introduction of legislation that will grant to union members the right of a secret ballot when voting on questions of internal union policy.

This is the first time any state has attempted to secure for union members the right to vote their consciences in those matters which affect the daily operations of the union and, therefore, have a vital effect on their personal lives.

For purposes of the legislation, these matters would be considered internal policy:

Seniority rules; rules of internal union discipline; the creation, administration or dissolution of union pension or welfare programs; whether expenditures not in the ordinary course of union business are proper; whether the union should engage in certain political activity; whether the union should strike or engage in picketing; whether to initiate collective bargaining negotiations; the terms desired to be included in a collective bargaining agreement; generally, any matter affecting the inner workings of a labor union and the welfare of its members and not subject to the exclusive regulatory jurisdiction of federal labor laws and federal agencies.

This legislation is designed to give union members greater control over the affairs of their unions and to end minority control of some unions.

In addition, I am asking for further legislation aimed at eliminating financial conflicts of interest of officers and agents of labor organizations.

Under this legislation, union officers and agents would be prohibited from acquiring financial interests which interfere with the performance of their duties. The legislation also provides that unions account fully to their members for all assets and financial transactions.

(MORE)

Under the proposed legislation, both unions and employer organizations will file annual reports with the Director of Industrial Relations, showing financial transactions and the financial condition of the organization.

I am proposing that an advisory council of three members be appointed by the Governor to inform the Governor and the Legislature concerning the operation, administration and enforcement of the provisions of the act. The board also will make recommendations for the improvement or revision of the act.

RONALD REAGAN
Governor

* * * * *

Senator Fred Marler (R-Redding) will carry the bill pertaining to the financial responsibility of unions and Assemblyman Charles Conrad (R-Sherman Oaks) will carry the legislation on the secret ballot for union members.

4/11

To the Senate and the Assembly of the Legislature of California:

TRAFFIC SAFETY PROGRAM

I am today proposing a state traffic safety program involving new legislation, executive action and voluntary citizen participation. This broad, new program is aimed at cutting down drastically on the growing numbers of traffic accidents and fatalities in California.

Paramount in this program are measures aimed at reducing the numbers of accidents involving drunk drivers. We are studying plans now for pilot programs in several counties which would identify, analyze and recommend specific treatment methods for persons arrested for drunk driving.

We will also seek stiffer controls on motorcycles and their drivers. Legislation will be sought to: require applicants for motorcycle drivers' licenses to first qualify for auto drivers' licenses; require special driver tests for motorcycle drivers; require wearing of specified protective clothing by motorcyclists; require motorcycle and scooter operators to turn on their lights whenever their vehicles are in motion.

In the field of driver training, we will seek to upgrade classroom instruction, increase "behind the wheel" training to the point where it is available to all high school students, and improve standards for licensing and for course content in commercial driving schools.

To increase safety on our roads, we will encourage the construction of freeways, expand the spot improvement program of the Division of Highways in order to eliminate known problem areas where accidents are likely to occur, intensify efforts to obtain California's share of federal highway funds, continue and expand the program to eliminate unprotected grade crossings and encourage safety engineering in the design of roads.

In the area of vehicle inspection, I believe California should be allowed to maintain its program of random mandatory roadside inspection and not be forced by federal standards^{to} inspect every motor vehicle.

Our program is also aimed at improving emergency medical services. Legislation will be sought requiring every ambulance, by July 1, 1969, to be staffed with two fully qualified persons, thus insuring that first aid can continue while the ambulance is in transit.

Legislation will also be asked including requiring advanced first aid training for police, sheriffs and firemen and requesting the Highway Patrol to study and test the use of helicopters in providing emergency medical services in rural areas.

The administration will also seek enabling legislation that will allow the state to obtain benefits available to California under the National Highway Safety Act of 1966.

It will also support long-range research efforts into the causes of traffic injuries and the testing of safety devices, support orderly expansion of the Highway Patrol, and establish a traffic court study commission to review the system of justice in traffic law enforcement.

I will designate the Administrator of the Transportation Agency, Mr. Gordon Luce, as the coordinator of California's traffic safety program and ask him to prepare a comprehensive traffic safety plan which will integrate the efforts of all agencies involved in traffic safety into an effective system which relates action programs to system objectives.

I will also call on all areas of the private sector to aid in building a strong penetrating public education campaign in the field of public safety and will instruct the Governor's Traffic Safety Committee to work closely with the California Traffic Safety Foundation and other groups to implement these efforts.

Enactment of these varied efforts and programs can do much to make California streets and highways the safest in the nation.

RONALD REAGAN
Governor

#

STATEMENT OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN TO THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

(Delivered by Philip M. Battaglia, Executive Secretary to
Governor Reagan, on April 17, 1967.)

Chairman Jackson and members of the Committee:

I believe our country can and should have a Redwood National Park in California. My Administration is very willing to proceed with an orderly and equitable plan for such a park--under certain conditions which I will go into later.

I appreciate the opportunity to offer testimony before this committee and would like to acknowledge that the creation of a Redwood National Park ultimately rests with Congress. I am grateful that the committee has permitted a three month delay in the hearings to enable the new Administration in California time to develop its ideas about a national park. And we are fortunate to have a Californian as the ranking minority member of this committee.

Members of this honorable Committee are already aware that California has done much over the past 60 years to protect the magnificent redwoods along our North Coast. We have created--because of the foresightedness of conservationists and lumbermen--a series of state redwood parks that are held in trust for the citizens of California, and indeed, the nation.

We can be justly proud of our redwoods and the redwood state parks that the people of California have formed--Jedediah Smith, Del Norte and Prairie Creek Redwood State Parks. With the creation of these parks, and with the assistance of the lumbering industry, the great redwoods have been protected and conserved.

But there now is--as there has been for the past few years--a concerted drive to establish a Redwood National Park along California's North Coast. The plan has received extensive study in recent years and has been the object of even more investigation during the three-and-a-half months of this Administration. Our study of the various plans for a Redwood National Park has convinced us that any legislation for the creation of a national park most certainly will contain features which are not totally acceptable to the many and varied interests involved. For this reason, I am convinced that if there is to be a park, all of the

interests must be willing to negotiate in good faith toward a compromise solution.

I would like to cite one example: A common feature of several park proposals has been the exchange of private timberlands for the so-called "Redwood North Purchase Unit," a redwood forest owned by the federal government and operated by the United States Forest Service.

I have met with the owners of private timberlands affected and they--moving from their previous position--have assured me they are now willing to enter into exchange discussions even though it may mean the temporary disruption of their lumbering operations.

So also, representatives of my office met with appropriate federal officials in this city last week to discuss such an exchange. And I must frankly tell the members of this Committee that I was disappointed to learn that the United States Forest Service appears to be adamant in refusing to relinquish this property. Such an attitude is unfortunate. I repeat that if there is to be a national park, and I truly hope there will be, that all parties, including the various agencies of the federal government, must be willing to modify their positions in a spirit of good faith for the common good.

It should be noted that discussions with these same federal agencies concerning the exchange of land between the State of California and the federal government have been encouraging and an awareness of the problems involved has been exhibited. Because nearly 50 percent of the land in California presently is owned by the federal government, it is my duty to the taxpayers of California to protect further encroachment upon an already too-small tax and economic base.

As you know, the California Constitution specifically prohibits the divestiture of state-owned lands except under very rigid and controlled conditions. Therefore, any Redwood National Park which would encompass any, or all, of our state parks must be approved by the California State Legislature. I am extremely doubtful that the Legislature would agree to any plan that does not protect the interests of all California citizens.

We in California recognize the desirability of including, in addition to the Jedediah Smith and Del Norte Redwood State

Parks, privately held lands such as those in the Mill Creek area. But we also recognize the absolute necessity of maintaining a stable economy for the area affected. People, as well as trees, must be considered. Emotionalism and an adamant attitude are not the proper building blocks for a national park.

Therefore, it seems to me that the best way to assure that a Redwood National Park is developed--one that is planned on an orderly and equitable basis--is to immediately develop a joint industry-state-federal approach. I might hasten to add that this approach must have one primary interest: To achieve the best, most usable park, consistent with the various principles which I believe are basic and which I will now outline.

1--The park must not deprive the residents of the area of their jobs.

2--The State of California must receive full, fair and equal value from the federal government and its agencies for any state land incorporated into the national park, thereby satisfying California legal requirements. Full, fair and equal value does not mean payment in cash. As has already been pointed out, the federal government currently owns nearly 50 percent of the land total in California and dollars cannot buy the priceless land we have remaining. State land must be exchanged for equal federal land.

3--Private interests which give up land and timber must receive fair exchange in fee title to a like kind of property. Negotiation, rather than condemnation, must be emphasized. Land and timber obtained from private interests should wherever possible be exchanged for suitable U.S. Forest Service lands. The payment period for cash transactions involving private property taken must be funded in the minimum number of years required for maximum tax advantage to the private owners affected.

4--Consideration should be given to the inclusion of seashore areas. Trees are important for such a recreational area, but so also, in California, are beaches. This fact has been recognized in at least one of the proposals before you for consideration--that of Representative Don Clausen.

5--In addition to land exchange with private timber interests, there are other means available to maintain and encourage the economy of this area, particularly during the period of

park development. Several of these have been discussed by my representatives with officials of the federal agencies involved. I trust that serious consideration will be given to accelerated Forest Service activities in the area, expanded road and construction contracts designed to permit local contractors to participate, and development of a localized transportation center near Crescent City which would encourage visitors to take guided tours rather than merely pass through the park in their automobiles.

6--Provisions must be made for full in lieu taxes on a permanent basis so that local governmental units--already hampered by a narrow tax base caused by federal land ownership--will not experience further hardship. For example, 72 percent of Del Norte County is already under federal ownership.

7--Harassment of the lumber industry must stop. The legislation should contain requirements to this end.

8--The interests and goals of the various conservation groups must be given consideration.

Should this committee desire, we will be most pleased to submit specific and implementing details concerning many of the basic considerations I have outlined.

I am confident the owners of private timberland in the area will grant their assurances that they will continue their moratorium on cutting virgin timber pending completion of discussions among the state, the federal government and the industry.

The State of California is prepared to immediately join with representatives of the other interests involved in order to bring about the detailed plans necessary for the creation of a Redwood National Park.

Such discussions should resolve the many problems of the land exchanges that are vital to the creation of any national park. Thus, lands presently held by the United States government must be exchanged in fee with the State of California for state park lands to be included in the national park. Discussions must also concern a determination of what is a fair and equitable exchange in fee between private lumber interests and federally-owned lands such as the area commonly referred to as the Redwood Northern Purchase Unit. Consideration must be given not only to total acreage but also to quality, species, volume of board feet, accessibility, economics of logging operations, and so on.

As Governor of California, I feel it is my obligation to the people of my state to propose these broad principles as guidelines for action. I respectfully urge before this honorable Committee that serious consideration be given to the principles I have outlined in order that a truly national redwood park will result for the benefit of all Americans.

Thank you for your courtesy.

#####

4/29

Transcript of Speech by Governor Ronald Reagan before the
University of Southern California Law Day Luncheon

(Los Angeles.)

We are here today to celebrate Law Day.

It is fitting that we do this on May 1--the same day that lawless communism celebrates the anniversary of the Red Revolution.

The contrast is even greater than it might seem at first glance.

Communism by definition is a government of men--not of laws.

It is the very antithesis of what our founding fathers had in mind when they laboriously and carefully designed our Constitution.

They feared a strong, central government. Because a strong central government is a threat to personal liberty.

But, even more, they feared a government of men. Because they knew from first-hand experience that government by men is government uncontrolled and that is tyranny.

They knew that no man was safe in his house, or in his property or in his person if his rights, personal or property, depended upon the whims of men or of a man.

They set out to prevent this from happening. And the job they did through the document they wrote was the best in the history of man.

But they were not infallible and the Constitution--great as it is--is not a perfect document.

It can work only so long as a people truly desire to be free, only so long as men refuse to subject themselves to the rule of other men.

The man who said "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" was not speaking lightly or tritely.

Eternal vigilance is indeed the price of liberty. And that price is not too high to pay.

But liberty, without law, without legal safeguards is not and cannot be liberty in the long run. It becomes, instead, license, revolution and anarchy.

It leads, without qualification, to mob rule and from there to the rule of the many by the few. And these in turn establish or disestablish law as they see fit, or ignore the law and rule by fiat or edict.

What free men must achieve in order to remain free is a delicate balance wherein some liberty is sacrificed in order that the remainder can be preserved.

This cannot be successfully achieved or long maintained unless those who make the laws are answerable to the people and unless the people are willing and able to hold them answerable.

We have jealously guarded the concept that ours is a government of laws, not of men.

But we must always remember that the laws are written by men, interpreted by men and changed by men. And that men are judged under the law by other men.

Because of this, Americans have an obligation to themselves and to those who will come after them to see that those who write the laws, those who interpret them and those who judge under them are men of ability, men of honor and men who are fair-minded.

Now a governor can recommend laws and execute them, but he cannot make them under our system. Nor can he elect or appoint those who do.

And, with the exception of his clemency power, the governor cannot judge under the law, but he can, in fact under our system, he must, appoint those who do judge.

In many ways this is the most awesome power a governor has. Because, while judges must in theory be approved by a vote of the people, in actuality, a man appointed judge, with rare exceptions, has a lifetime job. An inherent weakness in our system is that it is nearly impossible for the average citizen to have all the factual information necessary to make an intelligent decision in voting for a judge, and therefore, he usually votes for the incumbent.

This, as I say, places an awesome responsibility and power in the hands of the governor. He in effect, controls the administration of justice, through the men he chooses. Justice can be good, bad or indifferent depending on the judge and on the man who appoints the judge.

Now there are many in California, including many in the legislature, who prefer our present system. They recognize that a governor can and may make bad appointments to the bench. They recognize that governors can, and many have, made appointments to the bench as political payoffs.

But they feel--sincerely--that over a period of years, the system balances out and that in the main the quality of the courts

Some of these men frankly feel that the appointment of judges is better off in the hands of a governor than it is in the hands of anyone else.

Their reasoning is clear. In California, a party seldom remains in control of the governor's office more than one or two terms at a time. This means that each party, under a system that encourages the political appointments of judges, will wind up with its share.

I suspect that this is true.

But I submit that this is not the way to improve the quality of our appointees to the bench. Nor is a party balance necessary to justice in our criminal courts.

I submit to you that justice should not be political.

The theme of Law Day this year is that "no man is above the law and no man is below it..." I would add that all men are entitled to equal justice under it.

I believe that using our courts as political plums in a spoils system is no way to assure the first--or to achieve the second.

That is why I am disappointed that the Senate Judiciary Committee last week killed for this session legislation introduced at my request that would have taken the appointment of judges out of the political area.

During the campaign I promised we would seek action in this area. That promise was made in a hundred different speeches. The reaction of one hundred different crowds made it obvious that the people want assurance that California justice is not justice diluted by partisan politics. The appointment of dozens of judges, many of which must be regarded as political payoffs, by a lame duck governor last fall and winter, did nothing to build the confidence of Californians in our political system or in our administration of justice. My mail reflected this and reflected even more strongly than during the campaign the people's wish for something better.

Because of my beliefs, because of the promises I made and because it is obviously the people's desire, I sent to the Legislature the bill that was killed last week. Actually, the bill would take a constitutional amendment to become effective and therefore, after legislative approval it would have to be submitted to a vote of the people. I am sorry the Senate Judiciary Committee did not give the people the right to make that decision.

That bill, known as the California Judicial Selection Act, I believed, would once and for all take the appointment of judges out

of the political arena.

It was carried on the Senate side by Sen. Donald L. Grunsky and I am grateful to him for his work and his efforts to report the bill out of committee. And I am grateful to those others who also voted to report it out.

Under the bill a judicial nominating commission would have been created, consisting of the Chief Justice of the State Supreme Court, two attorneys appointed by the State Bar and three lay citizens named by the governor. That commission would review the names of those proposed by any person for appointment to the appellate courts. After review, the commission would submit at least two names to the Governor who would then make an appointment from that list.

At the trial court level the commission would be augmented by three persons from the community where a vacancy existed. One would be a member of the local bar designated by the local bar president, one would be a judge and the third would be a lay person named by the governor.

When a vacancy occurred the governor would be required to submit at least three names to the commission and the commission would in turn recommend from this list at least two names back to the governor. The governor would then appoint a judge from among those names. If the commission were unable to recommend at least two persons from the governor's list he would be required to furnish additional names. This would assure that the governor must submit the names of qualified attorneys as possible bench appointees.

There is one other key provision to this bill. It would change the election procedures to further take the naming of judges out of politics. Instead of making the election of municipal and superior court judges contested races, voters would be asked only to vote yes or no as they now do on the appellate court level. If the vote were no, the judge would not be re-elected and a new judge would be named under the appointive system I mentioned a moment ago.

Let me say now that I think what I have proposed is what the people want and what in the interests of justice, the people deserve. I promise unequivocally that I will resubmit this legislation next year and for as long as necessary to have it enacted into law.

Politics has no place in the administration of justice in California. Even though we must wait for legislative action as the first step in taking politics out of the appointment of judges on a

permanant basis, we are continuing to do our best to minimize its effect on a voluntary basis.

As most of you know, we have formed committees in those districts where judicial vacancies occur. These committees are composed of members of the state bar, the local bar, a judge and a lay citizen. They sift the names of candidates for judge and turn in their recommendations to my office.

Without exception, we have appointed the candidate who the committee rated highest.

We will continue to do this until the Legislature and the people act.

But the selection of judges is only one facet of the program we are working on in California to assure justice for all our people and at the same time make it possible for the law abiding to live under the law without fear of it or of those who refuse to abide by it.

In the area of law enforcement legislation introduced as part of this administration's program is moving along.

This package under the sponsorship of Sen. George Deukmejian is an effort to strengthen "soft spots" in the state's laws and crime prevention programs.

California is the leading state in terms of major crimes. On a percentage basis, we have nearly twice our share--nine percent of the population and about 17 percent of the crime.

I am convinced that enactment of this proposed legislation will help deter crime, will slow the flood of pornographic material now available on our news stands, will speed and strengthen the administration of justice and will assure California citizens the best and most efficient law enforcement agencies in the nation.

This legislation includes: *crime package*

First: An effective law to restore to the cities and counties the ability to enact local laws designed to meet local problems. This is commonly referred to as the "implied pre-emption issue."

