

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	9	n.d.	Report	Candidate's FACT BOOK prepared by Bob Haldeman by the Republican Research Center. "Miscellaneous" tab. 5 pages.
64	9	09/14/1962	Other Document	Remarks by Richard Nixon: Support of School Construction Bonds (Proposition 1-A). 1 page.
64	9	09/12/1962	Other Document	Richard Nixon at Republican Associates Luncheon: New Industry Means Employment. 2 pages.
64	9	09/26/1962	Other Document	Richard Nixon at Luncheon with "Celebrities for Nixon" Committee: Unemployment in the Film Industry. 2 pages.
64	9	10/04/1962	Report	Richard Nixon at South Bay Rally, Manhattan Beach, Ca.: Brown Considers Tax Increases. 2 pages.
64	9	09/13/1962	Other Document	Richard Nixon remarks at Masonic Constitution Day Celebration, Chico: Anti-Communism Program for California. 2 pages.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
64	9	09/20/1962	Other Document	Richard Nixon, San Jose, Ca: Program for Progress in Welfare. 2 pages.
64	9	09/23/1962	Other Document	Richard Nixon statewide radio address: Protecting Our Citizens-Programs for Progress. 4 pages.
64	9	09/12/1962	Other Document	Richard Nixon remarks; Sacramento Kick Off Barbecue: Recreational Facilities and Conservation. 2 pages.
64	9	09/30/1962	Other Document	Richard Nixon statewide radio address: Educating Our Children: Programs for a Greater California - Number 2. 5 pages.
64	9	09/22/1962	Other Document	Richard Nixon remarks; Before the North San Diego County Nixon for Governor Barbeque: Should Subversives Speak on Tax-Supported Campuses. 2 pages.
64	9	n.d.	Report	"Believe It or Not" re: signed letter addressed to John Bailey, DNC, seeking cancellation of scheduled hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee in Los Angeles. 1 page.
64	9	08/26/1962	Report	"Defeat of UNRUH Anti-Communist Resolution by Democratic State Committee." 1 page.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
64	9	08/05/1962	Other Document	Remarks by Richard M. Nixon; Before the Republican State Central Committee Meeting; Sacramento, Ca. 2 pages.
64	9	08/07/1962	Other Document	Remarks of Richard Nixon at Annual Meeting of the Section on Family Law, American Bar Association, Bellevue Hotel, San Francisco. 2 pages.
64	9	08/28/1962	Report	Nixon's Support of the Central Valley Project and Other Reclamation Programs. 2 pages.
64	9	08/28/1962	Report	Nixon Civil Rights - Dick Nixon's "Deeds" in Eliminating Discrimination in Employment. 2 pages.
64	9	10/03/1962	Other Document	Richard Nixon remarks: The Brown Myth of Fiscal Responsibility; Nixon for Governor Rally, Pasadena. 2 pages.

MISCELLANEOUS

BY THEIR VOTES YE SHALL KNOW THEM

COMMUNISM

(And Sometimes By The Way They Don't Vote!)

"This is our chance to stand up and be counted."

Assemblyman BRUCE REAGAN
(R-Pasadena) 4/18/61

On April 19th the Assembly voted overwhelmingly to pass AB 1559 (Louis Francis (R-San Mateo) and twenty other Republicans) which gives school boards the power to prevent use of school buildings for subversive purposes.

The fact that the bill was introduced and that it passed overwhelmingly were almost foregone conclusions, ever since the state supreme court by a 4-3 decision upset the former statute which prohibited the use of school buildings by subversive organizations.

In the opinion of the legislative counsel, the new provisions are constitutional. Briefly they require that a school board may refuse authority to use its property to any person or organization --unless, under penalty of perjury, they file an information statement stating that the property will not be used "for the commission of any act which is prohibited by law."

Use of school property by an individual or group "for the commission of any act intended to advocate or teach concrete action for the overthrow of the U.S. Government" is prohibited.*

As is often the case with good legislation in this area, the significant thing here is not who voted for the bill--we expected substantial support--but who voted against the bill. In the words of Minority Floor Leader Joe Shell (R-Los Angeles):

"If you want, at the taxpayers expense, to provide a platform for subversive groups, you will vote against the bill."

Well, eight people did vote against the bill. The eight, all Democrats, were: Phil Burton (San Francisco), Robert Crown (Oakland), Bert DeLotto (Fresno), Edward Elliott (Los Angeles), John Knox (Richmond), Lester McMillan (Los Angeles), John O'Connell (San Francisco), and Nicholas Petris (Oakland).

*Note that this interferes with no ones constitutional rights of freedom of assembly on public property. It does, however, provide a safeguard against the use of that property to "bite the governmental hand which provides the service."

The Mystery of the Missing Votes!

The vote was 69 AYE, 8 NAY, which of course adds up to 77, but this was one of those days when all 80 assemblymen were present and voting. Obviously, three people "ducked" this roll call for reasons of their own. A check of the list revealed that these were also Democrats, Gus Hawkins, Tom Rees and Jesse Unruh (all Los Angeles).

We've included a reproduction of the Assembly Journal page on this vote, and you might also note that all three of these gentlemen were recorded on the very next roll call. It would be interesting to hear their explanation of failure to vote--especially in the light of the fact that Jesse Unruh apparently has the inside track to be the next Speaker of the Assembly, which position, with his present White House connections, bids fair to make him the most powerful Democrat west of Sam Rayburn

* * * * *

Speaker Presiding

At 10.23 a.m., Hon. Ralph M. Brown, Speaker of the Assembly, presiding.

CONSIDERATION OF DAILY FILE (RESUMED)
THIRD READING OF ASSEMBLY BILLS (RESUMED)

Assembly Bill No. 1559—An act to amend Sections 16564 and 16565 of the Education Code, relating to use of school property.

Bill read third time.

Speaker pro Tempore Presiding

At 10.37 a.m., Hon. Carlos Bee, Speaker pro Tempore of the Assembly, presiding.

Demand for Previous Question

Messrs. Don A. Allen, Hanna, Hegland, Burke, and Beaver demanded the previous question. Demand sustained.

The question being on the passage of the bill.

Bill passed by the following vote:

AYES—Bruce F. Allen, Don A. Allen, Bagley, Bane, Beaver, Bee, Belotti, Bradley, Britschgi, George E. Brown, Burke, Busterud, Cameron, Carrell, Casey, Chapel, Collier, Cologne, Conrad, Coolidge, Cunningham, Cusanovich, Dahl, Davis, Dills, Flournoy, Francis, Frew, Gaffney, Garrigus, Grant, Hanna, Hegland, Hicks, Holmes, House, Kennick, Kilpatrick, Lanterman, Leggett, Levering, Lowrey, Luckel, Lunardi, Marks, Meyers, Mills, Monagan, Mulford, Munnell, Nisbet, Pattee, Porter, Reagan, Rumford, Schrade, Sedgwick, Shell, Sumner, Thelin, Thomas, Waldie, Williamson, George A. Willson, Charles H. Wilson, Winton, Wolfrum, Z'berg, and Mr. Speaker—69.

NOES—Burton, Crown, DeLotto, Elliott, Knox, McMillan, O'Connell, and Petris—3.

NOTE: Present but not voting—Unruh, Rees and Hawkins

Bill ordered transmitted to the Senate.

Assembly Bill No. 1765—An act to amend Sections 8560 and 8562 of the Business and Professions Code, relating to structural pest control.

Bill read third time, and passed by the following vote:

AYES—Bruce F. Allen, Don A. Allen, Bagley, Bane, Bee, Belotti, Bradley, Britschgi, George E. Brown, Burke, Burton, Busterud, Cameron, Carrell, Casey, Chapel, Collier, Cologne, Conrad, Coolidge, Crown, Cunningham, Cusanovich, Dahl, Davis, DeLotto, Dills, Elliott, Flournoy, Francis, Frew, Gaffney, Garrigus, Grant, Hanna, Hawkins, Hegland, Hicks, Holmes, House, Kennick, Kilpatrick, Knox, Lanterman, Leggett, Levering, Lowrey, Luckel, Lunardi, Marks, McMillan, Meyers, Mills, Monagan, Mulford, Munnell, Nisbet, O'Connell, Pattee, Petris, Porter, Reagan, Rees, Rumford, Schrade, Sedgwick, Shell, Sumner, Thelin, Thomas, Unruh, Waldie, Williamson, George A. Willson, Charles H. Wilson, Winton, Wolfrum, Z'berg, and Mr. Speaker—79.

NOES—None.

Bill ordered transmitted to the Senate.

Speaker Presiding

At 10.46 a.m., Hon. Ralph M. Brown, Speaker of the Assembly, presiding.

