

California State Archives
State Government Oral History Program

Oral History Interview

with

W. DON MACGILLIVRAY

California State Assemblyman, 1967 - 1974

and

MARY E. MACGILLIVRAY

August 8, 9, and 10, 1989
Santa Barbara, California

By Carlos Vásquez
Oral History Program
University of California, Los Angeles

RESTRICTIONS ON THIS INTERVIEW

None.

LITERARY RIGHTS AND QUOTATION

This manuscript is hereby made available for research purposes only. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the California State Archivist or the Head, Department of Special Collections, University Research Library, UCLA.

Requests for permission to quote for publication should be addressed to:

California State Archives
1020 O Street, Room 130
Sacramento, CA 95814

or

Department of Special Collections
University Research Library
405 S. Hilgard Avenue
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90024-1575

The request should include identification of the specific passages and identification of the user.

It is recommended that this oral history be cited as follows:

W. Don MacGillivray and Mary E. MacGillivray, Oral History Interview, Conducted 1989 by Carlos Vásquez, UCLA Oral History Program, for the California State Archives State Government Oral History Program.



March Fong Eu
Secretary of State

California State Archives
1020 O Street, Room 130
Sacramento, CA 95814

Information	(916) 445-4293
Research Room	(916) 445-4293
Exhibit Hall	(916) 445-4293
Legislative Bill Service (prior years)	(916) 445-2832

PREFACE

On September 25, 1985, Governor George Deukmejian signed into law A.B. 2104 (Chapter 965 of the Statutes of 1985). This legislation established, under the administration of the California State Archives, a State Government Oral History Program "to provide through the use of oral history a continuing documentation of state policy development as reflected in California's legislative and executive history."

The following interview is one of a series of oral histories undertaken for inclusion in the state program. These interviews offer insights into the actual workings of both the legislative and executive processes and policy mechanisms. They also offer an increased understanding of the men and women who create legislation and implement state policy. Further, they provide an overview of issue development in California state government and of how both the legislative and executive branches of government deal with issues and problems facing the state.

Interviewees are chosen primarily on the basis of their contributions to and influence on the policy process of the state of California. They include members of the legislative and executive branches of the state government as well as legislative staff, advocates, members of the media, and other people who played significant roles in specific issue areas of major and continuing importance to California.

By authorizing the California State Archives to work cooperatively with oral history units at California colleges and universities to conduct interviews, this program is structured to take advantage of the resources and expertise in oral history available through California's several institutionally based programs.

Participating as cooperating institutions in the State Government Oral History Program are:

Oral History Program
History Department
California State University, Fullerton

Oral History Program
Center for California Studies
California State University, Sacramento

Oral History Program
Claremont Graduate School

Regional Oral History Office
The Bancroft Library
University of California, Berkeley

Oral History Program
University of California, Los Angeles

The establishment of the California State Archives State Government Oral History Program marks one of the most significant commitments made by any state toward the preservation and documentation of its governmental history. It supplements the often fragmentary historical written record by adding an organized primary source, enriching the historical information available on given topics and allowing for more thorough historical analysis. As such, the program, through the preservation and publication of interviews such as the one which follows, will be of lasting value to current and future generations of scholars, citizens and leaders.

John F. Burns
State Archivist

July 27, 1988

This interview is printed on acid-free paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTERVIEW HISTORY i
BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY iii
SESSION 1, August 8, 1989

[Interview with W. Don MacGillivray]

[Tape 1, Side A] 1

Childhood in East Los Angeles--Military service
--More on life in East Los Angeles--Life during
the Depression--Perceptions of the Japanese-
American internment--Going into the construction
business--Serving on the Santa Barbara City
Council--Being appointed to the airport
commission--The annexation of the Santa Barbara
Municipal Airport--Thomas M. Storke's influence
in Santa Barbara politics--Storke's civic spirit
is missing in the nation today--How television
has diluted political leadership--Why at-large
municipal elections alienate elected officials
from their constituencies--The issue of urban
growth and planning while on the city council--
Other members of the state legislature from
Santa Barbara.

[Tape 1, Side B] 33

More on Santa Barbara legislators--Economic
opportunities from serving on the state
legislature--Why he became a Republican--The
free-enterprise system--The importance of
planning--Local and state government--Why he
decided to run for state government--Ronald
Reagan asks him to run--Why he supported Reagan.

