

Richard Nixon Presidential Library  
White House Special Files Collection  
Folder List

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
64	7	n.d.	Report	Candidate's FACT BOOK prepared by Bob Haldeman by the Republican Research Center. Includes cover page, index, and "The Seven Deadly Sins of Campaign Management." 3 pages.
64	7	n.d.	Report	Candidate's FACT BOOK prepared by Bob Haldeman by the Republican Research Center. "Biographical Material" tab. 9 pages.
64	7	n.d.	Report	Candidate's FACT BOOK prepared by Bob Haldeman by the Republican Research Center. "Agriculture" tab. 3 pages.
64	7	n.d.	Report	Candidate's FACT BOOK prepared by Bob Haldeman by the Republican Research Center. "Budget" tab. 5 pages.
64	7	n.d.	Report	Candidate's FACT BOOK prepared by Bob Haldeman by the Republican Research Center. "CDC" tab. 13 pages.
64	7	n.d.	Report	Candidate's FACT BOOK prepared by Bob Haldeman by the Republican Research Center. "Civil Defense" tab. 3 pages.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
64	7	n.d.	Report	Candidate's FACT BOOK prepared by Bob Haldeman by the Republican Research Center. "Civil Rights" tab. 5 pages.
64	7	n.d.	Report	Candidate's FACT BOOK prepared by Bob Haldeman by the Republican Research Center. "Economic Expansion" tab. 5 pages.
64	7	n.d.	Report	Candidate's FACT BOOK prepared by Bob Haldeman by the Republican Research Center. "Education" and "Government Reorganization" tabs. 4 pages.

# Candidate's FACT BOOK

prepared for

**BOB HALDENAN**

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

by the

REPUBLICAN RESEARCH CENTER

Room 821

315 West Ninth Street

Los Angeles 15

MAdison 3-6227

The Republican Research Center is a co-operative project of the California Republican State Central Committee, Republican Associates of Los Angeles County, and the campaign organizations of the major statewide candidates. Its co-ordinated program eliminates duplication of effort and carries into political campaigning the Republican principle of efficiency without lessening effectiveness, something we hope will be returned to California state government following this year's election.

INDEX

BIOGRAPHICAL MATERIAL

AGRICULTURE

BUDGET

CDC

CIVIL DEFENSE

CIVIL RIGHTS

ECONOMIC EXPANSION (Business Climate, Jobs, etc.)

EDUCATION

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

LAW ENFORCEMENT (Crime, Narcotics, Prisons, etc.)

RECREATION & PARKS (Squaw Valley, Conservation,  
Fish & Game, Natural  
Resources)

TAXES

WATER

WELFARE

NIXON

BROWN

FACTS & FIGURES

MISCELLANEOUS

---

---

"THE SEVEN DEADLY SINS OF CAMPAIGN MANAGEMENT"

\* \* \* \* \*

1. **ADLIBBING**           No study, no plan, no theme, no calendar, no budget --  
result: no hope.
  
2. **WHEELSPINNING**   Using a lot of horsepower while standing still.  
Always talking to the same groups of people because  
you didn't get a truly representative committee.
  
3. **FISCAL**  
    **FATHEADEDNESS**   Using wrong proportions of your budget for the wrong  
things. Substituting spending money for clear  
thinking.
  
4. **GADGETEERING**     Substituting a clever slogan or a glow-in-the dark,  
whizz-bang balloon for solid intelligent conversation  
and enough volunteers to cover the district.
  
5. **IMITATING**  
    **ATLAS**            Trying to carry the whole campaign on your shoulders;  
attempting to do all the work yourself rather than  
seeing that it gets done.
  
6. **POLLYANNAISM**    Wishful thinking, refusing to face the true facts  
about yourself, about your candidate, about your  
opponent, about the district and about the issues.
  
7. **PANICKING**        Reacting to the actions of your opponents or the timid  
sheep in your campaign, wasting time in frantic  
conferences rather than sticking to the main task and  
steering your own course.

compiled by

REPUBLICAN ASSOCIATES OF LOS ANGELES  
315 West Ninth Street - Room 1123  
Los Angeles 15, California

**BIOGRAPHICAL MATERIAL**

THE REPUBLICAN TEAM FOR STATEWIDE OFFICE IN '62

The reason Republican candidates for statewide office have been consistent winners, despite the fact that Democrats have been in the majority in this state since the early 1930's, is the fact that the GOP has consistently presented higher quality M E N to the voters.

And never in the history of California has the Republican Party presented a better team of candidates to the people than in 1962. Each is qualified in his own right; they complement each other in age, experience, background and personality. They make quite a contrast to their Democrat opposities

Democrat

Republican

GOVERNOR

"Half-Vote" Brown, who couldn't deliver his own delegation at the 1960 Democrat convention. vs

Richard M. Nixon--a man of national and international stature--a leader for a leading state.

LT. GOVERNOR

Glenn Anderson, a political accident whom even Democrats admit would be a disaster as Governor. vs

George Christopher, two times mayor of a great city--a Democrat city in voter registration.

ATTORNEY GENERAL

Stanley Mosk, who's played politics as National Committeeman, while state crime has skyrocketed. vs

Thomas Coakley, a distinguished judge who's presided on the bench in most of the counties of our state. Three years Assistant Attorney Gen.

CONTROLLER

Alan Cranston--sole qualification: founding the ultra-liberal CDC. vs

Bruce Reagan. More than a decade of legislative experience, president of a large financial institution.

TREASURER

Bert Betts. In succession, he's appointed a roofing contractor and an automotive repair man as Assistant Treasurer. vs

John Busterud. Legislative leader, outstanding attorney, state's leading authority on constitutional reform.

SECRETARY OF STATE

Don Rose, a party hack selected to balance the ticket. vs

Frank Jordan, Secretary of State since 1942.

UNITED STATES SENATOR

Richard Richards--idol of the CDC liberals--rejected by the voters in favor of Kuchel in '56. vs

Thomas H. Kuchel, running on a record which includes: Assemblyman, State Senator, State Controller, GOP State Chairman, and U.S. Senate Whip.

RICHARD M. NIXON

born in Yorba Linda, California, January 9, 1913; second of five sons of Hannah Milhous and Francis Anthony Nixon; married Patricia Ryan, 1940; two daughters, Tricia and Julie.

Education

elementary and secondary education in California public schools; graduate of Whittier College (A. B. 1934) and Duke University Law School (LL. B. 1937).

Professional Career

General practice of law in firm of Bewley, Knoop and Nixon, Whittier, California, 1937-42; attorney in Office of Emergency Management, Washington, D. C., Jan to Aug 1942; of Counsel, firm of Adams, Duque and Hazeltine, Los Angeles, California, 1961 to present.

Service Record

Commissioned in the Navy as a Lt. (j. g.) in 1942; served in the South Pacific for 13 months; stateside duty in Ottumwa (Iowa), New York City, Philadelphia, and Baltimore; discharged as Lt. Commander in Jan. 1946; presently Commander, USNR.

Public Service

U. S. Representative from California, 80th and 81st Congress, 1947-51 (Un-American Activities Committee, Select (Herter) Committee on Foreign Aid, Education and Labor Committee).

U. S. Senator from California, 82nd Congress, 1951-53, elected by a majority of 700,000 votes (Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee, Labor and Public Welfare Committee).

Vice President of the U. S., 1953-61 (President of the Senate, statutory member of the National Security Council; personal representative of President Eisenhower on goodwill trips to 54 countries; Chairman of the President's Committee on Government Contracts; Chairman of the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth).

Republican nominee for President, 1960, barely defeated in the closest popular vote in history.

Candidate for Governor of California, 1961

Nixon for Governor Committee  
3908 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, California  
DUnkirk 8-3385

## BIOGRAPHY OF GEORGE CHRISTOPHER

George Christopher's personal history and long career in public service are dramatic proof that America is still the promised land of the melting pot and opportunity, where all citizens are free to seek and achieve outstanding accomplishments on their own initiative and ability, without regard to race, creed or color.

The son of a Greek immigrant, George Christopher left day school at the age of fourteen because of his father's lingering illness, but continued his schooling at night. Four years later he graduated from high school and enrolled in college, where he studied for five years, graduating with a degree in accounting. This totalled nine years of continuous night class attendance.

After practicing as a Public Accountant for several years, he founded a small milk company. Today the highly successful Christopher Dairy Farm is the largest independently owned dairy in the San Francisco Bay Area. A conscientious fighter for the rights of small business, farmers and consumers against monopoly, George Christopher has long vigorously opposed price-fixing laws and agreements.

The memory of Christopher's youth has never been left entirely behind as indicated by his constant efforts and financial support in behalf of athletic groups and other character-building youth activities. Today, more than 30,000 California children each year attend baseball and football games through his generosity.

In 1945, following his meteoric success in the business world, George Christopher entered public service through election to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. San Franciscans rewarded his ability, his courage and his energy "to get things done" by re-electing him to the Board by overwhelming majorities. He twice served as President of the Board in recognition of the highest vote ever accorded any member of that Board.