Such a law will allow local law enforcement agencies to more thoroughly police their jurisdictions, especially in the areas of vice, sex offenses and offenses against public decency.

Second: Laws increasing penalties for those criminals who, during the commission of a robbery, burglary or rape, inflict great bodily harm upon their victims with dangerous weapons. I believe

society must be protected from those who would inflict personal violence on its members. Three measures identical to those we have introduced were passed by both houses of the Legislature in 1965 but were pocket-vetoed by the last governor.

Third: Comprehensive legislation dealing with pornography and obscenity, with special emphasis on prohibiting dissemination to minors of "harmful" material. A careful effort is being made to avoid any suspicion of censorship.

Fourth: We recognize that from time to time persons are arrested unjustly or as victims of circumstances. Yet, despite their innocence, they must live the remainder of their lives with a public police record. Our bill, by closing certain records, will provide relief for such persons while, at the same time, preserving those records for use by law enforcement agencies and other authorized persons.

But we are convinced that even more effort on the part of all of us is needed if we are to control crime in California.

Statistics show:

In 1965, the last year for which figures are available, California was above the national average in five out of seven major categories of crime.

During the same year California led the states of at least 5 million population in total crime.

That year California murders went up 14 percent, rapes increased five percent, robberies nine percent, burglaries 11 percent and all offenses increased an average of nine percent.

This was not an unusual year. It was the continuation of a pattern; in 1964 all offenses went up 10 percent, in 1963 they went up 7 percent, in 1962 they were up three percent.

There are many reasons and theories given for the increase in the incidence of crime.

I do not hold with the theory that says society is to blame, when a man commits a robbery or a murder and therefore we must be understanding and as sympathetic for the criminal as we are for the victim.

True, there has been a spirit of permissiveness abroad in the land that has undoubtedly added to the juvenile delinquency problem. This is a time of affluence, where young people have time on their hands, and seek outlets once provided by jobs.

There is talk these days that punishment is not a deterrent and as punishment becomes more difficult to mete out, those who would be deterred by the threat of punishment feel freer to commit crimes and acts of violence.

There is a belief in some quarters that grievances, real or fancied, can be remedied by marches or even by riots.

The courts at the appellate level have narrowed the difference between liberty and license and in some areas have overbalanced the scales of justice so that the rights of society are outweighed by decisions granting new rights to individuals accused of crimes.

For a variety of reasons, including those listed above, the streets of many of our big cities have become unsafe at night and in some neighborhoods, even in the daytime.

A major reason, I think, for the increase in crime is the very progress we are making which benefits and enriches our civilization.

Scientific and technological advances are being utilized by and adapted for use by the criminal element.

Modern methods of transportation and communications, and modern tools and weapons are used daily by those who prey on society.

If we are to reverse this trend it is essential that society also use to the fullest our scientific and technological advances in the prevention, detection and control of crime. And in the correction and rehabilitation of criminals.

In addition, there is need for basic research involving the joint effort of various scientific and professional disciplines into the nature of crime, and criminals and into methods of detection, apprehension and treatment.

MORE

We are also proposing that a California Crime Foundation be created as a public corporation. Such a Foundation would be financed and served by both the private and public sectors.

Its purpose will be to develop a coordinated state, local and private effort toward developing new scientific techniques to combat crime, initiate research projects in the area of police management, administration and basic research in the field of crime, and encourage engineers and scientists to devote themselves to careers in crime research.

We hope we can finance this foundation by channeling to it funds appropriated for some existing state law enforcement efforts and by winning the financial participation of private foundations and the business community. This is certainly one of those areas where the independent sector can be, and should want to be, of help.

Of course, major efforts are constantly being made to stem crime by law enforcement agencies, both state and local, by departments of state government, by educational institutions and by private organizations.

Outstanding organizations such as the State Bar of California, the California Peace Officers Association, the District Attorneys Association, the California Council on Crime and Delinquency are all concerned.

We are convinced, however, from talking with state leaders in the fields of law enforcement and crime prevention that these efforts must be coordinated, that new efforts must be stimulated if we are to have an effective crime prevention program. Those engaged in this broad field must be able to share the results of the research and benefit from the progressive practices of others.

In order to achieve this, we are working with the Attorney General and his staff -- crime prevention knows no party lines -- with the leaders of local law enforcement, with the judiciary, and with the Legislature to develop a master plan for California criminal justice.

Details of this plan are embodied in legislative measures already before the Senate and Assembly.

We have four major objectives.

First, to provide for statewide planning and for orderly and

Second, we wish and expect to maintain the traditional partnership and spirit of mutual cooperation between the agencies of state and local government.

Third, we must provide coordination of the various agencies and groups involved in criminal justice projects.

And fourth, we must provide a vehicle to handle federal-state relations and to implement federal legislation dealing with crime control.

These objectives will be met by a council on criminal justice which will be established under the master plan.

This council, made up of representatives of all the agencies and bodies involved in crime control, as well as representative citizens, will function in much the same manner as the Coordinating Council on Higher Education functions and we are convinced it will provide the same sort of benefits.

The Council will be responsible for developing state-wide plans for the prevention, detection and control of crime and for the administration of criminal justice.

It will conduct studies, survey resources and identify the needs for research and development. It will encourage coordination, planning and research by the agencies of criminal justice throughout the state and will serve as a clearing house for the study and dissemination of information.

Such a council will give California the ability to attack crime and the roots of crime from many vantage points.

Of course, no program in itself can work miracles and/or eliminate crime. But this program will insure that we are utilizing to the fullest all the available resources and that we are continually coming up with new resources.

The war on crime is a never-ending one. And it is necessary that we pursue it constantly and with vigor if our citizens are to be safe on our streets and in their homes, and if man is to be able to live free from fear of his fellow man in an ever-contracting world and an increasingly more complex society.

I do not claim that our proposals contain all the answers. But I do say we have made a new beginning, a beginning that will increase the confidence of the citizen in his government, engender respect for the law and insure speedy and equal justice under it.

If it would seem that we are adding unduly to the responsibilities of the private citizen, let us be aware that history records when the freedom the Athenians wished for most was freedom from responsibility, Athens ceased to be free and was never free again.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Lyn Nofziger
445-4571 5.1.67

MEMO TO THE PRESS

C-O-R-R-E-C-T-I-O-N

Governor Reagan's Law Day Speech on Page 3,
8th paragraph, should have read:

"That is why I am disappointed that the
Senate Governmental Efficiency Committee etc."

#

The following is a wire from Federal Bureau of Investigation Director J. Edgar Hoover to Governor Ronald Reagan containing information for the Law Day Speech insert:

"On April 27, 1967, 29 police agencies in the State of California were linked through the California Highway Patrol computer in Sacramento, California, to the National Crime Information Center computer here in FBI headquarters. These agencies were successfully able to obtain instant information from data stored in the National Crime Information Center computer. This is the first computer-to-computer exchange in the history of law enforcement. In fact, it is the first use of this technology to link local, state and federal government. The rapid retrieval and exchange of information among law enforcement agencies is vital if we are to successfully fulfill our responsibilities. The California Highway Patrol, under Commissioner H.C. Sullivan, should be commended for their effort in this undertaking, especially Inspector David Luethje, and Lt. Ray Mayhugh, Mr. Richard Thompson and Mr. Lloyd Smith."

-o-

Following is the insert to Governor Reagan's Law Day Speech (insert after 5th paragraph, Page 8 endingare all concerned):

"As a matter of fact, we have already taken, in conjunction with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, one major step to help combat crime.

"California Highway Patrol Commissioner Harold Sullivan has arranged with the FBI for a computer to computer link-up between his headquarters and the National Crime Information Center at FBI headquarters in Washington.

"Thanks to Commissioner Sullivan, 29 police agencies in California were linked on April 27 through the Highway Patrol computer to the FBI.

"We are told by J. Edgar Hoover that this is the first computer to computer exchange in the history of law enforcement.

"In fact it is the first use of this technology to link local, state and federal government.

"Both the FBI and our law enforcement officials feel this link-up will be invaluable in our fight against crime by allowing the rapid retrieval and exchange of information between California and the FBI.

"But this is just one step."

(Pick up "We are convinced".....and eliminate "however".

#

STATEMENT OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN ON
COLORADO RIVER LEGISLATION*

I welcome this opportunity to make known the official views of California's new administration on the important water legislation now before this Subcommittee. The necessity for finding a legislative solution to the Colorado River water supply problem has been one of the paramount concerns of my administration since it took office. We concluded early that California's new administration would join with sister states and the Congress in an all-out effort to obtain constructive legislation at the earliest practicable date.

I see no reason to replot ground that has already been thoroughly plowed. There is no need to recite in detail the importance of water to California and the West, and there is nothing I need add to reinforce the fact that the Colorado River Basin and the Pacific Southwest face imminent and widespread water deficiencies. The record compiled at previous hearings on the Central Arizona Project and the Pacific Southwest Water Plan before this distinguished body, and on the Colorado River Basin Project legislation before the counterpart of this body in the House, established those facts beyond a shadow of a doubt.

California's administration, in concentrating on the support of basic principles, is determined not to be detracted by nonproductive argument over seemingly important, but often

*For presentation by William R. Gianelli, Director of the Department of Water Resources, before the Senate Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources in Washington, D. C., May 3, 1967.

overemphasized, peripheral issues. All of the Colorado River Basin States have made accommodations to each other, to interests opposed to dams, and to the Northwest. California has participated, and will continue to do so, in negotiations which are essential to enactment of the legislation needed in this area.

Our goals are clear and, we believe, are above argument. The need for action is unmistakable. What the entire Pacific Southwest needs now is legislation which satisfies the region's immediate needs through added development of the limited resources of the Colorado River, but recognizes also the area's longer-range requirements and sets in motion a program to augment the supplies of the Colorado. It is my objective today to bring to your attention those elements that California believes essential in this legislation.

We ask first that the legislation recognize the accepted fact that the dependable natural supply of the Colorado River is insufficient to meet all compact and decree apportionments to the seven states of the Colorado River Basin; and the further fact that the dependable supply available to the Lower Basin will be unable to meet existing uses and the added burden of the Central Arizona Project beyond perhaps 1990 or the turn of the century, even with California's existing uses limited to 4.4 million acre-feet per year. While it appears that the Lower Colorado supply has the potential of satisfying existing uses and those of the Central Arizona Project until then, this is the case only because several of the other states are not at this time using all of the water to which they are entitled and because California's

present uses will be cut back from 5.1 to 4.4 million acre-feet per year when the Central Arizona Project goes into operation.

The only certain way of assuring continued development and prosperity in the Pacific Southwest and of bringing peace to the Colorado River is to increase the natural supplies of the region. The legislation, then, should contain a reasonable promise that the additional burden of the Central Arizona Project will be relieved within a quarter of a century by augmentation of supply of the Colorado. In the meantime, existing economies should be provided with reasonable protection.

The merits of protecting existing water uses in the Lower Colorado River Basin, with California's uses being protected to the extent of 4.4 million acre-feet per annum, are based on a solid moral and economic foundation. The Colorado River Basin States struggled with this problem for months before resolving it early in 1965 in favor of protecting existing economies. This solution was found acceptable last year to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to the National Administration. There is no cogent reason to upset this accord.

Existing projects in the Lower Colorado River Basin were built on what has turned out to be an overly optimistic estimate of water supply. The economies that rely on these projects, all vital to the states and the nation, now face added hazard. The economy in California dependent upon the Colorado must scale back from an existing use of 5.1 million

acre-feet per year to 4.4 as a result of the lesser supply in the River and the U. S. Supreme Court's decision in Arizona v California. The logical way to protect the economy dependent upon the remaining supply of 4.4 million acre-feet and the enormous investment in physical works constructed to service this economy during the time interval preceding actual augmentation of the River is to provide in the legislation that existing uses shall have a priority over new uses until the augmentation is effected. With the 4.4 priority, the \$0.5 billion Colorado River Aqueduct and distribution system of The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California will flow less than half full. Without it, the Aqueduct will face imminent danger of being dried up completely.

Hence, we urge that existing uses in the Lower Basin, including 4.4 million acre-feet per year of use in California, be afforded priority over the Central Arizona Project until such time as the supply of the River is augmented. To do otherwise is to create another burden on the River without doing anything to relieve the basic problem of short supply. Relief from shortage and continued development of the economies of the Pacific Southwest can only come from a program that includes early augmentation of the area's limited supplies.

A primary purpose of the legislation should be to initiate studies leading to a well-founded decision on how best to accomplish augmentation. The nation can ill afford

delays in getting those studies under way. We believe the essential ingredients of an acceptable augmentation study to be: (1) that it be conducted under the supervision of an impartial body; (2) that it be completed on a timely basis; (3) that all related factors be considered, including those outside the purely engineering and economic fields; (4) that the rights of the states and regions be fully respected; (5) that the affected states be permitted to participate effectively; and (6) that the expertise of existing state and federal agencies be used to the maximum extent possible.

In recent weeks, several proposals have been advanced that call for a feasibility-level study of the North Coastal area of California as the initial source of export water supply for the Pacific Southwest. The State of California does not now, nor has it ever, objected to inclusion of its North Coast as one of the areas to be studied. We have asked and still ask, however, that the selection of California's North Coastal resources as a source of supply for the initial stage of the regional program be based upon a demonstration, using comparable levels of investigation, that it is, in fact, the best source for the Pacific Southwest. The people of the Southwest and of the nation at large have a right to expect that the project eventually constructed to relieve the water supply problems of the Pacific Southwest is the best of all available alternatives. This is not only existing federal and state policy, it's good economics.

California, like any other potential state of origin, must insist on full legal and economic protection to assure all users within its boundaries that water supplies will be available for use therein adequate to satisfy their ultimate requirements at prices to users not adversely affected by the exportation of water. The protective provisions must also give the users within the states of origin a priority of use, so that those users have in effect a right of recall, or a right to replacement with water of equal quality and no greater cost. Such provisions are included in S. 861, S. 1242, and S. 1409, but omitted from S. 1004 and S. 1013.

These provisions would apply to all interstate supplies regardless of source. As the new economy developed in the Pacific Southwest would not be allowed to perish, recall would be unlikely, and the state of origin would probably have to rely on replacement of its supplies. This would require that large sums of money be available within the program at that point in time to finance the replacement. Hence, California strongly supports creation of the proposed development fund, construction of projects that will make revenues available to the development fund, and dedication of a portion of the fund to protection of the states of origin.

Success of the regional program of development will depend in large measure upon the financial strength of the development fund. We must make it as strong as we can, and can ill afford to forego construction of justified projects that will return surplus revenues to the fund. Hence we support

construction of the optimum development at the Hualapai site that can be justified considering all potential uses and needs, giving full recognition to scenic and recreational needs, as well as to hydroelectric peaking power needs and values.

I say this in full knowledge of the strong stand conservationists have taken on the Hualapai Dam issue. The important values associated with the preservation of open spaces and wild areas must be given full consideration in reaching decisions as to the future use of the Colorado River and the natural areas associated therewith. However, reality also requires that full recognition be given to the requirements of meeting the food, fiber, power, and recreation demands of an expanding population.

Some of the bills before you contain, in addition to the Central Arizona Project, authorizations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of five new projects in the Upper Basin. Since it is our understanding that these features are favored by the state directly affected; are economically justified on the basis of Bureau of Reclamation studies; and, on the basis of both entitlement and physical availability, can reasonably be expected to have an adequate water supply, we support their authorization.

As previously stated, we believe that the studies of alternative sources of supply to augment the Colorado should be supervised by an impartial body, should include effective state participation, should be free from duplication of work force and work effort, and should make maximum use of expertise

already available. California supports the formation of the National Water Commission to review national water policy. We also support use of the National Water Commission as an impartial supervisor of the studies of means of augmenting the supplies of the Pacific Southwest. This support, however, is conditioned on: (1) immediate implementation of the Pacific Southwest regional study so that alternative solutions will be available for comparison by the early 1970's, and (2) assurances that the commission will not be used as a mechanism for delaying those studies.

For the augmentation studies to be meaningful they must also be timely. A high federal official recently stated that he was confident that the Colorado River would be augmented by 1990. We certainly hope that is the case. But less than 23 years remain to accomplish this objective. Augmentation could come from any, or a combination of several alternatives, including sea water conversion and weather modification. The critical time demands, however, relate to the possibility that broad-scale interstate exchanges of water represent the best solution. If so, many have proclaimed that 25 years' lead time will be required for such a regional program. The lead time, however, will be at least five, and perhaps as much as ten, years longer if the planning studies are deferred until the National Water Commission attempts to first solve the nation's water policy problems. If that happens, the Southwest will face a major water crisis before the turn of the century.

The Northeastern States have not been asked to defer their regional water planning to await the findings of a National Water Commission. The Northeast United States Water Supply study is already under way.

California is concerned over the possibility of too many national and federal water bodies and agencies becoming involved in western states regional water planning. Certainly, every effort is needed to avoid duplication of future planning efforts, the redoing of that which has already been done, and the bypassing of local authorities and expertise. Coordination of existing agencies and commissions is already a most difficult task. The Senate bill to create the National Water Commission, S. 20, as passed by the Senate, obviously seeks to avoid duplication, particularly as regards the Water Resources Council. However, it is equally obvious that the measure does not contemplate the Commission actually performing western, northeastern, or any other specific regional planning effort.

The provisions of the legislation authorizing studies of means of augmenting the supplies of the Pacific Southwest should recognize the planning expertise of the state organizations and the 11-state Western States Water Council. For example, the National Water Commission could be directed to consult with the Western States Water Council in developing policy involving western states water programs.

We regard the National Administration's position, as announced by Secretary Udall on February 1, and as contained in S. 1004 and S. 1013, as a long step backward from the regional approach which he initiated in 1963 and which had its first legislative hearing before this Subcommittee. The piecemeal approach now proposed by the Secretary avoids the fundamental water problem facing the entire West. The Administrations' proposal would add materially to the burden of demand on the River without attempting to solve the basic problem of an insufficient supply in the Colorado. California urges the Subcommittee to reject the Administration's proposal and to continue to seek a regional solution to what is truly a regional problem.

