

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Ronald Reagan Gubernatorial Campaign: Files,
1966

Folder Title: RR Speeches and Statements Book II
(6 of 6)

Box: C30

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

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

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

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

Citizens Committee To Elect

RONALD REAGAN GOVERNOR NEWS RELEASE...

Contact: Lyn Nofziger

IMMEDIATE RELEASE

EXCERPTS FROM A SPEECH BY RONALD REAGAN, HOLTVILLE, MAY 19.

The Governor promised four years ago to do something about the 160-acre limitation for irrigated farms. He could have started keeping that promise months ago when the federal government served notice it was breaking a contract of more than 30 years standing which specifically exempted Imperial Valley farms from this limitation.

Five Secretaries of the Interior have upheld the validity of this contract. But Secretary Stewart Udall has decided to turn off the spigot.

Now, granted this is a federal issue, a Governor truly representing his people could have raised his voice in protest.

He could mobilize the Governors of other states with similar problems to join him in this protest. He could go further. He could demand a review of the whole 160-acre policy based on the outmoded decision of 1902.

How does our Governor insist on this unrealistic limit while that same government adopts a policy that small farms are impractical, that another 2.5 million farms must be removed from the soil, that the Nation's needs can be met by one million large commercial farms.

Modern farming under irrigation requires an investment in machinery and labor costs which cannot survive this arbitrary rule by men who know nothing of the farmers' problems.

The press reports land values in the Imperial Valley have declined by \$250 per acre. But that is only one part of the ultimate costs of this bureaucratic interference. The housewife in the market place will pay in reduced quality and increased



EXCERPTS--Holtville--Page 2

prices. Maintaining the 160-acre limit on public lands to prevent speculation is justified, but there is no justification whatsoever for continuing this on privately owned property.

When the Feather River project is completed the Governor must choose between representing the best interests of California or being a handyman for Washington's starry-eyed sociological experimenters.

The course our present Governor has chosen to follow is obvious. We need to take the opposite course.

We need a State Bureau of Agriculture divorced from politics, a strong Director of Agriculture, and a Governor willing to heed their advice.

We need property tax relief for farmers and if there is to be a minimum wage for agricultural workers, it should be uniform throughout the Nation.

All of this is possible under an administration that has faith in the people's ability to run their own affairs. ###

5.19.66

NOTE: Since Mr. Reagan speaks from notes there may be some changes in his quotes. However, he will stand by any statements in these excerpts.

RONALD REAGAN GOVERNOR NEWS RELEASE...

REAGAN STATEMENT

BUSINESS CLIMATE IN CALIFORNIA

"While I was in Detroit I had the opportunity to talk with a number of prominent industrialists about the economy of California--jobs and plant expansion--things that the Governor really doesn't seem to care much about.

"These people verified what some of us have long thought--that California's tax laws and unemployment regulations make it difficult for big industry to locate in California and reluctant to expand plants already here.

"When California's taxes are \$100 higher than the national average per person, when business must pay unemployment insurance at record rates--often for people who are using their unemployment money as sort of a vacation with pay--industry looks twice, and after the second look, usually decides to go elsewhere.

"Beyond this, eastern industrialists tell me the Governor just doesn't seem to care. He has made little real effort to attract the plants that would provide the jobs that would reduce California's unemployment to somewhere near the national average instead of continuing to run 40% higher.

"Frankly, I am appalled that after eight years as Governor of the greatest state in the Union, the Governor still does not understand what makes our economic system work...that he still thinks a handout from Washington will solve every problem.

"Well, I don't think this. And after the November election, I expect to take concrete steps that will bring new industry into the state and encourage expansion of industry already here so that California can again provide jobs for all those who

want to work.

"I have already proposed to some of these men that, when I am Governor, they join with me and with leaders of California industry and labor to help devise a plan that will bring additional business into California.

"Some of the ways are obvious: get rid of punitive tax laws, offer tax incentives, eliminate some of the needless, time-consuming, expensive state forms and paper work, inaugurate meaningful job training programs with industry directly involved.

"And above all, offer state cooperation instead of state harassment, state help instead of state penalties.

"Along with this, when I am Governor, I will propose to the new Lieutenant Governor--and there will be one--that he join me in a major undertaking involving personal contact with expansion-minded businesses all over the nation, aimed at convincing them that California is not only people-oriented and job-oriented, but is also business-oriented.

"We will work to bring new businesses and new jobs to California to give our state the kind of prosperity that should go along with its climate and its natural resources and that will allow the state to meet its obligations and shoulder its necessary burdens at a minimum cost to the people.

"After all, it makes little sense to anyone--except the Governor and other so-called experienced politicians--that Californians should pay nearly \$1,000 for each family of four as the annual price of their state government, when Michigan, once nearly bankrupt and in the same deep fiscal trouble as California is in now, can operate in the black and take care of its people at about one-third the cost for that same family of four.

"Michigan has proven, as we can prove, that a citizen-oriented, citizen-run government, operating close to home, can do the job better and more cheaply than a politician-run government whose only solutions consist of turning to Washington and soaking the people."

3.29.66

P487-489

Citizens Committee To Elect

RONALD REAGAN GOVERNOR NEWS RELEASE...

Contact: Lyn Nofziger

For P.M. Release May 6, 1966

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY RONALD REAGAN IN SAN DIEGO MAY 6
to employees of the Pacific Telephone Company

"If the Governor had kept his promise to reduce unemployment in California to a level no higher than the national average, the savings in unemployment insurance payments would amount to \$150 million a year.

"But even pending this, millions of dollars in savings are possible if needed reforms are made in the unemployment insurance program.

"Since the burden of these added millions falls on the employer, the current cost of the program is a definite factor in our poor business climate and in our lack of ability to attract new industries and provide more jobs.

"Let me make it plain that I have no intention of suggesting that unemployment insurance should, in any way, be curtailed with regard to protecting California's working men and women. They have a right to depend on this as a legitimate insurance protecting them in the event of lay-offs or unemployment not of their own fault.

"In the last few years this administration has re-interpreted the program and now defines it, not as insurance, but as welfare. The Governor's appointees have liberalized it to provide benefits for those who quit voluntarily or who are fired for legitimate cause.

"It is even used to augment the earnings of those in seasonal occupations. The result is that the program has been weakened to the point where there must be



concern for its fiscal soundness.

"And the eventual victims will be the legitimate working men and women who are being sacrificed to provide prepaid vacations for a segment of our society which has made this a way of life.

"In spite of the fact that high employment industries with good records of keeping employees at work have lost their exemptions from this tax, and in spite of the fact the employer contributions have increased by 321% with the tax now based on \$4,100 per employee instead of the previous \$3,800, the fund which guarantees the program's fiscal soundness has dropped by more than \$330 million because benefit payments under re-interpreted regulations have increased by 351% compared to what they were nine years ago.

"Basically, what is called for to reverse this trend is a re-examination of the program's administration and a return to the idea that it is an insurance program and away from the present interpretation of it as welfare.

"Such a re-examination would take into account seasonal jobs and not pay benefits for times when these jobs are not available. Employees leaving jobs voluntarily or dismissed for misconduct were ineligible for benefits under the original statute. A 1965 amendment changed this and should be corrected to limit benefits to those losing their jobs through no fault of their own.

"Under the original statute, suitable employment is clearly defined as employment for which the employee is reasonably fitted which is in the vicinity of the employee's residence of last employment and gives him wages either equal to his weekly benefit for total unemployment or provides him work and wages for at least half the number of hours normally worked at full time in his occupation. Today this statute has been misinterpreted to provide that a person can collect insurance if he is not offered a job paying the same or more than he made prior to his unem-

ployment.