In 1955, the people of San Francisco elected him Mayor by the largest majority ever given a candidate for that office.

In 1959 the confidence of the people was again evidenced by George Christopher's re-election for an additional four-year term in the office of Mayor.

San Francisco, under Mayor Christopher's guidance, was designated by Fortune Magazine as "one of the best administered cities in the United States". The New York Times termed him a "Master Salesman" for the major part he played in the successful efforts to bring Big League baseball to California. Former President Hoover--a Republican whose outstanding talents were enlisted by the Democratic Truman Administration to reorganize and streamline the administrative offices of the Federal Government--has praised George Christopher as "the best Mayor of any large city with which I am acquainted."

Since George Christopher assumed the role of chief executive of San Francisco, the city has shown a continually declining crime rate. He has won national attention for his vigorous efforts to bring complete integrity to the Police Department.

In recognition of George Christopher's outstanding administrative ability, he was elected president of the American Municipal Association in 1957--a unique distinction rarely bestowed upon a first-term official. The organization consists of several thousand mayors and officials from more than 13,000 communities throughout the United States.

In his official capacity, George Christopher, with his charming wife Tula, has entertained with unfailing graciousness and hospitality kings, queens, premiers and presidents from all over the world. Following the 1959 visit of Nikita Khrushchev to California--requested by the President and the State Department--Christopher received a formal invitation to visit the Soviet Union. He accepted the invitation and in February of 1960 paid a courtesy call on the Russian Premier in the Kremlin and extensively toured the vast lands behind the Iron Curtain.

This historic Kremlin visit and tour of the country impressed Mayor Christopher with America's need to more fully awaken to the serious impact being made on the economy of the Western World by the Soviet brand of industrial competition.

As a dynamic public official and highly successful self-made businessman, Mayor George Christopher has consistently been a vigorous exponent of the free enterprise system, and throughout his career has steadfastly opposed excessive governmental controls.

He has had widespread rank and file labor union support in his campaigns for public office, and in his business life he has played a leading part in stabilizing labor negotiations affecting the milk industry. In the 22 years of its existence, his own plant has never experienced one hour of work stoppage.

A skilled negotiator, Mayor Christopher has successfully averted several threatened breakdowns in labor-management disputes of serious import to San Francisco, including streetcar and civic opera strikes.

He has acquired intimate knowledge of State Government through his close working relationship with legislators and State officials on common problems. He is a firm champion of urban-rural and inter-regional cooperation. In great demand in recent years for speaking engagements throughout California, George Christopher has a wide acquaintance and growing following in every section of the State, in recognition of his emergence as one of the truly outstanding men in public service on the California political scene.

\* \* \* \* \*

July 20, 1962

## **BRUCE V. REAGAN HIGHLIGHTS**

Bruce V. Reagan was born in Minnesota in 1902 and came to California in 1922, locating in Pasadena. He was married to Muriel Benton Reagan in 1923. Their son, Bruce V. Reagan, Jr., is in the investment business in San Diego, marking the third generation in this field. He is married to Lark Irene Reagan and they have three children, Bruce III, John King and Lark Erin Reagan.

Bruce V. Reagan served as a Major in World War II on Supreme Headquarters staff in England, France and Germany. He has been active in Veteran's Organizations, as well as Civic Affairs in such groups as Kiwanis, Chamber of Commerce, Masons, Tournament of Roses and many others.

A Republican leader for many years and a three term Assemblyman, Reagan serves on such committees as the Joint Senate Assembly committee for Public Retirement Fund Investing, Finance and Insurance, and Education and authored or co-authored many important bills in financial areas. Reagan has been known as a staunch conservative advocate of initiative and self reliance and as a determined foe of entrenched bureaucracy and galloping socialism.

Bruce V. Reagan has been a successful Investment Banking and Savings and Loan Executive in Pasadena for more than 30 years.

"To Safeguard Your Future"

Elect . . .

# **BRUCE V. REAGAN**

REPUBLICAN NOMINEE FOR

## **California State Controller**



**FINANCIALLY SOUND**

**EXPERIENCED — DEPENDABLE**

## THE JOB

### CALIFORNIA STATE CONTROLLER

1. Most important ELECTIVE Fiscal job in the United States. (Similiar Federal jobs are appointive.)
2. Responsibility for the Investment of hundreds of millions of public and retirement funds. (Teachers, Public Employees, etc.)
3. State's chief tax collector as Chairman of Franchise Tax Board and as state-wide member of the Board of Equalization.
4. State Auditor — Responsible to the people for honest, independent financial reports.
5. Responsible for all money disbursed from State Treasury for Education, Welfare, Highways and other subventions.
6. Active member of 18 important Boards and Commissions.
7. Offers vast opportunities to initiate constructive economies in California's Government.

## THE MAN FOR THE JOB

### BRUCE V. REAGAN

1. For more than 30 years recognized as a successful professional leader in fields of financial investment.
2. More than 30 years successful experience in investment of money for both public and private funds.
3. As an administrator, Reagan will replace present incompetents with experienced, able appraisers, and will eliminate present double taxation where possible.
4. Reagan as a businessman and legislator has proven his dedication to giving the people full, honest and accurate information at all times.
5. Reagan believes more careful auditing can cut present wasteful payout of State funds.
6. Reagan's broad experience will be of enormous value in deliberations of 18 boards and commissions.
7. Reagan expects to vigorously sponsor legislation in financial areas to build a better business climate for better jobs in a free economy California. His outstanding record in the State Legislature as a recognized authority on fiscal matters guarantees action.

JOHN A. BUSTERUD

Candidate for Treasurer  
State of California



PERSONAL HISTORY:

Age: 41

Married: Lives in Santa Rosa with his wife Anne and three children; John 7; James 4; and Mary 2

Education: Public schools in Coos Bay, Oregon  
University of Oregon, majoring in Economics; graduated with honors in 1943, Phi Beta Kappa  
Yale Law School, LLB 1949; an editor of Yale Law Journal

Military Service: Served in World War II with General Patton's 3rd Army. Now a Lieutenant Colonel, U. S. Army Reserve

OCCUPATIONAL HISTORY:

Attorney, practices law in San Francisco and Santa Rosa as a member of the firm of Broad, Busterud and Khourie

SERVICE IN CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT:

Legislator; elected to the Assembly from the 22nd District in 1956, re-elected in 1958 and 1960. (First ran in 1954, lost to incumbent by only 130 votes in a district with 60% Democrat registration. In 1956, he overwhelmingly defeated same incumbent.)

Republican leader; served as Republican Caucus Chairman in 1961 and 1962 Legislative Sessions.

Committees: Constitutional Amendments (Former Chairman)  
Ways and Means  
Judiciary  
Education  
Elections and Reapportionment

AFFILIATIONS:

American Bar Association, San Francisco and Sonoma County Bar Associations  
San Francisco Lawyers Club  
Commonwealth Club of California  
American Legion  
Veterans of Foreign Wars  
American Academy of Political Science  
Guardman, Bay Area youth welfare organization  
Trustee of Grace Cathedral  
Director of San Francisco Council of Churches

PLATFORM

PUBLIC FINANCE: "The Treasurer of California must market over a half billion dollars in State bonds, and safely invest millions of dollars in State funds each year. I pledge the utmost care in guarding and wisely investing the money of the people of California."

TAXES: "I have always fought higher State taxes, and shall continue to do so. Government already takes too much from your pocketbook at the Federal, State and local levels."

ECONOMY: "A vigilant Treasurer should be the 'watchdog of the public purse.' I will continue to fight for elimination of unfilled State jobs, for lower cost of government and to curb government waste. The only way taxes can be cut is by strict economy."

RECORD AS ASSEMBLYMAN

TAXES: Authored bills to repeal sales tax on drugs, reduce State income tax, cut taxes on small business, and give elderly citizens tax credit.

Opposed cigarette tax and higher personal income taxes.

ECONOMY: Consistently fought to slash government expenses, led economy bloc in 1962 Legislature which brought millions in budget savings.

BOND FINANCING: Authored legislation to require stricter controls over State bond financing.

Successfully fought to give people "the right to choose" by putting all \$970 million of 1962 State bond issues on one ballot.

Has supported important bond proposals for schools and college construction, and veterans' home loans, but urges more economy and "pay as we go" financing on new State programs.

\* \* \* \* \*



MAJOR ISSUES IN AGRICULTURELabor.

It is generally agreed that the Brown Administration and its political shock troops, the California Democratic Council, are strongly biased toward organized labor and have shown little understanding of agriculture's important contributions to the total state economy or to the particular problems characteristic of farming.

Although California wage rates are higher than those prevailing in competitive states, the Brown Administration in 1959 attempted to impose a minimum wage on farm labor. It was defeated only by the spontaneous and overwhelming objection of farmers.