Assembly Bill No. 1989—An act to amend Section 11012 of the Government Code, and Section 13911 of the Education Code, relating to investment of State Teachers' Retirement System funds.

Bill read third time, and passed by the following vote:

AYES—Bruce F. Allen, Don A. Allen, Bagley, Bane, Bee, Belotti, Bradley, Britschgi, George E. Brown, Burke, Burton, Busterud, Cameron, Casey, Chapel,

All voted on next bill!

THE FOLLOWING ITEM IS RE-PRINTED IN ITS ENTIRETY FROM THE LOS ANGELES EXAMINER 3/25/61

'I Never Felt Better,' Says Brown

SACRAMENTO—Radio and TV stations reported Thursday night Gov. Brown was suffering from physical exhaustion.

"I never felt better in my life," Brown told his Friday news conference.

"But, I have been told to take it a little bit easier."

Seems that after being up all day in conferences, meetings, speech making activities and evening dinner affairs and more speeches six or seven days a week "I have been getting awfully tired at night around 11 or 11:30."

He hasn't "even got a doctor."

However, Dr. Dan Blain dropped in to see him about another matter and "told me to go to bed early."

Dr. Blain is State Director of Mental Hygiene.

BROWN AND THE STATE VETERANS

The way Governor Brown (a non-veteran) and his Director of Veterans Affairs, Joseph M. Farber, have handled veterans programs in California have kept them under fire since 1959:

The Brown Administration cut certain items from the Department of Veterans Affairs budget, then reversed itself and reinstated the items.

Long-time civil service employees have been shuttled around without regard to proper procedures or consultation with the Veterans Affairs Board.

Reports by one state department have been repudiated and countermanded by other state departments and officials, including Brown himself.

Important contracts have been awarded through questionable procedures.

Specifically, here is the Brown-Farber record:

....In 1959, Brown cut from the budget the so-called "Field Bill" funds--a subsidy to private veterans organizations for furnishing claims and rights services to veterans and their dependents--and placed these services under state control. Leaders of veterans organizations are still complaining of the poorer service afforded to veterans by the state, as compared with that provided previously by veterans organizations themselves.

....Also in 1959, Brown deleted the subsidy to the counties for County veterans service officers, but has since reversed himself and reinstated the item in the budget in its former full amount (\$500,000).

....Veterans Affairs Director Farber in 1959 cut down on the sale of bonds for the "Cal-Vet" Loan program, and dismissed 57 appraisers from the payroll. Backlogs grew rapidly and soon the department found itself over 6 months behind. By 1962, however, the backlog had been eliminated.

Insurance Problem

Under Republican administrations the required insurance on veterans homes under the loan program was spread among a combine of 238 insurance companies. The Brown Administration, without allowing other insurance companies adequate opportunity to bid separately, awarded the multi-million dollar contract to a single company - the National-American Insurance Company - owned by Howard Ahmanson, a campaign contributor to Brown in 1958. Under the new set-up, veterans were required to have 100% coverage, and were offered no choice of companies.

Farber sent a memorandum to all holders of veteran loans implying a state endorsement of a National-American "homeowners" policy which included not only the required "fire and hazard" coverage, but also insurance on household contents and personal property. After protests from veterans and insurance companies, who objected to implied state endorsement of a single insurance company for insurance which went far beyond that required by the state for the loans, Farber retracted the memorandum, and admitted that veterans could secure insurance for personal property from any company they desired.

State Veterans Home

Farber charged poor administration and fiscal mismanagement at the Yountville Veterans home, proposed sweeping reforms, and summarily fired, without consulting or notifying the Veterans Affairs Board, Stanley F. Dunmire, the Commandant of the Home, a civil service employee. Key Democrats charged Farber with lack of authority.

In the words of Democratic State Senator Samuel Geddes, Farber chose to "flaunt the will and intent of the Legislature, the laws of civil service, and the State Constitution."

Legislative Counsel, Ralph N. Kleps, confirmed that Farber had acted outside the bounds of his authority, and held that civil service employees can be removed only by procedures prescribed in the state civil service act, involving notice and hearing. Farber admitted his wrongdoing, and reinstated Dunmire.

While the Yountville fireworks were popping, the State Department of Finance issued an official report recommending the changing of the Yountville Veterans Home to a mental hospital and the transfer of the facility to the United States Veterans Administration. Both Brown and Farber immediately repudiated this report, adding evidence to the already established fact that, in the Brown Administration, co-ordination is virtually non-existent!

SUPPORT OF SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BONDS (PROPOSITION 1-A)

Remarks by
RICHARD NIXON
Turlock
September 14, 1962

We cannot short change the youth of California. As we become the first State in the nation, our future depends on the education of our young people. It is therefore imperative that we have the necessary school construction funds for our rapidly expanding educational needs.

That is why I strongly endorse Proposition 1-A. This is why I endorsed the original school construction bond issue on April 28th in an address before the California Teachers Association and the National Education Association. This is why I reaffirmed my strong views by approval of a school construction bond issue on June 6th, the day after the primary.

In June, when I called upon my opponent to call a special session of the Legislature, I urged him to separate the education aspects of the Proposition from the other issues. To have had a straight school construction proposition on the ballot, unencumbered by other questions, would have shown good faith in the educational system of our State. For I believe that the people will vote for school construction when it is a legitimate need.

But the present State Administration placed politics above education and insisted on putting the bond issue before the people in November in exactly the same form in which it was defeated three months ago.

While I strongly favor Proposition 1-A, I regret that my opponent's administration has planned its budget so badly that the money for school construction cannot be raised unless the people further mortgage their future through more bonded indebtedness.

My opponent's irresponsible spending policies have made this bond issue necessary. But our worthy institutions, such as Stanislaus State College, must not be penalized for his recklessness. We must continue to expand our state colleges and universities to produce the type of young men and women who will be able to build a greater California.

The present administration is the first government in California history that has attempted to finance current expenditures from the proceeds of a bond issue that the people have not yet approved. I am sure that my opponent does not kite his personal checks. Why should he then kite the public checks of our state?

The history of Proposition 1-A is graphic proof of the fiscal chaos in Sacramento under the present State government.

NEW INDUSTRY MEANS EMPLOYMENT
RICHARD NIXON
at Republican Associates Luncheon
San Diego
September 12, 1962

The job gap in California must be of vital concern to every citizen. For as long as any section of California suffers from unemployment, or not producing up to its potential, all Californians suffer.

This applies equally to the depression in the lumber and mining industries in the northern counties, the depressed film industry in Los Angeles, or construction stoppage in San Francisco.

But it is particularly true in San Diego. For, as you know, San Diego has been a major labor surplus area since September, 1960. Today, aircraft industry employment alone is 12,800 below a year ago.

Two years ago, on the day I arrived in San Diego, my present opponent announced, "Unemployment is something that I am deeply concerned about." At that time, the unemployment rate in San Diego was 6.7%. Now, after two more years of the present State Administration, the latest complete monthly figures show that unemployment in San Diego is 8.4%.

In fact, these current figures show that San Diego has its highest unemployment rate since 1950 and its lowest employment rate since 1956.

The way to solve this problem is not to sweep it under the rug and say that everything is fine.

The way to solve this problem is not to appoint another meaningless study committee or phony task force.

The present State Administration has done both these things. And last week the study committee chairman, when asked for a progress report by a San Diegan said, "The fact is the key to an early reversal of the downward employment trend in San Diego is in obtaining Federal recognition of the economic value of, and high utilization of, the air frame and aerospace production potential."

In other words, the State committee to solve San Diego's unemployment problem has made this record in seven months: 1) It has abdicated its responsibility to Washington; 2) It has done nothing.

San Diegans have done a first-rate job on their own to attract industry and to diversify. This is a city of unusual vitality and one with an even greater future. You are people who do things and do them well. San Diego has fought for its city's development in the best tradition of our state. But, as I have said, this is all California's fight -- not just San Diego's. And this city needs forceful state action to build an economic climate which will help attract the new industry needed here.

I believe that the only way to honestly make new progress in San Diego -- and throughout the State -- is to end economic ignorance in California government.

As long as we retain a State Administration that has brought to California the most costly and wasteful government in the nation and the highest taxes in the nation, we cannot expect new industries to locate in California in the numbers we need to provide jobs we must have.

As long as we retain a State Administration whose answer to our economic problems is to sit back and hope for Federal contracts, we cannot expect businesses to remain in California. We will continue to lose too many.

We must fight for California's fair share of Federal contracts, but we cannot expect this to solve our problems alone.