"The result is that even in a period of relatively high employment, benefits paid are greater than the amount paid into the fund through the employers tax. It has become necessary to use subsidies such as surtaxes, federal loans and assistance to keep the program solvent.

"There is a disaster potential here in the event of a depression and since the tax is proportional to the payroll of the employer, a period of extreme unemployment could render the program useless.

"It is sheer folly and the height of irresponsibility if we fail to act now to put this program on a sound basis for the protection of the working men and women of this state."

5.5.66

RONALD REAGAN GOVERNOR

NEWS RELEASE

Contact: Lyn Nofziger

Release: 12:00 noon September 27

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY DONALD REAGAN, SACRAMENTO, SEPTEMBER 27

We have been brought together because of an interest we share in our participation in the greatest public school system in the world.

Now, for me to include myself may surprise some of you. There has been some effort to portray me as anti-intellectual.

The Governor has been taping everything I have said and has been editing those tapes before passing them on. As a result, there is in circulation an incomplete quote which I would like to use at this point in its entirety: "It is a strange paradox that this nation, founded upon the theory of individual freedom, should depart from this principle so far to establish a system of compulsory education."

Now in repeating that statement and printing it in his campaign literature the Governor has neglected to add, as I do, that "this is a paradox we gladly accept because we know as did the founding fathers before us that we can't have a truly free society unless we have a literate and educated citizenry."

Now, no doubt some purists are probably disturbed by this dichotomy in our free society.

But I am not one of them.

We have made this system work by controlling it as much as possible at the local level.

Teachers with an understandable claim to academic freedom sometimes face the close proximity of little "a" and her challenge to the nation's ability to teach as the teacher wants to teach.

There is an equally valuable right demanded by the parents forced to send their children to school--they claim a voice in how and what those children will be taught. And as Little Willie's mother and Little Willie's teacher meet eye-to-eye, I am sure many of you know who's in the middle.

But cumbersome as it is, this imperfect compromise has made the system work because all of us can meet and argue and decide.

Today there is a threat to this cumbersome, but time-tested, system.

If there is one opinion on which there is unanimity among local school authorities throughout our state, it is that there is too much regulation in Sacramento over all aspects of elementary education. Much of this regulation is in the form of mandated legislation requiring programs and educational appropriations without provisions for funding such programs.

When and if the funding does follow, with the money comes new instructions requiring further compliance. The time set for the programs and to hire staff is impossibly short.

Pity the poor administrator who can't get a decision or interpretation from the County Counsel on hundreds of pages of new legislation coming out of Sacramento's legislative "horn of plenty."

A few years ago the people of this state successfully lobbied for a measure and went home triumphant! They had hardly seen the Capitol Dome fade from sight when AB 45 was included in, and passed, as AB 145.

Here was proof that local districts that don't comply are denied additional funds and in some cases penalized.

Yes, they can vote on unification and if they vote right they get an additional \$15 per pupil. But if they vote against unification it means that not only don't get the \$15, but an even bigger penalty is applied.

The Statewide School District voted itself into a 44% penalty for non-

492

...right, of course, rates a promise of lower costs. But there is no indication that any school district ever lowered the tax rate after an election under AS 145.

The goal is to reduce 1,500 districts to 300, but I am sure some of you wouldn't die of surprise if the 300 were intended to become eventually 50 consolidated districts and in reality a single state system.

At any rate, since the State Board of Education is an appointed body any reduction in local control of education which grants more power to the state is a move toward political control.

And, of course, the district voting wrong must vote again and again every two years, supposedly on the theory its voters will eventually tire and give in.

Part of the reasoning behind this persistent effort is that larger unified districts provide more economical operation. Strangely enough, those who think this should know better.

Dr. Werner Z. Hirsch, currently at UCLA Institute of Government and Public Affairs, writing in the March 1960 issue of the National Tax Journal, suggests that "consolidation is unlikely to solve the fiscal problems of the schools in an urban America."

He finds no evidence that wholesale consolidation of school districts into larger units increases efficiency, and cites instead the gains that can be realized through voluntary cooperation by the districts and cities.

These include, for example, central libraries of audio-visual aids, joint hiring of guidance counselors, music teachers, etc.

Pigeon-holed somewhere here in Document are the findings of Dr. Joseph H. ... head of unification studies for the state from 1943-53.

He and others found that the ideal district size was between 10,000 and 12,000 pupils. This includes one high school, one or two junior high schools, and twelve elementary schools. The next most efficient size is 20,000 to 22,000.

But when you get above this there are strong indications that the cost of operation per pupil increases, as does the ratio of pupil to teacher.

New York City is already heading in the opposite direction with independent school boards under twenty-one assistant superintendents.

Unification is good when determined by local districts involved voluntarily and not forced from the state level.

It just doesn't make sense to have blanket rules, such as the state requirement that 60% of the budget must go for teachers' salaries. This penalizes districts of rapid growth and is a temptation to engage in dishonest bookkeeping.

This is supposed to be an incentive for reducing class size and there is a penalty for non-compliance.

But Los Angeles takes the penalty because it can't locate sufficient number of new teachers or build the required classrooms fast enough.

One wonders about the state-wide application of the second language requirement when districts, for example in Spanish-speaking neighborhoods, have the bulk of their students with a second language already and a need for more English, with teachers qualified and experienced in this particular teaching problem.

The major problem as you well know is the drastic shortage of all subject teachers. This shortage is due in part to the strict requirements imposed by the Fisher Act. It was designed to bolster the quality of California teachers but has had an opposite effect and has forced the hiring of provisional teachers to meet the demand.

Our master plan calls for the reduction from the present ratio of 33 1/2 pupils per teacher to 29-1/2. But we are training behind in teachers at a rate of 6,500 a year.

We have special provisions for some districts but they are not participating voluntarily, although some districts participate because they receive federal aid.

to \$900 per year per child. I am sure no one quarrels with this.

Indeed, this is part of our problem--because we are still not doing all we can in this often tragic situation.

Handicapped children wait their turn in line unable to start their education as pressure mounts and years go by.

But the problem is even worse at the other end of the spectrum--those exceptional individuals with an IQ of 130 and up. Here the state provides \$400, hardly pays for the cost of identifying such students, and provides nothing in the way of education suited to their exceptional abilities.

Have we moved so far away from individualism, so close to the ant heap, that we have forgotten that no progress ever resulted from mass movements? Always it is the individual who pioneers, thrusting above the crowd and lifting the rest of us a little closer to the stars.

Herbert Hoover said: "The greatest strides of human progress have come from uncommon men and women. When we are sick we want an uncommon doctor. When we are at war we yearn for uncommon generals and admirals. When we choose a president of a university we want an uncommon educator. The important need of this nation at all times is the leadership of the uncommon man and women. We need men who can stand unincorrupt, who are not concerned with applause meters, who will not sell out for cheers today."

Is a society truly great if it lines up each morning for daily assistance and handouts?

Do we want a California turning to Washington for the solution to its unemployment problem because it hasn't faith and trust in its own people?

Or do we want a creative society, a government mobilizing the full resources of our people to find solutions to our problems, and a people who are proud to be in control of their own destiny.

Even if we had no concern for the possible threat of a nationalized school system, we would have to question whether the federal government has shown any signs of doing the job better than we can.

In one city the poverty program budget for retraining 3,000 drop-outs totaled half as much as the entire school budget for educating 25,000 children.