5/4

STATEMENT OF HONORABLE RONALD REAGAN
GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA

Before the

PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*

May 4, 1967

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee: Ordinarily when the California witnesses appear before you on behalf of appropriations for flood control and reclamation projects, we are clearing up the debris from a severe winter flood, or are preparing for an unusually dry summer. This year is different, typical of California weather. We had one of the driest Februarys on record and were beginning to worry about water supplies when March storms brought the snowpack and streamflow up to about normal. Someone, however, forgot to turn the faucet off and the rain and extremely heavy mountain snowfall continued through March and right up to the end of April. Reservoirs are almost full, and we have almost a 200 percent of normal snowpack waiting for warm weather and the snowmelt season. We just have no place to put the water and we anticipate some real problems with agriculture in the San Joaquin Valley. Crops which have been planted may be flooded, and the expected flooding probably will mean costly delays for plantings not yet made.

All of this is just another way of highlighting California's need for continuing development of flood control and water storage projects, and the manner in which the federal projects fit in with scores of others being built by state and local agencies.

* Presented by Edgar Gillenwaters,
Deputy Director of Finance
State of California

I fully endorse the program which will be presented to you in some detail by the Director of Water Resources and the Chairman of the California Water Commission, as well as by many witnesses from local agencies. It is a sound program, a necessary program, and one which is realistic. It has full support of all parts of California.

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN - UNITED REPUBLICANS
OF CALIFORNIA CONVENTION - Long Beach Arena - 7:30 p.m.
MAY 6, 1967

It is a pleasure to be here tonight, talking again to the members of United Republicans of California.

I have that warm feeling a person gets when he knows he's among friends--friends with the same philosophy, the same goals, the same aspirations. Could be I'm especially conscious of this for the same reason a man only realizes how thirsty he really is when he takes a cooling drink. Besides that, the members of UROC have always supported their beliefs with their money and their energies. And, believe me, that makes you at least a little unique.

You have supported and worked actively and hard for those principles in which we believe and the candidates who represent them. Republican candidates and principles, of course.

It is the work and support given by you and the members of the other Republican volunteer groups which, in large measure, were responsible for the success of many of those candidates and principles last November.

I, for one, am grateful, and I know that that gratitude is shared by those others--winners and losers--who had your help.

That election put California on the right road--in the interest of harmony, let me hasten to say I use "right" in the sense of meaning "correct"--not the road back, but the road ahead to a better, more responsible, more meaningful life for all our citizens, a life in which they are allowed to develop and pursue their aims and ambitions to the fullest, without the constant interference and domination of big spending, big brother government.

But we have just started down that new road. There is much to be done and there are many problems yet to be solved and there are many pitfalls that lie ahead.

We have just begun to do the job that must be done. And nearly every move we make brings a fresh protest from those who think that your money and mine is theirs to spend--as they see fit and that government is formed for the benefit of those who govern.

We intend to put an end to that kind of thinking--an end to the philosophy that government has a right to match taxes to whatever it wants to spend instead of spending only what needs to be spent.

During the campaign it looked almost as if we could put our fiscal house in order without resorting to new taxes. We did not know just how bad the situation was then. Now we have had access to, and a chance to read, the fine print.

As a result, we have, as you know, submitted a revenue bill of nearly one billion dollars in increased taxes. Because of this there has been some editorial jumping-up-and-down-with-gee, holding that this makes a failure in our long-held belief in economy, let's set the record straight here and now. And bear with me if you have heard this. Our mail indicates that there is still confusion and misunderstanding.

Roughly half of that tax increase is necessary simply to pay off this year's deficit and put us on a pay-as-you-go basis. Half of the remainder is not a new tax so much as a broader based substitute tax to give, for the first time, direct property tax relief. Next year, with the deficit paid off, that relief can be more than doubled.

The remainder--about one-quarter of the total tax revenues--is for the normal increase to keep pace with population growth and increased prices and wages resulting from the federal government's policy of planned inflation. The increase is about 7 percent, in contrast with the 16 percent increase of the past year and the 12 percent average increase over the last eight years.

We tried for some \$250 million in economies in the budgets requested by all the divisions of government. We ended up with more than \$127 million. I'm just stubborn enough to think we got the \$127 million because we tried for \$250 million and we will continue to follow that policy.

Incidentally, one of the most heartening signs we have had in this brief administration is the recent poll which indicates most of our citizens favor our revenue package and, of those who favor it, 70 percent do so because they see the need to balance the budget. Now let me suggest--if you are among those who favor our efforts, don't tell me--write to your assemblyman and senator.

I want to assure you that we do not see this revenue bill as a cure-all. Our aims go far beyond this. We do not intend to balance future budgets by increasing taxes. Instead, we intend to balance them by making government more economical, more frugal, more workable. Like this year, next year--and the years following--will be years where we do not intend to spend one dollar more of the people's money than is necessary to conduct the people's business.

Let me digress for a moment. During the campaign, I became a kind of Johnny-One-Note on the subject of government of, and by, the people-- of building what I called a Creative Society by turning to the great power of the people instead of always creating additional bureaucracy. There did not seem to be much of a quarrel with this idea. In fact, once or twice I had to talk pretty loudly when it looked as if the opposition had claimed squatters' rights on the idea and was making more noise about it than I was. They even appointed a few citizens' commissions late in the campaign which, we hope, will surface one of these days for refueling.

But some who listened and endorsed before November 8 were pretty horrified to discover the campaign blossoms were bearing fruit. Somehow they remind me of an incident which occurred early in World War II.

A shipload of canned fish was interned in an Italian port and, when finally released for sale, the cargo brought \$25,000. It was then resold for \$50,000, and, as the war years went on, that shipment of canned fish kept changing hands until, finally, it brought \$600,000.

The last purchaser opened a can and tried the fish. Enraged, he got on the phone and demanded that something be done because the fish was spoiled. And he was told by the man who sold it to him, "But that fish isn't for eating; it's for selling!"

Well, our fish is for eating.

You would think that, when government can get things done without adding to the burden of the taxpayers, everyone would be happy. Unfortunately, that is not the case. Some reactionaries still think the only way to get things done is to soak the taxpayer--that, somehow, it isn't legal unless it's compulsory.

In pointing up the potential of a Creative Society during the campaign, attention was called to the cooperation between certain government agencies and private industry which resulted in 17,800 jobs for unemployed from the Watts curfew area in a 16-month period. These jobs were in private industry and two-thirds of them are still filled. Of the other one-third, half moved on to better jobs. The man who spearheaded this is Mr. H.C. McClellan and he is at work now setting up a similar program on a statewide basis at no expense to the taxpayers. A Congressman from the area that benefitted most--motivated either by partisanship or a philosophical refusal to approve of private industry-- has attacked this program on the basis that only government jobs and tax money should help the unemployed.

We have, as you know, a task force of 152 industrial and business executives--the best and most successful in the state--who will be working as full-time volunteers for the next several months. These men are bringing their special knowledge, skill and experience to bear on the structure of state government to tell us how we can bring modern business practices to government agencies. This study, incidentally, will cost the taxpayers only a few thousand dollars; the direct costs of it are being underwritten by public-spirited members of business and industry.

Strangely enough, some find something sinister in private citizens wanting to help out. Some of those who talk about the civic duty of citizens to contribute to Community Chest, an art museum or a music center think, if those same citizens want to help the government under which they live, they must have ulterior motives. Of course that is right, if a desire for better government can be termed an ulterior motive. Even some legislators are fearful that perhaps citizens shouldn't be snooping around their own government.

The fish is for eating. We have called on our fellow citizens to take time out from their own careers and business activities to man the administrative posts of government. Nothing has ever made me so proud as their response. No state government has ever recruited manpower to match ours. We have found that in California we have many men to match our mountains.

Other citizens will soon be embarked on a total study of our tax structure. And one day, with their help, Californians may have a logical, reasonable set of tax laws.

We have probably the most beautiful capitol of any of the states and soon we will have a new residence for California' governors in keeping with our California heritage. This, too, will be provided by the people voluntarily. A bipartisan group has formed a non-profit corporation to build, in the city of Sacramento, a dwelling to be donated to the State of California for use as an official residence for the governors. Gifts of not more than \$500 and not less than \$1 will be solicited on a broad statewide basis. Yet, even this has been distorted to appear as if a small band of so-called "fat cats" are doing something undercover and not quite nice.

Fortunately, the members of UROC, like most of our concerned citizens, do not follow this line of thinking. We have been brought together by a belief that one of our problems is too much government and too much compulsion...that we, as citizens, have a right to participate in our government in ways other than just paying taxes, running for office or seeking appointments.

But suddenly some, who apparently shared this concept prior to November 8, are opposed to the practice of that concept. Suddenly, too, the concept of economy in government has also become wrong to some, especially to some whose particular pet oxen have been gored by some of the proposed economies.

Now our economies are not aimed at eliminating needed services or programs. But they are aimed at trimming fat and waste, at cutting out the frills, at keeping government at the size where it remains the servant, and does not become the master, of the people.

And they are aimed at reducing the tax burden on the people. You have read some of the things we are doing, and have heard the outcry of the wounded. Five million dollars has been saved by cutting down on out-of-state travel by public servants who like to roam...\$20 million a year saved by cutting our unneeded workers in some of our institutions where the number of patients has dwindled by 40 percent but where, until now, there has been no reduction in the numbers of employees. Only this week General Lolli, our new administrator of General Services, sent me over a list of new savings totalling another million dollars--mostly in little things, little things that really add up.

Other millions are being saved because we have been able to persuade our colleges and universities to face up to the fact that as public institutions they have a public responsibility not to spend beyond the public's means. And let me add here that I appreciate their problems and the fact that they understand ours.

Now none of the things we have done should have surprised anyone, for just as we promised to bring government back to the people, so did we also promise to bring frugality and thrift back to government.

But we also promised to do this without hurting the truly needy and the truly deserving. That is why extra funds for the crippled children's program were approved...why money was left in the budget for needed salary increases...why extra funds to help teachers who retired on inadequate pensions and who have not had the raise needed to combat inflation were provided...why the state employment office has been instructed to make special efforts to find jobs for those state employees laid off through no fault of their own.

There were a few more promises, such as to take steps to cut California's soaring crime rate. And I am pleased to note that part of our anti-crime legislative package has already passed the Legislature. These are bills increasing penalties for crimes of violence. I will sign them next week.

Something was said also about eliminating government by hacks and cronies and relatives--and, to date, my only brother hasn't even asked for a job.

An issue discussed in the campaign was taking the appointment of judges out of politics. Unfortunately, the Senate Governmental Efficiency Committee has killed that bill for this session. But we will resubmit it next year or in following years if necessary. In the meantime, we have set up special screening committees composed of representatives of the bar associations, the presiding judges of the various judicial districts and lay representatives to insure that only qualified attorneys are picked as judges. To date, we have selected only the number one recommendation for each judgeship. There have been no exceptions.

In addition to proposed legislation that will take away the compulsory aspects of the school district unification law and other laws that have foisted costly programs on school districts without providing the funds for their financing, we have made a start toward restoring the 50-50 state and local financing of schools.

We are also moving forward on our agriculture program and on programs aimed at improving the business climate and at conserving our land, air, water and oceanographic resources.

Do not be fooled by the special interest propagandists. We will maintain our redwood forests, but we will not give them to the federal government without getting something of equal value in return, and we will not act in such a way as to endanger the economy of our northwestern California counties. And here we have the support of most of our congressmen and legislators and have won concessions from those federal agencies involved.

We will make provision for maintaining our wilderness areas, but we will not blindly set aside huge tracts so they cannot be used to meet the recreational and industrial needs of our expanding population.

We will press ahead on our state water program, but we will also cooperate in the fresh water program of the future--desalinization.

We will work to keep industry in California and to entice more industry here, but we will also work to diversify industry and to build new industries in new fields such as those offered by the ocean, so that California will not continue to be so heavily dependent on defense and other government contracts.

We will work to make and keep California number one...not only number one in terms of growth and economy, but also number one in terms of the kind of government that best suits a free people--a government oriented to their needs, but also a government oriented to their rights and their responsibilities.

We will strive continually to make the state an effective bulwark between the people and an ever-encroaching federal government. I still believe that government is best which remains closest to the people, but almost daily the Goliath that is the federal government moves to gather more power unto itself and to minimize the functions of both the Congress and the states. Those efforts will meet stern resistance in California. This is one state that does not intend to become merely an administrative adjunct of the federal government.

Recently, the President called the governors together to tell them the federal government wished to work more closely with the states in distributing federal monies and federal programs. This was followed by a visit to California of a team of federal officials seeking closer federal-state cooperation.

But, while federal officials were making promises to governors, lower echelon officials were disclosing plans by the federal government to bypass Sacramento in setting up new job programs and the Interior Department was going ahead with its efforts to make Imperial Valley farmers adhere to the outmoded 160-acre limitation.

It is not enough for our senators and our representatives to seek to pass legislation involving the several states, they must also work to insure that legislation does not infringe on the rights of the individual states and they must be wary lest they trade those rights for the federal dollar, which, after all, is merely what is left of the citizen's dollar after it has been run through those puzzle palaces on the Potomac.

I have met with our Congressman, on both sides of the aisle; I have talked with both our Senators. I have assured all of them that the administration in Sacramento will work with them and cooperate with them wherever the interests of the state are involved.

I have urged them to guard carefully those interests against the encroachments of the federal government. There is little use in saving our freedom at the local and state levels if we lose it on the national level. And it is people like you--dedicated, patriotic citizens, who are needed to save freedom at all levels.

As I said earlier tonight, it is the volunteer Republican organizations such as the UROC that have provided so many of the workers and so much of the enthusiasm and support for our party in California.

All of us, including myself, have much to be grateful to you for. We could not have won without you last November, nor will we know victory in 1968 without your wholehearted and undivided support.

But do we want to be like the nostalgic old grad who lives in the fading memory of one championship team, or do we look ahead and anticipate successive new victories?

To any who would live in the past--just remember, that past includes bitter defeats between 1958 and 1964. We could not have won in 1966 if we had stooped to the intraparty warfare that characterized our years of defeat.

We have not won a war, or even complete victory in a battle. We stopped our opponent's advance and halted our own retreat. But that is all. Let me remind you: we did not win control of the Assembly; we did not win control of the Senate; we did not win the office of Attorney General even though we had good candidates and good organization.

The 11th Commandment kept our party unified; but we were, and are still, a minority party. There is still much to be done in party building, in convincing independents and members of the opposing party that the course we chart leads to fiscal sanity, strong local government and individual rights and responsibilities.

Maybe there once was a time when our two-party system was less a difference in philosophy than a contest between partisans loyal to the old school tie, but that is not true today. Last November, millions of people voted to change, or at least pause to review, the philosophy of the party leadership then in power. They did not just decide to change hats and join the other club for a while.

Fortunately, for those millions of concerned citizens, we too had paused to take inventory. We discovered we could no longer afford the luxury of internal fighting, backbiting and throatcutting. We discovered our philosophical difference with those presently in power was greater than any grudge or split within our own ranks. We were ready and in position to offer an alternative for those concerned citizens who wanted to join with others, not to win a contest, but to preserve a way of life.

We must keep the door open--offering our party as the only practical answer for those who, overall, are individualists. And because this is the great common denominator--this dedication to the belief in man's aspirations as an individual--we cannot offer them a narrow sectarian party in which all must swear allegiance to prescribed commandments.

Such a party can be highly disciplined, but it does not win elections. This kind of party soon disappears in a blaze of glorious defeat, and it never puts into practice its basic tenets, no matter how noble they may be.

The Republican Party, both in this state and nationally, is a broad party. There is room in our tent for many views; indeed, the divergence of views is one of our strengths. Let no one, however, interpret this to mean compromise of basic philosophy or that we will be all things to all people for political expediency.

In our tent will be found those who believe that government was created by "We, the People"; that government exists for the people and we can give to government no power we do not possess as individuals; that the citizen does not earn to support government, but supports government so that he may be free to earn; that, because there can be no freedom without law and order, every act of government must be approved if it makes freedom more secure and disapproved if it offers security instead of freedom.

Within our tent, there will be many arguments and divisions over approach and method and even over the men and women we choose to implement our philosophy. Seldom, if ever, will we raise a cheer signifying unanimous approval of the decisions reached. But if our philosophy is to prevail, we must at least pledge unified support of the ultimate decision. Unity does not require unanimity of thought.

And here is the challenge to you. It is the duty and responsibility of the volunteer Republican organizations, not to further divide, but to lead the way to unity. As duly chartered Republican organizations, we all can advance our particular sectarianism or brand of candidates for the party to pass on openly and freely in a primary election.

But, as volunteer organizations, we must always remain in a position that will let us effectively support the candidates chosen by the entire party in a primary. To do less is a disservice to the party and, more importantly, to the cause in which we all believe.

Our 11th Commandment is perhaps more profound than we realize.

"Thou shall not speak ill of any Republican." To do so means we are inhibited in the support we can give that Republican if he should become the nominee of our party. Certainly our task is harder if we must challenge and refute charges made by our opponents if those charges were first uttered by us. I am proud that UROC and UROC's president--Joe Crosby--subscribe wholeheartedly to that commandment.

It is my belief that, as governor, I should neither endorse a primary candidate nor involve myself behind the scenes in primary campaigning. To do so is a misuse of the office with which I have been entrusted. When the primary is over, I believe I have a commitment--a contract if you will--to wholeheartedly support every candidate chosen by the party.

You, on the other hand, as individuals and as an organization, should be so involved. You, by your membership in a volunteer group, have proven you are activists--leaders in furthering the philosophy which brings us together. You must, therefore, be leaders in setting campaign standards--ready to endorse the party choice--just as ready to repudiate any candidate or campaign which refuses to abide by those standards.

Fight as hard in next year's primaries as you can for your candidates, but be against only those we must defeat in November of 1968. Let no opposition candidate quote your words in the general election to advance statism or the philosophy of those who have lost confidence in man's capacity for self-rule.

Just a year ago, we were a party almost totally without power. The two-party system existed only in theory. Out of sheer necessity, we achieved unity and victory. With that victory, we bought time--time to rally our forces for what may be our last chance.

#

An ancient Irish king, Brian Boru, once ordered the tide to halt, and when it would not, he had it beaten with chains--- to no avail.

We cannot order the tide of statism to halt but by our victories and by living up to our philosophy and our commitments to the people, we can reverse it.

And we can bring in a new tide on which will ride our concept of responsible, people-oriented government that works as the founding fathers meant it to work.

But if we are to do so we cannot wait for the changes in the moon or count on the opposition to destroy itself.

Instead we must continue to unite together and work together and then, God willing, together we can watch our tide sweep across the land.

