

00:00 – Lloyd Nolan: ...for California, the state of California, and all of us who work and live here. Now I'm sure you're also aware campaigns are expensive, and that's why tonight we're asking each of you to become a partner of Dick and his crusade, an active partner in

00:30 – Dick's march to victory. You can become an active partner in this crusade by making your contribution to Dick Nixon and a greater California tonight. All you have to do is phone your pledge right now to Harrison 40511, and then mail your contribution to post office box 1963, Salinas. Your contribution, no matter how large or small, will be used to help Dick, our next governor. Then on Election Day you can be

01:00 – proud of the part that you played by becoming a partner with Dick. So phone your pledge in right now, won't you, to Harrison 40511, and then mail your contribution to post office box 1963, Salinas. Thanks a lot.

[Applause]

Man: Richard, um, [undecipherable]

Richard Nixon: Thank you very much, Lloyd, I'm

01:30 – delighted to have you here and I understand a little later I'll tell our television audience that Lloyd Nolan will be over to handle some of your questions, so that you won't have to listen to me, to my voice, all the time, and I'll go forward now. This question comes from L.E., uh, Fouchs, I think is the name, F-O-U-C-H-S. It's 2852 Elk Run Road in Pebble Beach. He says on page 32 of the Monterey Peninsula Herald, dated Wednesday, the 19th of September,

02:00 – appeared in advertisement, "We too are against the Francis Amendment." He said, "Your name appeared along with Mr. Brown's. Was your name included in this list with your knowledge and/or consent?" And he enclosed the, or somebody at least, enclosed the ad, I have it here. The answer is that my name was not included with the others' names on this ad with my knowledge or consent, and

02:30 – I frankly resent my name being used that way because it does not tell an accurate story. It gives the indication, or the implication, that my opposition to the Francis Amendment is the same as Mr. Brown's and some of the others on that list—and it isn't. I oppose the Francis Amendment because of my concern over one section, a constitutional difficulty in section three. I believe that as far as the

03:00 – objectives of that amendment are concerned, controlling the Communist conspiracy in the state of California, that those objectives should be accomplished. I'm going to vote against the Francis amendment. If it should be passed, I will try to see that it isn't forced in a way that constitutional rights are not infringed upon. But I want to say this further, as I said before: I don't agree at all with Mr. Brown, when he said in opposing the Francis Amendment, that California doesn't need

03:30 – any legislation to deal with Communism in this state, that it doesn't already have. As I said again, and I said earlier and I repeat now: when I've travelled up and down this state, I find that in our state colleges and universities, there is no directive at the present time that is clear and unequivocal with regard to speakers on state, college, and university campuses, who have pled self-incrimination when questioned about Communist activities. I just believe

04:00 –that there should be such a directive, and I will see that there will be one, to the effect that any individual, who refuses to answer questions on the grounds of self-incrimination, when he is questioned about the Communist activities, should not have the right, and should not be given the dignity of appearing on a tax-supported institution. I just like to spell this out for one moment because there's been some controversy about it. Somebody said to me the other day, "But Mr. Nixon, doesn't a person have a right to plead the Fifth Amendment

04:30 – of the Constitution? To refuse to answer a question on the ground of self-incrimination?" And the answer is certainly he has! But a person does not have a right to teach in a federal institution or a state institution or to speak in a tax-supported institution—that is a privilege, and it must be earned. Let me use an example. A person who is working in a bank and who is questioned about a robbery in that bank

05:00 – has a right to refuse to answer questions about that robbery on the grounds that he might incriminate himself. But he certainly has no right to continue to work for that bank, if that's the attitude that he takes. And I say that any individual who refuses to answer questions about a conspiracy that is dedicated to overthrow the government of the United States should not then have the right to go right on a campus supported by that government and make a speech before students or any other group.

05:30 – That's my position and Governor Brown can take his, I think he's wrong, I think I'm right, and I think the people of California, Democrat and Republican support mine.

[Applause]

Nixon: The next question, "What are your views on Governor Brown's stand on the Chessman case?" I think I've already indicated that, this comes from Abe Sulman, 1360 Griffin Street, Salinas. I disagree with it completely. Mr. Brown has a right to believe to be against capital punishment.

06:00 – I happen to be for it. But as governor of this state, he, in that case, made it seem to me a very grave error. And that was in not taking the responsibility for carrying out the law of the state. And when he even went so far as to try to put the blame for his indecisive action on what might happen abroad or world opinion, it seemed to me that that wasn't something,

06:30 – that was a kind of passing the buck that we shouldn't have from a chief executive of this state. This one is from Gregario Ibenez of Speckles, California, I think I pronounced his name

correctly and pardon me if I haven't. It reads, "I am a Filipino farmer. I voted for you. I want to know if your program on welfare, saving 27 million dollars in costs, will it mean less taxes on all of us? I've worked twenty years. I have no dependents. So there's

07:00 – very little left after tax deductions. Will you be able to help us, or farmers like me? And why is there higher taxes in California than in other states? Where does it all go?" Well, Mr. Ibenez asked a lot of questions there, and I want to tell him that one of the reasons that I am for cutting government expenditures in Sacramento is so that we can reduce the burden on the tax payer. I think, too often

07:30 – we get the impression that the only people who care about taxes are the rich. But everybody pays taxes. When somebody buys a package of cigarettes, when somebody goes into a store, into a service station and buys gasoline. Individuals of course pay income tax, they have it deducted from their checks, and up and down the line. We all get property tax bills if we own our own homes, and the point is that politicians, they go around and make promises, big promises about all the money they're going to spend—

08:00 – I think they're insulting the intelligence of people, because the people have to keep those promises. I think we've got to cut expenditures, and I want to say in this respect, in the field of welfare, I am for a welfare program, a welfare program that will take care of the legitimate needs of everybody who needs it. Take care of our aging people, who certainly deserve the checks that they receive. Take care of those who are handicap, take care of others who

08:30 – qualify under the law. But if I could paraphrase a very famous statement early in the history of this country, I say: Let's be the most generous state in the Union for those who deserve it, but not one penny for the chiselers. And I say that 27 million dollars can be cut from welfare costs and not one individual who is entitled to welfare will be hurt by it. In fact, his case will be made safer, because the fact that chiselers are

09:00 – on the rolls is endangering the whole program. And to this man I say with us, a new administration, you can have a hope to cut that tax burden. With Mr. Brown, you don't have a chance, because his programs will increase taxes, certainly, over a period of time rather than reduce them.

[Applause]

Nixon: Now this says, over to Rex May here.

09:30 – Rex May: Make acknowledgments to people who are sending contributions, and this is Agnes Lonsberry, 104 Fountain Avenue in Pacific Grove, five dollars, thank you very, very much—

09:38-09:48 – [Silence]