The way to bring business and jobs to California is threefold:

1) We must have a vigorous, dynamic "California Crusade for New Business Investment" that will help our chambers of commerce and others as they search out and attract new industries.

2) We must have a state government that cares for the people's welfare while living within its means, so that businesses can operate with the assurance that taxes will not continue to skyrocket.

3) We must have a state government in which there is confidence -- an administration that is known throughout the nation for its dedication to private initiative, not government handout.

* * *

I believe that discerning Democrats agree with this analysis and this program. And the presence here today of so many good Democrats attests to this.

As Democrats, you are not deserting your party. Your party in California, under the radical influence of the CDC, has deserted you and the true principles of Democracy.

The handpicked candidates of the leftwing CDC, including my opponent, have put too much faith in government and too little faith in people. And they will find, on November 6th, that the people of California have lost faith in them.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE FILM INDUSTRY
RICHARD NIXON
At Luncheon with
"Celebrities for Nixon" Committee
Beverly Hills, California
September 26, 1962

California can only be as great as the sum total of all its parts. When any California industry suffers from unemployment or is not producing up to its potential, this must be a serious and personal problem for all Californians.

Thirteen days ago I was in Eureka in the heart of our great timber region. Lumber production has fallen more than 15% during the present State Administration. This is a serious problem for all Californians.

Four days ago I was in San Diego, where there are 12,800 more people out of work in the aircraft industry than a year ago. This is a serious problem for all Californians.

Let us look at the motion picture industry. The most recent figures show that almost 30% of the film cameramen in Local 659 are out of work; 17% of the film editors in Local 776 are jobless; many other technicians and performers are without employment. And this is a serious problem for all Californians.

The problem takes on added dimensions because movie production is more than an industry -- a means of making jobs. It is a symbol. During the formative years of our state, California became famous because of a seal that flashed on screens throughout the world. It said, "Made in Hollywood."

Now Hollywood is in trouble. And now California must pay its obligation to the industry that first made us world famous.

The root of Hollywood's trouble is in production of American motion pictures in foreign countries -- runaway productions.

In 1960, about 20% of American financed movies were made abroad. In 1961, this figure rose to 40%. And so far this year, 60% of American financed movies were produced overseas.

The reason for this exodus from Hollywood is not cheap labor or more skilled help or exotic locales. The reason is that foreign governments are giving subsidies to our productions. Britain gives a 75% guarantee on funds to finance a movie there. Yugoslavia, which accepts U.S. foreign aid, turns around and gives 90%-guaranteed financing for movies made in Yugoslavia.

To the great credit of our American motion picture industry, it has never received a government subsidy from Washington, has never asked for one, and does not want any such help today.

Yet it is imperative that something be done before it is too late. The present State Administration has had a do-nothing record for four years.

These are two actions that I propose to take.

1. There will be a major tax reform bill before the next session of Congress. It is important at that time to plug the tax loopholes that make run-away productions feasible. As Governor, I will carry our case to Washington

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE FILM INDUSTRY - 2

and fight to prevent Hollywood from becoming a tax-created ghost town.

2. By December 1, 1962, I will announce the appointment of the Governor's Council on the Motion Picture Industry. This Council will consist of top film industry leaders in management, labor and the performing arts.

It will draft a plan of voluntary, cooperative action to bring new life and spirit to Hollywood. And the prestige and support of the Governor of California will back up this action program.

BROWN CONSIDERS TAX INCREASES
RICHARD NIXON
South Bay Rally
Manhattan Beach, California
Thursday, October 4, 1962

California cannot afford four more years of the Brown Administration -- the most expensive state government in the history of our country, which has imposed on Californians the greatest additional state tax burdens known to man.

The voters must now choose between Mr. Brown and raising taxes, or new leadership and cutting the cost of government so as to reduce taxes.

While my opponent pledges no new taxes next year, his administration is now considering three proposals to increase taxes.

Either the left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing or else the people are being told less than the full story of our state's financial condition.

Right now state planners are looking into the advisability of soaking Californians with a statewide property tax, a rise in the cigarette tax, and a state withholding tax.

I oppose all three moves. I call on my opponent to also publicly repudiate these taxing schemes.

1. Statewide Property Tax

On September 28, Dr. Wallace W. Hall, State Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction, testified before the Assembly Interim Subcommittee on Higher Education in favor of a statewide property tax. He recommended a tax of 20 cents for each \$100 of assessed property.

Yesterday I strongly stated my views on this plan in detail. I oppose any state attempt to invade a tax field that has long been reserved for local government. And I oppose any state move to add a heavier tax burden on our homeowners.

2. New Cigarette Tax

In 1959, as part of the program that gave California the largest tax increase in the history of any state, my opponent put through a three cents a package tax on cigarettes.

Now, according to veteran Sacramento reporter Henry C. MacArthur of the Capitol News Service, "The administration is considering asking for an additional cent on cigarettes."

Mr. Brown has never denied this report. What is his position now?

3. State Withholding Tax

At the last session of the legislature, a resolution was passed to study a state withholding tax. Then, on May 8, the Department of Finance sent a questionnaire to all states that now have withholding taxes. But, far from simply trying to find out how withholding tax systems work, the Brown Administration asked questions designed to anticipate the politics of getting a withholding tax passed. On page three, this questionnaire asks: "Was there any opposition to the legislation which proposed withholding from any of the following? Employer, Taxpayer, Unions, Chamber of Commerce, Special Interest."

If the State is now preparing the groundwork for a withholding tax, the people should know about it.

I am opposed to this system of state taxation. In operation, a withholding tax borrows money from those who can least afford it. Officials at the State Board of Equalization have already been asked to compute the cost to the taxpayer of this scheme. By their calculations, an additional \$45 to \$60 million will be collected each year. The catch is that the State will have to return all but \$15 million because it will have been collected from those people who earn so little that they will not owe the State the taxes which have already been withheld.

This will just be another example of the boondoggling with kited checks for which this administration is already famous. The refunded money is nothing more than an interest-free loan to the state from people in the lowest income brackets.

* * * * *

Only a Houdini could pledge massive additional government spending and no new taxes -- and not welsh on one or the other of his promises.

Yet my opponent pledges no new taxes while running on a Party platform that promises \$1,360,000,000 in new spending over the next four years. Where does he propose to get this money? From a state property tax? From a new cigarette tax? From a withholding tax? The people of California have the right to know whether Mr. Brown is already hedging on his "no'new'tax" promise.

ANTI-COMMUNISM PROGRAM FOR CALIFORNIA
From Remarks of RICHARD NIXON
MASONIC CONSTITUTIONDAY CELEBRATION
CHICO
September 13, 1962

This is the three-pronged anti-Communist program that I believe must be vigorously pursued in California.

1. Investigation:

There must be public support for legislative investigating committees on both the state and national level.

I served on the House Committee on Un-American Activities for four years. My work was often unpopular. But I am proud of my service. And I am firmly convinced that the Committee performs a necessary function; first, of exposing the Communist tactics for the American people to see; second, of investigating the executive branch of government to uncover weaknesses in our security programs; third, of developing legislation to deal with Communism in the United States.

2. Legislation:

There must be public support of loyalty and security programs for federal, state, and local employees.

Working for the Government of the State of California -- or the United States government -- is a privilege, not a right. And a government employee should not be allowed to belong to an organization whose objective is the overthrow of the very government for which he is working.

We must deny the use of tax-supported schools for speeches by individuals who defy the subversive activities control act or who plead the fifth amendment before grand juries or legislative committees.

During the past few months I have had the privilege of talking on 15 college and university campuses in our state. I have found that there is no policy by the state administration to guide the college and university presidents in the state system on Communist speakers. I believe that a firm policy directive must be laid down by executive order and legislation.

3. Education:

We must greatly improve and make mandatory a program of teaching Communism tactics and the alternatives of freedom in our high schools, using authoritative text-books and trained teachers.

We must also have a voluntary program on Communism available on the adult level.

I feel very strongly about this question of education. As I have travelled around the country, I have found that the trouble with our attitude toward is not too much patriotism or too little patriotism, but too little knowledge.

PROGRAM FOR PROGRESS IN WELFARE
RICHARD NIXON
San Jose, California
September 20, 1962

Based on a study of California Welfare costs by nationally recognized experts, I shall make recommendations in the field of welfare that will result in a savings of 27 million dollars in federal, state and county costs and still give California the most generous and humane program in the nation.

Moreover, this saving to the taxpayers will be made without cutting one cent from the aid to the needy aged program or from others who are entitled to welfare payments.

Without depriving a single child in need, 25 million dollars can be cut from the Aid to Needy Children program by responsible changes in the law and regulations.