There is some strange perversion which takes place in the classic ploy of the carrot-and-the-stick when the New York Journal American reports students receiving \$1.25 an hour for part-time work in the school were fired when it was discovered they didn't have records as delinquents.

It doesn't take a genius to figure out the average kid will put two-and-two together and go out and break a few windows to keep his job.

It would seem that local school authorities should be able to count on the power of the state to stand between them and any threat of losing autonomy to the national government.

But all too often it seems like the last reel of a mystery serial on the late, late show. The heroine thinks she is safe by the side of her uncle and then discovers he is the murderer.

Now whether it is the intended goal or not the state seems bent on eliminating local control. Thus, the federal government would only have sole proprietorship over a single state-wide system.

But, strangely, at the same time we move toward more state control the state reduces its financial support proportionately. Where once it was 50%, it is now 35%--less in some urban areas where it dropped as low as 27%.

If the districts undergo this kind of forced unification leading to school enlargement, the property taxpayer bears a larger portion of the burden for this and at the same time he is gradually losing control.

Districts become too far removed from the people. Negative attitudes grow.

496

promoted and the chance of passing needed bond issues declines until like the districts themselves the problems grow bigger.

Some day someone is going to ask our loud questions about the state's role in the textbook business. Basic texts for each elementary grade recommended by the state board are provided free.

But is it possible that we could continue this plan while at the same time we opened supplementary texts to selection through competitive bidding by multiple publishers with the state sharing a portion of the cost and thus return some money to the local school districts?

Small local districts have flexibility and many good innovations in education come from these smaller districts and are later refined as they are applied to the larger districts.

As you perhaps have guessed I would remove forced unification from education policy.

I think we should re-evaluate the Fisher Act.

I would implement the recommendations stated in California's Need for Teachers, 1965 to 1975, published by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction: "the attainment of California's goals of quality education and maximum educational opportunity for all children and our youth depends upon preparing, recruiting, and retaining the highest qualified educational profession."

I would favor more local flexibility in curriculum and financing.

And you can add to the things I won't propose, the National Education Association's idea, which received a certain amount of local attention, for us to begin educating four-year-olds. Here in California it would cost about \$100 million to begin such a program and that's not counting the capital outlay for all the new schools that would be needed. I don't think it's in the best interests of our state to begin such a program.

497

children.

Then, to return to the positive, I would increase state aid to lighten the burden for the property taxpayer.

I know this calls for a comprehensive tax reform without gimmicks. This problem calls for an in-depth study of our complex system of school financing.

Let me add here with regard to financing, it is pretty naive if any of us believe we can solve next year's many problems with a 2% kickback in the federal income tax.

Now let me lay to rest a carefully resurrected ghost that has risen to haunt me and not entirely by accident! I realize the federal government has usurped so much of the taxing authority we can not refuse federal aid. But I have a deep mistrust of the federal controls that go with it.

I believe we should continue to press for earmarked funds to be left at the state and local level for us to spend as we see fit.

As I have said before, and been misquoted before, education is the savior of freedom, but removed too far from local and parental control it can become the tool of tyranny.

Problems we have, but also great excitement and challenges.

I know of no place better equipped to meet those challenges than the state. Major industries have entered the educational field with their own resources and made discoveries which can be put to work in our schools.

In New York, RCA working in cooperation with the schools, provides speakers from its laboratories on a regular lecture basis.

New aids for training have been discovered.

All of these things are out there available for educators in California.

I would propose any help that could be given at the state level to keep the open educational mind in California for any innovations to meet this year's challenges.

There is so little time for you and I to determine in what manner we will be remembered by the latest generation.

9.27.68

Since Mr. Reagan took my notes, there may be changes in the above text. However, he will come by the above text.

September 24, 1965

STATEMENT OF RONALD REAGAN REGARDING THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Many words have been spoken and written about the John Birch Society as an issue, particularly with regard to the stance and attitude of the Republican Party, even though the Society claims it is non-partisan and that its membership is almost equally divided between Democrats and Republicans. In recent months my name has been repeatedly injected into articles and discussions concerning the John Birch Society and its membership.

I have never been and I am not now a member of the John Birch Society, nor do I have any intention of ever becoming a member. I have never sought Birch Society support, nor do I have any intention of doing so should I become a candidate for public office.

In my opinion those persons who are members of the John Birch Society have a decision to make concerning the reckless and imprudent statements of their leader, Mr. Welch.

In all fairness to the members of this Society, I believe this statement would be incomplete if I failed to point out that despite the heavy criticism of the Society by many citizens, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, is on record as stating that the FBI has not investigated the Birch Society because it only investigates subversive organizations. Furthermore, the California Senate Sub-Committee in its 1963 report found the "Birch Society to be a Right, anti-communist, fundamentalist organization...neither secret nor fascist, nor have we found the great majority of its members in California to be mentally unstable, crackpots, or hysterical about the threat of Communist subversion". The report, however, was highly critical of the Society's domination by its founder, Robert Welch, and of his book, "The Politician", published several years before the Society was formed. I wish at this time to reaffirm my criticism of Mr. Welch and restate that I am in great disagreement with much of what he says. In my opinion, his charges against former President Eisenhower are utterly reprehensible.

The 1965 California Senate report does not disavow any of the 1963 findings, but is more critical of the Society mainly because of "inexcusable actions of a minority of irresponsible members and evidence of anti-semitism in that minority". According to this report, the Society has grown tremendously since 1963 and has attracted a "lunatic fringe of emotionally unstable people". Again, however, the Committee points out they are not representative of the Society's official policy. In my opinion, the Society has a responsibility to maintain vigilance to see that this element does not use the Society for witch-hunting, anti-semitism or any other un-American activity.

For the record, I would like also to state that I am opposed in principle to seeking support of any blocks or groups because in principle to do so implies a willingness to make promises in return for such support. It would be my intention, if I seek public office, to seek the support of individuals by persuading them to accept my philosophy, not by my accepting theirs. I would campaign on such important issues as the bureaucratic growth of our State Government, the excessive taxation that is already slowing California's economic growth and reducing job opportunities, and the increasing crime rate that makes our cities' streets a place of danger after dark.

RONALD REAGAN AND ROBERT FINCH SPEAK OUT ON THE ISSUES

EDUCATION

Among the first concerns of state government must be the quality of public education. How we do that job will determine the future of California. The education of our children during the next 15 to 20 years, when the population of California doubles, has to have the highest priority. We must seek creative ways of utilizing our human and technological resources in this field.

There have been two disturbing and inconsistent trends in California education in recent years: the State has been assuming increasing power over education and local control has been correspondingly eroded at the same time the State government is paying less of the costs of education and the local property taxpayer is paying more.

When Gov. Brown took office the financial support provided by the State amounted to 50% - it is now 35% and in some cases as low as 27%. At the same time, the Brown push has been in the direction of establishing a single statewide system of education under the State Board of Education, a body appointed by the governor. For example, while the State's financial participation has been greatly reduced, the local districts have in effect been deprived of the right to make their own unification decisions - that is, if they do not unify under State mandate they will lose \$15 per pupil and in addition an area wide tax will be imposed upon them. The lessening of local control and the increase in State power inevitably

provides an instrument for political control.

We have an immense teacher shortage aggravated by the Brown-sponsored Fisher Act. Our ratio of teachers to pupils has fallen to 45th among the fifty states.

Sacramento has deluged the local school districts with a blanket of rules and regulations. Much is in the form of mandated legislation requiring programs and educational appropriations without provisions for funding such programs. Rules making no sense have been issued such as the State requirement that 60% of the budget must go for teacher salaries. This penalizes districts of rapid growth and is a temptation to engage in dishonest bookkeeping.

