

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	13	06/01/1962	Other Document	"Communist Control" - Remarks by Richard Nixon, Manhattan Beach Rally, June 1, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 2 pages.
64	13	05/25/1962	Other Document	"Law Enforcement" - Statement by Richard M. Nixon, Los Angeles, May 25, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 3 pages.
64	13	06/01/1962	Other Document	"California's Crime Rate" - Remarks by Richard Nixon, Santa Ana, California, June 1, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 1 page.
64	13	05/23/1962	Other Document	"Broad Experience as Asset" - Remarks by Richard M. Nixon, Alameda, California, May 23, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 1 page.
64	13	05/23/1962	Other Document	"Quality of Brown Appointments" - Remarks by Richard M. Nixon, Berkeley, May 23, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 1 page.
64	13	05/18/1962	Other Document	"Government Reorganization" - Richard Nixon before Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, California, May 18, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 5 pages.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
64	13	05/23/1962	Other Document	"California Agriculture" - Richard M. Nixon, Los Angeles, California, May 23, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 3 pages.
64	13	05/29/1962	Other Document	"Welfare Statement" - By Richard M. Nixon, Los Angeles, California, May 29, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 2 pages.
64	13	06/04/1962	Other Document	"Brown's Incapacity to Lead" - Statement by Richard Nixon, Los Angeles, California, June 4, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 3 pages.
64	13	05/26/1962	Other Document	"Brown and Left-Wing Activities" - Remarks of Richard Nixon, Chula Vista Rally, May 26, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 2 pages.
64	13	06/23/1962	Other Document	"The CDC and Brown" - Remarks of Richard M. Nixon, at California Republican Assembly Meeting, El Segundo, June 23, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 2 pages.
64	13	06/01/1962	Other Document	"Equal Opportunity" - Remarks by Richard. Nixon, Republican Community Center, Los Angeles, California, June 1, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 1 page.
64	13	05/02/1962	Other Document	Squaw Valley remarks by Richard Nixon, before the Sunset Young Republicans, Los Angeles, California, May 2, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 1 page.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
64	13	05/30/1962	Other Document	"Agricultural Exports," remarks by Richard Nixon, Visalia, California, May 30, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 1 page.
64	13	05/17/1962	Other Document	"New Industry," Richard Nixon, Southern California Retail Grocers Association, Long Beach, May 17, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 1 page.
64	13	04/23/1962	Other Document	From the San Francisco Examiner, by Jack Lotto, April 23, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 2 pages.
64	13	05/03/1962	Other Document	"Francis Amendment," remarks by Richard Nixon, before the Junior Barristers of Los Angeles, May 3, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 1 page.
64	13	04/28/1962	Other Document	"Education," Excerpts from Remarks of Richard Nixon, before the California Teachers Association, Ambassador Hotel, Los Angeles, Saturday, April 28, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 3 pages.
64	13	04/28/1962	Other Document	"The Power of Government," Excerpt of remarks by Richard M. Nixon, 31st Annual Youth Banquet, Pasadena Junior Chamber of Commerce, April 24, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 2 pages.
64	13	04/26/1962	Other Document	Text of Water Policy Speech by Richard M. Nixon, Irrigation Districts Association, Sheraton-Palace Hotel, San Francisco, 12 p.m., April 26, 1962; for the Speakers' Manual. 6 pages.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
64	13	07/11/1960	Newspaper	Typed newspaper article: Hoped for Presidency for Self; "Comedown Arrives for 'Pat' Nixon", N.Y. Herald Tribune by Warren Rogers, Jr.; for the Speakers' Manual. 3 pages.

COMMUNIST CONTROL
REMARKS BY RICHARD NIXON
MANHATTAN BEACH RALLY
JUNE 1, 1962

I want California to have a Communist control program that will set an example to the nation.

This is why I have repeatedly asked Governor Brown to repudiate the soft under-belly of his party -- the California Democratic Council.

I have asked Brown to show some backbone, stand up and be counted on these three actions.

1. The letter from 43 of Brown's top party leaders urging cancellation of the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings in Los Angeles.
2. The resolutions of the California Young Democrats against state loyalty oaths and against the House Un-American Activities Committee.
3. Eight resolutions of the left-wing C.D.C. -- including eventual admission of Red China into the U.N., repeal of the loyalty oath, abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, presidential review for Soviet spy Morton Sobell, and reduction of U.S. military expenditures.

Yet Brown remains silent. He has apparently mortgaged himself to this far left fringe in return for past, present and future support.

Brown, in chameleon fashion, would like to be all colors -- red, white and blue -- as political expediency dictates. But unfortunately for him, his tacit support of the left-wing C.D.C. puts him squarely out of step with the National Democratic Administration, the majority of Democrats in Congress, and the sentiment of millions of California Democrats.

In distinct contrast to Brown's silence, I have proposed a four-point action program to combat the Communist menace in California.

As Governor, I will:

1. Propose top-priority legislation to deny the use of tax-supported institutions for speeches by any individual who refuses to comply with Federal and State subversive control laws or refuses to testify before Grand Juries or legislative committees investigating subversive activities.

2. I will stress hard-hitting enforcement of laws now on the books, including loyalty oaths.

3. I will activate, on a statewide basis, educational programs on the tactics and strategy of communism for both school children and adults.

4. I will emphasize the teaching of teachers and the use of authoritative textbooks for maximum effectiveness in anti-communist education.

The alternatives before the people of California on this issue are strikingly clear. There is Brown's do-nothing attitude. Or there is the opportunity to develop an effective anti-communist program that will make our state the leader in the nation.

LAW ENFORCEMENT
STATEMENT BY RICHARD M. NIXON
LOS ANGELES
MAY 25, 1962

The Governor's office is the weakest link in the law-enforcement chain in California.

Our State has the best local law-enforcement officials in the country. Yet they operate with one hand tied behind their backs because the Governor fails to give them decisive leadership and good strong backing.

The whole law-enforcement climate is affected by the quality of the man in the room at the top. When, as on the Chessman case, the Governor publicly wrings his hands, sheds copious tears and takes one step forward for each two to the rear, this attitude is felt throughout the State and duly recorded on the underworld seismograph

And the quake reaches tidal proportions when the Governor also opposes a responsible anti-crime program in the Legislature.

In 1959 and 1961, at least 15 measures were supported by the California District Attorneys Association, the California Peace Officers Association and the State Sheriffs Association. The adoption of this program would have brought stronger criminal penalties and more effective narcotics control.

Where did Brown stand? He bottled up legislation to protect the identity of informers, who are essential in narcotics cases; he torpedoed efforts to reasonably define our search and seizure laws. In short, the Governor's office lobbied against the law-enforcement program and killed it.

On the insidious narcotics problem, this is Brown's record: 1959 -- Brown refuses to recognize a problem and does nothing; 1960 -- Despite a petition signed by nearly 1,000,000 citizens, Brown again ignores the need for better narcotics-control legislation; 1961 -- three days after the State Assembly passes an anti-narcotics program, Brown finally gets on the bandwagon. Now, the Governor claims the credit for legislative action!

In 1962, effective law-enforcement legislation again ran smack into a Brown roadblock. The Governor was asked to put the question of local-state jurisdiction on vice laws before the special session of the Legislature. The Carol Lane decision had ruled that softer state law superseded stronger local laws. The Legislature could have taken immediate action to clarify jurisdictions and put strong local laws back into effect. Under the California Constitution, the Governor was the only man who could have brought this vital issue before the Legislature. The Governor refused to act.

This, then, is the law-enforcement climate in California today. This is the kind of support that the Governor's office is giving our dedicated state, county and local law-enforcement officials.

Today's serious crime wave in some of our major cities is indicative of the Governor's attitude on the problems of law-enforcement -- Brown gives lip service, not muscle. But only an ostrich with its head in the sand could fail to see the shocking picture that now faces every Californian:

1. From 1954 through 1960, California's population increased by 27 percent; our state's rate of major crime increased 90 percent.
2. In one year, 1960, there were more major crimes committed in California than in New York, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania combined -- three states which together have double the population of California.
3. Out-of-state crime czars now have a firm foothold in California, according to statements 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 United States Congressional investigation committees.
4. Our prisons are overcrowded and our prison officials are overburdened. In the last three years -- in close-security facilities -- there have been 40 cases of riots, murders and escapes.

Those are the facts which our Governor has smugly brushed aside or denied.

I believe we must have an immediate six-point action program to replace current complacency from the Governor's office, to provide the tools for effective local law-enforcement, and to make maximum use of our state's first-rate authorities on crime control and crime prevention.

1. We must have a Governor who will give strong, decisive leadership. The Governor, by word and deed, influences the whole law-enforcement climate in the state. California cannot afford a Governor who will hear no evil and see no evil. Crime must be recognized, rooted out, and made to pay the ultimate penalty when necessary.
2. We must have a Governor, who will encourage and support our conscientious local law-enforcement officials. The Governor, instead of raising obstacles, should present a realistic legislative program after consultation with the law-enforcement associations. Such a program should include the ultimate penalty as a possible sentence for big-time dope peddlers, as well as immediate action to overcome the adverse effects of the Carol Lane decision.