#

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Lyn Nofziger
445-4571 5.16.67

RELEASE: FLAT A.M.'S
WEDNESDAY, MAY 17

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN - MERCHANTS
AND MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION ANNUAL BANQUET,
BILTMORE BOWL - Los Angeles - May 16, 1966 1967

I don't care what the father of two eastern senators said about businessmen---I like you and I'm pleased to be here.

S.O.B. does mean sons of business---and without you and your fathers and grandfathers, this great nation would still be an agrarian nation, living mainly off the fruits of the land and largely by the sweat of our brows and looking to others to provide us with the good things of life.

Backward nations are backward and undeveloped nations are undeveloped not because of their climate and not because of their soil, but instead, for two other reasons:

--First, because of their political systems. Either they are too unstable like many of today's so-called emerging nations or else they are in the grip of modern day feudalism such as Russia's or China's.

--Second, because they lack both the knowhow and the political system necessary to build business, industry and commerce.

In the United States we have been blessed, not alone by our natural resources--other nations have great resources, too, but by our people--the world's most industrious, ingenious, enterprising and inventive--and by our political system--one of the few devised by man that is both stable and free.

Stable enough to let a prosperous economy evolve and free enough to allow initiative and ingenuity to triumph over the dead hand of bureaucracy and regulation.

Now, before someone reads narrow chauvinism into this, let me assure you I'm well aware that the typical American is an immigrant or descendant of immigrants from any and every country of the world. The new dimension here that made his accomplishment possible was the subject of study by Herbert Hoover who declared the answer lay in one thing--- "freedom." Here we unleashed the genius of every man by giving him freedom to an extent never known before by man anywhere.

Today, unfortunately, we see that freedom slowly vanishing on many fronts---all in the name of the common good---and stability sorely threatened by a political and social climate that acknowledges the rights of the individual, but not his responsibilities.

I know, those advocates of big government and more government controls point with pride at the state of the economy today.

Well, I say that the economy is as good as it is today, not because of government rules and regulations and nit-picking, but in spite of it.

The best testimony as to the vitality of American business and industry and the competence of the American businessman and industrialist is that they have managed to survive the rules and regulations with which they have been harassed for the last 35 years.

It makes you wonder just how good business would be, just how much more industry and agriculture would be producing if they weren't hindered and hampered at every turn.

If they weren't burdened by regressive taxes, swamped with government-ordered paper work and threatened by thousands of rules and regulations promulgated by hundreds of unrelated, uncoordinated agencies at every level of government.

It makes you wonder how much better off we would be as individuals if government weren't prying and poking into every nook and corner of our daily lives. Actually, there are answers if we'll only pay them heed--that percentage of agriculture regimented for more than 3 decades has declined steadily in the per-capita consumption of its produce--the larger unregulated percentage has increased per capita consumption of its produce 30 percent.

Take the war on poverty---a matchless boondoggle, full of sound and fury, but still with no record of accomplishment to point to. No one quarrels with the announced humanitarian goals, only with the abandonment of tried and true principles and the seeming belief that no answer is satisfactory unless it is a government answer.

The latest is a multi-million dollar scheme to set the Zuni Indians up in a cooperative store to retail their handcraft jewelry. If it works (and the government says it will), they'll gross \$150,000 a year. Overlooked is the pertinent fact that the Zunis on their own already are doing \$2 million a year in the sale of their jewelry.

With some understandable satisfaction a month or two ago, we vetoed a project in California to teach people how to picket and demonstrate.

For two hundred years, American business and industry have fought the greatest war on poverty the world has ever known.

At the height of the great depression it was employing ninety percent of the nation's workers.

There were proposals then, you know, to help industry employ the other 10 percent. But the political climate shifted and we went instead to the handout, the dole and make-work projects, government-sponsored and government-run.

And the only way we eliminated those, the only way we recovered under that approach was to become involved in a war.

And the only way that approach still keeps the economy running high is by way of war, known today as police actions.

It should be obvious by now, although it doesn't seem to be in some quarters---that there must be another and better way.

It should be obvious by now that a self-annointed group of experts operating out of either Washington or Sacramento cannot have all the answers to the problems that beset us.

And it should also be obvious that the sophisticated approach of seeking complicated answers by government to complicated problems isn't necessarily the best approach.

Those of us who do not see a panacea in the approach of big brother and big government are often accused of over-simplifying, of not being aware of the complexities of modern day life.

I reject that thesis.

But I do say there are simple answers to many of our problems-- simple but hard.

Answers that mean we, as a people, turn to government only to help solve those problems we cannot solve ourselves. That we turn to local government, then to state government and only as a last resort do we turn to Washington.

These are answers that say the government handout and the government regulation are not the answer. These are answers that say the solutions to the people's problems lie with the people, that the people have genius and courage to solve their own problems.

This is what I meant when I talked about the creative society during the campaign last fall. This is what I mean today.

Government must help, surely, government often must show the way and government may coordinate. But government must not supersede the will of the people or the responsibilities of the people. The function of government is not to confer happiness, but to give men the opportunity to work out happiness for themselves.

The theory of Communism holds that government eventually will wither away. The theory of Socialism says that government is the answer to all the people's problems.

The theory of the creative society says that government is best when kept closest to and most responsive to the people.

And that is the direction in which we are attempting to move in Sacramento.

And that is why you have been hearing in recent months the outraged and anguished screams of those who do not trust the people to govern themselves.

Most of you know of our government efficiency task force that is studying state government in order to make it more efficient, more economical and better able to cope with the people's needs.

In fact, many of you and your firms have lent us some of the nearly 200 top-flight executives we have working on the project.

You would think--as I have thought--I guess we're all pretty naive sometimes--that the willingness of business, of industry, of private citizens to volunteer their time and their money to help their state would win unanimous approval.

This is not the case.

We have some of those disciples of "big government knows best" on our backs.

They don't think private citizens should be messing around with their government. They don't think you and I have any real right to know what's going on there.

And they're suspicious of their fellow citizens who want to save the taxpayers money instead of spend it. They cannot conceive of how an efficient government could still be a government responsive to the people's needs.

Well, we have heard the criticism. And I can assure you that this non-partisan group--made up of both Republicans and Democrats--is going to continue with its task.

Let me note here that it is making progress and that it is receiving excellent cooperation from the various departments of government.

I am grateful to Kenneth Pryor who is heading the task force and to all those helping him.

I am proud of those loyal, dedicated civil servants who make government function through thick and thin and who are cooperating to the best of their ability with Mr. Pryor.

And I am proud, too, that our approach to government has set a tone within the ranks of our civil servants that is different--- healthily different from past years.

Do you know that during the first three months of this year we paid out more than six times as much money as was paid last year as rewards for labor-saving and cost-saving suggestions. And we've had triple the number of suggestions we had last year under an administration with another approach to government.

But our task force is not alone in seeking to streamline state government.

Our General Services Administration under General Andrew Lolli is doing a tremendous job.

Almost every week the general sends in a list of savings accomplished by increased efficiencies and better business practices. Some are little, some are big.

For instance, on May 1st the General told us his department has disposed of enough real property this year to net the state nearly \$664 thousand. In contrast, he saved another \$2100 by consolidating bids on 22 refrigerators and freezers.

He also adopted a device invented by an employee that will save \$81,600 this year in the production of textbooks.

These are only a sample of the savings he has accomplished.

Some more of a major nature are in the works. And the General is not alone.

Just last week the Department of Public Works told us we will save \$14 million next year by not filling 1,224 budgeted positions.

In the last four months alone the hiring freeze in Public Works has saved \$900,000.

You remember that California road map with the picture of a California governor on it? Well, there won't be a governor's picture on those maps any more---in fact, there won't be any maps---and that will save us \$192,000 a year.

With the help of the Telephone Company, we've also looked at our telephone system. Some people had gotten pretty fancy---lots of extra phones, lots of fancy hookups. We're doing away with what we don't need and the minimum saving will be half a million dollars a year.

When we set out to trim the fat from government spending, we aimed for an average cutback of 10 percent per department, realizing, of course, that each department would vary.

As a result of those early efforts, we got an eight-and-a-half percent average reduction.

But then we discovered all the snipers in this country don't carry rifles. Some of them give speeches or write editorials. And they were quick to point the finger and the pen at that 8½ percent and to say that we had found we couldn't do it. Well, you can let the seeds spoil your enjoyment of watermelon, or you can just spit 'em out.

I can assure you tonight we will have that 10 percent and more. The cuts I've told you about today are in addition to that 8½ percent. And there will be more.

Your state government can be run efficiently and we intend that it will be.

But all our emphasis has not been on cuts and economies. This is not a negative administration; this is an administration that is working and will continue to work to meet the needs of the state and help the people solve their problems.

Now I recognize that not a great deal of legislation implementing our campaign promises has come down from the Legislature. And perhaps we won't get all or even most this year of what we are seeking.

But let me tell you, we'll keep trying until we do. We think the people are behind what we are trying to do and perhaps they'll make some changes next year to help us get it.

Fortunately, much of what must be done can be done by executive action and this is how we're doing it.

I needn't burden you with the details of what Chad McClellan did in Watts---more than 17,000 persons placed in jobs in less than a year---or go into the details of his statewide operation.

But I would like to say that in the Bay Area alone he has signed up 1,500 businesses and industries to participate in his program.

In addition, we are actively working on programs to provide summer jobs both in and out of government for students.

Let me digress a moment. I've often thought that the federal government in its desire to provide cradle-to-grave care for our citizens is one of the big reasons for juvenile delinquency. If it is true that idle hands do the devil's work, the opposite also is true---a kid working after school or during the summer doesn't have much time to get in trouble or even much time to think about getting in trouble.

But a kid standing on the corner watching all the girls go by may also decide to steal a car to take one of them out.

Once upon a time it was easy for a teenager to get a part-time job because it was easy for a merchant, or a manufacturer to hire him. But that's no longer true.

Rigid minimum wage laws, high union scales, and the mass of paperwork involved in withholding taxes, social security, insurance and the rest make it difficult to hire anyone on a part-time basis.

This is largely a federally-made problem and it's one we'll be lucky if we live long enough to see the federal government solve.

But if it were possible to hire a kid and pay him out of the day's receipts without going through all the paperwork and regulations, a lot more teenagers and students could get jobs.

They talk about complex problems. I say we have made many simple problems complex and incapable of simple solution.

Well, let me get back to some of the things we are trying to do for California, Californians and California's business and industry.

Without going into detail, we are working hard in several critical areas.

We are working with the construction industry to see what can be done to revitalize it. This is one of California's major industries and it has been hurting. And when it hurts, all of California's economy suffers. We think we see daylight ahead.

We are putting together a transportation committee that will look at California's entire transportation picture and will make specific recommendations not only to the states, but also to the communities. Rapid transit, freeway construction, air travel, rail travel, all will be studied. But mostly this committee will put together and sift all the studies that have already been made.

In agriculture, Earl Coke already is at work with the entire agri-business community to minimize the economic damage caused by crop losses brought about by late rains and flooding conditions.

We have reactivated and will revitalize the governor's Advisory Commission on Ocean Resources with the long-range aim of improving our ocean-oriented industries and developing new ones.

These are some of the things we are doing that look to the future.

But we are also working for the present.

Our Parks Department this year is opening many new park areas and hundreds of new camping sites.

We are working with the federal government toward a Redwood National Park, and we have made a major breakthrough in federal-state relations in this area. Fortunately, we didn't know you couldn't get the federal government to give up federally-owned land in exchange for our state-owned land, so now the federal government will repay us in kind for the land they take for parks and we have assurances that the lumbering industry we dispossess will be given federal timber lands nearby, thus saving the area's economy.

We have won federal agreement for a road to the new Mineral King recreational development that will provide hundreds of new jobs.

The list is not endless, but we have made a start in many areas. We have started to work to build our state's economy. We have started to return state government to the people and to make it once again the servant of the people.

And we have used the strength of the state to seek and get better treatment and more recognition from the federal government.

And this is only the beginning.

We will push forward on all these fronts and elsewhere.

For if we succeed here, if we show we can build a creative society at the state level, we can start a prairie fire that will sweep this country clean of big brother government and again permit government of and by the people to grow and flourish.

Our goal is as it has always been--freedom--and whatever the price, it's less than the cost of doing without it.

Freedom rests, and it always has, on individual responsibility, individual integrity, individual effort, individual courage and, yes, individual religious faith.

Yes, we'll make mistakes, but I figure a mistake is evidence that someone stopped talking and tried doing something.

#

5/20

Address by Governor Ronald Reagan
Chico State College

Installation of President Robert Hill
May 20, 1967

(transcript of a tape recording)

Chancellor Dumke, thank you. President Hill, my distinguished colleagues up here on the top shelf, I am glad that I am backed here today by two of your very able representatives in Sacramento, Senator Marler and Assemblyman Johnson. I feel greatly honored to be present at the investiture of a new president of Chico State College. I have been on a number of campuses lately in effigy; it is nice to be here in the flesh. This is not my first visit to Chico but it is to the State College campus. As a matter of fact, I remember during the campaign I saw a great deal of Chico--running around town trying to find where they had taken my rented car that had been towed away.

I was amused also in some of the remarks made here to discover how much we have in common. When the Chancellor spoke of the peaks and the valleys I was wondering just how many of the audience had me in the valley at the moment and whether anyone had me at a peak. I also was interested to note that the term "honeymoon" had been used, and I didn't realize that the president and I had so much in common. If his honeymoon has been like mine, I am sure both of us have a suspicion that romance is dead in California. It is interesting also to note that the last swearing-in that I participated in took place at

midnight, and now I have moved up to mid-day in the case of the president of the college; evidently outgoing presidents don't appoint judges.

But I am sure that the president and I have more than this in common. You know, I have learned that there is a little bit of protocol in my office. I didn't know that this was true, but it seems that everyone who enters my office must enter reciting a certain phrase--"we have a problem." And I discover that the "we" is all inclusive; I am in that "we," and involved in the problem. One day when things looked pretty dark up there, very dark as a matter of fact, some one of the staff said to me "well cheer up, things could be worse" and so I cheered up and sure enough they got worse.

But you know, I think we do have more in common than just misery. Both of us have a responsibility for a great educational system and the part it plays in our State of California. The people of this state have made it abundantly clear that they are aware of the importance of education. As a matter of fact, in just these last few years from the beginning of this decade, while our State budget for general fund spending has doubled, the budget for our state college system has tripled.

The original purpose of public educational systems was to provide an education for those who were unable to finance one in the existing independent colleges and universities. California has gone farther. We have a three-phase program--three sections to our higher educational system.

A junior college system carries out the original concept of providing education for all. The University accepts the responsibility for extended graduate training and research, and a truly great college system, of which this beautiful campus is a part, offers a premium type education to exceptionally qualified undergraduates. Now, both the University and Colleges emphasize individual scholastic ability rather than lack of ability to pay. I doubt if anyone would suggest that we return, in all three phases of this system, to that original concept of simply basing qualifications for the University on inability to provide an education for one's self. At the same time I doubt if anyone should say that we would stand still and make no effort to chart new paths.

Now, while it would be extravagant and foolish to let the colleges and universities duplicate each other's functions (for the colleges for example to usurp the functions of the university system), I see no reason why, when a State College does become in fact a university, that the State College should be denied the right to take the title of university instead of college.

Reference was made to an area to which Glenn Dumke and I are in great agreement. The colleges are bound down by a budget system which will give the new president no flexibility whatsoever in the use of funds provided for the running of his school -- a line-item budget in which every dollar itemized must be spent for that item with no opportunity to change course in the middle of the year, or if an emergency arises, or to use

the dollars more advantageously if one can see a way to do that. While it would require legislation, I, as the Governor, will support every effort to provide the State Colleges with a program-type budget so that this flexibility will be there, so that those entrusted with administering the college are able to use their judgment, within, of course, those reasonable limits imposed by the Trustees. This is especially important when the funds fall short and we are unable to do all that we would like to do, which I think is all the time.

The problem of financing this educational program grows greater, and it grows greater nationwide. A number of foundations have announced studies into the future financing of higher education; without exception those studies have indicated that our traditional method of financing through general tax funds is now, or soon will be, inadequate if the quality of education is to be maintained. In California our situation is already at the emergency red point. We have a fiscal crisis brought on by years of faulty tailoring. Someone left a hole in the pocket. Now our citizens are paying the highest tax rate of any people anywhere in the United States, and they are going to be forced to accept an even additional burden in the coming year because of this faulty tailoring. The alternative of reducing the quality of education is unthinkable. It leaves us with no other choice but to sew up the hole in the pocket and to explore every possibility for other sources of revenue.

It was in this frame of reference that a suggestion was made to ask those receiving education to share at least in a portion of its cost; and let me point out that any such move, I have always insisted, must be accompanied by a plan that insures that no qualified student should be denied an education because of his inability to pay his share. I have asked the educational community to join in exploring a variety of methods to implement this, ranging from scholarships to "learn now--pay later" schemes or a combination of both or whatever new we come up with; and none of this was new with us. Indeed our own Coordinating Council for Higher Education has studied this problem and my predecessor made it known that he held the belief that the imposition of such a sharing of the cost was inevitable. It just happened to be my luck that "inevitable," like the present summer weather, came a little early.

But aside from the fiscal need, I would like to touch on this subject from the philosophical view point. Cries have been raised that we always have had free education in California. Well, I challenge this. Our students at present pay a portion of their education through fees, student fees. What has been suggested is not so much a drastic departure as an increase in what has already been going on.

To those who base their argument on the 99-year tradition of "free education," may I suggest that perhaps we have a greater tradition, one of self-reliance, of personal strength and integrity, and the tradition that those who can pay more,

do so, to make it possible for those less fortunate to share in our bounty. And I think it is time to switch to that greater tradition.

Today there is great concern among my generation that an era of permissiveness has resulted in unrest among our young people. But just to keep things in balance there is a wide-spread feeling among our young people that no one over 30 understands them. I would like to point out that understanding is a two-way street. I would think that for our young people intellectual curiosity alone would prompt the students to do a little research in that older generation. After all there is one attractive thing we have to look at; we are the only ones in this confrontation who have been both ages.

Now it might be reassuring to the young to know as they start to catch up with us, that growing old isn't bad when you consider the alternative. You know, I have no apology to make for our generation. Mistakes we've made to be sure. We haven't achieved all that we would like to have achieved. But still we are a generation that has lived through three world wars and a cataclysmic depression that shook the very foundation of our nation. I believe basically our generation has remained true to our belief in simple justice. We have remained compassionate to those less fortunate. We have stood firm in our duties to those who would come after us. At the same time, let me say, on behalf of you here in this younger generation, I think all of us are frank to admit you have more knowledge than we had at your age, are far better informed, and you are

far more aware of the winds that are swirling about and bringing changes in this world of ours. So I think with good will on both sides there are plenty of areas where we can get together.