Not content with this attempt to hobble California's farmers, Brown and the Democratic majority in the Legislature attempted to pass a "labor reform bill" which would have given state support to the attempt to unionize agricultural workers. The bill passed the Assembly but was defeated in the Senate.

Having been defeated in the Legislature, Brown -- through executive order -- restricted the importation of farm labor. This has been a long-time program of the CDC, which has repeatedly called for an end to the program (Public Law 78).

Brown's action in 1959 resulted in a loss of 25% of the Freestone peach crop for lack of sufficient labor to pick the crop. More recently, Brown has been silent about the Secretary of Labor's recent interpretations have in limiting the employment of bracero labor to 210 days in 35 weeks. Nor did Brown voice any objections when Billie Sol Estes' pal, Assistant Secretary of Labor Jerry Holliman, set bracero wages rates at \$1.00 per hour while he established rates in Texas at 70¢ an hour.

The Department of Agriculture.

Brown has made three politically inspired appointments to the key position of Director of Agriculture. First was the notorious William Warne, who later tried to downgrade agriculture and bury it in his own bureaucratic maze. Then he appointed James Ralph, who was recently fired by the national administration for being involved with Billie Sol Estes. His latest appointment is Charles Paul, who was picked for purely political purposes over the heads of more qualified career men in the Department and state farm leaders.

The Common Market.

Because California's agriculture is based on specialty crops, negotiations with the European Common Market are of crucial importance to California's farmers. Brown has gone down the line and endorsed the Kennedy Administration's proposals in this area. Other than to call non-productive meetings, he has initiated no efforts to see that California farm products are not put on the auction block in the proposed trade agreements program.

AGRICULTURAL FACTS - STATEWIDE

1. There are 99,000 farms; 67,000 of them are productive, commercial farms which put more than \$3 billion into the State's economy each year.
2. Agriculture generates wealth each year. Unlike mining or oil production, for example, the farmer renews wealth constantly. Moreover, agriculture generates employment and wealth in associated businesses--transportation, supply, equipment, etc.
  - (a) Production agriculture provides an average monthly employment of more than 450,000
  - (b) 8% of total civilian employment derives from agriculture.
  - (c) There are 35 persons employed in the processing of food and kindred products for each 100 persons employed in farm production.
  - (d) There are approximately 14 employees in the wholesaling of groceries and related products or raw materials, and 18 more in retail food stores, for each 100 persons employed on the farm.
3. California farmers spend about \$300 million each year for commercial feeds.
4. California farmers buy \$70 million worth of commercial fertilizers each year.
5. Labor earns \$453 million annually from agriculture.
6. California farmers spend about \$450 million on transportation each year.
  - (a) Agriculture accounts for 1/3 of all rail shipments.
  - (b) Agriculture accounts for 1/2 of all shipments out of California.
7. Machine hire costs California farmers \$100 million per year.
8. California farmers buy about \$90 million worth of petroleum products.
9. Seeds, plants, bulbs, etc., cost our farmers around \$40 million each year.
10. For every 100 people employed in commercial agriculture, 263 were employed in associated industries.
11. For each \$100 of gross income to farmers, the multiplied effect in the rest of the state's economy is \$280.
12. The average wage paid to domestic agricultural workers, on a combined hourly and piecework basis was \$1.27 during 1961.
13. While the number of domestic workers has remained fairly constant, the use of Mexican workers (braceros) has declined. Last year at peak periods, 206,790 domestic workers and 65,000 braceros were employed. In 1959 there were 204,300 domestics and 86,000 braceros.

**BUDGET**

A BUDGET TO MATCH OUR MOUNTAINS

It took California State Government exactly a century -- from 1850 to 1950 -- to attain a size and complexity of operation that required annual expenditures of one billion dollars. It took only nine years to double to two billion and it has taken only three years to bring us to the threshold of a three billion dollar budget.

Governor Brown says that this is all because of population growth but a few pertinent facts will refute this.

The state's population has increased 109% since 1945, but the state budget has gone up over 444% on a constant dollar basis.

State employees have gone up over 220% during the same period, and today 1 in 5.4 wage earners in the state works for state, local or federal government.

Total amount of the Budget: \$2,887,378,806. This is about 200 million dollars over the last budget. Governor Brown, who should perhaps be pricing items for discount stores, said the increase is "almost" \$199 million in his budget message. This is so much window dressing, since the hard figures won't be available 'til the June 30th statement is ready!

Perhaps more important, this budget is 45% higher than the last budget of the Knight Administration (1958-59), which was just under \$2 billion. If the Federal budget had risen as rapidly as the California state budget during the same period it would be \$114 billion today.

Comparison of Brown's 1962-63 Budget with Republican Budget 1958-59:

<u>Functions</u>	<u>1958-59</u>	<u>1962-62</u>	<u>% increase over 1961</u>	<u>% increase over 1958</u>
Education	796.4	1,140.6	8.0	43.2
Highways	457.8	551.5	-6.4	20.4
Social Welfare	188.9	295.3	23.8	56.3
Mental Hygiene	109.3	157.0	5.5	43.6
Corrections	49.1	88.9	9.9	81.0
Resources	123.6	189.8	17.7	53.5
Fiscal Affairs	32.8	45.8	6.2	39.6
Public Safety	20.6	23.0	3.1	11.6
Business & Commerce	12.4	29.0	7.9	134.0

**Table 1 PROGRESS OF THE BUDGET**

<b>Budget</b> <i>(excluding construction program)</i>	<b>General Fund</b>	<b>Special Funds</b>	<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>Surplus General Fund</b>
As Submitted .....	\$1,912,040,405	\$832,331,651	\$2,744,372,056	\$ 2,071,952
Added by Administration .....	2,766,665	3,469,073	6,235,738	.....
Revised Budget .....	\$1,914,807,070	\$835,800,724	\$2,750,607,794	.....
Assembly Version .....	\$1,912,412,636	\$835,548,442	\$2,747,691,078	\$ 1,974,793
Senate Version .....	\$1,910,537,364	\$835,576,375	\$2,746,113,739	\$ 3,715,065
Conference Version .....	\$1,912,269,624	\$836,926,621	\$2,749,196,245	\$ 666,408
Final Version—Second Extraordinary Session .....	\$1,908,642,294	\$836,926,621	\$2,745,568,915	\$ 4,320,738
Net Changes Between Original and Final Budget .....	\$— 3,398,111	\$+ 4,594,970	\$+ 1,196,589	\$+ 2,248,786

(Note: State Construction Program amounts to \$141,809,891, financed entirely by bond funds.)

Breakdown of Expenditures and Revenues into Dollar Components:

<u>TOTAL BUDGET REVENUES</u>	<u>*GENERAL FUND - REVENUES</u>
31.3 Sales Tax	44.5 Sales Tax
20.4 Highway Users (Gas) Tax	17.7 Personal Income Tax
12.4 Personal Income	17.1 Bank & Corporation Tax
12.1 Bank & Corporation	4.2 Inheritancs & Gift Tax
5.4 Motor Vehicle	4.1 Insurance Tax
2.9 Insurance	3.8 Cigarette Tax
2.9 Inheritance & Gift	3.3 Liquor Tax & Fees
2.7 Liquor	1.0 Horseracing Fees
2.7 Cigarette	4.3 All Others
1.5 Horseracing Fees	<u>100.0</u>
5.7 All others, including fees, oil revenue, etc.	
<u>100.0</u>	
<u>TOTAL BUDGET EXPENDITURES</u>	<u>*GENERAL FUND - EXPENDITURES</u>
41.6 Education	59.4 Education
20.1 Highway Transportation	25.7 Health & Welfare
17.9 Health & Welfare	4.7 Natural Resources
6.9 Natural Resources	4.6 Corrections
3.2 Corrections	2.2 Fiscal Affairs & Management
1.7 Fiscal Affairs & Management	1.2 Public Safety
1.1 Business & Commerce	0.6 Business & Commerce
0.8 Public Safety	1.6 All Other
6.7 Other	<u>100.0</u>
<u>100.0</u>	

Republican Cuts in State Expenses:

For only the second time in California history the Governor had to call an extraordinary session to secure passage of his fiscal bill.

Brown's corpulent budget met head-on with solid Republican demands for substantial economies:

1. <u>Elimination</u> of 859.5 positions from non-essential areas of government.	\$5 million
2. <u>Requirement</u> of "unidentified savings by statute, rather than hoping the bureaucrats would effect such economies.	6 million
3. <u>Elimination</u> of various non-essential government programs.	? million
4. <u>Substitution</u> of anticipated federal funds for state funds in public assistance programs, the administration would have enlarged the payments (again!).	<u>12 million</u>
<u>Monagan Task Force Committee recommended cuts (total)</u>	<u>\$23 million</u>

All of the GOP amendments fell to defeat under Assembly Democrat votes the first time around, but by the extraordinary session, election-year spenders were a little more amenable to ideas of thrift. Republicans succeeded not only in writing a statutory requirement for undistributed savings into the budget, but raised the figure \$2 million to \$8 million.