Another 2 million dollars will be saved in the handling of prescriptions by cutting the cost of red tape. California now pays 75 cents on each prescription for paper work alone, while the Veterans Administration processes prescriptions for only 21 cents.

Today, under the present state administration, California's handling of welfare programs has become a national disgrace. Costs have risen three and one half times faster than our population growth. Chiselers by the hundreds have been allowed to invade the relief rolls. And two national magazines, a study by the State Senate Committee on Social Welfare, and, numerous Grand Jury investigations have exposed loose administration, excessive red tape and unproductive increases.

But the cost of my opponent's failure to properly run the vital welfare program of California must be measured in more than dollars. It must also be measured in the destruction of character, moral fiber and self-reliance.

When welfare programs make it more profitable for a man not to work than to work, there is something radically wrong with the program.

When welfare programs make it more profitable for a man to desert his family than to support them, there is something radically wrong with the program.

From all over the state we have such reports: A man who earned \$242.00 a month by working, but gets \$364.00 a month for his family by deserting them; another man who increased his monthly income by \$110.00 by not working.

By adopting this five point action program of welfare reform, California will get more service for less money.

1. We must spend up action to find welfare chiselers and get them off the relief rolls. A recent state Senate report reveals that 58.2 percent of ANC cases are illegally receiving aid.

PROGRAM FOR PROGRESS IN WELFARE - 2

2. We must concentrate state efforts to reunite ANC families or make absent fathers support their families. In 44 percent of ANC cases involving absent parents, no investigation was made to locate the missing person, according to the Senate Committee's findings.

3. We must re-examine the size of welfare payments to end the common situation where family income is much greater on relief than when gainfully employed.

4. We must replace duplication and state dictation to the counties with greater local control and local autonomy.

5. We must restore the concept of personal responsibility; re-focusing our efforts on helping people to help themselves, rather than just doling out money.

PROTECTING OUR CITIZENS
PROGRAMS FOR PROGRESS
From a Statewide Radio Address
by RICHARD NIXON

September 23, 1962

This is the first broadcast in a series that I call, "Programs for a Greater California." Each Sunday evening until election day, I will tell you how I propose to give decisive leadership in dealing with the pressing problems of our state.

Tonight I will talk about "Crime in California."

We are all proud that California will soon be the first state in the nation in population. As the first state, we can also set an example for all the other states to follow.

Today, under the Brown administration, the record shows that instead of being the first State in crime prevention, we are first in crimes committed.

By the time this broadcast is over, there will have been nine major crimes committed in our State -- burglaries, robberies, auto thefts, murders, rapes and assaults.

We have the best local law enforcement officers in the nation, yet there were more major crimes committed in California last year, according to the F.B.I. than in New York, Pennsylvania and New Jersey combined -- three states with a total population twice that of California.

We have the best local law enforcement officers in the nation, and yet from 1959 to 1961, according to the California Attorney General, felony crimes increased 26.7%, adult felony arrests were up 24% and juvenile arrests rose 17.8% -- and these great increases in crime took place during a period when our population rose only 5.6%. In other words, we cannot blame more people as the reason for more crime.

Why then has crime skyrocketed in California?

The answer is that our dedicated local crime fighters have not had strong support from the present State administration. The Governor's office is the weakest link in our law enforcement chain. And Remember: A police badge is only as good as the Governor who backs it up.

What has been the record over the past four years?

1. There has been the endless agonizing in the Chessman case. This is a graphic example of executive indecision. But what is important is the effect of this indecision. The threat of the death penalty is a major deterrent to crime. And the handling of the Chessman case undercut this deterrent.

2. There has been a steady stream of authoritative reports showing that organized crime now has a firm foothold in California -- reports by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, by the United States Commissioner of Narcotics, by the Joint Judiciary Committee on the Administration of Justice, by the rackets subcommittee in the State Assembly, and by U.S. Congressional investigating committees.

The State Assembly Committee concluded in 1959: "Organized crime...does definitely exist in California and to an alarmingly dangerous degree. The hoodlum and gangster population of California, both permanent and transient, is sizeable...and there is every indication that an advance guard of eastern hoodlums and Mafia members -- men who know how to organize the narcotics traffic, and bookmaking, prostitution and rackets -- is here seeking a foothold."

When my opponent was confronted with this intelligence, did he immediately take forceful action? No. Instead he ignored these findings and called the study a "waste of the people's money."

3. There has been a population explosion in our prisons. They are now overcrowded and have become the breeding ground for forty cases of riots, murders and escapes in close-security facilities in the last three years alone.

4. There has been an executive record of stalling on vital narcotics legislation and building roadblocks against the efforts of law officers to get stronger crime fighting legislation.

In 1959, 15 anti-crime measures were introduced in the legislature with the support of the California District Attorneys Association, the California Peace Officers Association and the State Sheriffs Association. This program would have brought stronger criminal penalties and more effective narcotics control.

But without support from the Governor's office the anti-crime program was killed.

This then is the law enforcement climate in California today. This is how our state, county and local officials have been handcuffed by the present State administration. This is why California's crime rate is nearly double the national crime rate.

Crime in California must be recognized and rooted out. We cannot afford a state administration that hears no evil and sees no evil.

I believe that this eight-point action program will make our state into a model for effectively preventing and fighting crime.

1. Capital punishment -- the law of California -- must be firmly supported from the Governor's office. We must not encourage crime because of public vacillation over the death penalty. My opponent and I are diametrically opposed on this issue.

2. We must smash the narcotics traffic -- and my program includes giving the death penalty to big-time dope peddlers.

We must have stronger penalties for the possession and sale of dangerous drugs. We must speed up research on the causes and cures of narcotics addiction and we must improve public school educational programs on the menace of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

3. We must support our conscientious local law enforcement officials with a realistic legislative program.

Such a program must overcome the adverse effects of the Carol Lane decision. This decision ruled that softer state law superseded stronger local laws. We must take immediate action to clarify jurisdictions and put strong local laws back into effect.

We must adopt legislation, within our constitutional framework, to protect the identity of informers, who are essential in narcotics cases.

We must reasonably define our search and seizure laws.

We must get tougher enforcement of our parole laws to prevent the unsafe release of dangerous criminals.

California needs a Governor who will work with our dedicated local crime fighters, rather than against them.

4. We must set up a top-level Governor's Council on Crime Prevention and Law Enforcement to coordinate the fight for a safer California.

This Council will have representatives from all the major state and local law enforcement agencies, and representatives from the private voluntary groups that work in the field of crime prevention.

The Governor's Council will work closely with the F.B.I., the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and the other national agencies in the law enforcement field.

The Council will have a major responsibility for seeing that the state gives the necessary backing to local law officials and for making the legislative recommendations to give them the proper tools to do their job.

5. We must initiate educational programs to create a greater respect for our law enforcement officials.

This is especially important among the young people, and must be done in cooperation with our schools.

The Governor must take the lead in defending law enforcement officers when they come under unjust attack.

6. We must have a Governor who will personally lead the fight to drive the racketeers and hoods from California.

We must make California "off limits" to the eastern gangsters who are coming here because they think our state is a happy hunting ground.

7. We must have fast action to provide adequate prison facilities so as to end our state's shocking record of prison riots, murders and escapes.

8. State government must give meaningful encouragement to our voluntary agencies, church groups and boys clubs in their programs of crime prevention. This will be a primary function of the Governor's Council.

We must help curb juvenile delinquency by improving the employment opportunities for our young people.

Law enforcement is government's business, but crime prevention is everybody's business.

Together we can greatly strengthen our voluntary programs of education and recreation to give our youth the chance they deserve to lead full and productive lives.

These eight actions will assure a greater, saner California. These actions will restore Californians' confidence in our state government. These crime prevention and crime control programs will make California a model to the nation.

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AND CONSERVATION
RICHARD NIXON
Sacramento Kiek Off Barbecue
September 12, 1962

While we live in the greatest sportsmen's paradise in the world, good hunting and fishing areas have gotten harder and harder to find during the present administration in Sacramento.

As California becomes the first state in population, it is vitally important that we have adequate recreational facilities. Our State, which has always been world famous in this area, now ranks below New York in public recreation area and below Michigan in campsites.

We must take immediate action to speed-up the development of our unsurpassed natural resources, open them for use, and conserve them for the future.

We must particularly open up new areas for fishing and hunting -- an area that has not been given the priority treatment it deserves.

I believe that a seven-point action program is imperative.

1. Fishing

To inspire better fishing -- and perhaps fewer tall tales -- we must expand the catchable trout program. At the same time, there must be more emphasis on warm water fishery development in the many lakes, new reservoirs and canals of California.