There are those who employ academic freedom as justification for a license to go their way without interference, and under this high-sounding term the idea has been advanced that students and faculty should determine all educational policy without restraint. It is an interesting note that this is advanced as something new, as progress toward the future. In truth it is a return to something we knew in the medieval times. Back in the 11th century the University of Bologna had given so much authority in this way to the students that they could punish professors for being tardy, for not teaching as the students decreed they should teach. The students had the right to mark off the pages of the text books and to insist that the professors keep up and teach day by day as they had marked off the book. They even granted vacations, set pay scales, and hired and fired.

Now the teachers have understandably interpreted academic freedom to be their right to teach without political interference. In a sense of using education to promote partisan political viewpoints there can be no quarrel with this. Contrary to some of the charges that have been leveled in a kind of emotional atmosphere in the last few months, I want to assure you that my administration will resist any attempt to inject politics into our higher educational system and indeed we will work to remove any customs that have been inherited from the past which have

allowed a political foot in the door in this partisan sense in higher education.

But I think there is a third element in academic freedom. In addition to the rights of the students to learn, and the teachers to teach, there is the right of society to insist the educational system it supports will further the goals and the aspirations and the moral principles and precepts of that society. There is no question that the publicly-supported colleges and universities contributed to the emerging greatness not only of California but also of our nation, and that is good; but we have a right to insure that they do not, in some far-out interpretation of "freedom," weaken the social structure essential to the nation's strength and to the perpetuation of these very educational institutions.

In short, our great educational institutions exist, not for the teacher or for the student alone, but for all of society.

We have in California a piece of legislation born of the people's right to know, and I would like to quote to you the preamble because it is so much more than just an introduction to a piece of legislation. It says "The people of this state do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve them. The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servant the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people insist on remaining informed so they may retain control over the instruments that they have created."

In contrast to the permissiveness I have mentioned and which concerns so many of us today, I would like to point out a statement made by the late Winston Churchill. He said "When great forces are on the move in the world we learn we are spirits, not animals." There is something going on in time and space and beyond time and space which, whether we like it or not, spells duty. It is adherence to this sense of duty that has made us of another generation provide these educational institutions. And we have a right to hope that the young people taking advantage of them will pick up, when their time comes, that sense of duty and perpetuate them, perpetuate them in a spirit of learning and research and not in furthering propaganda or partisan viewpoints.

Reference was made earlier to the television broadcast I participated in the other night. I don't know how many of you saw it; it was shocking, at least to one of us on that program, to hear these educated young people from universities all over the world in their diatribes against this country and the great outburst of anti-Americanism. My first reaction was they had been brainwashed. Then my second reaction was we had failed somehow to sell our image; but I think perhaps if part of either of those views is true, there is another (that could be of more concern to us)--that perhaps we ourselves in recent years have blurred our image.

We tried to buy love in the world when we should have been earning respect. We have been so obsessed with mass movements, we have forgotten the sanctity of the individual, and have forgotten that this country unlike almost every country

in the world was founded on the belief--not of the common man-- but founded on the belief that each one of us is an individual.

They talk of the common man. Yes, we are common men, common in our determination to provide justice, a common viewpoint with regard to compassion for our fellow men, our willingness to lend a helping hand, and a common determination in the preservation of our individual freedom, and that leads us to the fact that actually we are uncommon people.

We, or those who came here in our families ahead of us, had only in common a great desire for individual freedom and the courage to go abroad in the world seeking it. When we are sick we want an uncommon doctor, when we are at war we want uncommon generals and admirals, when we pick a college president we want an uncommon educator and administrator for that job.

I think what I would say, if I could to the young people present, that all we ask of you is to weigh carefully all of the ideas that are being advanced for your consideration and your well being. Weigh them and if at any time they offer something that seems to spell out some kind of freedom from some disaster, some freedom or security, but in return you must give up some of your right to choose as an individual then you make your mind up that the price is too high. We are a compassionate people. I believe we should keep forever our tradition of building a floor beneath which no human being should live in degradation. But I think that if you are true to the heritage we are trying to pass on to you, you will insist at all times that you have

a sacred right to fly as high and as far as your own strength and ability will take you, and that is the national purpose of this country, and that national purpose should be upheld at all times by the educational institutions of this country.

Again my congratulations to you and to your new president. My thanks for being here.

###

.6-1-67

SUPPLEMENTARY TAX MESSAGE TO THE LEGISLATURE

To the Senate and Assembly of the Legislature of California:

In conformity with established practice, the Department of Finance in May updated its General Fund revenue estimates for the current fiscal year and for the 1967-68 budget period in the light of recent developments. Director of Finance Gordon P. Smith reports that cash receipts in the present year will be \$47.6 million below the projections made last December, and that the budget year will fall short of expectations by \$41.5 million, despite a probable improvement in business activity.

This adjustment in the estimate of current receipts also necessitates a \$10 million decrease in the estimate of revenue to be received under the tax program which I recommended to you on March 8, 1967. Therefore, total reduction in General Fund cash income available to finance the 1967-68 budget is \$99.1 million. Details of the many revisions making up this total are shown in two tables accompanying this message.

As a result of this change, we are confronted with two alternative choices of action: a further reduction in the proposed expenditure program or adjustments in the recommended tax program for 1967-68.

I anticipate that further savings will result from the intensive study being made of California's expenditure program by our organized task forces of businessmen. But this will require time, careful analysis and coordinated adjustments in many areas of State activity. A further cost reduction of \$100 million, however, cannot be achieved immediately.

I wish to reemphasize the important need for property tax relief as described in my Tax Message of March 8, and further urge that the recommended program not be eliminated as a means of adjustment for the revenue loss. California stands first among the states in property tax collections per capita.

(M O R E)

We lead the major industrial states in the ratio of property taxes to personal income. Rather than retreat from the goal of tax relief, we must lay plans now to expand the program in 1968-69, not only for the homeowner but also to seek methods which will make this State more attractive to business and industry. Only in this way can we expect to create the 250,000 new jobs required annually to accommodate our continuing population growth.

We must, therefore, select the second of the choices available to us: an expansion in our recommended tax program. To that end, I propose adopting the following changes in the tax provisions of Senate Bill 556 by Senator George Deukmejian:

	<u>Estimated Revenue 1967-68 in millions</u>	
	<u>Cash</u>	<u>Accrual</u>
1. Adopt the federal realty transfer tax when that levy terminates January 1, 1968	\$ 5.0	\$ 7.5
2. Conform the present \$4,000 annual gift tax exclusion to the federal allowances of \$3,000	0.7	0.7
3. Raise the insurance gross premiums tax from 2.33% to 2.6%, the level which prevailed from 1921 to 1943.	17.5	21.5
4. Extend the sales and use tax to:		
(a) Services involving repairs to tangible personal property. Such activities are now taxable as to parts used in repairs and alterations.	35.0	42.0
(b) Sales of gas and electricity for other than residential use.	45.0	60.0
TOTALS	<u>\$103.2</u>	<u>\$131.7</u>

It is estimated that these changes will produce approximately \$150 million in 1968-69. Consequently, it will both meet the \$99.1 million gap between expenditure proposals and anticipated revenues, and also will help place us on a pay-as-you-go basis for State capital outlay expenditures in 1968-69. This has been an expressed objective of the Legislature for several years.

Extension of the sales tax to repair services and to sales of gas and electricity (non-residential uses) also will make possible additional revenue for counties and cities under the Bradley-Burns Uniform Local Sales and Use Tax Act. The \$25 million of potential local government receipts from these sources will relieve to some further extent the intense pressure of property tax levies and will

However, it will be necessary to enact enabling legislation to allow amendments to county and city sales tax ordinances. These ordinances should be amended immediately, and I ask that you adopt the enabling legislation as an urgency matter.

We cannot delay action which will place this State on a sound financial basis. The State's revenue problem has been recognized for several years by responsible people in government and in the private sector of our economy. With this objective in mind, I urgently recommend your favorable action on the proposals I have made.

Respectfully,

RONALD REAGAN
Governor

#

TABLE 1
 REVISED ESTIMATES OF GENERAL FUND REVENUE
 1966-67 AND 1967-68
ACCRUAL BASIS

(In thousands)

Source Tax or Other	1966-67				1967-68			
	Budget*	Revised	Change		Budget*	Revised	Change	
			Amount	%			Amount	%
Alcoholic beverages:								
Beer and wine	\$14,700	\$14,514	-\$186	-1.3	\$14,240	\$14,100	-\$140	-1.0
Distilled spirits	65,950	64,625	-1,325	-2.0	64,350	62,800	-1,550	-2.4
License fees	3,445	3,445	-	-	3,480	3,482	+2	-
Bank and corporation	476,500	462,000	-14,500	-3.0	454,000	430,000	-24,000	-5.3
Cigarette	78,200	78,300	100	0.1	77,050	76,500	-550	-0.7
Gift	10,200	8,800	-1,400	-13.7	10,050	10,150	100	1.0
Horseracing	40,032	39,857	-175	-0.4	44,991	44,450	-541	-1.2
Inheritance	142,500	129,000	-13,500	-9.5	127,500	123,800	-3,700	-2.9
Insurance	136,900	141,700	4,800	3.5	117,300	122,250	4,950	4.2
Personal income	538,900**	523,900	-15,000	-2.8	554,100	546,900	-7,200	-1.3
Private car	2,481	2,477	-4	-0.1	2,700	2,750	50	1.9
Sales and use	1,234,700	1,217,200	-17,500	-1.4	1,138,600	1,127,400	-11,200	-1.0
Total taxes	\$2,744,508	\$2,685,818	-\$58,690	-2.2	\$2,608,361	\$2,564,582	-\$43,779	-1.7
Other revenue	135,991	143,582	7,591	5.6	117,527	123,168	5,641	4.8
Total revenue	\$2,880,499	\$2,829,400	-\$51,099	-1.8	\$2,725,889	\$2,687,750	-\$38,139	-1.4
Totals, Cash basis	\$2,620,088	\$2,572,500	-\$47,588	-1.8	\$2,710,359	\$2,668,880	-\$41,479	-1.5

*As shown in Schedule 2A of the 1967-68 Budget.

**As adjusted by provisions of Chapter 44, Statutes of 1967.

TABLE 2

REVISED ESTIMATES OF ADDITIONAL
GENERAL FUND REVENUE UNDER THE
GOVERNOR'S TAX RECOMMENDATIONS
(SENATE BILL 556)

(In Millions)

Tax	1967-68		1968-69	
	Cash	Accrual	Cash	Accrual
Sales and use--1% increase	\$321	\$374	\$400	\$400
Distilled spirits--75¢ per gal. increase	30	33	34	34
Tobacco:				
Cigarettes - 3½¢ increase	72*	78*	79	79
Cigars and smoking tobacco - 25% wholesale price	13+	13+	12+	12+
Bank and corporation 1% rate increase	87	87	70	70
Personal income--increase from adjusting bracket structure, raising maximum rate to 10%, and adopting credits in lieu of exemptions	<u>332</u>	<u>355</u>	<u>385</u>	<u>390</u>
Totals	\$855	\$940	\$980	\$985
Change from original estimate	-10	-6	0	0

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Lyn Nofziger
445-4571

RELEASE: FLAT A.M. 'S
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
MARINE TECHNOLOGY SOCIETY BANQUET
San Diego - June 6, 1967

I am not here tonight to speak as a would be expert in a highly varied and highly technical field.

Neither am I here to look into what I am certain will be an exciting future rivaling or exceeding anything dreamed of by Jules Verne or even seen on television.

But I do want to look for a few moments at the many areas that encompass the broad field of Oceanography, to look at some of the challenges that face us and to tell you how we in California hope to face up to those challenges.

Oceanography has important long range implications to the U.S. and to the world, and especially to those areas bordering on the seas.

There is little argument that sea water, sea life, both plant and animal, and sea bottoms contain the potential vastly to expand our food production, our mineral production and in general the world's wealth.

And, of course, advancing technology makes it increasingly apparent that the oceans in the not too distant future can supply major amounts of potable water to our coastal areas.

Here in California where we have large water-short areas we are vitally interested in desalinization concepts and processes.

We have watched with deep interest the progress made in recent years in bringing down the price of desalinized water to the point where today it is becoming feasible to use it in our city water systems.

In fact if the off-shore plant which will function from a man-made island off Huntington Beach operates as expected when completed in 1972, we will finally have what is pretty close to a major breakthrough in the production of fresh water -- 20 cents for every thousand gallons, and 150 million gallons of water a day.

Since water is of such tremendous importance to California let me digress just a moment to mention that sea water is only one of several possibilities for furnishing fresh water to our growing millions.

Ocean-oriented engineers have also talked of bringing water to Southern California in huge pipes laid off our coast either from the mouth of the Columbia River or perhaps from the mouth of the Feather.

Many experts believe this is possible but certainly much more research and engineering study must be done before we can say it is practical. And of course at this end it must meet one of the same obstacles that desalinized water faces. It must be pumped from sea-level to those areas needing it.

If such a project is otherwise practical this one obstacle is not insurmountable. Our great California water project will pump water over the Techapis and into our arid areas south of the mountains. And, of course, water from the Colorado is pumped in also.

A third area is that of reclaimed water. A good share of our water is used only once and then is carried off to sea. While the subject of reclaiming water may not be a proper one for an oceanographic meeting, certainly the development of ways and means to reclaim waste water is vital to our future. There are indications that this not only might be the cheapest solution to our long-range water problems, but it is also evident that a successful solution would minimize the need for further importation of water.

Sometimes I wonder where we might be today had we had the vision to look at the sea and at water reclamation methods 30 or 40 years ago and had spent on these projects just a fraction of the amount we have spent in bringing water in from the Colorado and down from the north.

But the problem of fresh water is only one of the many problems facing California, the Pacific coast and much of the world today that oceanographers can help solve.

The excitement and titillation of oceanography is the picture of the futuristic submarine and the man in the diving suit, it is the talk of distilling gold and other precious minerals from sea water, it is the vision of supplying world food needs from the sea.

But much of this futuristic world is already here. In fact, magnesium, bromine and potassium have been extracted commercially from the waters off America and one of California's major salt suppliers extracts its product solely from the sea.

New-type submarines and diving bells with arm-like mechanical claws are already exploring the oceans at great depths.

And aquaculture is becoming increasingly important in Japan including establishment of an oyster program in California which now produces 7610 million pounds annually. Small scale projects also are underway in the United States, but studies indicate there is much to be done in this area before sea-farming as differentiated from commercial fishing becomes an important source of the world's food.

While exploring the possibilities the ocean offers in new or exotic fields, we should not overlook these areas in which man has used the ocean since time immemorial -- fishing and commerce.

Both of these fields are of vital importance to California, to the West Coast and to the entire Pacific basin.

Some of you may not be aware of it but for years San Pedro has been one of the world's major fishing ports and San Diego has been not far behind.

But irresponsible commercial fishing, primarily by other nations has cut into the world's supply of edible fish such as tuna. Both a research program and international agreements are needed to develop and control means of levelling out catches and insuring sustained yields of commercial fishes.

Already great strides have been made in converting some species of fish, once thought of as non-edible, into fish flour, but more can be done in this area. A 1964 study found that the amount of animal protein needed for the entire world could be obtained by a mere 30 percent increase in the world fish catch, provided of course the means of distribution could be found.

But distribution of goods and things by sea is an area where we in the U. S. are falling badly behind.

California harbors, for instance, cannot handle the superships now being built. Japan, for instance, has one ship with a capacity of 150,000 tons and a draft of 66 feet, seven inches. San Francisco's main ship channel has a depth of just 45 feet.

It is obvious that either harbors must be improved or new and economical methods of off-shore loading and unloading must be found.

Largely because of economic conditions the U. S. in general has fallen farther and farther behind the rest of the world in shipbuilding and in cargo hauling.

California shipyards now operate at less than half their capacity. America's share of ocean-going cargo is constantly decreasing.

Here are areas where American ingenuity, inventiveness and initiative can change the picture, especially if government, industry and labor are willing to cooperate with each other.

In California we hope and plan to have a major hand in that change. Just as we also plan to take a major part in studying the ocean itself, its effect on climate, and its resources.

We think California, with its 1200-mile coast line, with its research and technology oriented industries and universities, with its great numbers of qualified and brilliant engineers and scientists, should lead the way.

California has much to gain from a determined effort to orient itself toward the ocean.

Our rapidly growing population needs not only water; it also needs jobs. Heretofore we have been a state oriented to agriculture and defense industries. Agriculture must continue to play a major role in the state's economy, and defense will also be of vast importance in the foreseeable future.

But we should not depend on federal funds as the basis for an industrial economy and advancing technologies will continue to cut down the numbers employed in agri-business while at the same time increasing production.

Therefore, California must turn in other directions to prepare for the future. One direction is west and that way lies the ocean.

California already has a solid oceanographic foundation. In the area of research we have the Scripps Institution at La Jolla. A group of our state colleges has banded together for further research at Moss Landing on the Monterey Bay. Our department of fish and game operates two research vessels but these are pretty much limited in areas of commercial and sports fishing. They seek to establish fish immigration habits and find other information of importance in the two industries.

Industry has become more and more aware of the ocean potential. Lockheed Board Chairman, Daniel L. Haughton, for instance, has called for the aerospace and petroleum industries "to join forces in exploration and development of the Continental Shelves."

Certainly, similar arrangements might mutually benefit many of our industries.

This state administration feels it has an obligation to lead the way. Not to tell business and industry and research what must be done, not to dip deep into the taxpayers pocket to provide a kind of subsidized approach, but instead to encourage, to work with and to provide the kind of governmental climate in which the many facets of oceanography can become meaningful, can spur the economy and increase our progress.

We have already begun.

I have appointed an expert in the field, Col. T. R. Gillenwaters, as a special advisor to lead this effort.

We have re-activated the Governor's Advisory Commission on Ocean Resources. This is made up of top men in the oceanographic field, many of whom are here tonight.

I would like at this moment to salute them and thank them for their willingness to help in this effort.

This Commission, called GACOR, already has recommended creation of an interagency council for ocean resources. If our studies find this practical, such a council could well be the forerunner to a state office of Marine Resources.