Obviously something must be done to salvage our educational system. We propose the following program.

1. The concept of unification is a good one but such determinations should be made upon a voluntary basis by the local district. Such matters should not be dictated by Sacramento. It is now recognized that the wholesale consolidation of school districts into larger units does not necessarily increase efficiency - indeed there are strong indications that the ideal district is between 10,000 and 12,000 pupils. After a district exceeds a certain size the costs of operation and the ratio of pupil to teacher actually increase. Smaller districts are more responsive to the people. They are flexible enough to try out new educational programs. Many good innovations have come from small units of government. The strongest school district is one with maximum local participation.
2. The financial support of the State to the local school districts should be increased to fifty percent where it was eight years ago. This would

501

provide much needed relief to the local property taxpayer. At the same time, the host of restrictions and controls which now accompany State grants should be reduced, allowing more flexibility and control for the local districts.

- 3. The entire question of teacher qualifications and particularly the Fisher Act and its consequences, should be re-examined. In this connection a review of teacher salaries and perquisites should be made to encourage the recruitment of qualified teachers. Our goal should be to increase the ratio of qualified teachers to pupils. At the present time we are running behind at a rate of about 6,500 teachers a year. The attainment of California's educational goals depends upon our preparing, recruiting and retaining the highest qualified educational profession. At the present time we are not doing so - in emergency proportions.
- 4. Although we have mandated special education programs to assist children in various categories such as the handicapped, we are not doing enough in some of these areas. Improvements are needed to make them meaningful, for example, in programs such as that for gifted children.
- 5. We favor more local flexibility in curriculum determination. Local school districts now must accept text books provided by the State Board of Education unless they can afford to pay the costs of supplemental text books themselves. This practice tends to remove more of the autonomy of the local districts than possibly any other single factor and eliminates local text book selection. While basic texts would continue to be provided by the State, supplemental texts should be available upon the choice of the local district with the State paying part of the cost.

502

6. Leadership now lacking should be provided by the State to assist the local school districts in personnel recruitment and placement, to stimulate library development and to aid in similar activities. Voluntary cooperation between the local school districts and cities should be encouraged to establish central sources of audio-visual aids, joint employment of guidance counsellors, music teachers, coaches, etc., and in similar matters.
7. We badly need and we propose an in-depth study of our complex system of school financing looking toward a comprehensive tax reform program without gimmickery.

We cannot have a truly free society unless we have a literate and educated citizenry. Education is the bulwark of freedom but if removed too far from local control, it can become the tool of tyranny. We must do what is necessary to establish and maintain the best possible system. Of course, quality education costs money - but one thing more expensive is ignorance.

REAGAN FOR GOVERNOR HEADQUARTERS
- 3 Kearney Street
San Francisco, California
392-8317 or 392-8305

Release: IMMEDIATE

Contact: Lyn Hofziger or Jan McCoy

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY RONALD REAGAN

The Governor, in his customary attempts to hoodwink the voters by telling them where he might stand and where he would like them to think I stand is running around the state referring to his free higher education program.

And he says I would endanger free education.

Now I wonder who he thinks he is kidding? Education, higher or lower, in California or out, is not free.

It is paid by you and me--the taxpayer--whether or not we own property.

And now the Governor's own fiscal policies are endangering the quality of our entire education system at every level.

These policies have already forced a nearly 50 percent cut in state funds to local school districts and doubled the property tax for all our home owners.

And at the higher education level he is juggling funds and using up reserves to meet current needs. Money specifically earmarked for other purposes is being used to help our state colleges and universities.

And even this is not enough. We are being forced to go to a \$230 million bond issue for school construction. I approve of and endorse this bond issue, Proposition 2. It has been made necessary by the irresponsible fiscal policies of this Governor, but this should be the last time. Hereafter we should be able to meet

504

expansion and construction needs of our college and university system on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Our college professors are underpaid and to cut costs the Governor reneges on the size of a promised pay increase.

Our Legislature approves more than \$400 million a year for higher education or approximately \$1,300 for each state college student and approximately \$2,900 for each state university student.

And yet this Governor allows 18,500 out-of-state students to attend our schools for a tuition of a half to a third of the actual cost and you pay the difference--a subsidy for each out-of-state university student of nearly \$2,000 a year.

Free higher education? Not for you the taxpayer.

And as costs continue to spiral and demand continues to mount it grows less and less free.

Now I have not advocated an immediate program of tuition charges for in-state students, but I do say that we must begin to study the problem lest we reach the point where the only other alternative is to cut back on the quality of the education our colleges and universities can offer.

With tax burdens in California already double the national average, with property taxes already at the breaking point, how long can we continue asking you to pay virtually all the costs of a voluntary education program?

Education in California is compulsory through high school. We pay those costs gladly, knowing that a literate citizenry is necessary to make our form of government work successfully.

University and college training is voluntary. True, the good that accrues to our state from our university graduates is

immeasurable, but that good also accrues to them. Who is to say that all of us in one way or another should not pay for the benefits that come to us as individuals. It is my belief that we all must pay a share in our way in life.

The question I raise is how long can we continue to put an ever increasing burden on the taxpayer? Where is his breaking point?

I think we are approaching it. And when that time comes our alternatives will then be either tuition or a poorer quality of education. I think we should look strongly at these alternatives. And then, if we, the people, choose partial tuition, we must do so within the context of a program that will make certain that the student who cannot afford tuition can still have an education.

If we choose this course we must also have an augmented program of scholarships for the needy students. There must be a plan of tuition payment deferred until after graduation when the student is earning. This, plus our many student loan funds, should protect the right of every student who wants an education, to get it. Then I make one additional proposal. The Governor, through the Council of Governors, should urge the federal government to grant tax credits to parents for at least a portion of the cost of educating their children.

We must do everything in our power to assure those persons who wish a higher education a chance to get it at a price they can afford. But we must also do it at a price the already overburdened taxpayer--you and I and all of us--can afford.

NOTE: Since Mr. Reagan speaks from notes there may be changes in this text. However, he will stand by the above quotes.

306

HEADQUARTERS FOR GOVERNOR HEADQUARTERS
3333 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California
213-381-5771

Release: Immediate

Contact: Lyn Hofziger or Clyde Beane

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY RONALD REAGAN
Conference of California Narcotic Officers' Association
Edgewater Inn Marina Hotel, October 20, 1966

I am firmly convinced that California has the finest police and sheriff's departments in the nation and perhaps the world. They have maintained this standard of excellency with little help from the present administration.

But in a world where new criminal techniques, court rulings, and an exploding population make crime detection and prevention ever more difficult, we need to make sure that all our local law enforcement agencies can be provided the same kind of advanced training now available only in the biggest cities.

For this reason I recently proposed that the state establish a police academy to insure that those cities, towns or smaller counties unable to provide their own academies will still have adequate training facilities for their police or sheriff's deputies.

A day or two later the Governor denounced me for that proposal, even though a piece of campaign literature he called back at the last minute indicated he planned to make the same proposal.

Now, of course the Governor must stand up and be counted as opposing such an academy.

But let me recite to you what J. Edgar Hoover said just last month about police training.

"Increased professional police training is no longer a desirable goal. It is no longer a matter of choice for United States law enforcement. It is an absolute necessity."

And in the same month he wrote "Police officers handicapped by the lack of proper training and leadership are unprepared to cope with the momentous criminal crisis which confronts most communities today. Common sense dictates the urgent need for long-range, full-scale training programs and modern facilities to make every enforcement officer a professional foe of lawlessness."