3. We must have a Governor who will not be influenced by the California Democratic Council. The CDC proposes to set up local citizens boards to investigate "mistreatment" of defendants at the hands of law-enforcement officials, rather than relying on our courts and removing obstacles in the path of sound law-enforcement.

4. We must have a Governor who will switch gears from neutral to high on the necessary expansion of prison facilities. And we must have a Governor who will take steps to eliminate the causes of prison riots.

5. We must have a Governor who will immediately set up a top-level state crime commission to coordinate the fight for a safer California.

We must make better use of our expert criminologists, penologists, local and county law officers in our fight to get the necessary laws, and to give every professional assistance available in our state.

6. We must have a governor who will give meaningful encouragement to our voluntary agencies, church groups, and boys clubs in their programs of crime prevention.

These are the actions that will assure the safety of the citizens of California. These are the actions that will close the leadership gap in the Governor's office. And these are the actions that will make our state a model to the nation in crime prevention and crime control.

CALIFORNIA'S CRIME RATE
REMARKS BY RICHARD NIXON
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA
JUNE 1, 1962

In the time it took us to eat our lunch today, 15 felonies were committed in California.

There are 700 felonies -- or one every two minutes -- committed daily in our State, according to the most recent statistics.

Equally shocking: There is a young person arrested every 2.8 minutes somewhere in California -- 500 juvenile arrests daily.

And our crime climate is deteriorating, not improving. California leads the nation in total offenses -- with nearly twice as many as New York. And there is little hope for improvement until our first-rate local law-enforcement authorities receive the proper support and encouragement from the State government.

No Californian should be satisfied with our present record.

There are many actions that State government can immediately undertake to reverse this insidious trend. This is not a partisan issue. Democrats and Republicans must join together to make California the first state in crime prevention.

Our dedicated local law-enforcement officials, who are the best in the country, must have responsible legislation to back them up.

We must have realistic search and seizure laws that protect constitutional rights without tying the hands of law-enforcement officers.

There must be legislation to give more protection to informants in narcotics cases, where this is the only feasible way to secure arrests.

There must be legislation providing for the ultimate penalty for big-time dope peddlers, who cynically corrupt our young people.

But the fight against crime cannot and should not be waged solely by government. There is a great deal that can be done by voluntary organizations, church groups, and service clubs. Law-enforcement is government business, but crime prevention should be everybody's business. The strength of America has always been our private initiative. It was not government that made America great--it was free enterprise, individual responsibility and private group action.

We must now harness this great force and this great strength in voluntary programs of education and recreation to halt juvenile delinquency and prevent crime. These are programs for a better California tomorrow. Our young people deserve the chance we can give them to lead full and productive lives.

BROAD EXPERIENCE AN ASSET
REMARKS BY RICHARD M. NIXON
ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA
MAY 23, 1962.

Brown is attempting to impose a hillbilly outlook on our State by trying to convince the voters that my national and international experience is a liability for service as Governor.

Because Brown has no first-hand knowledge of the nation and the world, he may think it isn't important to California. But Californians know that what goes on beyond our borders has a very direct effect on the State's welfare and economic progress.

One of the State's most pressing problems is agricultural export. There is a real danger that, without strong leadership from the Governor, California commodities could be put on the auction block under the new international trade agreements program. In this important area, would the State rather have a Governor who is an international novice or someone with broad knowledge of what happens at world bargaining tables?

Another of the many areas of national and international affairs that has a major impact on California is the serious and deadly traffic in narcotics from Mexico. Does Brown really believe that my 14 years of service as Congressman, Senator and Vice President will be a liability?

I believe the voters want a Governor who has the broad background to stand up for California and fight the State's case in national and international arenas.

Brown's form of isolationism would lead to sealing off the borders of our State to new ideas, new industry, and new opportunities. But Californians have been fence-busters from way back. We're not going to buy a two-bit approach to the world, the nation, and the state. This November we're going to close the leadership gap in state government.

QUALITY OF BROWN APPOINTMENTS
REMARKS OF RICHARD M. NIXON
BERKELEY
MAY 23, 1962

I believe that California deserves quality-in-government. Misplaced persons, second-rate administrators, and political hacks have no place in the operation of our State.

California has a great higher education system. It deserves the very finest men on the State Board of Regents--men who can devote all the time necessary to assuring continued quality in our University system. We cannot afford to have a member of the Board who lives 3,000 miles away from California in Washington, D.C.

Water is one of the most pressing needs in our State. Historically our water program has been above politics. In the past, quality has always transcended partisanship. We cannot afford to turn the water program over to a man of proven inefficiency in the foreign aid program.

Agriculture is our State's leading industry. Quality is an absolute must in picking a State Director of Agriculture. We cannot afford to play a game of political musical chairs with this position. California deserves better than the sort of man who was kicked out of Washington for his part in the Billie Sol Estes scandal.

We cannot afford to have a newspaperman, without financial experience, as our State Director of Finance.

Yet when I cite these examples of where California can and must do better, I am charged with "a smokescreen." Well, I say where there's so much smoke, somebody ought to get fired.

We cannot allow the State song to be changed to "out Where the Waste Begins." And I pledge to return above-partisan quality to government in California.

Californians deserve no less.

**GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION
RICHARD NIXON
BEFORE COMMONWEALTH CLUB
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
MAY 18, 1962**

Last November, New York -- a state that will soon be second to California in population -- repealed a clause in its Constitution that declared all land grants given by the King of England to be "null and void" after October 14, 1775.

In Michigan, as a result of the 1959 debacle that brought the state to the brink of bankruptcy, 144 delegates are presently convened in what is called "the con con" -- or Constitutional Convention.

Tennessee has recently reorganized its government to eliminate six boards and commissions. Hawaii streamlined its state administration in 1961 and abolished 323 jobs.

All across the nation people are concerned about the reorganization of their state governments and their state constitutions.

I think there is a basic reason for this attitude. Americans are worried about the trend toward "Let Washington Do It." And part of the reason for this trend is that our state governments -- bogged down in archaic restrictions and outmoded systems of management -- have simply created such a void in servicing the people that the federal government has often been forced to move in.

Now that the pendulum of government has swung so far toward Washington, Americans see the very serious dangers involved. We all recognize that Washington cannot know a state's needs as well as those at home. Washington brings a 50-state impersonal solution to a problem, not an individually tailored program for California or Michigan or New York.

Yet this is not the most damaging result of the trend toward Washington. Much more fundamental is the way it warps our basic fabric of government -- the Constitutional principle of Federalism, which is so essential to the preservation of freedom. It is not only the "local touch" that we have lost along the route to Washington, but something far more important -- self-reliance.

And so now America says, "It's time for a change." It's time to streamline state government. It's time to bring to it the vast experience we have gained in business, universities and civic groups. It's time to resume the responsibility for our states' welfare and our states' future. The answer to more government from Washington is better government in California.

The growth of California government has resembled Jack's magic beanstalk. By the end of World War I, there were already more than

100 independent offices, boards and commissions. The standard operating procedure whenever a new problem of a special interest arose was simply to add another box on the organizational chart. This process clouded lines of authority, slowed down decision making and skyrocketed the cost of government.

By 1961, the governmental atom had been split so many times that if the Governor were to spend just one day annually reviewing the work of each state body, he would barely have time to make the rounds in a year -- for there were 360 boards, commissions and agencies in the State government.

Recognizing the seriousness of this situation, the Governor submitted a reorganization plan, which was passed in a slightly different form by the legislature. The Governor's solution was to create a "Super Cabinet" of \$25,000-a-year administrators. The Legislative Analyst, A. Alan Post, estimated that this would cost the State in excess of \$250,000, without considering the additional technical staff needs or related operating expenses.

The Governor's plan failed to do away with a single agency of State government. On the contrary, it added another layer on top of the existing bureaucracy. Under the new plan, the super-administrators have no power to effect any changes in their departments. They cannot consolidate a single agency. They cannot abolish a single board. They cannot eliminate a single job. Lacking this authority, it is plain to see that the super-administrators cannot effect any economies in our State government -- either in budgeting or in programming.

In fact, what has happened is that the super-administrators have direct access to the Governor, but no operating authority; while their subordinates have operating authority, but limited direct access. The end-result of the 1961 reorganization has been additional problems of diffused authority, inadequate coordination, and poor communications.

The tragedy of this is that the need for revitalized government is greater in California than in any other State in the Union. California, which grows at the rate of 1,600 persons each day, cannot stand pat. We must create 20,000 new jobs each month just to tread water. And Californians do not intend to tread water. We want to be more than the biggest; we want to be the best.

As the first state in population we want to lead the nation in the quality of our state government. If we are to do this I believe we must immediately undertake a ten-point program to give California a more efficient, less costly and more responsive State government.

1. Our Constitution must be revised. It now meanders for 245 pages. It takes another 60 pages just for the index. It not only contains 256 amendments and over 75,000 words, but it's the only Constitution with an Article IV-Section 25, - Section 25-1/2, - Section 25-5/8, Section 25-3/4. In short, it is a case of verbosity on a rampage.

This might be merely ludicrous if it were not that the words interfere with the deeds. By freezing into our basic governing document all the solutions to past problems, we are putting a straitjacket on our ability to solve future problems.