2. Hunting

We must adopt a system to open up for hunting private and public lands that are now closed to sportsmen.

One possibility is a cooperative program through which landowners would be reimbursed by the hunters themselves for the use of their lands. This could work mainly for deer hunting through permits issued by the State to landowners and reissued by the landowners to the hunters. Another possibility is for the State to lease private lands and then issue permits for a fee sufficient to pay for the lease.

The other great area for recreational expansion in California is in public land. Nearly half of all the land in the State -- 47 million acres -- is owned by the Federal government. Great tracts of this wilderness can be opened to public use. And, by presidential order, the minimum security prisoners, now used for fighting forest fires, could also cut trails and roads in the wilderness areas and build campsites.

3. Legislation

The present local firearms registration is sufficient, and a bill requiring national registration of hunting weapons is not needed.

The bill that would outlaw carefully regulated dove hunting should also be opposed.

The Tule-Klamath waterfowl refuge must be retained as one of the greatest hunting and refuge areas of the West.

4. Resources vs. Industry and Water

There must be more spirit of compromise between the preservation of natural resources and the development of industry and water projects.

The State should investigate the effect of development on fish and wildlife so that it can propose changes or alternatives rather than flatly opposing new industry and water projects.

5. Federal-State Relations

The State must work to develop its own recreational facilities, rather than always holding out its hand to Washington for Federal help.

The Federal government has an important role in opening public lands and the collection of taxes for fishing and hunting equipment. But Federal action is neither a substitute for State action nor an excuse for State inaction.

6. Predatory Animals

The control of predatory animals must be improved. Too much game that could be utilized by hunters is being lost to predators because of the State's failure to control them. In no case should control of predatory animals be based on the acceptance of State deer management in local areas.

7. Safety

Study should be given to possible future regulation of deer hunters and other sportsmen in areas where hunter concentrations may impair their safety or the welfare of the game. Such steps probably will never be needed in some areas, but such regulation already appears to be indicated in such areas as the Modoc-Lassen region. Studies should be made now to gain proper acceptance when and if they might be required.

* * *

The State, under the present administration, has been dragging its feet in expanding the hunting and fishing resources and areas of California. A greater number of California's waterways and wilderness areas must be developed for present and future use by the growing armies of sportsmen. We must reverse the trend of too little and too late -- fewer and fewer opportunities for more and more sportsmen. I strongly believe that with greater effort and more imaginative planning the outdoorsmen of California can wind up with more fish in their creels and more game in the bag. And I pledge to give leadership to a program that will accomplish these goals.

EDUCATING OUR CHILDREN
PROGRAMS FOR A GREATER CALIFORNIA -- NUMBER 2
FROM A STATEWIDE RADIO ADDRESS BY
RICHARD NIXON
(over CBS Network from Los Angeles)
September 30, 1962

Each Sunday evening until election day, I will show you how decisive leadership can solve the pressing problems of our state. Tonight, I will talk about education and I will propose 12 steps to better education for all our young people.

A leading educator has said, "Knowledge, freely available to a people who have the right and the will to use it wisely, is the only real safety this world provides. Freedom of the mind is the foundation of all other freedoms, and if it is lost the others are soon found not worth keeping."

This is the basic reason why education is so important.

Our educational emphasis must be on giving all children an equal chance at the starting line. But it must also be geared to stimulating the students who are more creative -- who have exceptional abilities. I oppose the idea of using our schools as a leveling device with an inordinate emphasis on adjustment, rather than on opportunity and challenge.

Here is my program for progress, opportunity and freedom through education.

1. I believe that the strength and vitality of our educational system lies in the autonomy of the local, diversified school system.

The quality of our education largely depends on our local school districts and the decisions made within these districts. This is the best means that has ever been found of tailoring education to meet local living conditions.

Yet, during the past four years, there has been a trend toward greater and greater state dictation of curricula to the local school districts. This trend must be reversed. One way to do this is to see that each new State program imposed on the local school district includes a legislative act providing for the financial support of the program.

2. I believe our goal must be better salaries for our teachers and less emphasis on fancy buildings.

What is taught, and how it is taught, is far more important to our children's futures than having the fanciest drinking fountains, indirect lighting and ultramodern gimmicks.

We must create a renewed respect for our school teachers. They are professional people who are engaged in an important, honorable career -- often at considerable financial sacrifice. They should be relieved of non-teaching duties insofar as possible.

Like all professional people, our teachers have an obligation to those they serve -- an obligation which has traditionally caused them to refrain from going out on strike. However, the 1962 Democratic State Platform, in its Labor plank, appears to favor such strikes. I call on my opponent to repudiate this unfortunate impression that is clearly not in the best interests of our State.

3. I believe that the Fisher Bill should be amended, although I agree with the philosophy behind it -- renewed emphasis on teaching academic subjects, rather than "frills."

We must remember that we use our schools as training grounds for many types of jobs. Besides academic training, we must also teach vocational and specialized subjects. We cannot afford to discourage teachers in these fields. Nor should we penalize children who must have this kind of education.

Under a rigid interpretation of the Fisher Bill, we could unfairly and unwisely penalize vocational instruction. Yet more than half our students will eventually have jobs that require these vocational skills. I believe we must amend the Fisher Bill to take this into consideration in granting teacher credentials.

4. We must take immediate action to solve the serious "drop out" problem in California.

Between the eighth and twelfth grades, one out of every four pupils drops out of school.

Our state now pays welfare or institutional care costs for 25% of the young people who drop out of school. It would be better to spend this money on tailoring education for their needs, than to have to spend it after they are unemployed or in trouble with the law.

5. We must give greater support to our junior colleges from money out of the State's General Funds, so as to relieve some of the burden from the local property taxpayers.

Our junior college system is designed to prepare students for higher education; to round off the education of other students, and to prepare young people for vocations.

The Master Plan for Higher Education recognizes the need for junior college education, but the State has steadfastly refused to give it substantial support.

The local property taxpayers are not capable of taking on the great burden of the junior colleges, as they are now doing. The program was not adopted with this intent. And this situation must be remedied.

6. We must greatly improve our pupil-teacher ratio.

Of the 50 states, 44 do a better job than California in providing an adequate number of teachers for its students. At the present time, our statewide average is 33 students to one teacher at the elementary school level.

Our children must have adequate instruction -- and an overworked teacher is forced to do a disservice to herself and her pupils.

7. The State must once again pay a fair share of the cost of the local school districts.

At one time the State traditionally paid half the cost of the local school districts. Under the present administration, State support has gone down to an average of about 38%. And in some school districts, the State barely pays 20% of the costs.

Yet the State has been forcing the local districts to add more and more mandatory programs to their curricula, without paying its fair share of the added costs of these programs. I do not believe that the State should impose expensive programs on the local school districts and then simply pass the tab along to the local property taxpayer.

8. I believe that the State Constitution must be amended to allow local school bond issues to be approved by a simple majority of the voters.

At this time, the State can float a bond issue for school support with a simple majority vote, but local school districts are required to get a two-thirds vote.

A state school bond issue aids only such districts that must borrow from the State. But the money from local school bond issues stays right in the district. It is unfair to make it more difficult to support your own district than to lend money to other districts.

9. We must end our crowded classroom situation by a responsible school construction program.

On the elementary level, we now have 90,000 school children on half-day sessions and this number will increase unless action is quickly taken. These children must not be short-changed.

We must also approve Proposition 1-A so that construction will keep pace with needs on the higher education level.

10. We must end wasteful land requirements for state-financed schools. Today a state-financed high school must have forty acres of ground, whether it needs it or not. This is an unrealistic requirement in many rural communities and leads to wasteful practices.

There are other unnecessary and arbitrary state-imposed building requirements that substantially increase the costs of school construction.

11. We must improve the variety, quality, and management of textbooks.

The State must not place artificial restrictions on the variety of textbooks available by requiring publishers to lease their plates to the State Printing Office. California students should be able to learn from the best textbooks -- not just from the textbooks that the State is able to print itself.

The State must give the school districts a multiple choice of

textbooks at all levels. This will reduce the possibility of errors in selection and will give the local districts greater control over education.

The Brown Administration is guilty of shocking mismanagement of our school textbook program.

Thousands of children throughout California are now without textbooks. At the present time, there is an acute classroom shortage of arithmetic, handwriting, history and geography texts.

This serious and irresponsible situation has been admitted by Burtis Claypool, State Supervisor of Textbook Distribution.

The Cupertino Elementary School District, for example, is now short 4,910 basic texts. The Jefferson Elementary School District must have nearly 6,000 more books to meet its pupils' needs.