"Of major significance in changing the total was the increasing of 'unidentified savings' . . . from \$6 million in the budget as submitted to \$8 million in the final legislative version. This has the effect of increasing the prospective surplus by \$2 million and accounts for most of the net change in the surplus estimate."

-- A. A. Post, Legislative Analyst.

#### Precarious Budget Balancing:

Still, the soundness of Brown's fiscal policies is precarious -- witness the administration panic when Proposition 1 for State Construction Bonds failed to pass in June, throwing the 1962-62 Budget out of balance \$90 million.

Even if the electorate reverses its first judgement and approve the November Proposition for Construction Bonds, a balanced budget depends on several shaky Brown assumptions:

1. Favorable economic factors to bring an 8% increase in revenues.
  - 8.6% increase in personal income
  - 12% increase in corporate profits
  - New records in consumer spending and business construction

Hopefully California will enjoy such economic prosperity (and Brown is getting a boost from the White House with its increased spending and defense budget), but should any of these estimates fail to materialize the result could be serious.

With total state revenues \$2.6 billion, a 1% margin of difference between forecast and realization -- phenomenal accuracy by most standards -- amounts to more than \$26 million, a sizeable figure, particularly in red!

2. A surplus of some \$19 million from 1961-62 available for expenditure in 1963. Not known yet, this figure depends upon tax and other revenues living up to expectations. It also depends upon expenditures remaining within estimates. A greater caseload due to 1961 liberalizations of social welfare programs is predicted by some authorities to deplete this surplus.

Obviously, the time has come for a serious study of state spending and a return to solid financing.

**CDC**

THE CALIFORNIA DEMOCRATIC COUNCIL

Pat Brown and Richard Richards' actions this week in repudiating several long-standing positions taken by the California Democratic Council came as no surprise to those who have followed the actions of other Demos seeking re-election in 1962. This year, for the first time, the supposedly coveted right to appear as an "endorsed" candidate on the state mailing by which the Council advises Democratic voters whom it supports, became a stigma to some aspiring politicians.

This amulet to albatross transformation has actually led in a few cases to unheard of "no-endorsement" positions by CDC clubs -- a strange situation for what was primarily founded as an "endorsing" body.

BACKGROUND ON THE CDC

The California Democratic Council was founded at Asilomar in January, 1953. Republicans held 111 of California's 162 elective offices, and there had only been one Democratic Governor in the 20th century. The Democratic party had failed to carry the state for Stevenson the past fall despite a 3-to-2 registration advantage.

In those days the Democrats had no method for selecting candidates, and suffered from ticket-splitting free-for-alls which handed the election to the Republican -- often in the primary!

The remedy was a design for the selection of Democratic candidates -- foolproof even under cross-filing.

"A primary purpose of the proposed California Democratic Council would be to conduct a pre-primary convention every two years to endorse the best possible Democratic candidates for statewide partisan office -- and to build party unity behind them. A second purpose would be to do everything possible to promote and encourage pre-primary Assembly, County and Congressional District conventions."

Alan Cranston, first CDC President,  
to the Founding Convention, November 29, 1953

In March, 1954, the Council held its first state-wide endorsing convention -- and followed it with conventions in 1956 and 1958. Transformation of the CDC began at the 1957 convention when the first Resolutions Committee met.

These first resolutions have fallen into oblivion, but the charge issued by President Cranston gives a good picture of their nature:

" . . . We bask in the glorious achievements of the New Deal but we fail to grapple with the true issues of our day. It is to this task that we now must turn.

2.

" . . . The income of eight million American families still is less than \$2000. More than 25% of American families still live in slums. . . We must stand firmly at the side of labor to oppose so-called "right-to-work" laws. We must fight for a decent life for our fast-rising population of senior citizens.

"But all this is not enough. We must move on to new thinking about old and new problems . . .

"We must think anew about the whole matter of peace on earth. We must refuse to surrender totally to the tides of the arms race. It is our responsibility to seek a policy of peace to match our policy of power . . . If we fail to deal with it, we, or our children, or their children, will pay the price in a war of extermination."

The now-paramount Issues Conferences originated as insurance against an anticipated drought of enthusiasm in non-endorsing years. Founder Cranston admonished the CDC in 1957:

"At the Fresno Convention (1958) we must measure every action in terms of its consequences in the coming campaign . . . we must see to it that in our zeal we do not make it impossible to elect candidates who could carry out our ideas if they were elected. We cannot achieve what we are after by resolutions; we will achieve it by winning elections. Let us see to it that every resolution we pass is one on which we can stand squarely, not defensively, and one upon which our candidates can stand forth-rightly and without fear."

The 1960 Fresno resolutions and policy statements showed the true colors of the CDC and brought forth shocked screams from citizens who "thought" they were Democrats -- until they read the CDC resolutions, that is.

The Council's local chapters threw up a semantic smoke screen almost immediately, in effect saying, "we never said no such thing" when someone brought up the more radical points of the resolutions and policy statements. Democratic candidates endorsed by the CDC (many of whom were present and voted on the resolutions) were all too happy to "correct the distorted interpretation" of the statements.

Decidedly gun-shy after the violent public reaction to the 1960 manifesto, CDC'ers in 1961 chose to hide their ideas behind a facade of respectability. A comparison of their policy statements reveals very little difference between 1960 and 1961, however -- and not even a hint of retraction!

The damning effect of the 1960 Fresno convention has come home this year. A quick glance at the product of 1962's Fresno convention shows the extensive watering down which took place -- especially with the long arm of JFK present in the person of No. 1 White House counsel, Ted Sorensen, and U. S. Attorney Cecil Poole, who were pressed into service to fend off controversial resolutions critical of New Frontier policies.

Under such duress the convention:

1. Dropped from the disarmament policy statement the following paragraph:
 

"The risk of nuclear destruction is real, and that risk justifies assumption of some degree of uncertainty in a disarmament agreeeent. We would urge acceptance of a disarmament agreement with reasonably adequate inspection provision, rather than futilely insisting upon an absolutely foolproof inspection system which is too extensive for the other side to accept."
2. Scrapped a resolution condemning all nuclear testing in the atmosphere in favor of a minority report, magnanimously leaving it up to the President to decide whether to resume U. S. tests.
3. Slapped both the Brown and Kennedy administrations, however, by refusing to support fallout shelter programs at any level, despite the campaign of state and federal heavy-weights -- Sorensen, Poole, Charles O'Brien (Secretary to Brown) and Dick Tuck (U.S. Department of Commerce; formerly State Department of Motor Vehicles flack). In true Democratic style they shelved the issue by turning it over to a special study committee and the CDC Directors.

The California Democratic Council has gained power and prominence all out of proportion to its size -- 60,000 claimed members, or 1.5% of Democratic strength in California. Strong organization has enabled it to select, elect and control Democratic officeholders.

A Democratic candidate is faced with a dilemma. In a contested primary, if he hopes to raise the victory flag, he must seek the blessing of the CDC -- even though it may mean holding his nose over the resolutions.

Commenting on Brown's newly found disenchantment with the CDC, Dick Nixon raised a few questions:

"Why has it taken Brown two years to disavow the extreme positions the CDC took in 1960? Is it because he needed the legislative support of CDC-endorsed officeholders who firmly believe in the resolutions? Or is it because he has just learned from the results of a secret poll that a vast majority of the California voters violently oppose the radical positions of the CDC and recognize the obvious dangers in its program? Has he after all this time finally reached this position because of conviction or because of the probability of losing votes in November?

"Brown said at the CDC convention last January that he would not appear on the same platform with the radical left or radical right. He should now state whether this means he will not endorse Phillip Burton and John O'Connell, who are running for Assembly and Congress in San Francisco, and both of whom participated in the San Francisco riots against the House Un-American Activities Committee. Brown's new position requires that this time he now follow words with appropriate deeds and action."

YEAR-BY-YEAR COMPARISON  
of the  
CALIFORNIA DEMOCRATIC COUNCIL  
RESOLUTIONS AND POLICY STATEMENTS

Fresno, February, 1960

MILITARY AND DIPLOMATIC POLICY

. . . our long-term aim . . . (is) the remolding of the United Nations into a world organization that can enact world law, interpret it, and enforce world law upon individuals and governments alike, in the field of universal disarmament and war prevention.

There is reasonable hope that the Soviet Union is serious in its current policy of peaceful negotiations and the American government would be derelict not to explore in good faith every possibility of agreement.

. . . rather than insuring our security, the present United States strategy of deterrence pursued indefinitely will eventually result in war.

Geneva negotiations (nuclear testing and disarmament) should be immediately expanded to bring in other major powers, specifically including France and mainland China. (defacto recognition of Mao's government)

Santa Monica, March, 1961

(Exactly the same statement.)

We commend the proposition that the self-interests of the Soviet Union do not inevitably call for military aggression and that honorable negotiations are both necessary and possible.