2. We must streamline the swarm of State commissions, State bureaus, State agencies, and State departments. It is not enough to put a shiny tin weathervane on top of an old barn. We must replace the rotten rafters and sagging floor boards. There must be a statesmanlike reorganization of our executive branch of government to give the people of California more and better services for their tax-dollars. We cannot afford the wasteful duplication of having four separate agencies keep personnel records on any given state employee, and seven separate state agencies collect taxes.

3. We must get rid of the super-administrators, the unnecessary and expensive State-paid press agents, and all other surplus baggage that has accumulated in our government. Governments exist to perform needed services, not provide needless jobs.

4. We must make maximum use of our career employees, as well as our elected officials. To this end, I believe the Lieutenant Governor should conduct year-round investigations into the operation of government agencies and make recommendations for cost cutting and efficiency to the Governor.

5. We must reapportion the State Senate so as to give an adequate legislative voice to the metropolitan centers of the State, while still maintaining the majority representation from primarily rural areas.

6. We must have continuous two-year sessions of the State legislature. The Constitutional requirement to hold budget-only sessions in even numbered years has caused an erosion of legislative responsibility. The Governor, forced to call "special sessions" during budget years, now has total control over these legislative agenda. In these special sessions, the Governor is the only one who can determine what is an "emergency." In the past we have seen such "emergency" matters as legislation concerning cooking in hotel bedrooms!

Continuous two-year sessions will also permit long-range, in-depth committee investigations, with no fear of two year delays on issues of major importance.

7. We must unfreeze the two-thirds of the State budget that is not subject to legislative review or control. In the State's current \$2.9 billion budget, only a little over \$900 million was subjected to legislative scrutiny. We cannot have true fiscal responsibility until these mandatory appropriations and earmarked funds are exposed to the legislative searchlight.

8. We must initiate a "California Crusade for New Business Investment." Our business leaders and public officials must forcefully take our case to the country.

We must adopt tax and other fiscal policies that will help us attract new industry. We must reverse the trend that now sees some out-of-state industries passing over California in the search for new plant sites.

9. We must also have better coordination of those state and private activities that will make California's industrial and agricultural products competitive in foreign markets. I have personally seen the world-wide industrialization that now threatens California products abroad. This 20th Century Industrial Revolution is a great challenge to California. We must respond by making our products household words in places that were once only exotic names on a map.

10. The Department of Finance should be relieved of its petty responsibilities for such things as janitorial and grass-cutting services in order effectively to concentrate on planning for the overall growth of the State. Each State function cannot be performed in a vacuum. The decision as to where to put a freeway determines more than the future traffic flow; it determines future area congestion, which in turn determines future costs of doing business in California, which in turn determines the future economic health of our State. We must prevent highway planners or housing planners from starting a chain reaction without taking into account the ultimate link. It is time for the State Government to look at the forest as well as the trees. The leadership for this kind of forward-looking planning must come from the Governor and his top associates in the State administration

Besides these ten proposals, during the past month I have made other recommendations in the specific context of improving government activities in water development, education, and dealing with Communist activities in California. In the months ahead, I shall point out other organizational changes that can give California more effective programs in public welfare, agriculture, transportation, and other vital areas of State concern.

However, I want to make it clear that as important and necessary as I believe these changes to be, they are not a cure-all for California's problems. Changing the structure of government does not automatically change the substance of government. It is like setting up the best possible organization to produce and sell a product. Without the organization, there is little likelihood of successfully making a profit. But if the product does not fulfill consumer needs, even the best production force and sales team will not make the product a success in the long run.

By the same token, even the most streamlined operation will not guarantee success if the organization lacks decisive leadership, imagination, and drive.

Therefore, the success of our State, just as the success of a business, depends on three factors: responsible and forceful leadership; superior products -- in this case, programs that adequately meet the needs of a dynamic, growing State; and sound organization designed to keep costs down and production up.

This is not just the job of our elected public officials. As citizens, we do not fulfill our responsibilities to ourselves and our State by casting a ballot and then standing pat until the next election. California's destiny will only be fulfilled by progressive partnership of the private and public sectors of our State. I know that we can harness the energy of our citizens and our government to make California not only the biggest but also the best. Together we can make California a model of cost-conscious government with a conscience.

CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURE
RICHARD M. NIXON
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
MAY 23, 1962

The Brown Administration's record in agriculture favors one commodity -- the political plum. I propose to replace this bitter fruit with an eight-point action program that will benefit both the California farmer and consumer.

California's agriculture and its allied industries add \$12.6 billion annually to our State's total economic product. For every hundred workers on the farm, there are 263 others who are directly dependent upon agriculture. This means that every fourth worker in California is directly dependent upon agriculture. Clearly what happens to farming is of concern to every Californian. Agriculture is California's number one industry and we all have a major stake in its prosperity and growth.

1. To restore the farmer's confidence in his government, I will replace Brown's political appointees with men of quality and experience who are thoroughly versed in the complex problems of our state's agriculture.

Brown has made three consecutive politically-inspired partisan appointments to the key position of Director of Agriculture.

First there was William Warne, a man who had spent the previous decade out of the country and who had not been near California farm problems since the mid-30's. Brown later allowed William Warne to try to kidnap the State Department of Agriculture and bury it in his bureaucratic maze, even though the Legislature had specifically directed otherwise. It was only the united and spontaneous opposition of all farm groups across the State that blocked this self-serving move.

Next came James Ralph, a newcomer to California, who was fired by the National Administration for being involved in the Billy Sol Estes scandal.

And now there is Charles Paul, another newcomer, who was picked for purely political purposes over the heads of better qualified career men and farm leaders.

2. I will support a Federal minimum wage for agriculture and will oppose a California minimum wage law for farm workers. Such a California statute would only serve to put California agriculture in a position where it could not possibly compete with states that are currently paying far less for farm labor.

3. I will work to see that supplemental supplies of foreign labor are available when there is a shortage of qualified domestic farm labor. There are times at the peak of harvest when foreign labor is necessary to gather in its crops. Brown has given the silent

treatment to the need for such supplemental labor, even at times when the need for such assistance has been certified to by members of his own cabinet.

Brown and members of his staff have joined with such persons as former U.S. Assistant Secretary of Labor, Jerry Holleman, in adding restrictions to the use of supplemental labor. Holleman is another man who was caught with his palm greased by Billy Sol Estes.

There are many fine farm organizations in our State that have worked diligently to insure themselves of an adequate supply of domestic labor. I will encourage these voluntary farm groups in their activities in setting up referral offices and in their efforts to use domestic labor to the fullest extent.

4. I will use my experience in international affairs to find ways to increase our farm exports. California's agriculture is based on special crops. Only about 1-1/2% of our farm income is from Federal subsidies. There is a very real danger that these unsubsidized crops, with little political weight on the national scales, could be put on the auction block under the new international trade agreements program. Brown has no experience in international negotiations. Moreover, he is under pressure from his party in Washington. His typical response has again been to call do-nothing meetings. We need a governor who will stand up and fight for California's products. I will use my knowledge of the international bargaining table to see that the foreign market for our commodities is not traded away by State Department negotiators.

5. I will oppose all Federal attempts to impose the 160-acre limitation on State financed water projects. The 160-acre limitation was originally designed to assure equitable distribution of Federally-owned and Federally-reclaimed land. To use it as a political instrument for expropriation is nothing but a cynical scheme. Brown has talked out of both sides of his mouth on the 160-acre limitation, while his left-wing California Democratic Council has handed out the party line to support this outmoded concept.

6. I will see that the voices of all commodity groups are fully and equally heard. California is the greatest agricultural producing state in the nation. This wealth-creating power stems from more than 200 crops, many of which comprise the bulk of United States production. Cotton growers, dairymen, stockmen, fruit and vegetable farmers--all must be able to present their distinct and special problems to a Governor who will not play favorites.

7. One of my first acts as Governor will be to work towards restoring the State Board of Agriculture to its former outstanding

position in the nation. Now it is composed of eight members of Brown's political party and one traditionally academic appointment. For some time a tacit requirement for appointment to this Board was membership in the California Democratic Farmers Congress, a James Ralph partisan innovation.

8. Finally, I will replace indecisions with the strong leadership our State so desperately needs in all agricultural areas.

**WELFARE STATEMENT
BY RICHARD M. NIXON
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
MAY 29, 1962**

Governor Brown's contribution to welfare programs in California has been loose administration, excessive red tape, and unproductive cost increases.