Such an office could correlate interstate activities as well as coordinating federal-state activities and above all, offering support and help to the independent sector which, after all, must provide the main thrust if California is to develop as a major sea state.

But we envision looking beyond the borders of California, also. A sea-oriented state must look to others with the same interests and the same problems.

As soon as it can be conveniently done, I hope to meet with my fellow Governors from Washington, Oregon, Hawaii and Alaska to discuss the concept of a Pacific Basin Community.

Such a community eventually could look toward working with our neighbors of both the north and south, Canada and Mexico, in solving mutual problems, exchanging ideas and information.

A Pacific Basin Community of states could activate broad programs involving cooperation among the states, the federal government and the independent sector.

These programs could be as wide and varied as the field of oceanography itself.

These would include research into utilization of ocean resources, resolution of maritime legal questions; tax incentives; review and analysis of all related federal and state legislation, ways of improving maritime trade, fisheries research and development; ways and means of expanding mineral and oil exploration along the Continental Shelf, desalinization; pollution control in tidal and bay areas; improved weather and tide forecasting, and expanded recreational facilities.

In an era of spending billions for space exploration and many billions more for defense and for social experiments, the oceans have been largely overlooked except as how they affect the military.

The time has come to end the oversight, the time has come to look to the seas as we build for the future.

In California, at least, we intend to do just that.

#

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
PACIFIC COAST BUILDERS ASSOCIATION
SAN FRANCISCO June 8, 1967

I didn't come over here to talk about our problems in the legislature. You don't want to hear my problems when you've got problems of your own. I don't mean to imply that we're going to solve either yours or mine at this meeting but at least we can talk about them.

But first I do want to announce one bit of moral support we have to offer. At the request of a lot of people from your industry and from my administration I have proclaimed this as "California Home Improvement Month".

Actually, as you know Nancy and I celebrated Home Improvement Month a little early -- we moved. We had thought about making the mansion a project in Home Improvement but we figured we'd have to declare a Home Improvement Year, and invite the neighbors over to help.

Seriously Home Improvement Month is a good idea. It points up the fact that a family should have pride in its home -- and incidently it also sells a few building materials, some paint and a little hardware and gives some carpenters and contractors and plumbers and painters and electricians something to do. This administration doesn't think that's a bad idea.

As a matter of fact we think Home Improvement Month is such a good idea we were going to declare it last month but the weather was so bad we didn't think you'd get the full benefit from it. And after some of the weather we've had this month we may call the whole thing off, and call it Weather Improvement Month.

I do want to talk seriously a moment because I know your industry has been in a slump and when a major industry runs into problems the repercussions are felt in almost every other civilian oriented business and industry in the state.

You can't cut back on building without affecting the groceryman, the furniture and appliance dealer, the auto dealer and your government.

In Sacramento our entire tax structure and our budget is predicated on a booming economy. If that slumps then tax revenues fall and we either cut back on programs or increase taxes, which only adds to the problem.

One of the promises of our campaign and one of the aims of this administration is to improve the business climate in any way we can. Because the factors making up that climate are so interlocked we have to pay special heed when any one area is particularly hard-pressed and right now one of those areas is the home construction area.

But improving that climate will take more than just government. It will also take the help and cooperation of industry and business organizations and you as individuals.

At our end we are striving to improve our help and service to business, but we are also asking for and getting the help of the independent sector -- that fancy phrase for you people here -- you who work for the government and pay for the privilege.

I am convinced that if we work together -- government departments with each other and government with industry that we can end this slump even quicker than it now appears to be ending.

Let me tell you some of the things we are doing. We have established a task force on the building and construction industry which already has held several meetings. This committee is looking at a number of ways to improve the building climate. It is examining the situation to see if any new legislation is needed:

It is seeing where and how we can cut government red tape that might be a part of your problems.

It is examining the need for a possible supplemental money market.

It is looking at areas where it can assist the labor and building trades council

This task force is working closely with our Housing and Community Development Department.

The department, under the direction of Chuck LeMenager, is being re-oriented more in line with our thinking and philosophy regarding the role of government in a free society. A relatively new department, Housing and Community Development once looked almost entirely at the state's role in federal public housing projects.

But we don't believe those are the answers either to your problems or to the problems of our low and middle income families.

First of all, less than 35,000 public housing units have been built in California, less than one-20th of the low income family need.

Second and even more important, public housing basically is rental housing and often is subsidized housing.

Rental or subsidized housing does not build pride or breed a feeling of responsibility.

It is no coincidence that in areas where we have large public housing projects we also have major social problems.

Public housing too often becomes public slum housing. It is not and cannot be the answer to either our housing or our social problems.

We must look elsewhere for the largest part of our low-income housing; we must find ways of making it possible for a man to own a home as long as he is a working member of society.

This of course is no easy problem. On the average, a man can afford a home valued at between two and two and a half times his annual gross income. This means a man making a hundred dollars a week must have a home somewhere in the \$10,000 to \$12,500 price range. If he makes \$8,000 a year his home by this standard should cost between 16 and 20 thousand dollars, and therein lies a challenge.

Recently a metropolitan paper ran a story about a new development of 1,000 low-cost homes. But prices actually started at \$17,995. This is undoubtedly low cost to some but not to a sizable group in the below median income range.

Is subsidy, either federal or state, the answer to this problem? Or does the answer perhaps lie in finding better, cheaper ways of home construction, in better land utilization, in providing financial terms a low-income family can afford?

And doesn't it lie in convincing the low income wage earner that a home is a precious possession, worth working for, worth saving for, worth owning and worth keeping?

There are lessons to be learned in this area from the auto industry, from the television and radio manufacturers, from all those industries that have convinced everyman that he must have what they manufacture and that he can afford it because they have built one in his price range.

Sometimes I wonder at the logic or lack of it that tells a man he has enough money to buy a 3,000 dollar car over a three year period but that he cannot buy a \$15,000 house over a 20 year period.

I think the first thing an industry must have in order to push into a new area are facts. I have asked Chuck LeMenagar to gather facts through his Department and make them available both to industry and to government.

Incidentally, let me tell you about the kind of cooperation we are beginning to get in this effort.

One of the first things being done is to find out how many new, unsold housing units we have in the state. Now the Housing and Community Development Department has no money for this kind of survey so they have turned to business--in this case, the California Real Estate Association. And the CREA has acted quickly to meet the need. Through its members throughout the state, the CREA is taking this census for us and will make the results available to us, and therefore to you.

This is a survey that will prove of benefit not only to you, and to the CREA, but also to those in the business of making home loans.

I have also asked the Housing Department to take other steps to gather and make available any other data that is meaningful to your industry and the related business.

In other attempts to help the building industry, I am supporting the concept of the National Home Ownership Act which is currently before Congress. Hopefully, this act will cut federal red tape and give private enterprise a free-hand in the effort to provide more low-cost housing.

I have also endorsed your efforts to get legislation which will provide the necessary funds through market orders collected a

your industry--to do the vast research and development needed to promote greater home building activity.

I was pleased to note that Ward Crump on Monday predicted an upsurge in home building here in California.

But his other remarks indicated that the home builders still have not found a way to tap the low-income market. He predicts that financing will be more expensive and that a shortage of construction workers will mean an increase in costs.

And therein also lies a challenge. A nation that can harness the atom or develop a mechanical tomato picker can also find a way to beat the high cost of building labor.

If you can meet that challenge, and if we can help you meet the other problems you face, then we can have the best of both worlds-- a healthy building industry and homes at prices most of our families can afford.

These are goals worth working for. This Administration will do its best to carry its share of the load. And I have confidence that if you can work with a government that helps and does not hinder, that you will carry your share.

In a Creative Society, business and government working together can solve all the problems that face it.

I believe that here in California we can build more than just homes; I believe that we have the kind of genius and the kind of initiative in both government and the independent sector to build a Creative Society under which we can all prosper.

#

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
PACIFIC COAST BUILDERS ASSOCIATION
SAN FRANCISCO June 8, 1967

I didn't come over here to talk about our problems in the legislature. You don't want to hear my problems when you've got problems of your own. I don't mean to imply that we're going to solve either yours or mine at this meeting but at least we can talk about them.

But first I do want to announce one bit of moral support we have to offer. At the request of a lot of people from your industry and from my administration I have proclaimed this as "California Home Improvement Month".

Actually, as you know Nancy and I celebrated Home Improvement Month a little early -- we moved. We had thought about making the mansion a project in Home Improvement but we figured we'd have to declare a Home Improvement Year, and invite the neighbors over to help.

Seriously Home Improvement Month is a good idea. It points up the fact that a family should have pride in its home -- and incidently it also sells a few building materials, some paint and a little hardware and gives some carpenters and contractors and plumbers and painters and electricians something to do. This administration doesn't think that's a bad idea.

As a matter of fact we think Home Improvement Month is such a good idea we were going to declare it last month but the weather was so bad we didn't think you'd get the full benefit from it. And after some of the weather we've had this month we may call the whole thing off, and call it Weather Improvement Month.

I do want to talk seriously a moment because I know your industry has been in a slump and when a major industry runs into problems the repercussions are felt in almost every other civilian oriented business and industry in the state.

You can't cut back on building without affecting the groceryman, the furniture and appliance dealer, the auto dealer and your government.

In Sacramento our entire tax structure and our budget is predicated on a booming economy. If that slumps then tax revenues fall and we either cut back on programs or increase taxes, which only adds to the problem.

One of the promises of our campaign and one of the aims of this administration is to improve the business climate in any way we can. Because the factors making up that climate are so interlocked we have to pay special heed when any one area is particularly hard-pressed and right now one of those areas is the home construction area.

But improving that climate will take more than just government. It will also take the help and cooperation of industry and business organizations and you as individuals.

At our end we are striving to improve our help and service to business, but we are also asking for and getting the help of the independent sector -- that fancy phrase for you people here -- you who work for the government and pay for the privilege.

I am convinced that if we work together -- government departments with each other and government with industry that we can end this slump even quicker than it now appears to be ending.

Let me tell you some of the things we are doing. We have established a task force on the building and construction industry which already has held several meetings. This committee is looking at a number of ways to improve the building climate. It is examining the situation to see if any new legislation is needed:

It is seeing where and how we can cut government red tape that might be a part of your problems.

It is examining the need for a possible supplemental money market.

It is looking at areas where it can assist the labor and building trades council

This task force is working closely with our Housing and Community Development Department.

The department, under the direction of Chuck LeMenager, is being re-oriented more in line with our thinking and philosophy regarding the role of government in a free society. A relatively new department, Housing and Community Development once looked almost entirely at the state's role in federal public housing projects.

But we don't believe those are the answers either to your problems or to the problems of our low and middle income families.

First of all, less than 35,000 public housing units have been built in California, less than one-20th of the low income family need.

Second and even more important, public housing basically is rental housing and often is subsidized housing.

Rental or subsidized housing does not build pride or breed a feeling of responsibility.

It is no coincidence that in areas where we have large public housing projects we also have major social problems.

Public housing too often becomes public slum housing. It is not and cannot be the answer to either our housing or our social problems.

We must look elsewhere for the largest part of our low-income housing; we must find ways of making it possible for a man to own a home as long as he is a working member of society.

This of course is no easy problem. On the average, a man can afford a home valued at between two and two and a half times his annual gross income. This means a man making a hundred dollars a week must have a home somewhere in the \$10,000 to \$12,500 price range. If he makes \$8,000 a year his home by this standard should cost between 16 and 20 thousand dollars, and therein lies a challenge.

Recently a metropolitan paper ran a story about a new development of 1,000 low-cost homes. But prices actually started at \$17,995. This is undoubtedly low cost to some but not to a sizable group in the below median income range.

Is subsidy, either federal or state, the answer to this problem? Or does the answer perhaps lie in finding better, cheaper ways of home construction, in better land utilization, in providing financial terms a low-income family can afford?

And doesn't it lie in convincing the low income wage earner that a home is a precious possession, worth working for, worth saving for, worth owning and worth keeping?

There are lessons to be learned in this area from the auto industry, from the television and radio manufacturers, from all those industries that have convinced everyman that he must have what they manufacture and that he can afford it because they have built one in his price range.

Sometimes I wonder at the logic or lack of it that tells a man he has enough money to buy a 3,000 dollar car over a three year period but that he cannot buy a \$15,000 house over a 20 year period.

I think the first thing an industry must have in order to push into a new area are facts. I have asked Chuck LeMenager to gather facts through his Department and make them available both to industry and to government.

Incidentally, let me tell you about the kind of cooperation we are beginning to get in this effort.

One of the first things being done is to find out how many new, unsold housing units we have in the state. Now the Housing and Community Development Department has no money for this kind of survey so they have turned to business--in this case, the California Real Estate Association. And the CREA has acted quickly to meet the need. Through its members throughout the state, the CREA is taking this census for us and will make the results available to us, and therefore to you.

This is a survey that will prove of benefit not only to you, and to the CREA, but also to those in the business of making home loans.

I have also asked the Housing Department to take other steps to gather and make available any other data that is meaningful to your industry and the related business.

In other attempts to help the building industry, I am supporting the concept of the National Home Ownership Act which is currently before Congress. Hopefully, this act will cut federal red tape and give private enterprise a free-hand in the effort to provide more low-cost housing.

I have also endorsed your efforts to get legislation which will provide the necessary funds through market

your industry- to do the vast research and development needed to promote greater home building activity.

I was pleased to note that Ward Crump on Monday predicted an upsurge in home building here in California.

But his other remarks indicated that the home builders still have not found a way to tap the low-income market. He predicts that financing will be more expensive and that a shortage of construction workers will mean an increase in costs.

And therein also lies a challenge. A nation that can harness the atom or develop a mechanical tomato picker can also find a way to beat the high cost of building labor.

If you can meet that challenge, and if we can help you meet the other problems you face, then we can have the best of both worlds-- a healthy building industry and homes at prices most of our families can afford.

These are goals worth working for. This Administration will do its best to carry its share of the load. And I have confidence that if you can work with a government that helps and does not hinder, that you will carry your share.

In a Creative Society, business and government working together can solve all the problems that face it.

I believe that here in California we can build more than just homes; I believe that we have the kind of genius and the kind of initiative in both government and the independent sector to build a Creative Society under which we can all prosper.

#

6/11

REMARKS BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN - ISRAEL RALLY
Hollywood Bowl - Los Angeles - June 11, 1967

It is fitting that we gather here for this humanitarian purpose. While war is man's greatest folly and man's most cherished dream is of a world at peace, we know war still has the capacity to bring out the finest and most noble side of man.

This is an example. For always that nobler evidence of man's link with the divine is his willingness to bind up the wounds, ease the pain and bring aid to those who paid the full price of war.

May I express the hope that our efforts today may bring help to the families of those Americans who died in that tragic moment when friend failed to recognize friend.

But now let us pray for statemanship to bring the victor and the vanquished to the conference table with no spirit of vengeance or conquest. Let us have statesmanship to make a true peace, not an uneasy truce, while the grudges and mistrust are perpetuated. Let those who have lived in that land since man's beginning settle their differences with justice and recognition of the rights of each sovereign state and of individual men to choose their own destiny.

For one thing above all is important to remember; the men who died on both sides were in truth all casualties of the cold war. The real villain who stirred the witches brew until it boiled over into war was not in the battle. Having done his evil work, he stood aside as he has in each of the world's trouble spots. He stands now revealed at last as pursuing his goal of aggression with the Hitlerian tools of prejudice and bigotry. Let the aggressor so glaringly absent in strife be equally absent from the conference table. There must be no place at the table for the Russian Bear.

What I say now may seem contradictory, but it is no more so than our belief that some good is carried by every ill wind. In these last few days, we have seen reaffirmed the words of Alexander Hamilton almost two centuries ago. "A nation that prefers disgrace to danger is prepared for a master and deserves one."

The message to Americans is crystal clear: "Freedom is precious, defend it. It is not cheap, nor easy, nor neutral. It is dear and hard and real. Take sides for freedom or you will lose it."

In this day when so many of us are confused about our own course, we have learned once again there are causes worth dying for.

#

2.11.67

The following is a transcript of Governor Ronald Reagan's remarks to marchers on the West Steps of the Capitol on Saturday, February 11, 1967:

A funny thing happened to me on the way to Oregon. ~~I changed~~, I changed the schedule as much as was possible, knowing you were going to be here. You will recall that the Press carried the information a week or two ago that you were going to conduct that march and this appearance as of then, and I arranged then to be here in the Capitol because I don't think any group of citizens should ever come to this Capitol with the express purpose of delivering any message to the Governor and the Governor be absent.

Now my time I changed, as I say, as much as I could. I still must leave but I would like you also to know that because I believe, and I'm quite sure that there is nothing that I can say that would in any way create an open mind in some of you, but perhaps there are some---I mean--- I mean an open mind on this particular subject. But because, because I believe that a search for truth is the hallmark of scholarship---that I believe.

I believe that there would have been some merit in someone trying to find out the views of this particular side in this controversy.

Now Mr. Axelrod received a message from me as early as I knew this date had been established stating that I had this previous engagement. Mr. Axelrod has seen fit to make some charges and some statements with regard to what my views are but Mr. Axelrod has never made one effort to contact me and find out what my views are---

Let me, I'm not going to keep you here in the cold much longer, you're going to have a number of speakers---you're going to have a number of speakers---

Let me just say one thing with regard to so-called political interference with the University. As Governor I tell you that never will I permit a Regent of the University to actively participate in a political campaign in my behalf.

With regard to political interference I would suggest to you that there is a sort of grey area where certain lines must be defined. I do not believe that in a State University or college system that the administration of the State or the Legislature has a right to ever do anything that would seek in any partisan sense to involve the University in politics

Let me add one more thing. In this so-called grey area I do not believe it constitutes political interference for the people of the State---(inaudible)

And I also believe that the people, the people of California who without question or protest have down through the years contributed willingly and happily to the great and phenomenal growth of the educational system of this State, that those people do have some right to have a voice in the principles and the basic philosophy that will go along with the education they provide. And to this sense I will tell you now that, while I, as a member of the Board of Regents, will never inject politics in that Board as Governor---as Governor I am going to represent the people of this State.

###

2.11.67

The following is a transcript of Governor Ronald Reagan's remarks to marchers on the West Steps of the Capitol on Saturday, February 11, 1967:

A funny thing happened to me on the way to Oregon. ~~I changed,~~ I changed the schedule as much as was possible, knowing you were going to be here. You will recall that the Press carried the information a week or two ago that you were going to conduct that march and this appearance as of then, and I arranged then to be here in the Capitol because I don't think any group of citizens should ever come to this Capitol with the express purpose of delivering any message to the Governor and the Governor be absent.