SESSION 2, August 9, 1989

[Tape 2, Side A] 50

MacGillivray's marriage and children--Why Santa Barbara went to a city-manager system of municipal government--Hiring a city manager and working together--Why it was a mistake for Santa Barbara to go from a ward to an at-large electoral system--Discusses the Thirty-Sixth Assembly District--Why Isla Vista was a threat to him--Discusses his opponent Winfield A. Shoemaker--The partisan nature of the race--How Reagan brought government within its means--The negative aspects of welfare--Why raising the minimum wage hurts everyone--Discusses first term in the assembly--Remembers assembly colleagues and his own legislation--Impression of the legislative leadership--Compares contemporary legislative leaders--Discusses campaign costs and the role of money in politics--The first local issues he dealt with as a freshman legislator.

[Tape 2, Side B] 81

Dealing with oil spills in the Santa Barbara Channel--Conflict with the federal government--Discusses his legislation regarding oil spills--How getting legislation passed depends on a bartering system--Keeping Santa Barbara attractive to tourism--How limiting development hinders the ability to buy homes--More on oil legislation--Discusses 1970 race for assembly--His opposition from Isla Vista--His views on the eighteen-year-old vote and the Vietnam War--Dissent on the University of California, Santa Barbara campus--When the United States should intervene in foreign countries--The two great presidents of his lifetime--"Red-blooded Americanism"--The role of "intent" in legislation--More on the protests at the University of California, Santa Barbara campus in 1969-1970--Legislation to reimburse local agencies for police action against antiwar protests--Background to creation of the California Coastal Commission.

[Tape 3, Side A] 114

More on regulatory bodies--More on the errors of restricting development--Assembly Speaker Jesse M. Unruh--The qualities of a good assembly speaker--The differences between the assembly and state senate--Limiting incumbents' terms of office--Life in Sacramento and the advantages of having his wife with him in Sacramento.

SESSION 3, August 10, 1989

[Tape 4, Side A] 127

The best background for a legislator--How being a local official helped him in Sacramento--Too many laws in California--How judicial appointments are made--The courts have been politicized--The Justice Rose Elizabeth Bird case--Why he has always supported the death penalty--Television and social violence--The use of the exclusionary rule of evidence--The 1972 race against Gary K. Hart--More on why he opposed the eighteen-year-old vote--How a narrow victory affected his clout--His relations with Assembly Speaker Bob Moretti--His view of the spoils system--Compares Bob Moretti and Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.--Partisanship and strong political parties.

[Tape 4, Side B] 156

Solutions for California's pollution problems--The duties of the United States Environmental Protection Agency--Why it is to the benefit of oil companies to oppose pollution--How advertising affects consumer attitudes--The difference between enforcement and finding solutions among regulatory agencies--Charges of being "pro-oil"--Need to reduce dependency on foreign oil--How Watergate affected Republican political fortunes in California--Why he was defeated in his 1974 state senatorial bid--Proposition 9 and restrictions on lobbying--What his Masonic lodge brothers taught him about corruption--How to avoid conflict of interest among legislators--"Key-hole" journalism--How newspapers distort information--Who should be in charge of reapportionment.

[Tape 5, Side A] 185

What he learned about politics from being in the state legislature--His career after he left the state legislature--Working for the National Capitol Planning Commission--Why he is optimistic about politics--Serving in different levels of government.

[Interview with Mary E. MacGillivray]

SESSION 1, August 9, 1989

[Tape 1, Side A] 197

Childhood in Victorville, California--Student interests--Effects of the Great Depression on her family--How she met and married her husband --How they decided to build their first home and her participation--Mr. MacGillivray's first business ventures--Her role in the family construction business--Her husband's aneurysm--The effects on the family of her husband's career--What she liked about being the mayor's wife--Her role in MacGillivray's campaigns--Her response to her husband's decision to run for the state legislature--How the family business suffered--The issues in the campaign against Assemblyman Winfield A. Shoemaker--Why politics is 99 percent timing--The difference between a "leader" and a "politician"--Her role as a legislator's wife in the home district--Her membership in the PALS Club.

[Tape 1, Side B] 230

How legislators' wives were oriented upon arriving in Sacramento--Why the wives were the "equalizers"--There was no partisanship in the wives' relationships--Experiences with lobbyists--The goals of the PALS Club--The leadership of PALS--The difference between the assembly and senate--The relationship with Ronald and Nancy Reagan--Working for Reagan's presidential campaigns--Why she's a Republican--Her thoughts on scandals in President Reagan's administration--Why MacGillivray opposed the eighteen-year-old vote--Why she was glad her husband ran for a four-year term--Her role in building their current home--More on working in

the Reagan campaigns--Her role on the Western White House staff--Her memories of associating with the Reagans--Keeping your position in perspective while in politics--The downside of politics--Her advice to a newly elected legislator's wife.