(Apparently the CDC learned nothing from the torpedoing of the Paris Summit Conference, K and K's futile Vienna meeting, and negotiations on Berlin.)

The strategy of deterrence, if pursued indefinitely, is highly likely to lead to war.

(Would the CDC rather that we cease trying to deter aggression and allow it to succeed?)

Communist China should be involved in the agreements as soon as possible . . . We approve the expressed opinion of United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson that recent UN votes . . . point to the eventual admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

Fresno, January, 1962

(Resolution) . . . the United States should reaffirm its continuing support for the U. N. . . .

5. By encouraging the utilization of all vehicles for international cooperation . . . We particularly favor the creation of a permanent United Nations Expeditionary Force and an increased reliance on the International Court of Justice.

Negotiations with the Soviets on these conflicts (East-West, especially Berlin) is not appeasement or surrender, but simply common sense.

The risks inherent in disarmament pale in comparison to the risks inherent in an unlimited arms race . . . Complete disarmament must be our ultimate goal.

Any workable disarmament must include . . . Communist China and France. Thus, such powers should be represented at disarmament negotiations.

Fresno, February, 1960

MILITARY AND DIPLOMATIC POLICY (con't)

In the event Geneva negotiations deadlock . . . the United States should unilaterally suspend nuclear weapons tests indefinitely. (underlining ours)

CIVIL LIBERTIES

The House Un-American Activities Committee should be abolished.

Investigations of treason and sedition should be handled by governmental bodies other than legislative committees. Secret committees should be eliminated. Publication of names of subpoenaed witnesses should be prohibited. No committee should investigate in areas infringing freedom of thought, speech or association.

All state and federal non-disloyalty oaths should be abolished.

All legislation inhibiting powers of the Supreme Court in the field of civil liberties should be defeated.

Santa Monica, March, 1961

The United States should continue its moratorium on nuclear testing while negotiations for a comprehensive world-wide inspection system and a permanent test ban continue.

. . . we hereby reaffirm our continued support and endorsement of the policy positions which we have previously taken on such fundamental issues as non-disloyalty oaths, capital punishment, the practices of legislative investigating committees . . .

(The CDC thus advocates that loyalty to the U.S. no longer be a qualification for state or federal office; that no congressional committee should have the right to investigate Communist infiltration and subversion; that top-secret testimony be made public; and that there be no future reversal of Supreme Court decisions which have greatly restricted anti-subversive legislation in the U.S.)

Fresno, January, 1962

(Resolution) . . . the CDC condemns the Soviet Union's resumption of atmospheric nuclear testing (and urges an agreement to end testing, but) . . . we urge that the United States, pending such agreement, continue to refrain from such activity until such time as it is determined by our President that to do so would jeopardize our security . . . (It seems we should sit by and let the Soviets test until it's already too late.)

(Omitted this whole area from discussion. Made no effort to repudiate previous resolutions.)

Fresno, February, 1960

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Capital punishment should be abolished.

The goal of penal administration should be the prevention of crime and rehabilitation of the offender.

We urge all California Cities and counties to set up a Police Review Board, separate and distinct from the law enforcement department, with the power to hear citizen complaints of mistreatment at the hands of law enforcement officials, . . . and if justified to recommend that disciplinary action be taken against the offending official.  
(What ever happened to the courts of law?)

NARCOTICS

Police powers should not be extended and individual rights infringed even in narcotics cases, because police powers will not solve the narcotics problem, which is basically an economic, medical and psychiatric problem.  
(Perhaps this is true for some addicts, but would the CDC allow the pushers and peddlers, the destroyers of youth, to continue increasing California's narcotics traffic?)

Santa Monica, March, 1961

(The CDC adopted a "Crime" Policy Statement without reference to legal weapons for law enforcement officers, but emphasizing the "social sickness" that produces crime. As might be expected from the CDC, "Spare the criminal -- scorn the victim.")

The narcotics problem is but one of the pressing needs for governmental and community concern with the prevention and treatment of crime . . . we deplore the efforts by some law enforcement officials and groups to use the narcotics problem to whittle down constitutional guarantees.

We oppose any legislation to repeal or modify the Cahan and Priestly decisions. (Search and seizure and confidential-informants decisions which fetter peace officers) . . . we strongly affirm the rights of defendants to the fullest information necessary to the conduct of their defense.

Fresno, January, 1962

(No mention is made of the problem.)

Fresno, February, 1960

Santa Monica, March, 1961

Fresno, January, 1962

PORNOGRAPHY AND CENSORSHIP

(Resolution) . . . the Postmaster General is engaged in a massive censorship campaign substituting his own judgement for the traditional judgement of the courts . . . We ask that the Post Office Department be divested of all censorship powers, that the question here involved be determined by the Courts, where province over them properly lies.

Present governmental controls relating to pornography and obscenity are adequate.

BUSINESS AND LABOR: THE ECONOMY

We ask that the anti-trust laws of the state should immediately be strengthened and made more effective instruments for the denial of monopoly power and for the preservation of fair and open competition.

We further ask that the state should employ sufficient personnel to sustain an aggressive program of statewide enforcement of its anti-trust laws.

Extension of governmental censorship must be resisted as an infringement upon the constitutional protections of freedom of expression . . . Vigorous enforcement of existing laws with regard to pornography provide adequate methods of controlling the distribution of illegal materials.

(Parents and teachers of the one million school-age children who receive unordered filth through the mails each year might disagree with these assertions.)

We reaffirm that maintaining full employment and guiding the economy are prime responsibilities of government.  
(Underlining ours)

. . . We support the program of the Kennedy administration for maintaining purchasing power by extending unemployment compensation, raising minimum wages, and expanding Social Security benefits.

. . . we urge interest rate reductions beyond those currently proposed. Special consideration must be given to our senior citizens and low and middle income groups in any publicly-supported housing program.

Fresno, February, 1960

Santa Monica, March, 1961

Fresno, January, 1962

BUSINESS AND LABOR: THE ECONOMY (con't)

The restrictions on traditional union activities contained in the new labor law known as the Landrum-Griffin Law was (sic) sold as anti-corruption legislation . . . We urge the repeal of this loosely drawn, ill-conceived anti-labor law and the enactment of sincere anti-corruption legislation as was originally proposed.

(The CDC apparently believes that business monopoly should be restricted and "fair and open competition" preserved, but favors only the weakest possible safeguards against similar labor union abuses. The Landrum-Griffin Law, among other things, requires yearly financial statements from all unions.)

In the interest of stimulating the long-run growth of the economy and of combatting the current recession, we urge the Federal Government to increase substantially its spending on socially useful goods and services, such as on urban development, on publicly-owned natural resources and facilities, as well as on health and education.

(In CDC eyes, the federal government is the omniscient benefactor, whose duty it is to regulate all phases of the American economy. Rampant government spending on social welfare, labor benefits, public housing, medical care, and aid to education are camouflaged as "counter-cyclical expenditures." The loss of self-reliance and growing "let government do it" ethic are of no apparent concern.)

(Resolution) Whereas section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act permits state legislation which deprives labor and management of the right to bargain collectively, with respect to union security clauses . . . therefore . . . the California Democratic Council supports repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

(Section 14(b) allows the states to enact right-to-work laws.)

Fresno, February, 1960

AGRICULTURE

We oppose extension of Public Law 78 beyond June 30, 1961. In the event legitimate labor shortages still remain, we advocate normal immigration to fulfill these needs.

(Public Law 78 is the authorization for the importation of foreign contract labor (mostly Mexican) to meet labor shortages during peak harvest seasons. Normal immigration has never been sufficient to meet these seasonal shortages, as is pointed up in every annual report of the State Farm Placement Service.)

We urge support of AB 1223 now in interim committee. This bill would raise the minimum wage in California from \$1.00 to \$1.25. We call for the passage of this bill without exclusionary amendments. (underlining ours)

(Because California is already paying far higher average hourly wages than states with competing agricultural products, farm workers have traditionally been excluded from minimum wage legislation. If our state alone were to pass such a law, California farmers would be placed in an unfair competitive position, and many would be forced out of business.)

Santa Monica, March, 1961

We advocate the termination of Public Law 78 (allowing the use of braceros) within a short period of years and urge the state and federal government to start simultaneous development of adequate sources of American workers to replace them . . .

We urge legislation to protect the right of farm labor to organize and bargain collectively with their employers and to receive all social and legal benefits available to other workers.

We commend Governor Brown for his program of vigorously promoting and protecting the welfare of California agriculture through his revitalization of the Department of Agriculture under the leadership of William Warne, James T. Ralph and Charles Paul.