Now my time I changed, as I say, as much as I could. I still must leave but I would like you also to know that because I believe, and I'm quite sure that there is nothing that I can say that would in any way create an open mind in some of you, but perhaps there are some---I mean--- I mean an open mind on this particular subject. But because, because I believe that a search for truth is the hallmark of scholarship---that I believe.

I believe that there would have been some merit in someone trying to find out the views of this particular side in this controversy.

Now Mr. Axelrod received a message from me as early as I knew this date had been established stating that I had this previous engagement. Mr. Axelrod has seen fit to make some charges and some statements with regard to what my views are but Mr. Axelrod has never made one effort to contact me and find out what my views are---

Let me, I'm not going to keep you here in the cold much longer, you're going to have a number of speakers---you're going to have a number of speakers---

Let me just say one thing with regard to so-called political interference with the University. As Governor I tell you that never will I permit a Regent of the University to actively participate in a political campaign in my behalf.

With regard to political interference I would suggest to you that there is a sort of grey area where certain lines must be defined. I do not believe that in a State University or college system that the administration of the State or the Legislature has a right to ever do anything that would seek in any partisan sense to involve the University in politics.

Let me add one more thing. In this so-called grey area I do not believe it constitutes political interference for the people of the State---(inaudible)

And I also believe that the people, the people of California who without question or protest have down through the years contributed willingly and happily to the great and phenomenal growth of the educational system of this State, that those people do have some right to have a voice in the principles and the basic philosophy that will go along with the education they provide. And to this sense I will tell you now that, while I, as a member of the Board of Regents, will never inject politics in that Board as Governor---as Governor I am going to represent the people of this State.

###

6/12

REMARKS BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN - NATIONAL INSTITUTE
ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY - Disneyland Hotel - Anaheim
June 12, 1967

I am pleased to notice how many of our Californians are participating in this meeting---Richard McGee, administrator of the Youth and Adult Corrections Agency; Heman Stark, director of the Youth Authority and George Saleebey, deputy director of the Youth Authority.

We here in California are particularly proud of Dick McGee, who has given more than 23 years of service to California and is without question the leading correctional administrator in the United States.

His help to my administration and to previous administrations has been invaluable.

I noticed the theme for this year's meeting is "evolving problems and programs in crime and delinquency."

I might make a suggestion that you change it to "increasing problems." Because without question, the problem of crime and delinquency has grown steadily since the end of World War II until it is now perhaps the major domestic problem that faces our nation.

Let me cite a few statistics. I suspect most of you know them by heart, but they do serve to put in perspective the magnitude of the problem.

Since 1960, crime in the United States has increased by 35 percent for every 100,000 population. These are the FBI's national figures.

Most of this increase is accounted for among those who have been born or reached maturity since World War II---the 10 to 39 year old age bracket. In California, 80 percent of all crimes are committed by men and boys between 14 and 29.

The biggest increases in crime have been crimes against property---burglary, auto theft and the like.

At the same time that crime has been rising, police ability to meet the challenge posed by the criminal has diminished. It has diminished to the point where it is difficult to say any more that crime does not pay.

Only about 25 percent of our reported crimes are solved. I will leave it to you to decide whether some court decisions rendered in recent years are at least partly to blame for this shocking fact.

Even with only a 25 percent clearance rate, however, our prisons which hold 27,000 are full and 14,000 more are on parole. That means better than 2 out of every 1,000 Californians is in prison or on parole.

Our Youth and Adult Corrections Agency budget costs California taxpayers 83 million dollars a year. The annual correctional bill nationally runs something over a billion dollars.

And, of course, this is only a small fraction of the total cost of crime prevention and control. If you add in the cost of property losses, personal injuries and deaths, the total reaches staggering proportions.

Obviously, something must be done to halt this trend. The alternatives eventually are anarchy or a police state. Neither is particularly inviting.

In fact, the trend must be more than halted; it must be reversed. It is obvious from recent studies that a large proportion of our citizens fear for their own safety in their homes and on the streets.

Few women are brave enough or foolhardy enough to venture out alone at night any more. Many neighborhoods are not even safe in the daytime.

There has been a significant increase in the purchase and training of watchdogs. More and more citizens are buying firearms not for hunting or target practice, but for protection of themselves and their families.

In many areas citizens have banded together, rightly or wrongly, to patrol streets and in other ways attempt to protect the residents of their neighborhoods and communities.

Women are urged to carry whistles as a means of calling for help. Self-protection classes such as Judo and Karate flourish. Law-abiding citizens are genuinely concerned. And so are those of us who are ultimately charged with providing protection, maintaining law and order, solving and preventing crime and finding causes of crime and juvenile delinquency.

We are concerned not only because we face the problem, but also, and more importantly, because so far, we have failed either to solve it or to find the cause.

Not all our penologists, not all our social workers, not all our new theories have managed even to slow the trend.

We are here, hopefully, to see if there are ways to look at new ideas, to re-examine some time-tested methods that might have been more

Crime, its prevention and control, and the correction of the offender are all highly complex problems. Crime and the criminal are found in all walks of society, all economic strata, and in both city and rural areas.

I certainly am not here to offer any cure-alls or panaceas.

However, I would like to take a few minutes to give you some of my thoughts and tell you some of the things we in California are doing.

I do not hold with the theory that society is to blame when a man commits a robbery or a murder and therefore we must be understanding and as sympathetic for the criminal as we are/the victim.

Nor do I hold with the spirit of permissiveness abroad in the land that has undoubtedly added to the juvenile delinquency problem.

This is an era, not only of permissiveness, but also of affluence. As a result, many young people often have time on their hands. Many who might otherwise find jobs have no need to work. May I point out respectfully that we should question perhaps that part of the President's crime report that lays such emphasis on curing crime by eliminating poverty. This is a worthy goal in itself but it is interesting to note that during the great depression, we had an all-time low in crime.

I cannot help but believe that goods and privileges carelessly given or lightly earned are lightly regarded.

A boy who works for the money to buy a car and keep it in gasoline is much more likely to appreciate it and care for it than the youth whose car has been given to him and whose gas is purchased on his father's credit card.

Likewise, the boy or girl who can go out at night only if he or she behaves is more apt to behave than those who have not set rules to follow, and no responsibilities to accept.

This brings me down to two points. First, are we doing enough for our children by doing too much for them? Aren't they really better off if they are taught to accept responsibility and to learn that in the long run we all must earn what we get and that we usually get what we earn?

The second point is, haven't we made it almost impossible for many of our young people to earn legitimately the things they need and want.

In some cases we have taught them by example that they don't have to learn, that instead they have a right to expect to be given. I challenge that this is wrong. I challenge that nobody does any young person any favor by this approach.

But also, haven't our laws, aimed with the best intentions at preventing exploitation of children and providing old age security and of insuring meaningful wages---haven't these, by being too narrowly drawn and too rigidly implemented, put many kids to loitering on the street corners because they couldn't get jobs after school or during the summer?

I suggest that if exceptions were made in some of our laws regarding social security and minimum wages, and if some of our unions would cooperate by recognizing that a boy seeking a part-time job should fall in a little different category than the full-time skilled or semi-skilled adult, that we would take a lot of our young people off the streets and out of trouble.

You know, there are a lot of old maxims that are still true today and it is not corny to note that it is idle hands that do the devil's work and, as a result, there is often the devil to pay and it is you and I who usually do the paying.

In urging that we allow our young people the right to work and to earn and to gain the sense of pride that you only get through your own accomplishments, I am not overlooking the value of recreation.

I think, without question, that we need better and more recreational facilities. We need to make it possible for a boy or girl to play hard as well as to work hard, and to develop and take pride in his athletic skills or hobbies.

I suggest to you that this is another area where government, with its limited tax fund, can turn to business and industry to sponsor teams, to make available recreational facilities and to work with youth on an informal basis.

A slum boy living next door to a factory wouldn't be throwing rocks through the factory windows if the factory owner and foreman were friends who now and then extended a friendly hand.

Here is an area in the independent sector that offers tremendous possibilities.

Now I do not mean by all this that there is no such thing as a bad boy or that there is no place in our society for punishment. Far from it.

I do believe in the carrot and the stick philosophy---you know, where you offer the carrot as a reward for being ^{good} / and come up behind with the stick for being bad.

There is talk these days that punishment is not a deterrent, however, and I believe that that talk is partly responsible for our increase in crime.

Certainly, as punishment becomes more difficult to mete out, those who would be deterred by its threat feel freer to resort to crime and acts of violence.

Some court decisions have narrowed the difference between liberty and license and in some areas have overbalanced the scales of justice so that the rights of society are outweighed by decisions granting new rights to individuals accused of crimes.

California, as I have said, is the leading state in terms of major crimes. On a percentage basis, we have nearly twice our share--- nine percent of the population and about 17 percent of the crime.

I am convinced that enactment of legislation we have introduced will help deter crime, will slow the flood of pornographic material now available on our newsstands, will speed and strengthen the administration of justice and will assure California citizens the best, most efficient law enforcement agencies in the nation.

This legislation includes:

--First: an effective law to restore to the cities and counties the ability to enact local laws designed to meet local problems. This is commonly referred to as the "implied pre-emption issue."

Such a law will allow local law enforcement agencies to more thoroughly police their jurisdictions, especially in the areas of vice, sex offenses and offenses against public decency.

--Second: laws increasing penalties for those criminals who, during the commission of a robbery, burglary or rape, inflict great bodily harm upon their victims with dangerous weapons. I believe society must be protected from those who would inflict personal violence on its members. These bills, by the way, have already been passed and signed into law. We think they will be of major help in our war on crime.

--Third: comprehensive legislation dealing with pornography and obscenity, with special emphasis on prohibiting dissemination to minors of "harmful" material. A careful effort is being made to avoid any suspicion of censorship. Unfortunately, the legislation was recently held in committee on a straight party line vote even though it had the active support of our Democratic attorney general.

--Fourth: we recognize that from time to time persons are arrested unjustly or as victims of circumstances. Yet, despite their innocence, they must live the remainder of their lives with a public police record

Our bill, by closing certain records, will provide relief for such persons, while, at the same time, preserving those records for use by law enforcement and authorized persons.

But we are convinced that even more effort on the part of all of us is needed if we are to control crime in California.

A major reason, I think, for the increase in crime is the very progress we are making which benefits and enriches our civilization.

Scientific and technological advances are being utilized by and adapted for use by the criminal element.

Modern methods of transportation and communications, and modern tools and weapons are used daily by those who prey on society.

If we are to reverse this trend, it is essential that society also use to the fullest our scientific and technological advances in the prevention, detection and control of crime. And in the correction and rehabilitation of criminals.

In addition, there is need for basic research involving the joint effort of various scientific and professional disciplines into the nature of crime, and crime apprehension and treatment.

We in this administration are also proposing that a California Crime Foundation be created as a public corporation. Such a foundation would be financed and served by both the private and public sectors.

Its purpose will be to develop a coordinated state, local and private effort toward developing new scientific techniques to combat crime, initiate research projects in the area of police management, administration and basic research in the field of crime, and encourage engineers and scientists to devote themselves to careers in crime research.

We hope we can finance this foundation by channeling to it funds appropriated for some existing state law enforcement efforts and by winning the financial participation of private foundations and the business community. This is certainly one of those areas where the independent sector can be, and should want to be, of help.

Of course, major efforts are constantly being made to stem crime by law enforcement agencies, both state and local, by departments of state government, by educational institutions and by private organizations.

Outstanding organizations such as yours, the State Bar of California, the California Council on Crime and Delinquency, are all concerned.

We are convinced, however, from talking with state leaders in the fields of law enforcement and crime prevention that these efforts must be coordinated, that new efforts must be stimulated if we are to have an effective crime prevention program. Those engaged in this broad field must be able to share results of the research and benefit from the progressive practices of others.

In order to achieve this, we are working with our state attorney general and his staff--crime prevention should know no party lines--with the leaders of local law enforcement, with the judiciary, and with the Legislature to develop a master plan for California criminal justice.

We have four major objectives.

First, to provide for statewide planning and for orderly and effective development in the field of criminal justice.

Second, we wish and expect to maintain the traditional partnership and spirit of mutual cooperation between the agencies and local government.

Third, we must provide coordination of the various agencies and groups involved in criminal justice projects.

And fourth, we must provide a vehicle to handle federal-state relations and to implement federal legislation dealing with crime control.

These objectives will be met by a Council on Criminal Justice which will be established under the master plan.

This council to be made up of representatives of all the agencies and bodies involved in crime control, as well as representative citizens, will function in much the same manner as the Coordinating Council on Higher Education functions and we are convinced it will provide the same sort of benefits.

The council will be responsible for developing statewide plans for the prevention, detection and control of crime and for the administration of criminal justice.

It will conduct studies, survey resources and identify the needs for research and development. It will encourage coordination, planning and research by the agencies of criminal justice throughout the state and will serve as a clearing house for the study and dissemination of information.

Such a council will give California the ability to attack crime and the roots of crime from many vantage points.

Of course, no program in itself can work miracles and/or eliminate crime...but this program will insure that we are utilizing to the fullest all the available resources and that we are continually coming up with new resources.

The war on crime is a never-ending one. And it is necessary that we pursue it constantly and with vigor if our citizens are to be safe on our streets and in their homes, and if man is to be able to live free from fear of his fellow man in an ever contracting world and an increasingly more complex society.

I do not claim that our proposals contain all the answers. But I do say we have made a new beginning, a beginning that will increase the confidence of the citizen in his government, engender respect for the law and insure speedy and equal justice under it.

^{it}
If/would seem that we are adding unduly to the responsibilities of the private citizen, let us be aware that history records when the freedom the Athenians wished for most was freedom from responsibility, Athens ceased to be free and was never free again.

#

6/15

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Lyn Nofziger
6.15.67

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Excerpts from speech by Governor Ronald Reagan, California
Broadcasters Association, Hilton Hotel, San Francisco

It is a pleasure to be here with you people from the fields of radio and television.

As you may know, I started my career in radio (as a sports announcer) and the last job I had before becoming Governor was in television--driving a 20 mule team.

So we really have a lot in common, you and I.

Actually, of course, we have more in common than just our backgrounds in this business.

You and I are free enterprisers who still recognize and put up with the need for some regulation of business, industry and broadcasting by government.

I suspect, too, however, that most of you believe like I do, that that regulation should be minimal and should not go beyond the amount necessary to insure that the rights of each of us, along with public health and safety, are protected.

There is a difference between regulation and control.

Free men recognize the need for some regulation by government.

But sometimes, well-intentioned men in government -- even in a nation such as ours -- in their efforts to insure equality and protect the rights of the people -- cross over the borderline that separates regulation from control.

This has happened in many areas, at many echelons of government. The higher the echelon of government that regulates or controls, the more of us those regulations or controls affect.

That, incidentally, is one reason I believe that government is best when, as much as possible, it is kept at the echelon closest to the people.

As long as there is freedom of movement in this country -- as long as a man can vote with his feet -- he can walk away from onerous or unjust local regulations and even state regulations.

It is more difficult if controls are imposed at the national level.

All too often they have been.

We can all cite examples: the farmer who cannot grow what he wants without being subject to fines; the members of the religious sect fined and jailed without trial for failure to pay Social Security. In a nation where religion is recognized as a cause for exempting a man from bearing arms, these people had livestock and farm machinery seized for violation of a regulation.

Your own industry regulated of necessity because the airways belong to the people has often been threatened with regulations and commission decisions that go beyond regulation and fall into the "government knows best" classification.

All of us recall Newton Minnow and his description of television as a vast wasteland and the decision by certain FCC members to upgrade the quality of television.

Many of you have run into problems as to what constitutes public service and what constitutes equal time.

Just recently, we had the FCC proposal that free time must be offered the opponents of cigarette smoking to compensate for the time tobacco companies buy.

Now, not to smoke is a laudable thing to do, (I don't smoke), but the sale of tobacco and the smoking of tobacco are not illegal.

It makes one wonder whether the FCC is going to demand free time for the opponents of beer and ale, or the opponents of sports, or the opponents of religions.

Does Father indeed know best in these areas?

I understand the FCC would also have broadcasting companies divest themselves of sports enterprises and limit the number of commercials that can be shown during an event.

Where indeed does regulation end and control begin?

Now don't misunderstand me. I do believe there are some areas in which the FCC must rule, and I certainly have no objection to the equal time rule when it comes to politics.

In fact, I kind of like that idea.

Incidentally, I am not one of those who worries that television has upset our conduct of politics.

Those who scare us with stories that skilled performers can use the camera's magic to the end that all public offices will be filled with actors aren't really talking sense. In the first place, show business pays better. But in the second place, they reveal an ignorance of what the camera can actually do.

Television, even more than radio, is actually a return to our old-time tradition of taking to the stump. When our nation was sparsely settled it was possible for a candidate making the circuit to be seen by almost all the voters. As we grew in size and numbers, only a few actually saw the candidate. They made their decision on what they had heard or read about him.

But now, via the medium of television, they all can see him and hear him. And let me reveal something known to actors -- you can't lie to the camera. When it rolls in for that bigger-than-life closeup, you'd better mean what you say, for insincerity will show up like a putty nose.

I think that television has made it possible for more people than ever before to judge a man on his merits. With whatever faults can be assessed against television, in this instance it is the hero. It has brought us back to the political stump meeting where the voters can look and listen and decide.

There is an area of political coverage, however, that has many people disturbed for which, I am almost sure, there will never be an entirely satisfactory answer.

That is the area of elections coverage, especially involving the use of computers and the quick forecasts of victory or defeat.

Nobody can be certain what the effect really is in California from national predictions in New York which is three hours ahead of us.

In 1964, it was obvious that Lyndon Johnson had won long before California polls were closed. But it is not obvious what the net effect was in California.

Did Republicans quit going to the polls because the Presidency was lost and therefore hurt the chances of their state-wide candidates? Or did Democrats, victory already in hand, not bother to vote and thus hurt their local candidates? Or did both?

We don't really know, but we are concerned that, even if Democrats and Republicans don't vote in equal numbers, advance victory disclosures breed voter apathy.

I do not know what the answer is, but I am inclined to go along with those who, in national elections would have polls opening and closing at the same time -- not the same hour but the same time -- throughout the nation. ✓

Maybe some will think this is not practical and maybe there is a better answer. Regardless, this I believe is a problem that needs solving.