While students are going without books today, only two years ago the Brown Administration burned thousands of surplus books.

This is a clear indication of how the present State Administration has failed our children and is incapable of fulfilling the basic needs of our classrooms.

12. I am firmly opposed to Federal Aid to Education. On this, my opponent and I are diametrically opposed.

From my experience in Congress and as Vice President, I know that Federal Aid to Education will soon lead to Federal Control of Education. And I do not want bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. to tell us how or what to teach our children here in California.

Beyond the philosophical reasons why I reject Federal Aid to Education, let me ask this question: Can Californians afford it? California would pay much more to the Federal Government for support of an education program than we would get back in Federal funds. It would cost Californians six dollars for every four dollars returned to us. In other words, we would be paying a great premium for Washington red tape.

But opposing aid to education from Washington means assuming the responsibility to support better education in California. Only we can give California the best paid teachers, the lowest drop out rate, and the best educational system at all levels in the nation.

As parents, we know that there is nothing more important than the education of our children. We want our children to have the very best -- not only in educational facilities, but also in educational quality. If it takes sacrifice to give this to our children, then sacrifice we must.

As free citizens, we also know that there is nothing more important than the education of our children. We have not been able to give our children an inheritance that will allow them to deal with the problems of a world half-free, half-ruled by Communist dictatorship. And the survival of our great nation depends on how well we prepare them for the challenges they must face.

SHOULD SUBVERSIVES SPEAK ON TAX-SUPPORTED CAMPUSES

RICHARD NIXON

Before North San Diego County

Nixon for Governor Barbeque

Saturday, September 22, 1962

On the issue of whether subversives should be allowed to speak on the campuses of our tax-supported institutions, my opponent has again displayed an incredible ignorance of what has been going on, what this issue is all about and what should be done about it.

1. This is the record of my opponent's ignorance on what the issue is all about.

On March 21, 1961, when asked his views about the scheduled campus appearance of Frank Wilkinson -- who had refused to answer Congressional Investigators' questions on the grounds of self-incrimination and who had been identified under oath as a member of the Communist Party -- my opponent replied, "Well, my view of Mr. Wilkinson and anybody of that nature is that he should be permitted to speak."

However, on September 19, 1962, after I had made my position clear, he made this statement: "I don't believe we should permit any subversives to speak on our campuses. I don't see any reason why we should give them a platform from which to spread their poison."

For the sake of California, I am glad that my opponent has completely reversed his position. But, unfortunately, he completely misses the point. The question is not of disallowing "subversives" to speak. Rather, it is a question of determining who is a "subversive." His undefined statement on "subversives" is a clear mandate for actions based on unfounded charges. On the other hand, my position clearly defines "subversives" and what to do about them.

2. This is the record of my opponent's ignorance on how to handle this situation.

My program states two criteria for banning subversives from appearing on State campuses: (a) I would deny the use of tax-supported schools for speeches by any individual who pleads self-incrimination (the Fifth Amendment) before a legally constituted legislative committee or grand jury investigating subversive activities, and (b) I would deny the use of tax-supported schools for speeches by any individual who defies the provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1951.

I again call on my opponent to answer these two questions:

Does he agree or disagree with my program to deny a state platform to individuals who have taken the Fifth Amendment about subversive activities?

Does he agree or disagree with my program to deny a state platform to individuals who have flaunted the basic Federal anti-subversive law?

This is what the people of California want to hear -- not some vague, meaningless statement.

3. This is the record of my opponent's incredible ignorance of what has been going on.

On September 19, 1962, he stated, "There hasn't been a Communist speaker on a university campus in the four years I have been Governor."

Now let us look at the facts.

During his four years in office, there have been eight speakers on State-run campuses who have refused to answer questions about subversive activities before legally constituted legislative investigating committees.

--On February 22, 1961, Anne Braden addressed a noon meeting at Dwinelle Hall on the University of California campus in Berkeley.

--On May 16, 1960, Archie Brown spoke in Griffith Hall on the Berkeley campus.

--On March 17, 1960, Harry Bridges spoke at a noon rally in Wheeler Hall, University of California, Berkeley.

--Frank Pestana spoke at a noon rally in Wheeler Hall Auditorium, Berkeley Campus, on May 1, 1961.

--Frank Wilkinson has spoken at least twice on the University of California Campus -- once on March 22, 1961, in the Wheeler Hall Auditorium and once on February 16, 1962, in a room of Wheeler Hall.

--John Howard Lawson spoke on October 10, 1960, at Dwinelle Hall, Berkeley Campus, and again on November 23, 1960, on the Los Angeles Campus of the University of California.

--Maud Russell spoke on the University of California Campus at Santa Barbara, according to Chancellor Kerr's list of 1960-61 Campus Speakers. She also spoke on the Berkeley Campus, on November 28, 1960.

--And, most remarkable of all, Clinton E. Jencks appears on the 1960-61 and 1961-62 payroll of the University of California as a teaching assistant in the Department of Economics.

I am turning over to the press the public records on these eight individuals -- showing the chapter and verse on their subversive activities as reported by legislative investigating committees.

Under my programs, these eight individuals would have been barred from speaking on the campuses of our State colleges and universities. And I believe this is the action that the people of California want from their Governor.

BELIEVE IT OR NOT

1. On April 22, 1962, 43 officers, including presidents and vice presidents, of Democratic clubs in Los Angeles County Central Committee signed a letter addressed to John Bailey, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, urging him to use his influence to seek cancellation of scheduled hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee in Los Angeles. The letter stated in part that the hearings should be cancelled "in the interests of insuring a Democratic victory" and "there is the very obvious danger posed against local Democrats of liberal persuasion".

2. On May 28, 1962, the Los Angeles Times and the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner carried a story which included the following statement: " A spokesman for the Governor replied that Brown 'had never heard of such a letter. Naturally, he would not comment on something he had never seen'."

3. Brown has had enough time to comment. He remains silent. Does he agree with the 43 signers or is he afraid that he will lose their support and campaign aid if he repudiates the stand of the 43?

w

DEFEAT OF UNRUH ANTI-COMMUNIST RESOLUTION BY DEMOCRATIC STATE
COMMITTEE
AUGUST 26, 1962

On Saturday, August 25th, Eugene Wyman, the new Chairman of the Democratic State Committee, said the Democratic party was prepared to adopt an anti-Communist resolution which would be the answer to GOP charges that the CDC is an extremist left-wing organization. He said: "The resolution committee, with the assistance of responsible Democratic leaders, is working on an anti-Communist resolution which I feel will be unanimously adopted.

"It will be so stiff and unequivocal in its language that it will put the Democratic Party on record in a manner that no Republican has been able to achieve."

He said the proposed resolution "probably will contain provisions to bar the use of the name Democratic in connection with any organization or individual who has been remotely linked to any truly subversive cause."

On Sunday Assemblyman Unruh introduced an anti-Communist resolution. But, lo and behold, the left-wing CDC maintained its control over the Democratic party and succeeded by a vote of 267 to 193 to eliminate a portion pledging the Committee to take all legal steps to deny Communists membership in any official or semi-official branch of the Democratic party.

The successful attack by the CDC was led by State Senator George Miller, Jr., Assemblyman Philip Burton, and Tom Carvey, president of the CDC.

When the amendment was adopted, Unruh didn't recognize "his own child" and moved immediately for adjournment of the Committee session, thus killing his resolution.

Brown should be challenged again and again to repudiate the support of the left-wing CDC. He has termed the organization his strong right arm. It is obvious he will not cut off his right arm.

Remarks by Richard M. Nixon
Before the Republican State Central Committee Meeting
Sacramento, California
Sunday, August 5, 1962

Today, for one overriding reason, we are assembled in the most significant convention in the history of our Party in California.

This November, for the same reason, Californians will vote in the most important election in our State's history, and the most important in the nation in 1962.

What makes this convention and this election so significant and so important is that the next Governor of California will lead the most populous State in the Union.

We, as a State, will have finally realized a destiny that was predetermined from the beginning by the energy of our people, the bounty of our soil, and the beauty of our climate.

Over fifty years ago, a great English historian, Lord James Bryce, wrote, "California is in many respects the most striking in the whole Union, and has more than any other the character of a great country, capable of standing alone in the world."

For the first 180 years of our country's history, national leadership rested in the East because of the population factor. But now, with California leading the way, the West assumes the responsibility of leadership. And so, right now we are confronted with this basic question: Will our State be led by men with the imagination, the determination, and the drive equal this great challenge?

I charge that the present State Administration -- by its record, by its words, by its action -- is completely incapable of giving this sort of dynamic leadership.