INTERVIEW HISTORY

Interviewer/Editor:

Carlos Vásquez
Director, UCLA State Government Interview Series,
UCLA Oral History Program
B.A., UCLA [Political Science]
M.A., Stanford University [Political Science]
Ph.D. candidate, UCLA [History]

Interview Time and Place:

August 8, 1989
Home of Mr. and Mrs. MacGillivray in Santa Barbara,
California
Session of one hour

August 9, 1989
Home of Mr. and Mrs. MacGillivray in Santa Barbara,
California
Session of three hours

August 10, 1989
Home of Mr. and Mrs. MacGillivray in Santa Barbara,
California
Session of two hours

Editing

Vásquez checked the verbatim manuscript of the interview against the original tape recordings, edited for punctuation, paragraphing, and spellings, and verified proper names. Insertions by the editor are bracketed. The interviewer also prepared the introductory materials.

Mr. and Mrs. MacGillivray reviewed the edited transcript and returned the transcript with only minor corrections.

Papers

There exist no private papers which the interviewer was able to consult for this interview, although he did have access to well-organized scrapbooks covering the period Mr. MacGillivray served in the state legislature.

Tapes and Interview Records

The original tape recordings of the interview are in the university archives at UCLA along with the records relating to the interview. Master tapes are preserved at the California State Archives.

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY

W. Don MacGillivray was born in Los Angeles, California, on August 13, 1919. He attended Los Angeles public schools and graduated from Abraham Lincoln High School in 1937. He attended Los Angeles City College and then went to Santa Barbara State Teachers College. He returned to college in 1946 to study industrial arts. Since 1948 MacGillivray has been a licensed building contractor in Santa Barbara.

MacGillivray served in the California National Guard until 1940 and went into active service with the United States Navy from 1942 to 1946. During World War II, he was a flight instructor for the navy. After the war, he served in the naval reserve until 1957 when he retired with the rank of lieutenant commander.

MacGillivray was elected to the Santa Barbara City Council in 1947 and served in that office until 1951. In 1955 he was appointed to the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport Commission and in 1963 he was elected mayor of Santa Barbara. He left that post in December 1968 after a city charter was approved adopting a city-manager system of municipal government. A life-long Democrat who changed party affiliation in 1963, MacGillivray was elected as a Republican in the Thirty-sixth Assembly District in 1969 where he served two terms. In that capacity, he became the crucial forty-first Republican vote for the short-lived Republican majority in the state assembly. In 1974 he ran unsuccessfully in the Eighteenth State Senatorial District.

In 1976 MacGillivray was chairman of the Ronald Reagan for President campaign in Santa Barbara County and in 1980 the co-chairman of the same effort. In 1982 he worked for Governor George C. Deukmejian's election and in 1983 was appointed by President Reagan to the National Highway Safety Commission. In 1984 he again served as co-chairman of Reagan for President in Santa Barbara County and in 1988 was appointed by the president to the National Capitol Planning Commission in Washington, D.C. He lives in Santa Barbara with his wife and serves on the California Contractors State License Board.

Mary E. "Dee" MacGillivray was born on June 17, 1920, in Corona, California. She moved with her family to Victorville, California, as a young girl and attended public schools there, graduating from Victor Valley High School.

After high school, she moved to Santa Barbara to attend Santa Barbara State Teachers College after which she attended the Knapp College of Nursing, also in Santa Barbara. She met her husband while in nursing school and they were married on July 4, 1943.

After Mr. MacGillivray was discharged from the service, she helped him establish his building contractor business and physically participated in the building of their first home. Mr. and Mrs. MacGillivray are the parents of two children, Jock MacGillivray and Sandra Dee MacGillivray McGraw. While raising a family and keeping a home, Mrs. MacGillivray also managed to maintain her nursing license which was especially useful when, at the age of thirty-five, her husband suffered an aneurysm and she helped nurse him back to health.

During Mr. MacGillivray's political career as city councilman, mayor, airport commissioner, and assemblyman, she was active in his election campaigns. She was also an active member of the PALS Club, the women's auxiliary of the state legislature, while her husband was in the assembly. Mrs. MacGillivray served as a volunteer in the Western White House during the Reagan administration, 1980-88.