Before Brown came to office, California had developed a liberal and humane record in welfare matters. Since Brown has been in office, this is the record:

1. Costs have skyrocketed. State funds for welfare programs have risen over 25% in the last two years, while our population has gone up only 7.5%.
2. Laxity and red tape have caused two national magazines to single out California's Aid to Needy Children and Unemployment Insurance program as grim examples of slipshod and self-defeating administration.
3. Brown's Administration has allowed unscrupulous individuals to take advantage of the humanitarian aims of the welfare programs. The investigation of an unmarried mother of three children in San Jose is a case in point. She had received more than \$20,000 in welfare payments, although she lived in a \$31,000 home, had a \$1,000 mink coat, a \$3,200 automobile, \$1,000 of French provincial furniture, and the services of a gardener.
4. Brown's State Board of Social Welfare has contributed to the breaking-up of homes by ruling that the reason for the absence of the father is immaterial in Aid to Needy Children cases. This has caused parents to separate solely to get public assistance. In one case where a father earned \$242 a month, his family received \$364 monthly in public assistance once he had left his wife.
5. Brown's answer to these problems is more staff at County expense. Yet our dedicated caseworkers are already so snowed-under with form-filling, memo-writing, and a five-foot shelf of regulations that they literally do not have time for casework. This immersion in a sea of papers is also responsible for the enormous and costly staff turnover -- now 25-33% a year.

We must take immediate action to eliminate these roadblocks that obscure the laudable aims of our welfare programs. People become aged, illnesses are crippling, children are neglected, families are deserted, unemployment increases. We must be concerned for those who are handicapped, either by physical, social or economic forces over which they have little control.

We must get more service for less money from our social welfare programs. We deserve a better deal as taxpayers. And those on public assistance deserve a better deal as human beings.

Therefore, I propose a five-point action program of welfare reform.

1. We must immediately replace the segmented and costly approach to social welfare problems with inter-departmental coordination. For example, unemployment, under-employment and racial discrimination are all sources of the dependency problem. There must be a closer tie between the Department of Employment and the Welfare Department. Some employment office representatives should work in Welfare Department offices. Adult education facilities and services should be brought into this program to increase employment skills.

2. We must clear away the underbrush of regulations so that caseworkers and administrators will be able to concentrate on the families needing assistance, rather than being forced to give most of their attention to an endless stream of petty details.

3. We must have greater local control and local autonomy to meet local conditions. State and county relations are currently at a low point. Instead of teamwork, there is suspicion and mistrust. Instead of leadership, there is dictation and duplication from the State to the counties in which the programs must be carried out.

4. We must restore the concept of personal responsibility. We must refocus our attention on helping people to help themselves, rather than just doling out money. The welfare programs must be more than a method of transferring funds. Prevention and rehabilitation must be the basis of all programs.

5. A concentrated effort must be made to re-unite ANC families. And where reconciliation of families is not possible, more effort should be made to obtain support payments from the absent father. Some counties are doing a good job in this area, but the Brown Administration has frowned on these efforts as "punitive."

These actions will assure that our tax dollars are spent in the most constructive and waste-free manner. And these actions will assure that no scandal or administrative snafu will threaten our future ability to help the honest and unfortunate people who are relying on our assistance.

**BROWN'S INCAPACITY TO LEAD
STATEMENT BY RICHARD NIXON
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
JUNE 4, 1962**

Governor Brown has been a costly embarrassment to the people of California. Here are ten situations where Brown has consistently displayed his incapacity to give effective leadership.

1. Brown has embarrassed Californians by showing an appalling lack of knowledge of government and its operations.

--He claims not to have known that the 27-year Squaw Valley contract was given to his crony William Newsom during his Administration.

--He did not know that the State Constitution prohibits retroactive pay raises to State employees.

--He did not even know that his own salary as Governor had been raised by \$4,100 until the press called it to his attention.

2. Brown has embarrassed Californians by displaying a Hamlet-like compulsion to duck difficult decisions.

--His indecision turned the Chessman case into an international incident.

--His indecision delayed effective narcotics legislation until the State Legislature forced his hand.

--His latest indecision on refusing to repudiate the extreme left-wing positions of the California Democratic Council has clouded his ability to represent all the people of California.

3. Brown has embarrassed Californians by his compulsion to put his foot in his mouth.

--To the Communist-supported "Women Striking for Peace," Brown said, "I hope your message rings around the world."

4. Brown has embarrassed Californians by substituting file-and-forget reports for immediate action.

--He created a commission to study metropolitan problems, such as smog and transportation -- then he ignored the recommendations.

--He created a group to study consolidation of Bay Area bridges, airports and port facilities -- then ignored the recommendations.

--He called for reports on water, State printing, State planning, reapportionment, fallout shelters, and Squaw Valley -- all these reports have been involved in unsolved mysteries.

5. Brown has embarrassed Californians by his inability to keep good men in State government.

--Robert McCarthy, who ran the Department of Motor Vehicles with great efficiency, resigned with this blast at Brown: "It has become increasingly hard to work for a spineless administration that lacks both courage and principles."

--When the Chairman of the Veteran Board, Arthur McCardle, resigned, he added, "I have nothing but absolute disgust and repulsion for the lies, deceit and treachery coming out of Sacramento."

6. Brown has embarrassed Californians by loading the State payroll with his relatives.

--One of Brown's sons-in-law is assistant to the State Director of Corrections. Salary; \$10,860.

--Another of Brown's sons-in-law is a deputy attorney general. Salary: \$7,728.

--Brown's sister-in-law is on his staff. Salary: \$10,380.

--Brown's brother is a State inheritance tax appraiser. Fees for part-time work in one year: \$7,640.

7. Brown has embarrassed Californians by playing blind partisan politics.

--His record of appointments shows that Brown has picked 1109 Democrats and 325 Republicans.

--He has lobbied for and has passed new election laws designed to buck up his political machine.

--He has supported the most flagrant political juggling of legislative boundaries in the history of California.

8. Brown has embarrassed Californians by courting Jimmy Hoffa support

--Brown appointed Dutch Woxberg, a former chief Hoffa aide, to a top State position.

--Brown has enthusiastically accepted the endorsement of the Hoffa-controlled Teamster bosses in California.

9. Brown has embarrassed Californians by refusing to repudiate the extreme left-wing positions of those close to him.

--He has refused to repudiate the letter from 43 of his top party leaders urging cancellation of the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings in Los Angeles.

--He has refused to repudiate the Young Democrats' resolutions in opposition to loyalty oaths and the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

--He has refused to repudiate eight left-wing resolutions of the CDC --including eventual admission of Red China into the U.N., presidential review for convicted Soviet spy Morton Sobell, and reduction of U. S. military expenditures.

10. Brown has embarrassed Californians by standing pat at a time when it is imperative that our state move forward.

--He stands pat with the worst record of highway fatalities in the nation.

--He stands pat with the worst record of major crimes in the nation, despite the great efforts of our dedicated local law-enforcement officials.

--He stands pat with the fourth worst teacher-pupil ratio of any State in the nation.

--He stands pat with the highest total State and local tax collection per capita in the nation.

BROWN AND LEFT-WING ACTIVITIES
REMARKS OF RICHARD NIXON
CHULA VISTA RALLY
MAY 26, 1962

Governor Brown applies a cynical double-standard to his actions. He is quick to call on others to repudiate right-wing extremists, while he firmly refuses to repudiate the left-wing extremists of the California Democratic Council.

This group endorsed and in effect selected Brown in 1958. Brown is their man again this year. Brown owes it to the voters to stop stalling and give a frank reply to this question: Does he approve these eight on-the-record positions of the CDC?

- "The eventual admission of Communist China" into the United Nations.
- Repeal of State and Federal loyalty oaths.
- Abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.
- Presidential review of the conviction of Soviet spy Morton Sobell "to secure ultimate justice."
- Reduction of U.S. "expenditures on both missile and conventional forces."
- Repeal of the Landrum-Griffin anti-racketeering act.
- U.S. foreign aid to countries regardless of their forms of government.
- Investigation of local police by citizen boards for alleged "mis-treatment" of defendants (rather than relying on our courts and removing obstacles to law-enforcement).

These are a cross-section of the California Democratic Council's bug-eyed proposals that will weaken our state and nation. Surely Brown has an opinion on these well-known issues. My position is unequivocal I'm firmly against every one of these CDC proposals.

This is not all that Brown sidesteps. On April 22, 43 members of the Los Angeles County Democratic Committee, officials of the CDC and President of Democratic Clubs wrote Democratic National Chairman John Bailey urging him "in the interests of insuring a Democratic victory" to use his "influence to seek cancellation of the scheduled hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee in Los Angeles. These letter-writers felt that House Un-American Activities Committee hearings "can be only harmful to the cause" of the Democratic Party in California.

This view can hardly be shared by millions of rank-and-file Democrats who want to expose and stamp out the Communist menace in California. This view can hardly be shared by the majority of the Congressional Committee, who are elected Democrats.

Yet Brown again remains silent. He has not publicly supported his party leaders' contention that the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings could be harmful to his party. He has not publicly repudiated the letter and its strange contention.

Why has Brown consistently declined to repudiate this dangerous brand of political quackery? I have made my position absolutely clear on both the radical right and the radical left. Californians are still waiting to hear from Brown on where he stands.

I am not alone in asking Brown to stand up and be counted. The President of the University Young Democrats at Berkeley has just sent Brown an "open letter" stating, "In short, Governor Brown, I'm asking you to fire your speech-writers, get some new ones and tell them to put some guts into your speeches."

Brown and his ghostwriters certainly owe this to the people of California.