Even their billboards symbolize an attitude of complacency and smugness. "Keep California First," they read. Does this mean that they are merely satisfied with being first in population? Or are they also satisfied with this record:

First in the cost of government;

First in taxes;

First in unemployment;

First in crime.

Mr. Brown is apparently satisfied with this record of dubious "firsts." But I am not satisfied. And millions of Republicans, Democrats, and Independents are not satisfied.

Now is the time to deal with these problems -- not sweep them under the rug.

We offer all Californians a clear choice. We pledge to bring this choice before the people in the most intensive, hard-hitting campaign in California history. And we pledge to carry this campaign into every precinct, every home, every factory, every farm.

We pledge to bring to California a State Administration that is worthy of the first and greatest State in the nation. We shall put an end to rule by clique and crony.

-OVER-

We pledge to bring into State Government a team of the best executives and technicians in the State. And we shall kick the second-raters and political hacks out of Sacramento.

We pledge to lead the nation in job opportunities for all our citizens by creating the best climate for new private investment of any State in the Union.

We pledge an Administration dedicated to attracting new industry -- not an Administration that can be smug while we rank ninth among the major industrial States in building new plants since the beginning of 1961.

We pledge to replace the spineless soft-on-crime attitude of the present Administration with strong, vigorous backing of local law enforcement officials.

We shall wage an all-out campaign to make the homes, streets and highways of California safe for our citizens.

We shall initiate the most effective State program for fighting communism in the nation -- a program that will include education, on the student and adult level, on both the dangers of communism and the positive alternatives of freedom.

We pledge to cut the costs of State government so that we can reduce the tax burden borne by our citizens.

People from all over the country have come to California because our State offered greater opportunity than they had in their home states. It is our goal to create even greater opportunity for better jobs, greater opportunity for new businesses, and greater opportunity for human dignity. But this goal can only be attained if our State is led by men who believe in and encourage free, private enterprise.

We can make California a model for other states to follow -- but we cannot do it by throwing up our hands and turning to Washington, D.C. for the solutions to our problems.

Californians have always been proud of our self-reliance and individual enterprise. We will not be meekly made into a giant puppet pulled by strings in Washington. This is a standard that unites all Republicans and appeals to all Californians. This is a cause worth fighting for, working for, voting for.

The present State Administration is incapable of doing this job because it is handcuffed by the California Democratic Council, an official Party organization, whose radical philosophy puts too much faith in government, and too little faith in people. This is the organization that Mr. Brown has described as his "good right arm."

And this is why millions of Democrats will join with us this fall -- not because they have deserted their Party, but because their Party, under the influence of the CDC clique, has deserted them and the true principles of the Democratic Party.

The people of California know that in the continuing fight for freedom there is no greater need than to strengthen the responsibility and quality of State Government. They know that now is the time to reverse the insidious trend toward more arrogant, power-hungry bureaucracy in Washington. And they know that the best answer to bigger government in Washington is better government in Sacramento.

In this fall's election California will speak to the nation. Let our message not be that we will continue down the dismal road to bigger government, higher taxes, and less freedom. Rather let our voice ring out from the West, saying, "We, the people of California, with a great tradition of seeking opportunity, with a true frontier spirit, cast our vote for free enterprise, self-reliance, local responsibility, and for the best State Government in America." ###

Remarks of Richard Nixon
Annual Meeting of the Section on Family Law
American Bar Association
Noon, Tuesday, August 7, 1962
Bellevue Hotel, San Francisco

There is nothing more important to the survival of our system than the preservation of family ties. Too often we tend to look at great problems, such as the world struggle with communism, merely in terms of governmental actions and solely as the responsibility of high officials. What we fail to bear in mind is that our basic strength derives from our families, our churches, and our daily relations with each other. And the nourishment of our basic strength is just as vital to winning our international struggle as dramatic events in Geneva, Washington, or at the UN.

History tells us that the break-up of families precedes the break-up of civilizations. It is therefore particularly tragic to report that there were 400,000 divorces granted last year in our country -- more than 1,000 each day -- affecting the lives of 300,000 children. And I am sad to say that my State of California had the highest divorce rate in the United States.

For these reasons, it is clear to me that no members of the Bar have greater social responsibility than you who work in the field of family law -- responsibility that goes beyond the "letter of the law." As counselors to those in marital difficulty they must go beyond legal procedure and attempt to strike at the root of the problem.

We all realize that the problems of instability in the home are only symptoms of some malfunctioning in our society -- distressing, fundamental symptoms -- yet not the basic causes of the illness.

These problems are relatively new in our society. In fact, the recent origin of the Section on Family Law of the American Bar Association attests to the newness of the problem. Why is this so?

I believe the difference between ourselves and our ancestors can be summed up in one word -- discipline.

The discipline of our forefathers was partly based upon religious ideals; partly upon exacting demands -- the necessity to tame a continent.

Today we have conquered the wilderness and are a prosperous society.

Fortunately today's freedom from want has encouraged some men to look to new horizons -- to conquer space and do other once undreamed of things.

But regrettably it has also freed other men to look on life as one big free lunch counter.

Basically, and non-legally speaking, this is what we are dealing with in our juvenile courts and our divorce courts.

When we no longer have other battles to fight we tend to fight each other.

To counter this trend, we must work on two levels: the substantive and the procedural.

Turning first to the procedural.

1. I am sure you are all familiar with the work of the Conciliation Court of Los Angeles County, first under the direction of Judge Louis H. Burke, and now

-Over-

presided over by Judge Roger Pfaff.

With a staff of trained marriage counselors, this court has restored over 15,000 children to united homes during the past seven years. The court now reconciles an average of sixty out of every one hundred couples.

I might also add that the savings to the taxpayers by keeping these cases off the relief rolls have been substantial.

Here in California six counties have established conciliation courts modeled on the Los Angeles plan since 1958.

All counties throughout the nation that have a divorce problem warranting special attention should give serious consideration to adopting this system.

2. I believe the time has come to institute widespread teaching of domestic relations in our secondary schools. Here I refer not to sex education but to the teaching of the sanctity of the home, the responsibilities of parenthood, and the fundamentals of marriage relationships.

Let us squarely face up to the fact that the incidence of divorce among teenage marriages is twice as great as any other age group -- and let us do something about it.

3. I believe that much could be accomplished to insure the stability of the home through education in the mass media -- the press, radio and television.

This is a fitting campaign for the Advertising Council. I do not mean anything as trite as "Is This Divorce Necessary?" -- but the dissemination of information on the availability of pre-marital, marriage and family counseling through our community-supported agencies would serve a very useful purpose.

Turning now to the substantive level.

We must rededicate ourselves to our religious ideals, which in too many cases have been eroded by pragmatism in conduct; we must seek the pleasure in duty, rather than the duty of pleasure; we must substitute work and achievement for ease and indolence; and we must return to individual responsibility, not diluted collective responsibility.

In these ways we will recreate the American character that tamed the wilderness. For although the problems we face are not from hunger and want, we nonetheless have very great difficulties ahead.

From without, our country is faced with intensive political and philosophical competition from the communist world. We face a new kind of economic competition from the European Common Market, which will require far-reaching adjustments in our economy. We face new social problems at home, which have been created by an increasingly urban and industrial society. And we continue to face the problems that are always inherent in a democracy.

I firmly believe that as a nation we have the capacity to solve these problems. But it will take renewed effort and dedication, as well as strong individual self-discipline. The work of members of this organization with youth and families can be a major building block in restoring the national qualities that have made America great.

#####

NIXON'S SUPPORT OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT
AND
OTHER RECLAMATION PROGRAMS

When Brown accuses Dick Nixon of voting three times against the Central Valley Water Project he not only shows his abysmal ignorance of the legislative process, but even worse he shows his fiscal illiteracy. Using C.O.P.E.-supplied materials, Brown wholeheartedly accepts the "spend and spend, and tax and tax, and elect and elect" point of view.

The facts are that Nixon has supported the Central Valley Project and other reclamation projects in California and elsewhere, but he also supported the concept of responsible and prudent expenditure of funds. Here is what happened in the legislation cited by Brown:

The 1949 Bureau of Reclamation Appropriation

In August of 1946, President Truman requested the Secretary of the Interior to postpone work on all public works projects which could be deferred and specifically to limit expenditures for construction projects to \$85,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1947 and 1948. Mr. Truman's reason for this request was to reduce inflationary pressures which at the time were severe.

As a result of Truman's order, the Bureau of Reclamation had large unexpended balances that enabled it to expend more than \$141,000,000 in fiscal year 1949. This was more than twice its 1946 outlay. The House Ways and Means Committee accordingly recommended a reduction in appropriations for 1949 for the simple reason that the Bureau could not spend more money in an effective and appropriate manner.