But generally speaking political reporting on both radio and television is good and improving.

And I think that as these media, like newspapers continue to develop specialists in the area of political reporting, it will improve even more.

Up to now I have pretty much been discussing commercial radio and television, but as you know there is another facet of American television - educational television or public television.

And this is a little different matter from commercial television.

Certainly the broad concept is laudable. Non-profit television, supported by public subscriptions, foundations or philanthropies or by those for whom it provides services, such as school districts, can and does provide a useful function.

Educational or public television can be educational in the very broad sense, presenting programs of importance and significance that have an intensive, if not extensive, viewership.

But I do not believe in federal subsidies for television, any more than I believe in them for any other form of communications-- newspapers, magazines, radio.

And I believe even less in government-owned or operated public communications media, including television.

Yet there are hints of government-operated public television on the horizon. By public, I mean, as opposed to closed-circuit television - I mean television that any owner of a VHF or UHF television set can pick up.

Now I know there is government-operated television in many nations including Britain -- where it got so bad they had to let private enterprise come in and open a competing network.

And even in Britain, once the people were given a choice, it became clear that they preferred to choose their own programs instead of having their government choose them for them.

But pressure groups in this country and in California continue to press for government sponsored public television.

TV Guide of June 10 notes that a committee of prominent people has been formed, sponsored by six foundations, "to drum up grass-roots excitement for non-commercial video's potentials."

The magazine adds: "while lobbying for pending congressional legislation creating a federally-supported TV service is ruled out as one motive, it is hard to see how this could not be uppermost in the minds of committee leaders."

Looking around in our own state we recently discovered that the television advisory committee set up under the last administration has some pretty grandiose plans also.

Looking into them we found that the state has bought engineering surveys charting a state-wide television network -- in fact two networks -- with the announced goal of bringing "educational television to every community in California having a population of 1,000 or more."

In order to accomplish this goal, the advisory committee proposes an elaborate state-owned and operated interconnecting network, including microwave links, translators, community antenna television and even existing phone company facilities.

Under the plan the state could own and operate up to 12 new television stations; it would operate a video tape and film library, and a distribution system for delivery of tape and film to stations.

The state even would petition the FCC to reserve "the top 30 UHF channels for state-wide instruction service."

While this proposed state-wide system would be used for instructional purposes during the day, it would be used to broadcast to the general public in the evenings.

You people would be taxed in order to provide you with some more competition.

The committee estimates all this would cost 18 million dollars in the initial phase. This does not include operating costs.

In addition, you remember that wild plan for California to launch its own orbiting communications satellite for 25 million dollars.

Last fall we thought it was just a campaign gimmick, but now we find they were serious. Contracts were actually let out for research into the proposed project.

Now, what does all this mean to us?

It means, for one thing, the state goes into direct competition with private television.

Even more important, it has the dangerous potential of putting the state into the propaganda business.

The power to subsidize is the power to control and complete ownership gives complete control.

I am totally opposed to putting the state into the control, and dissemination directly to the public, of information.

No matter how well-intentioned an administration might be, I am convinced given that kind of power, no government could long deal honestly with the people concerning its activities.

Congress wisely recognized this when it refused to let the Voice of America prepare programs for domestic use or consumption.

Now this does not mean that government should not use television. Closed circuit television is a tremendous educational tool for our schools and could be more widely used. Through it, every child could have the benefit of our best teachers.

Classes and courses clearly marked as sponsored by a unit of government and shown on non-government TV are of great value.

But government should not control the means of dissemination. This administration opposes it and will continue to oppose it as long as I am in office.

#

PLEASE NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be changes in, and/or additions to the above text. However, he will stand by the above quotes.

#

6/19

SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN - NATIONAL SHERIFFS'
ASSOCIATION - Riviera Hotel - Las Vegas, Nevada -
Monday, June 19, 1967

It's a pleasure to be here today---where the heat only comes from the sun.

Las Vegas is really a wonderful place. Where else outside of government do people throw money away. The big difference, of course, is that here you can do it yourself; in government, we do it for you.

But it's nice to see all you sheriffs out there. I've been a sheriff myself---you can't make a living in Hollywood for more than 25 years, without being a sheriff and if the picture makes money, polish the star, you'll wear it often.

First time I ever played a sheriff, the director told me all I had to have was a hard head and a white hat. I think your job takes a little more than that. But I'm sure most of you agree that what is needed more than anything in our country today is people with a hard-headed approach to our problems and a vital interest in seeing them solved.

This is especially true in the field of law enforcement where the problems increase daily and where there are no easy solutions. I once played a sheriff who thought he could do the job without a gun. I was dead in 27 minutes of a 30-minute show. You may still have your guns, but there are those who've done everything but tie your hands and take your guns. It is time for society to give to those on the firing line the weapons needed in the fight against crime.

Traditionally in our country, the sheriff is the symbol of law enforcement. And in many places today he is assuming increased importance as new situations arise affecting the public safety that extend beyond the scope of individual police departments or that require the coordination of law enforcement services within the country.

The magnitude of the problems facing sheriffs and all law enforcement agencies is illustrated by statistics showing that crime is increasing rapidly throughout the nation.

Just last week the F.B.I. reported the largest increase in serious crime in the last nine years took place in the first three months of 1967. Crimes of violence, murder, rape, robbery, assaults, were up 20 percent.

Since 1960 crime has increased by 35 percent, even when you allow for the increasing population. In fact, crime is increasing four times as fast as our population.

In fact, it has reached epidemic proportions. Imagine newspaper headlines announcing the threat of a nationwide epidemic that would take nearly 10,000 lives, hospitalize another 200,000 and cause financial losses of more than a billion dollars.

The outcry would be tremendous.

Yet, that is a description of our annual crime losses and the outcry has hardly risen above a whisper except in isolated instances.

We know that our biggest source of crime is our young male population---those between 14 and 29. In California, this group commits 80 percent of all crimes.

And during the next 20 years this age group will increase twice as fast as the rest of our population. Needless to say, the effects could be devastating.

Already in our country few women are brave enough or foolhardy enough to venture out alone at night. Many neighborhoods are not even safe in the daytime.

There has been a significant increase in the purchase and training of watchdogs. More and more citizens are buying firearms, not for hunting or target practice, but for protection of themselves and their families.

In many areas, citizens have banded together, rightly or wrongly, to patrol streets and in other ways attempt to protect the residents of their neighborhoods and communities.

Women are urged to carry whistles as a means of calling for help. Self-protection classes such as judo and karate flourish. Law-abiding citizens are genuinely concerned. And so are those of us who are ultimately charged with providing protection, maintaining law and order, solving and preventing crime and finding causes of crime, and juvenile delinquency.

The threat to society by crime places a number of responsibilities on all of us at the state and local level who have a responsibility for the public safety.

First, we must focus public attention on this problem and enlist widespread public support in coping with it.

Second, we have a responsibility to make sure that the public receives the facts about the problem and about feasible solutions to it.

Third, we must make sure that we are making the best use of all available resources for preventing and controlling crimes.

Fourth, we must work to bring the best and the most modern scientific resources to bear on the crime problem.

Let me elaborate: effective law enforcement is primarily a local responsibility. Other levels of government, both state and federal, can supply assistance, but we must never forget that the basic tasks of crime prevention and control belong at the local level. This places a great responsibility on cities and counties to provide adequate support for their law enforcement officers, and to provide the necessary facilities and equipment for keeping the peace.

This is an area for partnership between state and local government, with you having the primary role and the state providing those services which must be statewide to be effective.

It is important to recognize that unless both local and state law enforcement agencies meet their responsibilities, we may find them usurped by the federal government or ceded to it by default.

When this happens we will have, in effect, a national police force. And we will have taken steps to abolish crime only at the risk of our freedom.

The answer to growing demands placed on law enforcement is not federal or state domination, or the imposition of some regional super government. We can strengthen local governments so that they can cope with crime.

This involves effective utilization of existing resources, including cooperation and coordination between local governments.

In many areas, the sheriffs as the chief county law enforcement officers must provide imaginative leadership. In California, many programs have already been developed along this line. Many city police departments have joined with the sheriffs' departments in the joint use of central services, such as identification, records, communications, laboratory, and jail facilities. In some counties, smaller cities have contracted with the sheriff's office for the provision of police services.

Another step in the war against crime must be the mobilization of public support. One of our aims has been to involve the citizen and the independent sector in government. There are many things government cannot do alone, and there are many things the independent sector can do better than government. You know, they may not believe it in Washington, but when given a chance, the average American wants to contribute to solving the problems which face us---including the crime problem.

In our state, we see citizens involved in crusades to "stamp out crime." We find businessmen forming parole advisory committees to aid our correctional program. We find industries interested in contributing funds and manpower to crime prevention programs.

And this does make sense. When citizens and government work together to fight crime, it is the citizen who gains in terms of increased public protection.

There are not enough sheriffs and police to reverse the crime trend without the continuing support of our communities. Public information and community relation programs are no longer luxuries for law enforcement agencies. They must become essential parts of day-to-day operations.

A surprising fact is that part of the increase in crime stems from the very progress we are making which benefits and enriches our civilization. The same scientific and technological advances that benefit all our citizens are being utilized and adapted for use by the criminal element.

Modern methods of transportation and communications, and modern tools and weapons are used daily by those who prey on society.

It is essential that society also use to the fullest our scientific and technological advances in the prevention, detection and control of crime. And in the correction and rehabilitation of criminals.

In addition, there is need for basic research involving the joint effort of various scientific and professional disciplines into the nature of crime, and criminals and into methods of detection, apprehension and treatment.

One of the imaginative developments in progressive law enforcement techniques has been the experimental helicopter patrol of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. This morning I am happy to participate with Sheriff Pitchess in launching a similar 3-day experimental aerial patrol for Clark County and the City of Las Vegas. I am sure you will be hearing much more about this from experts in the field.

The original helicopter patrol project was a cooperative venture of the federal government, a private aircraft firm and local law enforcement. This type of project can be a model for the future wherein different levels of government and the private sector cooperate for progress.

Another scientific development shows that a cooperative partnership can exist between different levels of government. As many of you know, our Highway Patrol has arranged a computer to computer link-up between our State Capitol and the National Crime Information Center at F.B.I. headquarters in Washington. Twenty-nine police agencies in California were linked on April 27, through the California Highway Patrol computer, to the F.B.I. information system. We are told by J. Edgar Hoover that this is the first computer to computer exchange in the history of law enforcement. In fact, it is the first use of this technological advance to link local, state and federal governments.

We feel it will be invaluable in our fight against crime by allowing the rapid retrieval and exchange of information between California and the F.B.I. and in this kind of legitimate cooperation, there is no danger of local authority being usurped.

But this is just one step. We are convinced that efforts now being made throughout our state and nation must be better coordinated, and that new efforts must be made if we are to be truly effective in preventing and controlling crime. Those engaged in this broad field must be able to share the resources and the research, and benefit from the progressive practices of others.

In order to achieve this, we are working with the state attorney general, leaders of local law enforcement, the judiciary, and the Legislature to develop a master plan for California criminal justice. We have four major objectives:

First, to provide for statewide planning and for orderly and effective development in the field of criminal justice.

Second, we wish and expect to maintain the traditional partnership and cooperation between the agencies of state and local government.

Third, we must provide coordination of those agencies and groups involved in criminal justice projects.

Fourth, we must provide a vehicle to handle federal-state relations, and to implement federal legislation dealing with crime control.

Under this plan, we hope to bring together all the agencies and bodies involved in crime control, as well as representative citizens, to develop statewide plans for the prevention, detection and control of crime and for the improved administration of criminal justice. Such a plan will give California the ability to attack crime, and the roots of crime from many vantage points.

Of course, no program in itself can work miracles or eliminate crime, but we feel this program will insure that we are utilizing to the fullest all the available resources, and that we continually are searching for new resources in the never-ending war on crime.

We have also proposed legislation for the creation of a crime research foundation to be financed and served by both the private and public sectors.

Its purpose will be to develop a coordinated state, local and private effort toward developing new scientific techniques to combat crime, initiate research projects in the area of police management, administration and basic research in the field of crime, and encourage engineers and scientists to devote themselves to careers in crime research.

We hope we can finance this foundation by channeling to it funds appropriated for some existing state law enforcement efforts and by winning the financial participation of private foundations and the business community. This is certainly one of those areas where the independent sector can be, and should want to be, of help.

Now these steps we are taking are not meant as cure-alls or panaceas. But they are moves in what we hope is the right direction.

But I think that just as important as the mechanical steps we are taking is a need to redirect the thinking of some of those engaged in the war on crime.

I do not hold with the theory that says society is to blame when a man commits a robbery or a murder and therefore we must be understanding and as sympathetic for the criminal as we are for the victim.

Nor do I hold with the spirit of permissiveness abroad in the land that has undoubtedly added to the juvenile delinquency problem.

This is an era, not only of permissiveness, but also of affluence. As a result many young people often have time on their hands. Many who might otherwise find jobs have no need to work. May I point out respectfully that we should question perhaps that part of the President's crime report that lays such emphasis on curing crime by eliminating poverty. This is a worthy goal in itself

but it is interesting to note that during the great depression we had an all-time low in crime. Poverty is one contributing factor, but we should not delude ourselves that simply by improving social conditions we can automatically eliminate crime.

I cannot help but believe that goods and privileges carelessly given or lightly earned are lightly regarded.

A boy who works for the money to buy a car and keep it in gasoline is much more likely to appreciate it and care for it than the youth whose car has been given to him and whose gas is purchased on his father's credit card.

Likewise the boy or girl who can go out at night only if he or she behaves is more apt to behave than those who have no set rules to follow, and no responsibilities to accept.

This brings me down to two points. First, are we doing enough for our children by doing too much for them? Aren't they really better off if they are taught to accept responsibility and to learn that in the long run we all must earn what we get and that we usually get what we earn?

The second point is, haven't we made it almost impossible for many of our young people to earn legitimately the things they need and want.

In some cases we have taught them by example that they don't have to earn, that instead they have a right to expect to be given. I challenge that this is wrong. I challenge that nobody does any young person any favor by this approach.

But also, haven't our laws, aimed with the best intentions at preventing exploitation of children and providing old age security and of insuring meaningful wages- haven't these, by being too narrowly drawn and too rigidly implemented, put many kids to loitering on the street corners because they couldn't get jobs after school or during the summer.

I suggest that if exceptions were made in some of our laws regarding social security and minimum wages, and if some of our unions would cooperate by recognizing that a boy seeking a part-time job should fall in a little different category than the full-time skilled

or semi-skilled adult, that we would take a lot of our young people off the streets and out of trouble.

You know, there are a lot of old maxims that are still true today and it is not corny to note that it is idle hands that do the devil's work and, as a result there is often the devil to pay and it is you and I who usually do the paying.

In urging that we allow our young people the right to work and to earn and to gain the sense of pride that you only get through your own accomplishments, I am not overlooking the value of recreation.

I think, without questions, that we need better and more recreational facilities. We need to make it possible for a boy or a girl to play hard as well as to work hard, and to develop and take pride in his athletic skills or hobbies.

I suggest to you that this is another area where government, with its limited tax funds, can turn to business and industry to sponsor teams, to make available recreational facilities and to work with youth on an informal basis.

A slum boy living next door to a factory wouldn't be throwing rocks through the factory windows if the factory owner and foreman were friends who now and then extended a friendly hand.

Here is an area in the independent sector that offers tremendous possibilities.

Now I do not mean by all this that there is no such thing as a bad boy or that there is no place in our society for punishment. Far from it.

I believe in the carrot and the stick philosophy--with the carrot dangled in front as an inducement for being good at the same time you are ready to come up from behind with the stick for being bad.

There is talk these days that punishment is not a deterrent, and I believe that talk is partly responsible for our increase in crime.

As punishment becomes more difficult to mete out those who would be deterred by its threat feel free-er to resort to crime and acts of violence.

Some court decisions have narrowed the difference between liberty and license and in some areas have overbalanced the scales of justice

so that the rights of society are outweighed by decisions granting new rights to individuals accused of crimes.

There was the case of the young boy who come home from school and found a man--a boarder in the home--washing blood from his hands in the kitchen sink. He told the boy he had cut himself.

The boy went into the bedroom where he found his 10-year-old sister's body hidden under clothing and papers.

He ran screaming from the house.

The little girl had been stabbed 60 times and had been mutilated in a savage and depraved manner. Cigaretts had been ground out in some of her wounds.

The murderer was convicted and sentenced to death. But the California Supreme Court in a 4-3 decision reversed the conviction and death penalty not because there was any question of his guilt but because of technical reasons and because "there was insufficient evidence that the defendent intended to commit mayhem or to torture."

Obviously, I'm not telling you this with the idea of shocking you with a story of a crime of violence. Every one of you has plenty you can tell from your own experience. I am telling it only to point up the need for common sense and realism in the war on crime. Let us have an end to the idea that society is responsible for each and every wrong doer. We must return to a belief in every individual being responsible for his conduct and his misdeeds with punishment immediate and certain.

With all our science and sophistication, our culture and our pride in intellectual accomplishment, the jungle still is waiting to take over. The man with the badge holds it back.

As we look at the many problems facing law enforcement, we cannot afford to overlook the fact that mass criminal violations and mob violence are increasingly endangering our communities. Some euphemistically call this "civil disobedience." It is nothing more or less than deliberate and premeditated violations of the law by groups of people. Protest that takes the form of criminal violations, leads to violence, mob rule, and ultimately to anarchy, where no man has either freedom or rights.

Those who go about the country forecasting "a long, hot summer" and predicting where the next riots will take place contribute to disturbances and disorders because some of the more irresponsible elements seem to feel an obligation to justify these predictions.

I am also a little tired of those who proclaim that we must pour so much money into a community program, or enact this or that social legislation, or else we face a wave of riots and unrest. Government must be responsive to the needs of its citizens; it must provide equal opportunities in education and employment; and it must work to alleviate adverse social conditions. But it must not bow to threats of violence which amount to political extortion.

Let me close by saying that we are aware that your tasks become more difficult every day, and that we recognize the tremendous gains you have made in coping with them.

The war on crime is a never-ending one. It is necessary that we--all of us--pursue it constantly and with vigor. Certainly this must be so if our citizens are to be safe on our streets, and in their homes, and if man is to be able to live free from fear of his fellow man, in an ever-contracting world, and an increasingly more complex society.

#