THE CDC AND BROWN
REMARKS OF RICHARD M. NIXON
AT CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY MEETING
EL SEGUNDO
JUNE 23, 1962

The primary election results spell only bad news for Mr. Brown. More than 16 percent of the Democrats who voted preferred three unknowns to Brown, and an estimated 5 to 7 percent wrote in the names of Republican candidates on their Democratic ballots. With such a protest vote among Democrats of over 20 percent, it's little wonder that Brown declared he was "going down to victory."

* * * * *

Whether or not Mr. Brown ever makes up his mind about engaging in free and open TV debates during the forthcoming campaign, it is time for him to get off the fence and either accept or reject the left-wing extremist support of the California Democratic Council.

He should stop stalling and tell the voters of California his position on these six on-the-record resolutions of the CDC.

Repeal of state and federal loyalty oaths.

Abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

"Eventual admission of Communist China" into the United Nations.

Reduction of U.S. "expenditures on both missile and conventional forces."

Repeal of the Landrum-Griffin anti-racketeering law.

Investigation of local police by citizen boards for alleged "mis-treatment" of defendants (rather than relying on our courts and our local police commissions).

This is simply a cross-section of proposals adopted by CDC conventions after Brown called the CDC "his strong right arm" in 1959. Every one of them would gravely weaken our state and nation in some vital area of public affairs.

Yet Brown accepts the support and the endorsement of the CDC. He can't have it both ways: either he accepts this support, and these extremist views along with it, or he must openly and unequivocally repudiate it.

As recently as May 27, I publicly challenged Brown for a straight answer, which the voters of this state surely deserve. The silence

has been deafening. My own position, on the other hand, is absolutely clear and I re-state it now: I am firmly against everyone of these CDC proposals.

Every voter, every thoughtful citizen of both parties, deserve an answer. Between now and November, I intend to keep reminding Brown of that fact -- and of the further fact that one sure mark of leadership is the courage and willingness to take stands on major issues of public policy.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY
REMARKS BY RICHARD NIXON
REPUBLICAN COMMUNITY CENTER
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
JUNE 1, 1962

A few months ago I read a letter to the editor in one of our local papers that expressed in simple, direct language one of the most serious problems of our time -- one that hits our Negro citizens with particular hardship and that is all too often neither understood nor fully appreciated by the community as a whole.

The letter read:

"I am a high school student and my question is, will there be any jobs available when my fellow students and I are ready to go job hunting?"

"I ask this because I have been watching friends and relatives go practically out of their minds because they can't find work.

"One man in particular has not worked steady for two years. He supplies vegetables and fruits for his family from that spoiled and left at Twelfth and San Pedro Streets. He is an American 27 years old. He is a baker by trade, yet qualifies for other jobs."

The letter was signed by a student from Roosevelt High School.

This student was, of course, expressing more than dismay at the cruelty of blind discrimination -- he was also expressing real concern for his future and wondering whether there was any hope in this situation.

It is little wonder that we see the formation of organizations such as the Black Muslims -- a group that has turned its back on hope and retreated to violence and racism as a solution. But neither violence nor hate, whether directed at the Negro or white can produce the changes we know must come and will come. These changes must be based on cooperation and personal opportunities for promotion. We cannot have progress if we are going to encourage class and racial distinctions. We cannot achieve progress and opportunity for all through purely legalistic approaches. A more positive approach is necessary. That is why, as Governor, I will use the moral and persuasive powers of my office to bring employers together for voluntary action in the field of equal job opportunities, and opportunities for promotion.

This approach will give the high school student, who wrote the newspaper, and others like him, the opportunities to lead full, useful and happy lives.

SQUAW VALLEY
REMARKS BY RICHARD NIXON
BEFORE THE SUNSET YOUNG REPUBLICANS
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
MAY 2, 1962

The shenanigans at Squaw Valley are still unexplained by the Brown Administration. The Governor's flimsy defense has not cleared the air. It has only raised more questions.

Why didn't Brown cancel his crony's contract after the Newsom outfit was found guilty of serving liquor to minors? This is a major violation. Does the Governor condone such conduct?

Why didn't the Governor cancel his crony's contract after the Newsom outfit was cited for more than 30 concession violations? These violations include uncleanness, poor maintenance, unauthorized advertising, infractions of housing regulations, violation of fire codes and unauthorized removal of equipment. Does the Governor condone such conduct?

Why has the Governor allowed this situation to fester for 21 months without an audit of his crony's books? Rather than answer these questions, Brown makes these three points:

1. He says: "Some of the material is entirely new to me."

This is a sorry comment from the man responsible for the entire operation of our state government. As a lawyer, Brown should know the old adage, "ignorance of the law is no excuse." As a governor, he should know that you can't slide off your constitutional responsibility on underlings.

2. Brown says that he awaits a subordinate's report on the situation. Californians have come to recognize this tune as "Variations on a Theme by Brown." The theme is, "stall for time--people may forget." The people won't forget. They want answers -- now!

3. Brown says that he's sure that his crony Newsom would be willing to sell out for \$210,000.

Why WOULD'N'T Newsom accept \$210,000 for stock that cost him nothing? The time has come to stop waiting for reports, to stop waiting for action. It is time for the Governor to cancel this shabby contract. Remember; Standing pat is no substitute for moving forward, and government-by-crony is no substitute for good government.

Let's close the "leadership gap" in Sacramento.

AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS
REMARKS BY RICHARD NIXON
VISALIA, CALIFORNIA
MAY 30, 1962

California needs a Governor who will stand up and fight for our State's agricultural and industrial exports.

We are now the number one exporter in the nation. In 1960, our exports totaled nearly \$1.8 billion, of which almost half a billion dollars came from farm products. This means that 10% of all U.S. farm exports come from California.

Today our farm and factory products are threatened from all sides. From abroad, we face the stiffest competition in history. While from Washington, D.C., there is the very real danger that State Department negotiators could put our specialty crops on the auction block under the new international trade agreements program.

I am sure that everyone in Tulare County has seen the new statistics that show county farm income on the decline for the second straight year. Farm income is down over \$11 million. The year before the drop was almost \$8 million. Nearly every product has been affected -- alfalfa hay, Valencia oranges, turkeys, cotton, cattle, table grapes, emperor grapes and Muscats.

This trend must be reversed. I have already proposed an eight-point action program to aid California farming. High up on my list of priorities is action to increase farm exports. This is an area in which my long experience in international affairs can pay big dividends for all the people of our State.

But of equal importance, we must return quality administration to the State's handling of agriculture. We must end the Brown tradition of appointing political hacks to the key position of Director of Agriculture. And we must restore the State Board of Agriculture to its former outstanding position in the nation.

This I pledge to do as your Governor.

NEW INDUSTRY
RICHARD NIXON
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RETAIL GROCERS ASSOCIATION
LONG BEACH
MAY 17, 1962

Over the years, the people of California have demonstrated a remarkable capacity for breaking ground in a great variety of fields -- in aircraft design and production, in architecture and building, in electronics and other areas of science, in agriculture, in finance, in fabrics and clothing, in the energy industries, and in many other areas of economic growth.

Many of these activities started as small businesses. They have grown, prospered, and created opportunities for employment and investment. This is because Californians have been eager to do original thinking, to do things that have never been done before, and to devise better ways of doing old things.

Unfortunately, now it is true that thoughtful people are having doubts that this great record can be continued. These doubts are based, not on any question of the capacity of the people, but on the widespread belief that there is now an unfavorable business climate in California.

Already, we have heard the President of Cannon Electric say that his firm's next expansion will be in the Midwest. The treasurer of another California-based company -- which built its latest plant in Nebraska -- was equally blunt: "We can't compete if we keep our operations here." A third executive also has said that his company has "made its last expansion in California."

We must immediately reverse this trend and again inspire confidence in the economic growth of California. We can do this by holding the line against the spiral of record-breaking budgets and increased taxes. We can do this by correcting the unsound fiscal policies of the State; by wiping out frills and extravagance; by cutting red tape and excess paper-work, and by streamlining and reorganizing government operations.

But equally important, we can inspire a new wave of business confidence by doing a better job in State government, rather than running to Washington to get the job done.

FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER
BY JACK LOTTO
APRIL 23, 1962

REDS 'BURY' NIXON

The Communists "buried" former Vice President Richard M. Nixon this week.

At the same time, the Reds blew to life the long-dead Alger Hiss case.

They indicated they are going to push the Hiss espionage-perjury case as a campaign issue to turn a Nixon slip into a fatal political plunge.

And, the Communists jubilantly trumpeted that they expect Nixon to be killed politically in his campaign for the governorship of California,

The official Communist Party mouthpiece, "The Worker," told the comrades confidently:

"It is not unlikely that we can safely forget about Nixon after next November."

Nixon has been an archenemy of the Reds for nearly 15 years, since, as a freshman member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, he spark-plugged the investigation of Hiss.

The former State Department official was convicted of perjury in 1950, and given a five year prison term for denying he gave secret Government documents to a Red spy ring.

Nixon, inadvertently, provided the ammunition for the new all-out attack in his just-published book, "My Six Crises." He erred when he said the FBI found the typewriter which helped convict Hiss.

The mistake was jumped on by Hiss as supporting his contention of a "frame-up."

During Hiss' two trials, the FBI swore it never had possession of the machine. The defense found the old, battered typewriter and introduced it into evidence.