Now maybe this is a little strong for a Governor who has done nothing about our crime problem in eight years, in fact a Governor who has actively opposed many pieces of legislation aimed at strengthening the police's hand in the battle against crime. But it isn't too strong for a Governor who would fight to cut back California's crime rate, for a Governor who views crime as one of our state's most serious problems.

#####

10.20.66

NOTE: Since Mr. Reagan speaks from notes there may be changes in this text. However, he will stand by the above quotes.

~~FILE~~ FOR LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR COMMITTEE

~~State~~ Headquarters: 1200 J Street, Sacramento, California

~~Southern~~ California Headquarters: 3959 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, California

~~Contact~~: Howard Seelye (213) 620-1160

Tax Reform, for release Tuesday, September 6, 1966

Badly-needed tax relief for property owners, plus creation of new jobs for Californians will result from a program of tax reforms proposed by Ronald Reagan and Robert H. Finch, Republican nominees for Governor and Lieutenant Governor, in a joint declaration today.

Reagan and Finch presented a seven-point program plus "Five Fair Play Commandments for California Taxpayers," including recommendations that personal property taxes on household furnishings be abolished, that an "Assessors' Senate" and a "Citizens Advisory Board" be established.

In addition, a recommendation that the State Board of Equalization be expanded from four to six members, with the additional members from Southern California, was proposed.

The "Five Commandments" offered by Reagan and Finch were:

1. A basic standard value should be applied with equity on all property in California.
2. The tax assessor should be lifted from his present role as political juggler behind whom some free-spending elected officials hide.
3. Tax appeals procedures should be strengthened.
4. An "Assessors' Senate" should be established to give taxpayers and local governments a say in rules and regulations governing property tax administration.
5. An entirely new tax climate must be created in California - a tax climate that truly aims at the creation of jobs.

The two candidates urged that the next session of the legislature enact laws providing tax and assessment ceilings on property to shift the burden of carrying the tax load from property owners.

The seven proposals for tax reform made by Reagan and Finch were:

1. Abolish personal property tax on household furnishings.

2. Eliminate double taxation on subsidiary dividends of corporations
3. Establish a system of credits permitting a partial write-off of inventory tax payments against state franchise taxes and eliminating inventory taxes as rapidly as possible.
4. Assessment of state and federal land holdings in California with an in lieu payment returned to the counties.
5. Conform state income tax laws to those of the federal government and support the ballot measure (Proposition #14) this year to accomplish this end.
6. Create a State Tax Court to hear tax appeals from the rulings of the State Board of Equalization and State Franchise Tax Board.
7. Add two members to the State Board of Equalization, so that a truly representative state-wide board is achieved.

Reagan and Finch said that California's antiquated tax structure is the greatest impediment to the creation of vitally-needed new jobs in the State and the present method of taxation neither meets the needs of today's Urban Age nor even keeps pace with the State's economy.

"Today's tax structure penalizes local governments, the federal programs oppress the local governments, and the state government stands idly by with its hand thrust deeply into local pocketbooks," the joint announcement stated.

They said their proposals are the immediate steps that can be taken in California. In addition, they said, a complete study is needed that would look to a systematic overhaul and up-dating of the tax structure.

The two GOP standard bearers added that it is the State's responsibility to lift the burden of inequities, to find other means for obtaining needed revenues and to correct abusive burdens upon the property taxpayer.

Seven and a half years of Brown and Anderson have placed California's revenue picture in a "bleak" position, Reagan and Finch said, with a revenue gap next year projected at \$240 million.

RONALD REAGAN GOVERNOR

NEWS RELEASE...

Contact: Lyn Nofziger

Release: TUESDAY 9.27
8:30 PM

EXCERPTS FROM RONALD REAGAN SPEECH, HAYWARD, SEPTEMBER 27, 1966

"A nationally syndicated columnist whose orientation is not exactly to the right of center came to California recently and discovered, much to his horror, that Californians are not happy with the high cost of welfare.

"I'm not surprised that a great reporter discovered this. During the primary campaign I traveled up and down this state and after every speech the audience asked questions.

"Always, one of the first two or three questions was: 'If you are elected Governor, what will you do about welfare?'

"Before I answer that, perhaps other questions should be asked: What is wrong with our welfare system? Is it too expensive? What is it accomplishing?

"There is much wrong with our welfare system. Welfare in the United States was originally conceived as a means of tiding over a man or a family until they could get back on their feet.

"Today, welfare is a way of life for some families, even unto the third and fourth generations.

"Welfare, by some of this governor's appointees, is viewed as a part of our great American heritage. No longer would they confine it to the needy. Rather they would extend it to the lazy and the greedy at the expense of those who see no sin in honest toil. We are told the guideline is redistribution of income.

"Is our welfare system too expensive? Since this administration has held office,

costs to the state for welfare have risen 113.7%, while population has increased by only 27.9%. The cost to each California citizen is up 90.2%--50% above the national average.

"Or to put it another way--if you are the head of an average family of four, you will pay out nearly \$250 this year as your share of the state's welfare load, nearly double what it was eight years ago.

"Certainly there is a need for welfare. Nobody would advocate leaving the old, the disabled, the families with children, or those in temporary distress to go hungry or be in want.

"I, for one, certainly suggest nothing like that.

"Indeed, I have advocated and I continue to advocate more, not less, help to our aged and infirm so they might have not only the necessities, but also some of the luxuries that make life worth living.

"I think as the largest and the richest state in the union, we can do not less. Indeed we have a moral obligation to do as much as possible.

"But it is ridiculous for the present administration to call on the people of California to do more and more for those whose only desire is to do less and less. If you don't believe it, let me point out that in Los Angeles county alone, in the last three years, welfare fraud cases are up 170%.

"Even the Governor, now that an election year has arrived, seems to have come to this conclusion. In fact, all of a sudden his speeches on welfare are sounding awfully lot like mine, and here I've been thinking all this time he was taping everything I said in a hunt for possible slips. I'll resist the temptation to think perhaps I've won a covert.

"He's saved me at least one bit of trouble. He's fired his Welfare Director and received the resignation of another top welfare worker who is his own campaign manager's sister.

"But it's possible his speeches sound familiar because we've heard them in the past.

510

standard of paperwork as huge amounts of regulatory material pour in monthly from the State Department of Welfare to county officials. Currently they are inundated by 22 procedure and program manuals and record handbooks--enough to fill a four foot bookshelf.

"Such a situation makes sense only to an old and tired administration more interested in providing soft-jobs for hacks and cronies and relatives than in serving the people.

"It is a situation that can be remedied. Better service can be provided and better results can be obtained at a reduced cost to the taxpayer by a Governor who wants those results. And this Governor would want them.

"Let me make some suggestion, none new, but all ignored.

"First, we could and should increase allowable family income to truly dependent clients--enough to keep up with increasing costs of living.

"Increased costs in this area would more than be offset by increased savings in other areas.

"For instance, there would be no welfare for the able-bodied unless they were either to work at state jobs or to accept job training that would fit them to take their places as productive members of society.

"There would be great savings by reducing and simplifying procedure and making a single uniform program instead of the seven overlapping programs now in force.

"The Cal-Flex Plan should be implemented which would better allow county officials to meet their own particular problems.

"Most important of all, consistent with what I have chosen to call 'The California Plan', we could turn over to the old Governor's new proposal to spend \$100 million in government funds for job training--but to the private sector of the economy. This would be a real step towards providing a real solution to the unemployment problem. I don't know if that's a job or not, but it's a job.