(Quite an impressive record of "leaders." Warne -- condemned by a congressional committee for his waste of U.S. funds in Iran -- went on to empire-build in the Water Resources Department and fell under

(continued)

Fresno, January, 1962

Fresno, February, 1960

Santa Monica, March, 1961

Fresno, January, 1962

AGRICULTURE (con't)

fire from Senate Democrat leader Hugh Burns: "If I were an executive of a corporation, I wouldn't have such a man working for me." (See Ammos #13 & #17) Ralph gained notoriety when he was removed from the U.S. Department of Agriculture -- after having already been demoted from Assistant Secretary of Agriculture -- because of involvement in the Billie Sol Estes scandal.)

MEDICAL CARE

Whereas there is an urgent need to provide adequate medical care for the people of the United States . . . Be it therefore resolved that we meet this challenge by urging and working for passage of the Forand Bill at this session of Congress.

(The Forand Bill -- medical care financed under Social Security -- was defeated in 1960.)

As a long-range goal, we urge establishment of a national health insurance program. While developing such a program, the federal social security mechanism should be extended to give medical benefit coverage to those who are employed as well as those who are retired, and to include recipients of public assistance on a tax-supported basis.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

We call for the rewriting of our nationality and immigration legislation to conform to our best liberal and democratic traditions.

As an immediate measure, we ask that the present law be amended to provide a statute of limitations of five years,

(continued)

The CDC reaffirms its positions calling for revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952. Specifically:  
1. Non-allocation of visas on the basis of race, color or national origins.

(continued)

Fresno, February, 1960

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION (con't)

after which non-citizens can no longer be threatened with deportation procedures, and foreign-born citizens can no longer be threatened with procedures to revoke their citizenship; such non-citizens and foreign-born citizens, after said five year period, shall be subject only to the laws and penalties generally applicable to all citizens and residents of our country.

(Under the present McCarran-Walter Act, non-citizens and foreign-born citizens can be deported and citizenship revoked under certain circumstances if they become involved in criminal or subversive activities, or otherwise prove themselves undesirable.)

MISCELLANEOUS

Morton Sobell

(Resolution) Morton Sobell is serving his tenth year in prison. He has steadfastly proclaimed his innocence throughout his imprisonment.

Many eminent Americans and other world figures including jurists, scientists, clergymen have also expressed substantial doubt as to his guilt.

There does exist the possibility of human error in matters of judgement that has been subjected to the political tensions of the day.

(continued)

Santa Monica, March, 1961

Fresno, January, 1962

2. Revision of the grounds for exclusion and expulsion of persons.
3. Elimination of the national origins quota system.

Fallout Shelters (Resolution)

Whereas, it is the aspiration of the Kennedy Administration to give to the American people the maximum security in a world fraught with chronic crises; and

Whereas, fallout shelters are under consideration as a means to that end; and

Whereas, majority and minority reports of the Resolutions Committee have been filed with this convention on this issue; and

(continued)

Fresno, February, 1960

MISCELLANEOUS (con't)

Martin Sobell:

CDC has traditionally expressed concern for possible infringements upon justice and civil liberty.

CDC calls upon the President of the United States to review again the facts in the Sobell case and take necessary action to secure ultimate justice.

(Morton Sobell was convicted of aiding Julius and Ethel Rosenberg in their efforts to obtain U.S. atomic secrets and send them to the Soviet Union. He has been identified on numerous occasions in congressional committee hearings by corroborated witnesses as an active Communist agent and close associate of Rosenberg in the Communist apparatus. His release from prison has long been a pet project for agitation by both the Communist Party and its numerous front organizations ever since the close of the Rosenberg trial.)

Santa Monica, March, 1961

Fresno, January, 1962

Fallout Shelters

Whereas, the CDC Convention delegates can best achieve the widest study and wisest counsel by a referral of this significant and complex controversy to a committee for study, which should make its report and recommendations at the earliest feasible time, in such manner as it believes will be most suited to its purpose; and

Whereas, this procedure is in the best interest of the democratic process and the Democrat party;

Now therefore be it resolved that this resolution be substituted for those submitted by the Resolution Committee in its majority and minority reports, and that a study committee be appointed promptly in order that it may prepare its report and recommendations as expeditiously as possible, in such manner as will best accomplish the objectives herein.

(Translated: we oppose fallout shelters, but we dare not say so publicly.)

**CIVIL DEFENSE**

THE CIVIL DEFENSE MUDDLE

Major Problem: The plain fact is that California has no civil defense program -- no full-scale plan, no general or specific policy, no clear guide-lines for local and county planning, no systematic program in action for providing some defense against blast, some protection against fall-out. Except for a few private firms and even fewer private families, there simply is no civil defense in this state.

There is, to be sure, an Emergency Office (although what it does except provide good salaries for a few more political hacks is hard to say) -- but no record of effective action.

There is not, to be sure, the clear national guidance that is needed in this area. BUT this does not mean that the state can evade its responsibility to its own people -- or, at the least, make enough noise often enough to build a fire under the national Civil Defense organization so that it begins to provide such guidance.

Political Football: Every level of government kicks the ball and passes the buck to the one above it -- the cities to the county, the counties to the state, the state to the federal government. And no hard and fast plans get made, no effective action gets taken. No lower unit wants to budget or spend its own money -- when there remains a chance of loans and grants from above.

Responsibility? No possible doubt: either the Governor provides the necessary leadership or no one provides it. And the incumbent has not provided any.

For the Future:

--- to the maximum extent possible, no new public buildings without provision for shelter areas (where appropriate -- especially, schools and major office buildings);

--- planning for utilization of parking lots, civic centers, rapid transit tunnels/viaducts/under and overpasses;

--- sensible stockpiling program (food and water, medical supplies, key raw materials for reconstruction);

--- immediate collaboration with private firms for post-attack rehabilitation planning (including major service industries -- e.g., banking and insurance);

--- concise, specific, definite emergency orders for the whole civilian population: what to do, where to go, etc.

These are some of the things that can be done now, steps that can be taken by state authorities -- even in the absence of national guidance. We can make a start. And some of the problems we can -- if we must -- solve by ourselves and with our own resources. Footdragging and endless buck-passing is, in any case, no adequate answer

S.F.  
News-  
Call  
Bulletin

11/20/61

## Politics Today

# Brown in a Jam On Civil Defense

By JACK S. McDOWELL  
News-Call Bulletin Political Editor

Confused by civilian defense? You're not alone.

It's not generally known, but a staff memo issued to members of California's Joint Legislative Budget Committee a few days ago has sent these lawmakers into some plain and fancy head-scratching.



McDOWELL

Legislative Analyst A. Alan Post, in a discreetly unpublicized memo, suggested that the senators and assemblymen on this important money-bags committee take a good, careful look at the effect of Gov. Brown's recent actions on the status of the state's civilian defense operations.

**THE PROBLEM** involves legal and financial questions—the stickiest kind for any administration.

The legislators were informed, for example, that the role of the California Disaster Office has been "radically changed" from that on the books—and the basis it has been financed in state budgets.

By executive order, the governor created a new civilian defense chief when he named Highway Patrol Commissioner Bradford Crittenden to the cabinet post of "public safety administrator." He also decreed that the "key responsibility for disaster operations" would be in the hands of the California National Guard—under Crittenden's direction.

**BROWN ALSO** created a post of "state emergency welfare director" to be responsible for the population's food, clothing and shelter needs in event of a disaster. This job is in the State Social Welfare Dept. and is designated as the state's liaison officer to deal with the federal government regarding use of U. S. funds for emergency supply purchases.

Then there's the Dept. of Motor Vehicles, which now has executive orders to study the feasibility of setting up some sort of a statewide registry to locate and reunite the scattered members of families after a disaster.

Despite all this, the budget-scanning lawmakers were informed, the California Disaster Office "continues to be charged with planning for an emergency—but has no operational authority."

Post warned the legislators: "The changes in duties, through these new executive (governor's) orders, create some serious doubt as to whether the California Disaster Office really will and can do the planning any more."

The governor may have to open the special legislative session in February to civilian defense—if it turns out legislative action is necessary to legalize the spending necessary for his program.

**CIVIL RIGHTS**

RICHARD NIXON'S PUBLIC  
RECORD ON CIVIL RIGHTS MEASURES

House of Representatives

1947 - POLL TAX

Voted for a bill to prohibit the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting in Federal elections.

Voted against a motion to prevent voting on the anti poll tax.

1949 - POLL TAX

Voted for a bill to make unlawful the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a condition for voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Voted three times against Southern Democratic sponsored motions to adjourn discussion of the anti poll tax bill--motions which, if passed, would have killed the measure.

Voted for three motions to close debate on the bill and to approve it as read into the Journal.

Voted against a motion to recommit the bill for further study.

SEGREGATION IN THE COAST GUARD

Voted for a measure to prohibit segregation or discrimination because of race, creed or color in the Coast Guard Women's Reserve.

1950 - FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES ACT

Voted for the passage of the bill calling for the establishment of The Fair Employment Practices Commission to investigate charges of discrimination in employment situations and then to make appropriate recommendations.

Voted four times against Southern Democratic motions to delay consideration of the bill.