The Government then proved the incriminating documents were typed on it. Later, the defense claimed the typewriter was a Government "plant."

Allegations of "fraud by typewriter" were rejected by all the courts, up to the U.S. Supreme Court, in appeals for a new trial.

Said "The Worker":

"Richard Nixon made the mistake of putting his lies in a book. His lies about Alger Hiss, the Cuban invasion...are down in black

and white where opponents can pick them apart. And it may drive the final nails in the coffin in his political career.

"We'll begin with the lies about Hiss, which will haunt Nixon through the months of his gubernatorial campaign...Nixon lied about the most important evidence in the (Hiss) case...An innocent man was convicted. Nixon's lie cannot be brushed off as a mere 'researcher's mistake.'"

In view of the Communist statements and claims, this formal announcement by U.S. Attorney-General Robert Kennedy should be kept in mind:

"The claims made by Mr. Hiss and on his behalf regarding factual matters in connection with his conviction cannot be substantiated. All the pertinent files and records in the case have been reviewed carefully. This review confirmed that the FBI never had possession of the disputed typewriter."

FRANCIS AMENDMENT
REMARKS BY RICHARD NIXON
BEFORE THE
JUNIOR BARRISTERS OF LOS ANGELES
MAY 3, 1962

No one concerned with the security of our State and Nation can quarrel with the aims of the Francis Amendment, which is designed to combat the communist menace in California.

Governor Brown says this is "a very, very bad bill." He says, "I am against it in every way." I emphatically disagree with Brown. There is an urgent need for a more effective program to combat communism in California. Our State cannot stand pat on the communist threat. And we cannot tolerate a State Administration that substitutes smugness for action.

Unfortunately, there appears to be a fatal Constitutional flaw in the Francis Amendment. Because of loose drafting in Section 3, which allows a wide assortment of groups and individuals to designate subversives, the Amendment may inadvertently give the communists a constitutional escape hatch.

For 14 years in Washington -- as Congressman, Senator, and Vice President -- I dealt with communist-control legislation, and I know that the communists ferret out a legal loophole with the cunning of a rat after cheese. I was one of the sponsors of the Federal Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 and I saw how communist tactics hog-tied this in the courts for ten long years. If the communists could do this to a carefully constructed law, which was finally held constitutional by the Supreme Court in 1961, it is easy to see what a field-day they would have in attacking a piece of legislation with the potential defects of the Francis Amendment.

This is why I regret that I can neither sign or support the Francis Amendment in its present form.

My alternative in vigorously pursuing the fight against communism in California is this:

At the next session of the Legislature, I will present a first priority anti-communist program. Among its provisions; it will deny the use of tax-supported institutions for speeches by any individual who refuses to comply with Federal and State subversive control laws or refuses to testify before Grand Juries or legislative committees investigating subversive activities; it will stress hard-hitting enforcement of laws now on the books, including loyalty oaths; it will activate on a statewide basis educational programs on the tactics and strategy of communism on the school and adult levels; it will emphasize the teaching of teachers and the use of authoritative text-books to do this job.

On this issue -- fighting communism in California -- as on all issues, I aim to close the "leadership gap" in Sacramento. Under the next Administration, California will not stand pat; we shall move forward in solving our state's problems. In so doing we shall set an example for other states to follow.

EDUCATION
EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF
RICHARD NIXON
BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
AND THE
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
AMBASSADOR HOTEL, LOS ANGELES
SATURDAY, APRIL 28, 1962

Between the eighth and twelfth grades one out of every four pupils drops out of school and goes out into the labor market unprepared and short-changed on his education. In terms of unemployment, juvenile delinquency and the state's welfare programs, this is "social dynamite." It cannot and it should not be glossed over. So long as we have our over-crowded classrooms and our high rate of student drop-outs, we cannot say California has the kind of education system which the first state in the nation deserves.

* * *

We must remember that a majority of our children do not go on to colleges and universities. We must recognize more adequately the needs of students who want vocational training. Our California junior colleges are coming into the forefront in filling specialized educational needs. They also are expected to take in some 50,000 additional students who otherwise would attend private and public colleges and universities. For this task, the junior colleges have been promised greater state aid -- a commitment which has been substantially unfulfilled to date. It is essential that we fully emphasize their importance and their high standing in the educational community.

* * *

Our education headaches are not about to be finally resolved. The crest of children to be educated is yet to be reached. The total public school enrollment is 3,825,000 -- double that of 1950 and as great as the state's entire population a few short years ago. By 1970 the number will jump to five million. We cannot limit our perspective to the decade ahead. We must build a philosophy of education that will serve as a sturdy framework for our educational giant for many years to come.

* * *

We educate American children for a different purpose and to a different end than the communists. We should not push the panic button with each new communist achievement. We are educating free citizens to live in a free society. We don't, at about the tenth grade, test our children and send the rejects off to the factory or to the mines in Siberia. There is no American equivalent to Siberia to swallow up all but the brightest students. We educate children to earn their livings in a free and competitive society. We also educate them to be well-rounded people. Further, we have a responsibility to our children which goes far beyond the needs of a communist society. We are educating our future voters and leaders and opinion makers.

EDUCATION
EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF
RICHARD NIXON
BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
AND THE
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
AMBASSADOR HOTEL, LOS ANGELES
SATURDAY, APRIL 28, 1962

California is near the bottom of the list among the 50 states in numbers of students for each teacher in our elementary and secondary public schools. With the exception of six other states, California has the most crowded classrooms in the nation. Because of such overcrowding, more than 90,000 students attend half-day, split sessions.

The solution lies in increasing the number of teachers in California and using our school buildings to greater purpose, so that we can arrive at an improved pupil-teacher ratio. This would in itself improve the working conditions of our teachers.

Beyond this, teachers should be relieved of non-teaching duties insofar as possible.

* * *

The recommendations of our teachers should be given the highest priority in any assessment of our education needs and any assessment of where our money should be spent.

* * *

We must make sure that the state receives the maximum educational benefit from every dollar it spends for educational purposes. There is a drastic need for a thorough-going review of our present method of distributing state aid toward the end of increased equity and effectiveness -- not only for the children but for the taxpayer.

EDUCATION
EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF
RICHARD NIXON
BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
AND THE
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
AMBASSADOR HOTEL, LOS ANGELES
SATURDAY, APRIL 28, 1962

There is no doubt that we need more classrooms. For this reason, I urge support for the two state bond issues proposed for the construction of new school, college and university buildings. These include the \$200 million bond issue for state construction. More than 80 percent of this capital outlay bond issue will go for construction at the University of California and the state colleges.

Properly drawn, local school bond issues also deserve support. Our general policy should be to pay our bills as we go along. But in our present fiscal situation created by higher spending throughout our state government, schools that will be used many years into the future must be financed on a time-payment plan. As in buying a car, we would rather pay cash, but when we cannot afford it, we are forced to finance our purchases, even if it costs us more.

It is inconsistent and wrong to oppose federal aid to education, and then vote against the local and state bond issues or other funds needed to support a top-quality, locally-controlled school system. There is in the final analysis only one effective answer to the pressures for vastly increased federal aid and the threat of federal control. Our states and local school districts, and all responsible citizens, must assume the burden of responsibility for adequate support. The most effective way to avoid dictation on education from Washington is to do a better job of meeting the needs of education at home.

THE POWER OF GOVERNMENT
EXCERPT OF REMARKS BY
RICHARD M. NIXON
31ST ANNUAL YOUTH BANQUET
PASADENA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
APRIL 24, 1962

The impact of the federal government on every aspect of the American economy is direct and immediate, and it runs deep. The amount it spends and the rate of spending, the bite and distribution of taxes, federal deficits and surpluses all set the framework for personal spending and saving and for basic decisions by private management.

There could be no more dramatic demonstration of this fact than last week's controversy over the price of steel. Without getting into the merits of the situation from this distance, the longrun lesson still is clear. The federal government has a near-controlling voice in wage-price decisions, and it has the power to back up its views in no uncertain terms.

There is a parallel lesson for every one of America's towns and cities and states. By its command over powerful media of public communication and over the public purse-strings, the federal government is also in position to move into areas of public policy traditionally reserved to our states and local communities.

The events of last week thus raise with unmistakable clarity the overriding issue of the Federal government's impact not only on economic decisions but also on the far broader area of local and private autonomy. The controversy over steel prices, and the way in which that controversy was settled, sharpens the basic question of self-government in America -- and certainly not least in California, the bellwether of growth and progress among all the fifty states.

It does no good to deplore encroachments on local liberties or to view with alarm the future of our freedom as private citizens. The only answer that will make any real difference in the longrun is effective action -- the actual record of performance chalked up by our cities and states and by private and voluntary groups and organizations. If they do the jobs the American people want done and provide necessary public services, then the opening wedge for federal encroachment will be blocked off.

Effective action means, first of all, vigorous and creative local and state government. And this, in turn, depends on top-quality candidates for all offices at every level. It means candidates, and public officials, who have the skill and experience and drive to speak up and stand up for state and local autonomy and not cave in whenever the federal government offers tempting handouts. In no areas of public concern is such local initiative more vital than education and urban development, close as these are to our day-to-day way of life and to the development of tomorrow's citizens.