514

"We could call this program 'JOB'--short for 'Job Opportunities Board'. It is patterned after a proven program, a program that has supplied more than 5,000 jobs in Watts since last summer's tragic riots.

"Job Opportunities Boards would be job location and training centers involving government and private industry. These boards would take able-bodied persons on welfare and would either provide for them suitable training, or in cases where there are some skills, would find them jobs.

"JOB would service as a coordinating center to receive information from business and industry on job openings throughout the state.

"The state would help by providing information on welfare recipients and other data, and data processing needs.

"Persons in training would continue to receive welfare checks until their training was completed.

"Such a program would have the added advantage of providing needed workers to industries unable to fill the demand for skilled and semi-skilled workers.

"A Job Opportunities Board would be a sample of the way most problems facing our nation are being solved somewhere on the citizen level throughout our nation."

Since Mr. Reagan speaks from notes, there may be changes in citations. However, Mr. Reagan will read by all above parts.

9.27.66

373

Citizens Committee To Elect

RONALD REAGAN GOVERNOR NEWS RELEASE...

Contact: Lyn Nofziger

Release: 10:00 a.m. September 29

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY RONALD REAGAN
Rossmore Leisure World, Seal Beach, September 29

I have said before that there is nothing we Californians cannot do, that we have the youngest, most talented, best educated people in the world here.

I am also aware that we have another group in our midst, a group that at once constitutes one of our major assets and at the same time one of our greatest responsibilities.

That group is our senior citizens, those Californians who have reached the years of retirement but certainly should not be limited to a life of idleness.

Robert Browning has Rabbi Ben Ezra saying, "Grow old along with me. The best is yet to be--the last of life for which the first was made."

Browning said that 100 years ago; today we seem to have forgotten that it is the last of life for which the first was made.

All too often, when a man reaches 60 or 65 we have considered that his life's work is done; that we can hand him a pension or a social security check and retire him to the shuffle board courts, the park benches and the television set.

Now, I certainly do not mean to imply that a man should not be allowed to retire at 60 or 65 or that a company does not have a right to set its own retirement policies.

And neither do I mean to imply that a retired person should not, if he so desires, watch television, lounge in the park or play shuffle board.

What I am saying is that many of our senior citizens are not ready for

516

graduation into a sedentary life just because they have retired. Many of them want and need to feel useful, many of them would like and could use the extra income work after retirement could bring.

Senior citizens should not be second-class citizens.

To treat them as such is to dishonor them and to penalize our society. The experience and the wisdom a man gains with age cannot be substituted for by youth and vigor alone.

History is replete with the names of so-called senior citizens who rose to greatness, did their best work or affected the course of history in their sunset years.

Dwight D. Eisenhower was elected to a second term at the age of 66. Konrad Adenauer led West Germany in his 80s. Chiang Kai-shek is building Free China in his 70s. The philosopher George Santayana did his best work in his twilight years. Winston Churchill leading Britain during the worst days of World War II was in his 60s. The names are legion.

And the numbers of senior citizens in California are also legion. California has the largest number of senior citizens in the nation.

Which means we also have the biggest backlog of unused talent. As Governor I would propose that we turn to this vast pool of talent to help solve the problems facing this state.

Retired teachers, retired businessmen and women, retired professional people could be used to help train and retrain those adults in our population who have little or no education or job skills.

Many of our areas of labor shortage could be filled by still active and ambitious senior citizens if the earnings limitation were removed from social security.

As Governor I would work through the Council of Governors and with all the

517

influence the Governor of the nation's largest state could bring to bear to see that this was done.

Social security should not be treated as welfare but as insurance bought and paid for by those on it. To tell them they cannot have what they have bought and paid for except on the government's terms is morally wrong. To limit the income of a man who still wishes to work is wrong.

The earnings limitation is a discriminatory law which hurts those with little money. Today when our society demands more skilled workers than we are able to provide it is doubly wrong to deny society those skilled workers over 65 and to deny those workers unlimited opportunity to supplement their social security income.

But we must do more than worry about those healthy, able bodied senior citizens who still can contribute to our society. We must also take whatever action is needed to assure those senior citizens who can no longer work, who have never had the opportunity to put away a nest egg, who may be sick or disabled, the right to live in dignity, the right to have not only the necessities, but also some of the luxuries of life.

To this end, as Governor I would also work to see what could be done to persuade the Congress to extend social security to all those over 65. There is no legitimate reason for government to force some segments of our population to contribute to social security and at the same time refuse to allow others.

Every working man knows that unless something is done to reverse the upward spiral of living costs he won't be able to make ends meet when he reaches retirement. Our senior citizens already are feeling the pinch of prices that run constantly higher while income remains nearly static. In 1949 social security paid a couple \$68.40 a month. Today that payment is \$152.50. But this \$152.50 actually buys less in the grocery store and the clothing store and elsewhere than the \$68.40 did seventec- years ago.

518

This situation can be remedied in only one way. And I would work to see if the Congress could also be persuaded to provide a built-in cost of living clause in the social security law. Many unions have such clauses in their contracts. Why should the elderly have less?

Until such time as social security is expanded to cover all our senior citizens the state of California must take the lead in assuring that those not covered are treated with the same dignity and consideration.

The old Governor does not think so. Not long ago in an effort to compensate for the increased cost of living social security added a few dollars to each check. California Old Age Assistance cut its payments by the same amount thus cancelling out the raise to our senior citizens who receive checks from both programs. A delegation of senior citizens made the journey to Sacramento hoping to discuss the problem with the Governor. Indignant that someone should question his wisdom, he stalked angrily out of his office and refused to see them.

A new Governor would insist that recipients of State Old Age Assistance also be treated with dignity and respect, also be paid enough to keep up with the rising inflation and also be given relief from the frequent and humiliating means of investigations to which they are now subjected.

There are other places where a concerned Governor--a Governor concerned with the welfare of all the people--could lead in such a way as to make life easier and more comfortable for our senior citizens.

For example action must be taken to insure that the homes these people bought in their working years are not taken from them in their non-productive years through confiscatory property taxes.

Although recreation and adult education fall largely under the responsibilities of local governmental units, I feel strongly that both adult education and recreation should be oriented to a greater extent than now toward our senior citizens.

519

Many senior citizens are still anxious to learn. Many others are equipped to teach and to lead in these areas.

Parks and playgrounds should be not just for the young but also for the young at heart and for those who prefer the quiet of the out of doors to the blare of the radio or television.

The administration of a new Governor would turn to the elderly to see what their needs and desires are, how best the state, working with the cities and the counties and school districts and the private sector of our economy could make the best use and reap the most benefit from our senior citizens while at the same time assuring them freedom from the worry of want and the discouragement of idleness in their sunset years.

#####

9.29.66

NOTE: Since Mr. Reagan speaks from notes there may be changes in this text. However, he will stand by the above quotes.

Commonwealth Club
#S. 10.28

San Francisco

520

Now, I have never (and you might be surprised to learn this) suggested that a tree is a tree and urged the woodman not to spare the ax. There are few problems that are of more concern to more people or more difficult of solution than the preservation of the very nature of our state. Obviously, we can't preserve every foot of the pastoral scene and continue to provide living space for a population increase that is double the national average. But we must oppose those who would fill and ~~preserve~~ level and pave everything in the name of progress.

views

At the same time, there are the ~~views~~ of those who would preserve inviolate completely - and those who would conserve/some of our wilderness, still allowing for development for recreational use, and their differences must be reconciled because ~~they~~ there is a place for both.