Voted for two motions to consider the bill immediately.

Senate

There were no civil rights measures before the Senate during Nixon's Term (1950-1952).

As Vice President - Presiding over the Senate

1957 - CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

In order to speed consideration of the Civil Rights Bill after months of delay by opponents in the House, Senators Knowland and Douglas devised a plan to by-pass the Senate Judiciary Committee. Under their plan, the House-passed bill was placed immediately on the Senate calendar where it could be called up for Senate consideration at any time on a simple majority vote.

On June 20th, 1957, Knowland objected to referring the Civil Rights Bill to committee, and Senator Russell (Dem. Georgia) took issue with this objection. After considerable debate, Vice President Nixon stated that in his opinion Senator Russell's point was "not well taken," and that Rule XXV, on which Russell relied, did "not require mandatory referral of all bills to committee."

The Vice President put the question to a vote, and after eight days of debate the Senate agreed to Knowland's motion that it begin immediate consideration of the Civil Rights Bill.

As a result of Nixon's action, a further period of obstructive delays was avoided, and the way was cleared for passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

JURY-TRIAL AMENDMENT TO THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1957

Nixon publicly opposed this Amendment guaranteeing jury trials in all cases of criminal contempt, and after its adoption by the Senate, he stated:

"This was one of the saddest days in the history of the Senate because this was a vote against the right to vote."

August 2, 1957

1960 - CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

Nixon publicly and repeatedly supported the Administration's proposals, most of which were incorporated into the Civil Rights Act of 1960. Nixon stated on February 15, 1960:

"I believe the recommendations . . . the President has made in his civil rights message will provide the kind of stimulus and leadership that is needed to bring adherence to the (Supreme Court) decision."

BROWN RECORD ON CIVIL RIGHTS

In 1959 three major pieces of civil rights legislation were enacted: (1) FEPC; (2) Equal treatment of citizens in business establishments; and (3) Prohibition of discrimination in any publicly assisted housing accommodation.

The Record of the Fair Employment Practices Commission

Governor Brown boasts of FEPC as his prime accomplishment in the field of civil rights. It consists of a five-member commission appointed by the Governor and administratively assigned to the Department of Industrial Relations. The FEP Act instructs the Commission to stress conference, conciliation, education and persuasion. If conciliation fails, the Commission may call public hearings and, if necessary, seek court enforcement of its orders.

During the Commission's first 31 months of operation, 1592 complaints and requests for investigation were docketed. Through April, 1962, 1207 cases were closed, and in only 384 (31.8%) of them was discrimination found and corrected.

Compared to other services in State government, FEPC is expensive in relation to its caseload. Over the first 33 months of operation, FEPC cost \$709,000, or \$567 for each case closed, and \$1846 for each case of discrimination which it found. This compares with an average administrative cost of \$122 for each welfare case handled in California. The average caseload for each FEPC "consultant" was 36 per year (only 3 per month over the first 31 months). Welfare workers have caseloads averaging 120 per month, or FORTY TIMES AS GREAT. Other employees in the Department of Industrial Relations average more than 700 cases per year.

Despite this high cost in relation to work output, the budget of the FEPC has more than doubled since it was established: from \$162,343 in 1959-60 to a proposed \$341,248 in 1962-63.

Major criticism of FEPC and Brown is that there has been too much emphasis on the purely legal aspects of the Fair Employment Practices Act - and not enough leadership extended on the personal and educative level - something which is vitally needed. Brown has a law on the books which gives him the opportunity to give lip service to the principle - but there have been no real strides forward or significant breakthroughs in opening up closed fields of employment during his administration. And, further, the present commission has made little attempt to do research into the causes and cures in this area.

Housing in the 1961 Session!

In 1961 the author of the 1959 anti-discrimination in housing bill, Gus Hawkins (D-L.A.), introduced legislation to extend the prohibition to all housing, privately as well as publicly financed, except one-family dwellings occupied by the owner. The FEPC was to be given the authority to enforce the provisions of the bill. The legislation was bitterly fought, with labor supporting it strongly and the California Real Estate Board opposing it. In addition, there were others who felt that such legislation violated property rights under the U. S. Constitution.

The bill never got out of the Ways and Means Committee in the Assembly, but a watered-down version was reported out later that limited its effect to publicly-assisted housing (i.e., apartment houses built with FHA, VA or California Veteran Loans) and also tract homes with five or more units, and any house with a veterans tax exemption. While the Assembly passed the bill, the Senate Committee on Govern-

mental Efficiency sent the bill to a between-sessions study committee. A second bill introduced by Hawkins was enacted which prohibits discrimination in the sale of homes that are financed by Cal-Vet loans.

### Anti-Discrimination Bills, 1961

Two companion bills requested by Mosk and introduced by Assemblyman Philip Burton (D-S.F.) and Senator Hugo Fisher would have required the state to revoke licenses of business or professional people who refused services on the basis of race or religion. The Senate version was killed in committee, but the Assembly bill was passed, 51-15, and died in Senate Committee.

Two other bills were also enacted into law. One outlaws the cancellation of insurance on the grounds of race, color, or national origin; the other banned inquiry into race in the charging of insurance premiums and in applications.

### 1961 Reapportionment Controversy

The Los Angeles Sentinel (Negro Weekly) led a drive for the "two and four" program by which the principal Negro areas would be spread over two Congressional districts and four Assembly districts instead of being concentrated largely in one Congressional district. The drive was a complete failure. While it drew support from Richard Richards, the American Jewish Congress, and the Los Angeles County Republican Central Committee, the CDC refused to even permit a resolution to be presented on the floor of the March, 1961, convention.

Assembly Speaker Jesse Unruh is generally considered to have been the force frustrating this plan, but he had the assistance of Pat Brown and Assemblyman Robert Crown (D-Alameda), chairman of the Elections Committee. Hawkins was also severely criticized for being in on the plot.

In June, after it became clear that the leadership elements of the Negro community had been snubbed and that nearly all of Los Angeles' Negroes were lumped into one huge "Jim Crow" Congressional District, the Sentinel bitterly denounced Brown, Mosk, Unruh, and the Legislature, and blamed the liberals generally as the:

"prime seducer of the Negro community and its voting power... the actions of the Democratic liberals on representation in government reveal them -- not the bigots and reactionaries -- as the true enemy of the development and self-expression of our community."

The "liberals", for all of their agitation against using race or color as a criteria in employment and housing, had formed a Congressional District by drawing a "color line" around the Negro community.

### Brown at the Governor's Conference

Governor Brown's chameleon-like transformations on civil rights were again revealed at the Governor's Conference in July, 1962. While Republican governors were pressing for a strong resolution on civil rights, Brown said that he didn't want a resolution on civil rights even presented to the conference because it might "divide" and cause dissension with the Democratic Party. Just as President Kennedy has refused to even present a "promised" civil rights bill to Congress during his first two years, Brown also became a man willing to compromise progress for the Negro because he is afraid to antagonize the Southern wing within his own party.

Republican pressure finally brought a civil rights resolution to the floor; but when the vote on it came, Brown was upstairs getting into formal dinner dress, while the more conscientious governors tended to the important business at hand.

**ECONOMIC EXPANSION**

THE BUSINESS CLIMATE . . . Brown  
 versus The Facts, Brown versus His  
 Own Experts, and California versus  
 New York . . .

# 1962 CAMPAIGN AM-MU-NI-TION !

THE RESEARCH CENTER  
 REPUBLICAN STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

July 23, 1962 Number 1

THE W O R S E N I N G J O B C L I M A T E  
 H o t A i r v e r s u s C o l d F a c t s

The Hot Air (courtesy of Edmund G. Brown):

"The California Economy is growing today--and creating new jobs by the hundreds of thousands--because we have the best business climate in the United States." (EGB 5/1/62)

The Cold Facts, beginning with the June 23 Chronicle:

DOW JONES AVERAGE 539.19 Off 11.30	San Francisco Chronicle <b>Business World</b> PAGE 36 SAN FRANCISCO, SATURDAY, JUNE 23, 1962 CCCCIA	N. Y. STOCK VOLUME 5,640,000 Shares
---------------------------------------	---	--

## Marchant to Close Bay Plant

**1200 to Be Offered Jobs In Southeast**

**1200 AFFECTED**  
 The 1200 manufacturing personnel to be eliminated by relocation of the calculator facility will be offered employment at the new facility, with full amenities. South-Corona Hardware announced it will also sponsor a consulting service to help workers desiring to remain here to find new employment in the Bay Area.

The plant to be closed, the company said, "for many years has been producing." The move, it declared, is "in accordance with a corporate program of modernization and consolidation of manufacturing facilities."

Marchant is a pioneer Oakland business machine firm that was founded in 1916 in the East Bay city. For many years it was a leader in the production of desk calculators and it was responsible for many developments in the field of data processing.

The company was merged into South-Corona in 1961, the parent company in 1962.