Moreover, there was a large measure of suspicion in the Congress of the Bureau of Reclamation's operation in the Central Valley under the direction of Richard L. Boke and William Warne, now Brown's Super Agency "Water" Czar. In hearings on the Interior Department Appropriations Bill, the committee report castigated Warne and said specifically: ". . . The Bureau of Reclamation expended funds in direct contravention of the clearly expressed intent of Congress and positive instructions issued by the Secretary."

The vote on April 25, 1947, on the Kirwin Amendment to recommit the bill to restore the reductions made by the committee was 140 for and 197 against. Nixon voted no. In the vote following the final passage of the bill the vote was 307 for, 30 against. Nixon voted yes.

The Fifth Year Maximum Debt Pay-Off Period

The second vote that Brown cites: Under the Reclamation Act of 1939 as originally passed it became established policy that repayment of construction costs on dams would be made within 50 years from the date when the power feature became revenue-producing. The committee on public lands had reported a bill that would have increased the amortization period up to 78 years. The Bramblett Amendment called for establishment of a maximum of 50 years for repayment.

Opponents of the legislation contended that:

(1) A basic condition for any reclamation project is economic feasibility. If the costs of construction cannot be paid out in 50 years, there is good reason to question the economic feasibility of the project.

(2) Reclamation increases the value of the lands in the project area and for this reason, 50 years is ample time to pay off the reclamation costs of the project.

(3) It is not a good principle to burden future generations with costs that can and have been met on a pay-as-you-go basis.

(4) Proponents did not establish that requiring repayment within 50 years would cause rate increase charges to users of power. In fact, interest rates over an extended period might have the opposite effect.

On January 2, 1947, the amendment was approved by 320 to 134. Nixon voted yes. The bill was given final approval 231 to 121. Nixon voted yes.

Other Nixon Support NOT Mentioned By Brown

Brown doesn't bother to mention other Nixon votes for reclamation. Here are the facts: on the 1952 Interior Department Appropriations, Nixon opposed a reduction in funds for the Bureau of Land Management. He opposed an increase of \$12,026,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation for eight new projects. He supported an increase of \$16 million for the following existing projects: All American Canal, the Central Valley Project, the Columbia Basin and the Missouri River Basin. He opposed a reduction of \$10,417,222 for the Bureau of Reclamation which would have cut back existing projects. He supported final passage of the bill appropriating a total of \$520,082,307 for the support of the Department of Interior. In all of these votes, Nixon was with the majority.

DICK NIXON'S "DEEDS" IN ELIMINATING DISCRIMINATION
IN EMPLOYMENT

The Committee on Government Contracts

On August 13, 1953, the Committee on Government Contracts was established by the executive order of President Eisenhower, and given the assignment of "improving and making more effective the nondiscrimination provisions of government contracts." During the seven years of its operation under the Eisenhower Administration, Dick Nixon served as its chairman.

During the period from 1953 to 1960 the committee made the following important breakthroughs in solving the problem of economic deprivation based on race, color, religion and national origin:

Eliminated much employment discrimination in the District of Columbia by securing the agreement of the D. C. Board of Commissioners to include the non-discrimination clause in all contracts after November 16, 1953, and secured agreement from Capital Transit Co. and Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co. to integrate their work forces and employ the non-discrimination clause in their work contracts.

The standard non-discrimination clause for government contracts was strengthened to include upgrading, promotion, recruiting, recruitment advertising, training, and apprenticeship.

Direct negotiations were undertaken with major contractors to integrate their work forces at technical, professional, and clerical levels. For example, one automotive parts fabricator who never before had employed Negroes was persuaded to employ them on the basis of merit throughout his vast industrial plant, including semi-skilled, skilled, and supervisory workers.

A Negro electrician was hired for the first time in the District of Columbia by a contractor engaged in the construction of a federal building.

A Federal Reserve Bank in Chicago agreed to employ Negroes for the first time.

A large public utility in St. Louis advised that its company offices would be integrated.

A large chemical company in St. Louis completely revised its employment practices so that Negroes are now employed in many jobs, as opposed to the former practice of hiring Negroes only for janitorial work.

A large packing company in Omaha, Nebraska, for the first time, hired Negro clerical and white-collar workers.

A manufacturer of precision production tools in Cleveland, Ohio, employed Negroes in the production line for the first time.

A large manufacturer of component parts for jet aircraft in Kansas employed Negroes in the production line.

A large government activity in the South increased its employment of Negroes fourfold and has opened job opportunities in higher job levels than previously.

Summing up the results of the Committee's work, Nixon stated:

"A way to sum up what has happened is this---in scores of companies throughout the country a laborer can now become a welder; a janitor can become a machinist; a hod carrier can now become a bricklayer; a maintenance man can now become a mechanic; a mechanic or machinist can now become a foreman. And this is true of any employee---regardless of his race, creed, or color."

The work of the committee was also praised by someone who has never been a particular fan of Dick Nixon's:

"This committee, headed by Vice President Richard Nixon, has done a very good job on elimination of discrimination on work done under government contracts,"

Eleanor Roosevelt

My Day

August 11, 1960

THE BROWN MYTH OF FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY
RICHARD NIXON
Nixon for Governor Rally
Pasadena
October 3, 1962

If my opponent is elected, he will have to increase taxes. If I am elected, I will stop the rise in taxes. I will cut government expenses so that we can get the surplus that will allow us to reduce taxes.

The choice is clear! A vote for Brown is a vote to increase taxes; a vote for Nixon is a vote to cut spending, stop the rise in taxes, and reduce the burden on the taxpayers.

My opponent has made a "no tax" promise that he can't possibly keep and still keep his other campaign promises. It is this stark fact that the present State administration now tries to cover up by manufacturing myths of fiscal responsibility, balanced budgets, and meaningless pledges to turn over a new leaf and go straight next year.

1. The Myth of Fiscal Responsibility

Mr. Brown, October 1: "The first thing I had to do as Governor of the State was to assure the people of the State that they would have fiscal responsibility in their State government. My friends, they have had it."

Is it fiscal responsibility to raise the State budget 52.6%, while the population has gone up only 15.5%? This has been done.

Is it fiscal responsibility to raise individual personal income taxes 106.2%, while the population has gone up only 15.5%? This also has been done.

Is it fiscal responsibility to raise the authorized bonded debt of the State 110.4%, as has been done?

Is it fiscal responsibility to raise the State payroll 47% and the number of State employees 26.4%?

After looking at the Brown record of so-called "fiscal responsibility", I can only agree with him that the people "have had it."

2. The Myth of the Balanced Budget

Mr. Brown, October 1: "We have had four balanced budgets..."

Last year, the present State administration spent \$4,222,000,000 -- the highest State spending in the nation.

Last year, the present State administration taxed the people \$4,156,000,000 -- also the highest state tax collection in the nation.

In other words, Mr. Brown spent \$66 million more than he took in.

In order to claim a balanced budget, as he now does, he had to borrow \$66 million, which he did.

For the moment, let us stop talking about billions and millions. Let us say that you earned \$5,000 last year and spent \$6,000 -- you would be a thousand dollars in debt. If you then went to the bank and borrowed the extra thousand dollars to pay your bills, you would actually be further in debt -- for you would have to pay interest on your loan. You would hardly brag that you had balanced your family budget.

Yet Mr. Brown has done just this -- and on the grandest scale in history. Clearly, his claim of a balanced budget is nothing more than a grandstand play.

3. The Myth of No Tax Increase Next Year.

Mr. Brown, October 1: "I have made a pledge that there will be no new taxes next year."

As long as Mr. Brown supports his party's platform, a tax increase is inevitable. The cost of the 1962 Democratic State Platform in additional spending in California over the next four years will be a minimum of \$1,360,000,000. Where can the State possibly get that kind of money without raising our taxes?

Last Monday, in our joint appearance, I gave my opponent the opportunity to repudiate this plan to drive our State to the poorhouse. He refused to do so.

In fact, while pledging "no new taxes," I have learned that the present State Administration is right now considering three new taxes. Tomorrow in Manhattan Beach I will set forth the new tax proposals now under consideration by the Brown Administration.

* * * * *

The people of California already pay out 30 cents on every dollar in taxes. They deserve more than the meaningless moratorium on new taxes that the present State administration proposes in an eleventh hour attempt to disguise its record of increase of nearly one billion dollars in new taxes over the past four years.

The people of California deserve a government dedicated to bringing taxes down -- and this will only happen when government stops spending the taxpayers' money as if it were going out of style.