Now, our party's platform recognizes this problem, and as a matter of fact, it's part of the heritage of our party. Twenty-two of the thirty-two national parks in this country -- three of the four in California -- came into being under administrations of our party.

Leadership is needed to form an effective regional body ~~among~~ among the two California and three Nevada counties in the Tahoe Basin to protect the beauty of the Basin and the very purity of the lake itself. This will require the cooperation of our state and our administration with the government of Nevada. It will require, also, some control of our own highway department, which sometimes seems all too guided by the devotion to the principal of the shortest distance between two points.

Right now at Lake ~~Ex~~ Tahoe there was a threat of a four or six-lane highway along the west shore of that lake, and I doubt if this can be accomplished without destroying a great deal of the sylvan beauty of that area.

Our redwoods are a problem, and thanks to our public-spirited citizens in the past, we have preserved almost in toto the remaining groves of what can be called the truly virgin ~~stands~~ stands of big trees.

We have some 115,000 acres in 28 state parks scattered over 500 miles from

521

the Oregon border south. Now it's true that I have opposed the present suggestions for the creation of a national park because I believe as these have been proposed-- first of all, they are unnecessary for the preservation of these redwoods which now are preserved in our park areas, but I believe they would be destructive to the economy of the area. As a matter of fact, a few years ago our state legislature made a proposal that if a national park should come into that redwood area it should envision being created without the taking of more privately-held land but should make use of the more than 50% of the area that is presently owned by the Federal government including also our own state-held land in those parts.

But now I believe a proposal for a national park has been made that, in principle, all of us should look at with the idea that this could solve that problem. If we have a national park in the area it should be for the right purpose. It should be to open up that area to tourism, to have the national promotion that would help and that would give this area more than the single principle economy it now has.

And Congressman Don Claussen has made a proposal that envisions a national park bigger than either ~~x~~ of those that have been proposed presently in Washington. It involves the trading and the exchanging of Federal and state lands and park lands we k now have , and it envisions a park that will preserve not only the redwoods but that will add into it open recreational areas, lagoons, streams, mountainsides and many miles of rugged beach and ocean frontage. And while no one at this point can claim to have looked at the plan enough to endorse it completely in detail, I do believe this is the common sense answer to the problem that confronts us of preserving both the economy of ~~x~~ an area and preserving the great natural heritage that none of us want to see destroyed.

This entire problem of open space and recreation outdoors calls for imagination and a willingness on the part of a state administration to innovate. For example, we should look at the possibilities of using tax incentives, because it's not just the area of great outdoor wilderness areas where people must pack up and move in and spend the time there. There is a shortage in all of our urban areas

522

today, and as we continue to grow, for that kind of open space where someone can go in a few moments or a short period from their home, just for a few hours out on green grass beneath the trees, to have a picnic, to sit there and just be out in the quiet and the beauty of nature. And I don't believe that it's always essential that this be ~~accomplished~~ accomplished by the acquisition of land by government.

I believe there is a possibility of leasing. I believe there is a possibility, not yet explored, of using tax incentives to induce ~~build~~ builders and make it economical and practical for them to design their tracts and ^{their} suburban areas, and provide open spaces. Some are already doing it, but we could make it more possible for others to do it and to ~~follow~~ follow that pattern.

I believe that more consideration should be given to the freeway routes through our cities, and I believe that we should be allowed to have committees in our cities (including some of the great architects that we can muster) to present views to the Highway Commission - again, contrary to the straightest or the shortest distance between two points --- views that will take into consideration the esthetic values of the community in which we live. I just don't believe that anyone in Sacramento knows as well as the people in San Francisco where a freeway should go ~~the~~ through San Francisco.

But now when we talk conservation, there's another kind of conservation I'd like to touch upon. I'd like to touch upon human conservation.

PAGES 523-537 ARE MISSING

THE ORIGINAL COPY WAS TOO FAINT TO DUPLICATE

SUBJECT:

ADDRESS TO:

DATE:

QUESTION 1: What do you think of the Number One problem in the state today and what do you need to do about solving it?

REAGAN:

"The state's No. 1 problem is, as it has been since the end of the second World War, meeting the needs of our people and maintaining the good life in California in the face of confounding population growth."

"Within that frame of reference, the first order of business for the future is to reclaim the state's tax system, abandoned with a view to ending tax competition for the 1960 primary campaign, the average annual rate of which is now carrying more than half a billion. There are other taxes imposed by local governments, but the state is going to have to do something to help out."

"I have pledged myself to presenting the next session of the legislature with a comprehensive tax reform package which will achieve this urgent requirement."

REAGAN:

"There are many major problems facing California today: Crime, the cost of government and the high tax rate, smog, educational problems, but involved in all of these is eight years of leadership failure in Sacramento. I think that that lack of leadership is the Number One problem in the state today, as it has been since 1960. I would propose, as governor, to offer the kind of leadership needed to serve our problems, to put our state on a sound fiscal basis and to restore the confidence of our people in their state government."

QUESTION 3: Are you in favor of a rapid transit system for the Greater Los Angeles area? If so, what action do you feel should be taken properly by the governor to speed up development of such a system?

BROWN:

"This has been a top priority of my administration. Relentless population growth gives us no choice but to proceed with the finest, most extensive freeway system in America. But freeways alone are not the answer. If they are not coupled with modern, efficient mass transit in our major urban areas, we will face mounting congestion, air pollution and destruction of scenic resources."

"Providing such a system in Los Angeles or any other major city is primarily a responsibility of local government and requires vigorous local leadership. But the governor can and should help. And I have done so."

"I strongly supported the Metropolitan Transit Authority and led the move to create the Southern California Rapid Transit District when the need for a new structure was demonstrated."

"I supported and signed legislation in the 1966 legislature to secure long-term financing for Los Angeles mass transit. I also signed legislation for \$10 million in short-term financing from state bonds or revenues, allowing the district to move ahead on engineering plans without the need for a tax to support the financing."

"Our aerospace study, leading to a design for the California Integrated Transportation system, has done much to speed the state's mass transit development throughout the state."

REAGAN:

"I have a great interest in the kind of mass transit system that can be developed in California. I believe that the state should be a leader in the development of such a system. I have supported the Metropolitan Transit Authority and the Southern California Rapid Transit District. I have also supported the California Integrated Transportation system. I believe that the state should be a leader in the development of such a system."

QUESTION 3: Do you believe that there should be a law putting a ceiling on property taxes?

BROWN:

"The only proposal advanced for such a ceiling is that of Assessor Watson and I do not favor it for this simple reason: It would not bring immediate relief to the taxpayer because it would have to wait on, among other things, an amendment of the Constitution in 1983, and then would be phased in over a period of years."

"I prefer immediate property tax relief and that is what I have proposed as a part of my comprehensive tax reform program. In the field of school support alone, I

propose that we lift \$200 million in education costs from the shoulders of the property taxpayer."

"And I have pledged to fight for return to California each year of \$500 million in Federally collected tax."

"That is all the reduction of the property tax load. And it is immediate."

REAGAN:

"I am not sure that a law putting a ceiling on property taxes is the answer to the problem since higher assessed valuations can always be used to raise taxes no matter what the tax limit might be. The answer to the property tax problem is to shift some of the tax burden from property to other more equitable sources of revenue. As governor I would initiate a study leading to a complete overhaul of California's entire tax system."

QUESTION 4: In your opinion what are the major causes of the drug crime problems in California? What specific steps do you advocate to first check the rise, and, secondly, to reduce crime?