The Oakland branch sales and service office will continue to operate on a fully staffed basis and will move to a new location in Oakland when the plant is sold.

Marchant's announced move to Orangeburg, South Carolina, taking 1200 jobs with them, was just one in a long series of such moves by firms who have found it necessary to either move or expand outside California:

Cutter Laboratories new plant is in Chattanooga . . . Friden, Inc. (business machines) makes expansions only outside California, the firm's home state . . . Essick Manufacturing (air conditioners) has new plants in Wisc., N.J., Texas and Ark., and has "made its last expansion in California."

According to newspaper and trade sources, other firms not expanding in California include Cannon Electric, Ampex Corporation, Food Machinery, Inc., Schlage Lock, and Robertshaw-Fulton Controls.

A private study conducted in January, 1961, showed that 31 companies, including Heywood-Wakefield (furniture), Challenger Lock and Allied Control Company, had either moved out of the Los Angeles area or were liquidated. Later that year Rheem (hot water heaters, etc.) closed its South Gate manufacturing plant because it was cheaper to manufacture in the Midwest and ship in to California.

California Metal Trades Association reported in March, 1961, that 26 companies had either suspended or curtailed operation in the San Francisco Bay Area -- with a resulting loss of 8,650 jobs and \$47,000,000 plus in annual payroll.

"Our company has been growing steadily and profitably for a number of years, and we expect to continue to expand our operations at the moment, and, frankly speaking, California is not included in our expansion plans" . . . quoted from a letter to Pat Brown (1/12/61) by the president of Interstate Engineering Corporation.

Note that these companies by and large are not defense connected. The companies which are being hurt are the generalized small manufacturer, precisely the element we need to provide three vital factors in the California economy:

- . Balance in case of any cutback in defense spending or unemployment due to technological changes in that industry.
- . Job outlets for the less-skilled worker.
- . Growth through new ideas and products.

The "widget" manufacturer is disappearing from the state scene, and with him our chance to take up the slack in the job market and help create the 250,000 new positions we need every year.

B R O W N   versus   H I S   O W N   E X P E R T S !

All this is borne out by Brown's own experts, who apparently haven't been informed about the party line. No just Irving Perluss, Brown's Director of Employment, whose tactlessly truthful "the resultant high taxes make for a bad business climate" remark last year touched off a storm.

This time it was Dr. Charles Tiebout (tee-boo), Associate Professor of Economics at UCLA, and a consultant to Brown's Economic Development Agency. On June 21, 1962, speaking at the Governor's Conference on California Growth, Brown's expert said:

"A region's growth depends on its ability to export its products. Its fortune is tied to its ability to sell to other regions. We have done an excellent job selling to other regions.

"But, the increase in California's exports from 1947 to now has become almost all defense. Outside of the defense industry we sell less than we did a decade ago. Almost all the increase is in the defense and space market.

"This is my main worry. We need to attempt to diversify the export market. We must plan for growth, but we must also plan for decline."

LISTED BELOW ARE SOME OF THE REASONS WHY IT MAY BE A LITTLE DIFFICULT TO "DIVERSIFY" :

California has the second highest tax rate per \$100 of personal income of the ten largest industrial states.

TAX RATE PER \$100 OF PERSONAL INCOME	
California	\$ 5.16
Michigan	5.32
Pennsylvania	4.53
New York	4.45
10 STATE AVERAGE	4.24

Per Capital state and local taxes are the highest in the nation.

The 1959 tax law changes for corporations resulted in a 38 % increase in collections in the first full year.

Changes in the unemployment insurance law by the 1961 Legislature will cost employers an additional 160 million dollars annually . . . and this is on top of the 65 million dollar annual cost of liberalizations made just two years ago.

California has the second most liberal workman's compensation program of all the states.

Average hourly earnings of production workers are the third highest (2.66) in the nation, trailing only Michigan (2.76) and Washington (2.68).

A \$750 million annual public assistance program -- most generous of any state.

BROWN'S BOASTS versus ROCKY'S RECORD

On June 18th, Governor Nelson Rockefeller answered Brown's unsupported boasts with a few quiet facts. In a speech to the Empire State Chamber of Commerce, he cited the record:

" . . . New York had more new factories underway since the beginning of 1961 than the next two states combined.

"A survey by the independent magazine Industrial Development and Manufacturers' Record shows 352 new plants for New York in 1961 plus 169 more in the first five months of 1962 -- a total of 521.

"What does the same survey show about other States for the same period?

"Well, the totals were:

For Ohio, 272  
For Pennsylvania, 244  
For Illinois, 236  
For Texas, 228  
For Florida, 226  
For Massachusetts, 193  
For North Carolina, 173  
FOR CALIFORNIA, 159 -- compared with our 521.

"California is the state now most closely rivaling us in population -- but we in New York have built or started more than three times as many new plants since the beginning of last year.

"AND CALIFORNIA'S INDEBTEDNESS HAS BEEN SOARING WHILE NEW YORK'S HAS BEEN DECLINING." (our capitalizing.)

In closing, Rockefeller asked a rhetorical question, "what does all this mean?"

"That the fiscal integrity of government -- despite what President Kennedy says -- is of prime importance in attracting new industry, in encouraging the investment of capital in new and expanded plant and equipment, and in creating more and better jobs." (underlining ours.)

**EDUCATION**

**GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION**

BROWN'S REORGANIZATION PLAN  
"Jobs for Deserving Democrats"

With no general reorganization since 1929, our state government has become a jumble of 360 haphazardly arranged boards, commissions, committees, and agencies, each one

- (a) responsible directly to the Governor
- (b) jealously guarding a vested, bureaucratic interest.

In 1959 Pat Brown set out to solve this muddle by the usual means: appointing a Governor's Committee to devise a solution to the problem! After two years of study, the Governor's Committee on Organization of State Government recommended lumping all departments, boards, and commissions into eight super-agencies, each headed by an administrator who serves as the "outpost of the Governor" and is responsible to the state's chief executive. The signature of the committee's chairman, Bert Levit, former Director of Finance, was conspicuously absent from the final report as it crossed the Governor's desk.

THE BROWN SUPER-AGENCY PLAN

Nevertheless, Brown in 1961 asked for and was granted authority by the Legislature to appoint four \$25,000-a-year administrators and create four super agencies -- Health and Welfare, Youth and Adult Corrections, Resources, and Transportation.

Brown did not stop here. By executive order he expanded his "cabinet", elevating four more state directors to head "ghost super agencies" -- Revenue and Management, Business and Commerce, Employment Relations, and Public Safety.

Brown has stubbed his toe more than once over the plan. The Governor alienated agriculture by assigning the Agriculture Department under the Resources Agency -- against the Legislature's specific intent. A barrage of objections from California's largest industry met Brown's attempt to "get the camel's head under the farmer's tent and then take over the entire Department of Agriculture," and forced Brown to appoint Agriculture Director, Charles Paul, to a ninth, independent cabinet post.

Insurance Commissioner F. Britton McConnell sees Brown's creation of agencies without statutory authority and his own subordination to Brown crony Preston Silbaugh, Savings and Loan Commissioner and "ghost agency" head, as a device to seize control of the insurance department for political purposes.

The agency plan for government reorganization looks good to the casual observer. Charted on paper it appears logical and orderly. But it is as effective as a lead life preserver.

"The addition of more people to the payroll has not, historically, resulted in lower governmental costs."

Dr. James Bell, State Executive Reorganization.

Dr. Bell wins a "Master of Understatement" degree. By the very provisions of the bill, each administrator may "employ staff and consultants, and appoint advisory and technical committees to assist in the work." Should it produce some department economies, they would be offset by the increased cost of \$250,000\* for the agencies. (\*estimate by A. Alan Post, Legislative Analyst.)

#### THE JOKER IN THE DECK - NO POWER

The economies - which Brown cites as if they were already accomplished - will come about only if internal organization and procedural changes are made and offices physically consolidated. The catch is: the administrator has no power to effect any changes in departments under him, to consolidate a single agency, to abolish a single board, to eliminate a single job. In the words of the bill's author:

"The administrator would not have the power to transfer authority from one department to another. He could only recommend changes to the Governor and to the department heads ... It would be no different than it is now when the Governor settles differences between department heads. An agency head cannot say this is the way we will do it. He must have executive approval before any change can be made." Gordon Winton, before Assembly Government Organization Committee, April 28, 1961.

Apparently the agency head must, by some hidden method of persuasion, effect economies in budgeting and programming - without the authority to made any administrative change!

In short, Brown's reorganization scheme has not done away with a single agency of state government; <sup>1</sup> it has added four more at the top and produced:

- increased communications problems
- tangled lines of authority
- sluggish decision-making
- another layer of political fat -- "jobs for deserving Democrats"

---

<sup>1</sup> By the admission of Hale Champion, Director of Finance, the 11 agencies which were abolished in 1961 were largely non-functioning, some would have lapsed anyway, and the abolition was mainly a matter of cleaning up the statutes.