Effective action means, also, leadership by private business and private organizations in many fields and professions. To the extent, for example, that our free medical profession moves forward in the development of private and voluntary health plans, just to that extent can we hope to avoid irresistible pressures for a compulsory federally-controlled system--with all its consequences for the quality of medical care in this nation.

Effective action means, finally, an intensive campaign of public information and education. The blunt fact is -- as Commerce Secretary Hodges pointed out in his speech at Los Angeles last week -- that most of the American people are utterly uninformed about the nature of a free economy, about its operating procedures, and about the central role of fair profits in such a system. Fewer than 5 per cent of our adult citizens have ever had so much as a one-year high school course in economics. And in a recent poll of college students, 60 per cent thought that profits were, in general, a bad thing. The dramatic significance of such misinformation can be seen in the confused public reaction to the steel controversy. It can be seen in the curious notion that a 10 cent an hour increase in "fringe benefits" is automatically non-inflationary -- that it does not, like a regular and open wage increase, raise industry costs at the same time and by the same amount.

America's competitive economy -- and America's freedom -- cannot afford this sort of basic misinformation.

These are all forms of action in which Chambers and Junior Chambers of Commerce can and must undertake roles of special responsibility. As local business and professional leaders, Chamber members know the facts. They recognize the dangers. And they are in position to take effective counteraction. Their longtime record in philanthropy and public service is a distinguished case-in-point. For the future, this record must be tremendously multiplied -- if the concept of self-government is to have more than historic interest in the annals of a free society.

Text of Water Policy Speech
by RICHARD M. NIXON
Irrigation Districts Association
Sheraton-Palace Hotel, San Francisco
12 p.m., April 26, 1962

One of the greatest challenges to the dynamic growth of California is that of water development. Potentially, there is enough water to meet all our needs. Our job is to redistribute it - fairly and equitably.

The history of water development in California is a long one. The credit belongs to no one man. Since the beginning of this century we have been developing water. We will continue to do so imaginatively and creatively.

The East Bay Municipal Water District, the Hetch-Hetchy system, the Owens River Aqueduct, the Metropolitan Water District, the Central Valley Project, the Imperial Irrigation District and the Coachella Valley County Water District all deserve mention as do many others. As a result of these programs we have some of the richest farmland in the world and the resources for a burgeoning population.

The state entered the water development picture in 1947 when the Legislature authorized a comprehensive study of all water resources, and from that study evolved the California Water Plan in 1957. The first step of the Plan that will eventually encompass many water programs was to be the Feather River Project.

Californians approved the financing of the Project in good faith. We must keep faith with them. It is only fair to tell the people of California that the \$1 3/4 billion price tag never will cover the costs of the program. This was known at the time but nobody wanted the responsibility of putting a \$2 billion bond issue on the ballot. So the situation was conveniently compromised. The truth of the matter is that no one can honestly say what the Feather River Project will cost, and we must face that fact.

Like the Feather River financing approach, the entire program has been a bipartisan achievement. Until recently water has been non-political, and properly so. It is much too vital for party credits. Although he was a Republican, Harvey Banks, former Director of Water Resources, served in two administrations. He handled the assignment as a non-political one.

Indeed, those were the days -- before politics began to poison the water situation -- when the present Governor could truthfully declare:

"When I walked in as Governor of this State there were great pressures back and forth as to whether I should retain Harvey Banks as the head of the Department of Water Resources. But I had worked with him as Attorney General and I knew there wasn't a better water engineer in this State, and the water program of California as it moves ahead will be a monument to Harvey Banks."

We know, of course, what happened. The Governor lost the services of Harvey Banks, the man whom he praised for taking the Feather River Project to the voters so successfully. Until then, water was free from politics. I am determined to return it to that freedom.

Water also needs freedom from federal meddling. California's water developments prove that self-government at the local level is the best government. This is basic to my philosophy. Water projects already built are the best possible evidence of the effectiveness of local self-government. The vast irrigation works built by the irrigation districts, the municipal systems constructed by public agencies of one kind or another, and the works of private utilities all testify to the resourcefulness and achievement of local units. The job of the state should be to encourage this kind of achievement, not displace it with larger government. This philosophy should be basic to the state as well as to the federal government.

The function of the state is to guide and encourage local communities to help themselves. There is considerable criticism that local units are not getting the help they need. This can be cured only by a direct and able Director of Water Resources who has the confidence of his staff and the people in the communities which his department serves.

What is needed is not more layers of government -- but fewer. Getting rid of the present Governor's super-cabinet will be one of my first acts. Replacing the present water director with a man of Harvey Banks' calibre will be next.

At all costs, the counties of origin of the water must be protected. Present population distribution does not necessarily reflect the population of the future. There is enough water available, if properly harnessed, to serve all the people of the state. In the meantime, we must not make the same mistake in philosophy that the federal government makes when it tries to lay claim to all California water. We believe in the water rights of the counties of origin and of the original users. But unless our resistance to federal encroachment is extraordinarily vigorous, the question of protecting the rights of the counties of origin may well be merely academic.

In my opinion, as far as the Feather River Project is concerned, too much power has been vested in the Administrative branch of state government. The plan would be sounder if it contained more inherent checks than the Governor's vague promises to deal fairly with all sections of the state. Under the super-agency program of the present Administration, the Governor has virtual life and death power over the units of the Feather River Project and at the same time he has delegated that authority to an appointee who is not accountable to the people. The super-agency only dilutes the responsibility of putting the water program into effect. Besides these serious drawbacks, it adds a considerable burden of unnecessary expense.

Now let us examine federal participation. I favor it only to the extent necessary on legitimate grounds. Flood control is an example. California must seek and obtain its share of federal money for that. The same is true of federal projects which made water available to users who agreed to abide by federal restrictions.

But California should not enter into federal agreements which compel our people to adopt wholly artificial rules limiting their right to use state water. The 160-acre limitation does not satisfy our present farm economy. When Governor Brown went so far as to threaten higher water rates on farm holdings of more than 160 acres he showed a total disregard for the agricultural facts of life. The farmers who grow peaches, pears and other fruit crops could survive with 160 acres of irrigated land, but cattle ranchers, some row-crop growers and grain farmers would go broke. I am against the 160-acre limitation at all times and in all places where state water development is concerned. It is not suited to California. We should not accept it as a part of any agreement with the federal government. The fact that the Brown Administration implicitly recognized it in state contracts with water users reflects a gratuitous compromise of principles. The use of 160-acre or any acreage limitation on privately owned land is a step toward socialized agriculture -- with the manifesto being written in Washington.

There is still another aspect of speaking up for California. We should spare no effort in defending our water against claims of the federal government. The tempo of these claims has been growing steadily. So far, Congress has failed to enact the necessary laws to protect the states against these encroachments. In the Santa Margarita watershed, some 6,000 people have been hailed into court by the United States to hear the government claim that it had a "superior" right to the water supply of that river. This litigation has gone on for more than 10 years. It has been annoying, disheartening and expensive to the people. We should use every means to settle or end this litigation. If the federal government wishes to exert special claims to our water supply, it must pay for it, and not attempt to take that supply under the guise of sovereign rights. The Santa Margarita battleground stands as a prime example of the vigilance we must always exercise to resist the ungrounded assertion of alleged federal rights over ours on our own water.

More recently, the United States told the city of Fresno that it did not intend to follow the laws of California and that by reason of putting a dam across the San Joaquin River there simply was no more water available for people downstream. In making this claim, the U. S. Attorney General disclaimed any responsibility for what the Secretary of the Interior had done before, and concluded that when the United States acquired the territory of California from Mexico in 1848, the United States became the owner of all lands and all rights to use water within the territory.

These are only two instances of the broad claims being made by the United States. We must take the battle of preserving California's waters into the Congress and courts of the United States.

Let us look now at power development. We must not use a water project as a means of getting the state into the power business through the back door. On the Feather River Project, California will need more power than it can produce, and the private and local utility systems are ready, able and more than willing to provide the margin to pump the water over the mountains. In return, these same systems have agreed to purchase all the power which the state can produce along the power drops of the aqueduct and from Oroville Dam. Incidentally, I do not believe that dam can be built without the sale of the power at a fair market price as originally agreed. This is important to the final pricing of the water.

At the outset, the present Administration announced its policy to negotiate with the existing utility systems for the extra power needed to operate the aqueducts. Since the new Director of Water Resources has taken over, there has been an ominous change entirely in keeping with his past experience and performance which I have discussed at some length during this campaign.

The Power Committee, which was used by the former director to consult on all matters pertaining to power requirements, distribution, sale and exchange, has been strangely inactive. I will reactivate the Power Committee. There is talk of the possibility of constructing a nuclear plant to generate power needed for pumping. The amount of money available to build the water project will not be sufficient to do that job, too. There is no money available to build an atomic plant and it is not needed.

Now let us turn to the problem of prices. Some areas of this State are experiencing difficulty in contracting with the state for Feather River water. The problem arises because each area contracting with the state must repay that portion of the capital cost of the entire project which is charged to the area on the basis of proportionate use of the facilities. Some of the thirstiest areas are agricultural. They have modest valuations and some of them feel they cannot raise the necessary payments either through taxes or water charges to fulfill their obligations.