BROWN:

There is a certain distortion in that question. The California Crime Report of 1970 shows that California has had the smallest increase in violent crime of all the states from 1967 through 1970.

The same report shows that murders last year in California for the same three years were also the national average.

In addition, the FBI report proves that crime in relation to population growth has risen almost twice as fast nationally as it has in California. The juvenile crime rate actually declined last year. The narcotics arrest rate has decreased sharply.

I am committed by training as a lawyer, experience as a law enforcement officer and belief in the rule of law in our society. I am proud of the effective law enforcement legislation of the past 7 1/2 years.

We have enacted the nation's toughest laws for laws, tightened controls on firearms and dangerous drugs, outlawed firearms and Molotov cocktails, and stiffened penalties against those who invite violence.

We have attacked the roots of crime—poverty, ignorance, prejudice and family breakup.

I have proposed these additional steps:

—State assistance to local police by providing superior equipment and resources which local governments cannot afford.

—A further crackdown on those who peddle pornography to children.

—Control and treatment for victims of dangerous drugs.

—A statewide information system to utilize the immense capabilities of modern computers in the fight against crime.

—A new unit in our judicial system, a family court to help prevent divorce and family breakup which leads to so much of our crime.

—A basic requirement in combating crime is public

respect and support for local police, who constitute the first line of defense against the criminal. They are doing a magnificent job in California. Those who raise the false cry of "crime wave" in the hope of political gain do these dedicated officers a grave disservice."

REAGAN:

The major causes of the increase in crime in California, aside from increasing population, are certain judicial rulings which have made it more difficult to apprehend and convict criminals and have taken away the rights of cities and counties in some areas to prosecute and bring to justice criminals in their areas.

To check the rise of crime I would seek legislation restoring the rights of cities and counties to prosecute in areas now pre-empted by the state. I would seek legislation strengthening state police authority, thus assuring small departments of adequate training. I would also seek to strengthen state laboratories that will utilize the latest scientific police and detection

QUESTION 5: During the last year California had dramatic experience in dealing with racial conflict. Please state your appraisal of the present and future of this problem in this state and your suggestions for its solution.

BROWN:

The first item of action must be decisive and prompt enforcement of the rule of law such as was demonstrated recently in San Francisco's Hunters Point. There, a superior system of dealing with violence — based on what we learned from the Watts riots — brought the National Guard in promptly and imposed an immediate curfew. The effectiveness of the methods used there was demonstrated by the early control of the situation and by the fact that there were no deaths in the rioting.

The second point of action is one that has to be pursued side by side with the first getting at the causes of such violence such as the McCone Commission findings: job, identified as unemployment, lack of training, job, education, poor housing, inadequate transportation, and isolation from the rest of the community, to name a few.

REAGAN:

California's so-called ghettos are largely economic ghettos and many of the problems that exist there can be solved by improving the economic lot of the residents. This can be done through educational and job training programs, working with government and the private sector. As governor I would work to assure adult education and job training programs for all those who need new skills to progress economically. In addition, I would want to provide the kind of business climate we need—and do not have—to assure that jobs are available for all our people."

QUESTION 6: The state's role in paying a percentage of local school costs has been increasing in the past 10 years by the reduction of local school districts. At the same time the state has put more curriculum demands on local schools. What do you believe should be the future relationship between local schools and the state—financially and educationally?

BROWN:

The question implies that there has been a marked change in state contribution to local school costs but that simply is not the case.

In the last 20 years the state share generally ranged between 41 and 42 per cent. Currently it is 42.75 per cent. In only two periods, around 1947 and 1953, when constitutional amendments temporarily raised the state tax share to around 47 per cent, has the state share changed appreciably.

During my term of office we have more than doubled the state's assistance to local schools but even that remarkable effort has not increased the percentage of the state's share to ease the burden on the property tax payer.

That is why I have pledged to bring on the next legislature a program that will raise the state's share to at least 50 per cent and guarantee adequate per pupil expenditures for every child in the state.

Regarding curriculum, the state must remain committed to keeping up minimum standards of instruction so that all California children, regardless of where they live, have a sound education.

Within that framework, we need to allow local districts greater freedom in planning their curricula. That is why I supported a bill to that effect in the last session of the legislature and why I will support even more far-reaching legislation next session.

REAGAN:

Basically I believe the state must pay at least 50 per cent of the cost of operation of our schools. This was the traditional amount until the present administration's policies began cutting it back to as low as 47 per cent in some areas. At the same time I would like to see schools have more a certain percentage of state aid and I would like to see the legislature that is about to convene take action on school districts.

QUESTION 7: Has this state gone as far as it can in its fight to curb smog? Can smog be eliminated in this decade?

BROWN:

No. We have gone farther than any other state and farther than the federal government. We are the only state that spends more than \$1 million a year on research and control and each year I have requested more funds than legislature has granted. We were the first to establish local air pollution control districts; we now have nine of them covering 14 counties. We were the first to create an air pollution research center; ours uses the great facilities of the University of California.

And we were the first state to require both gasoline and exhaust pollution control systems on all automobiles.

This vigorous action has paid off by keeping thousands of tons of dirt out of our skies every day.

Here are the things I am working for:

First, the federal government should order all post offices, government installations, and military bases to honor our state and local control regulations.

Second, we shortly will begin monitoring the air in all 53 counties to determine how clean the air is and what is polluting it. This will give us a clear base from which to forge controls. We are urging the Federal Government to do the same thing on a national basis.

Third, we have prevailed on the University of Southern California and the University of California to step up training of men and women in air pollution work. This commendable action needs to be accelerated and expanded to other schools.

Fourth, the development of workable mass transit systems will do a great deal to reduce smog from one of its major sources: Automobiles. As I said above, I will continue to push for such systems in our major cities.

Can smog be eliminated in this decade?

No, not entirely, unless we develop new energy sources for industry and vehicles other than fossil fuels. Our great scientific community is to work on the development of nuclear power and fuel cells, among other things.

But, with what we know right now, we can reduce pollution to levels which will halt the environmental damage and health hazard which smog now poses.

REAGAN:

I don't think any state has done all that we have done in the areas of research and planning and control. I think we have gone as far as we can in this decade.

PAGES 540 to END ARE MISSING

THE ORIGINAL COPY WAS TOO FAINT TO DUPLICATE

SUBJECT:

ADDRESS TO:

DATE:

RONALD REAGAN STATEMENT ON STRICTER FIREARMS CONTROL

"I don't think that the control of firearms has to do with this (sniper shooting of 8/1 at Austin, Texas). We've seen--even where you have such controls, such as the Sullivan Act in New York--the wrong person can always get ahold of a weapon if he wants to. I don't mind telling you that while I certainly want every provision that can be made to try and keep the wrong person from getting a gun, such as a known inmate of a mental institution being able to come out and in 24 hours acquire a weapon--I think we have to have that kind of protection. I think we have to have protection with regard to minors getting guns, such as mail-order and so-forth. But I would resist any effort ~~making~~ along the lines that have been ~~proposed~~ proposed by some, that ~~we~~ would take from the American ~~people~~ his Constitutional and historic right to own and possess ~~fire~~ firearms. I'm opposed to that. I am opposed to registration in the broad sense of all firearms because in every dictator-run country where there's been a take-over such as in ~~the~~ Hitler's Germany and in Russia, it's been proved that it is very easy to render the populace harmless by simply going down a registration file and confiscating the guns, and I'm opposed."

--Press Conference, 8/2/66, Los Angeles