There are several possible approaches to the problem:

The first is to charge as much of the entire project to the general taxpayer of the state as is justified. For example, fish and wildlife, recreation, flood control, are some of the benefits which will come to the state as a whole. They should not be charged against the water user. The Legislature should be encouraged to find as many of these statewide beneficiaries as possible and to the extent that others benefit, the cost of the facilities should be reduced insofar as the direct water user is concerned.

In addition to bond proceeds, the state will be using money from the California Water Fund to pay for the Feather River Project. That fund is made up of moneys that come to the State of California through its oil, gas and mineral reserves. As the matter now stands the water users must repay all capital costs with interest. This includes interest on the California Water Fund, even though there is no requirement that the state itself pay interest on that money. Consideration should be given to the possibility of waiving that interest. It would help the rural areas, but it would also benefit the metropolitan areas because the reduced interest charge would apply to all contracting agencies.

The contract with the state is flexible insofar as postponing payments is concerned. Inasmuch as the land to which this water is delivered will increase in value, the principal payments of each contracting agency should be delayed long enough to permit the increased value to be reflected. This will delay the day of payment, not excuse it.

Each area must be encouraged to search broadly and deeply its own financial resources. There is an understandable tendency to throw the expense

of a project to somebody else, particularly to the state. But the local area must act boldly and imaginatively in its own behalf, and extend itself fully in order to contract for water from the state project.

If the estimates for California's growth hold up, and we have every reason to think they will be exceeded, the demands on our water supply will require increasingly imaginative planning.

Just as the Feather River Project and other units in the California Water Plan were planned by past administrations almost 20 years ago, so it is up to us to lay out a resourceful plan for the generations to come. Here are some of the things we should be doing now for the sake of our people, and farms and industries of tomorrow:

We should be working now at full throttle to develop the financial means for implementing the next stage of the California Water Plan. That means that the great seasonal surplus waters of the Northwest, the Mad, Eel, Trinity and others, must be diverted into the Sacramento River and through the Delta for distribution into other parts of the state. Our experience with the Feather River Project indicates that finance is the key to water development. We must give our immediate attention to that task.

All water resources development must be envisioned with a view to their incidental use for flood control, fish, wildlife and recreation. There is an ever-growing demand on our recreational facilities with the growing numbers of people coming to our state. Imaginative planning can accommodate, at least to some extent, the wholesome outdoor recreation of our people. The costs of these programs must be borne by the people generally, not by water users specifically.

Waste disposal is equally as important as water supply. In some ways it is even more important because one community's disposal may be another community's supply. As our communities grow, problems of water quality become even more important. Many of our ground water basins are the basic sources of supply for million of people. These basins must be kept pure so that their function may be continued. Salt water intrusion must be stopped. This program requires intimate cooperation and coordination between the innumerable local agencies charged with this responsibility, as well as the state agencies that are designated to oversee the area-wide problem.

The imminent threat of water pollution is not only local. It is statewide, and even national. The federal government is moving into the picture in a big way. California, if it is to manage its own water supply and disposal system, must give priority attention to the business of water quality and disposal. It is a problem readily overlooked or shoved into the background because the far reaching consequences of pollution and contamination cannot always be seen immediately. I would propose legislation that will bring water quality control into the forefront as one of our most pressing problems.

We should not dismiss the possibilities for the future in the conversion of sea water. The blunt truth of the matter is that we may well need

both the water from the California Water Plan and converted saline water. Desalting research should be encouraged in every way possible. This must go on at the same time as we are developing our fresh water supplies. In the case of sea water, we have a supply that is inexhaustible. Another thought to keep in mind is the amount of brackish water that has invaded our underground water tables. That, too, will eventually have to be converted. Saline water conversion research must be pressed forward with honest diligence not as a substitute for the California Water Plan but as a very necessary adjunct. Here, too, I find myself in substantial disagreement with the philosophy of the present Director of Water Resources. He was willing to see the small research appropriation for desalination of water go down the drain in this year's budget.

Whole civilizations have been buried under the dust of parched lands. New ones rise up where there is water. This is California -- rising as the giant among the 50 states.

California's population will pass the 20 million mark by 1970.

This is why our water must be harnessed to the fullest possible extent. This is why we must learn to tap the ocean economically and sift the work of our scientists and the ideas of our dreamers for new breakthroughs. This is why we need top leaders in state government -- leaders who will keep politics out of water.

###

COMEDOWN ARRIVES FOR 'PAT' BROWN

by Warren Rogers Jr.

LOS ANGELES, July 10--Like Wonderland's Alice trying to decide which side of the mushroom to eat--left to grow bigger, right to grow smaller--California's Pat Brown finally had to make up his mind today.

Gov. Brown's moment of truth came at the California caucus. Fittingly, perhaps, the setting was pure Hollywood--the lush, plush Hollywood-Knickerbocker Hotel, where even the smoke-filled rooms seem to have been designed for a Cecil B. DeMille Biblical epic.

Downtown, in the more prosaic hostelries like the Biltmore and Mayflower, amid all the pre-convention hoopla, the man they were all talking about was Edmund G. (Pat) Brown. Will he or won't he?

Little old ladies from Pasadena, would-be starlets vying in bathing suits for the title "Miss Democratic Convention 1960," the fat man running and shouting through the lobby with a big button in his lapel saying "Relax," the tough old political realists and the awe-struck first-timers--they all were ready, at the drop of a hat in the ring, to ask or answer the question: Will he or won't he? Will he release California's eighty-one votes, or won't he?

DECISIONS COME HARD

Decisions come hard for Pat Brown. It is not that he can't make up his mind. He can and does, often. He is rather like Mark Twain on the question of smoking. Mark Twain said he saw nothing hard in trying to quit smoking--he had done it many times. Pat Brown makes up his mind many times, and unmakes it just as often.

His latest decision on the Democratic Presidential nomination came, apparently, a few hours before the California caucus. He told reporters he had informed Sen. John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts whom he will support and "he (Kennedy) was pleased."

Did this mean, the newsmen asked, that the Governor was supporting Sen. Kennedy? Gov. Brown chuckled and replied, "You will have to draw your own assumptions." How many of California's eighty-one votes would Sen. Kennedy get? That, as far as the Governor was concerned, would have to remain a mystery for the time being.

Pat Brown is squirming in the spotlight once again because as California goes, so might go the rest of the convention. For a man to whom affability is almost a fetish, the burden is very heavy. He knows it is impossible to choose among friends and have all of them keep on loving you as they did before.

2.

but choose he did. He came out for Sen. Kennedy.

BACKING AND FILLING

For months, Gov. Brown had been backing and filling. One day he seemed to be for Sen. Kennedy, the next for Adlai E. Stevenson. For awhile he was for himself, but that bubble burst as the political winds reached gale force in the spring.

Even now, the great psychological moment may have passed. The number of votes he is said to control appears to be diminishing as the pre-convention days tick off. Yet, as late as last night some of his advisers planted this bug in the Governor's attentive ear:

"Look, Pat, the cameras will all be on you when they call the roll at the convention. California is alphabetically number five on the roll. Here's what you do:

"When California is called, you get up and ask to make a statement. As a Governor, you will be granted your request. Then you walk down the aisle very slowly and, to heighten the suspense, halfway to the rostrum you bend down and carefully tie your shoe laces.

"Up on the stand, with everybody watching, you dramatically announce that California wants to lead the way and cast its vote for Kennedy. You'll be a hero! You'll be Secretary of State...Attorney General... anything you want in the Kennedy administration."

EYED WHITE HOUSE

That is a pretty heady prospect for any professional politician. But it is a come down for Pat Brown. Only last fall his eye was on the White House. Then he lowered his sights to the Vice-Presidency. Now he is beginning to wonder whether he can hold onto what he's got.

In November, Gov. Brown was thinking so seriously of the Presidency that his friends put out a brochure comparing him favorably with New York Governor Rockefeller, himself then enjoying a Republican Presidential boom.

The Brown partisans used phrases like "fresh faces...high potency personality...decisive and strong governors" and summed it all up this way:

"The Governors of New York and California would seem to be increasingly noteworthy counterpoints to each other and the rest of the national scene in the months ahead."

Gov. Brown has never decided to take himself out of contention for the Democratic Presidential nomination. Like a Topsy in reverse, his prospect just kept shrinking. His popularity really took a beating in the much-publicized and controversial affair of the execution in May of Caryl Chessman.

3.

SHOCKED BY OPPOSITION

An index to the way things stand, came in California's June 7 Presidential primary. Gov. Brown drew 1,354,031 votes. But, to his great horror, the political unknown who opposed him--George H. McLain, whose chief claim to attention was his advocacy of pensions--got a staggering total of 646,387.

And so, Pat Brown went to his moment of truth at the Hollywood-Knickerbocker, with about as much enthusiasm as a nearsighted bull-fighter approaching a particularly tough toro. Will he or won't he?

He did. It remains to be seen now whether, having now nibbled off one side of the mushroom, his political stature will grow taller or shorter.