[Session 1, August 8, 1989]

[Begin Tape 1, Side A]

VASQUEZ: Mr. MacGillivray, to begin this oral history, tell me something about your own life, where you were brought up, what your parents did, that sort of thing.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, historically, my parents both came from Scotland. My mother [Maud Davies MacGillivray] and father [James MacGillivray] met on the Braemer Ranch here in Santa Barbara in 1914, and later married. I was born in 1919 in Lincoln Heights, Los Angeles, California. I grew up there.

My dad was superintendent, or rather, the foreman of Lincoln Park, and he ran the conservatory there. He was a plantsman. Graduated from the University of Edinburgh [Scotland] in that particular field [botany]. And he worked in that position until he passed away.

VASQUEZ: What year was that?

MACGILLIVRAY: He passed away in 1933. I attended [Abraham] Lincoln High School.

VASQUEZ: Were you an only child?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, no. I have a brother that's twenty months younger than me. His name is Alex [Alexander J. MacGillivray]. He's a graduate of Santa Barbara State College and got his master's degree at Claremont [Men's College]. He was teaching in Long Beach city schools until his wife insisted he go into the [building] trades I was in, the construction business, so they too could [drive] a Cadillac. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: [Laughter] He went from teaching to the [building] trades?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. And that's what both of us came up here to go to college for. I worked for Lockheed Aircraft [Company] for two years after I graduated from high school, and found out school teachers were making \$1,800 a year and I was making thirty-three and a third cents an hour. That's why I decided to go into higher education.

Of course, when the war [World War II] came along, I joined the navy, flew in the [United States] Navy, and stayed in the reserves until, oh, about my thirty-seventh birthday. Then I decided that I'd had enough.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about your military service. When did you go into the service and why the navy?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I was in ROTC [Reserve Officer Training Corps] in high school. Then I went into the 160th Infantry in the [California] National Guard at Exposition Park. And then, when the war came along, I decided I wanted to sleep on bedsheets rather than on wool blankets. So I went into the navy and [became] a cadet. I had learned to fly in college under the Civilian Pilot Training Program. And when the war came along, I went right into the navy as a cadet and ended up as a lieutenant commander in the navy.

[Interruption]

VASQUEZ: We were talking about your military service, when you went into the navy.

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, well, let's see.

December 7 was the day the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, and I think it was around the eighth or ninth or tenth that I went down to Los Angeles and enlisted. And I was offered a commission, and I said, "No, I'd rather learn the basics of the military aspect of flying than just what I know." So I went through as a cadet. [Laughter] When they found out that I'd had the civilian pilot training, they [made] me a ground school instructor [while still] a cadet. And then, because I had the ROTC and the National Guard, they made me a cadet officer immediately. Then, on our final examination on instrument flight--they gave us ten hours of instrument training--I was the only flyer that hit the airfield on the instrument approach.

So they immediately sent me to Atlanta, Georgia, where they were setting up an instrument flight instructor's school. And that's where I spent most of World War II, right there in Atlanta, Georgia, at the naval air station instrument flight

instructor school. We taught naval air transport pilots. We had people from all of the various allied services of the world that came to our schools to learn to fly on instruments and radio navigation.

While I was there, I, along with an old-time navy pilot [Donald T. Ball], was in on the birth of the GCA [ground control approach]. And then we moved to Gainesville, Georgia, then to Banana River Naval Air Station [in] Florida. That's where we set up the training for naval air transport pilots to fly ground control approach. And that happens to be where Patrick Air Force Base today is, plus the Kennedy Space Center. After the war I came home.

Driving home from military service, we [saw] a place that was built out of railroad ties in Gila Bend, Arizona. It was a restaurant. And we [decided] that if we went to the Southern Pacific [Railroad] Company we could get enough railroad ties to build our house with. So we decided we'd get out of the navy. So I stayed in the reserves, came

home, and we built our first house. And we liked it so much that I just stayed in the construction business.

VASQUEZ: Before we get to that postwar period, let me ask you a question. What did you learn about Americans and being an American during the Second World War? For most servicemen it is the first time they come into contact with Americans from other parts of the country. Was that the case with you?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, you've got to realize, in Lincoln Heights, when I was a kid, we were more or less the melting pot of the world. What they call ghettos today were just units within the Lincoln Heights district, or the Eastside of Los Angeles. People that spoke the same language all lived together.

VASQUEZ: What kind of groups amalgamated there?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, we had the Jews in Boyle Heights; the Italians right on the L.A. River, between Main Street and, oh, Figueroa Street or whatever you want to call it; and we had the Mexicans all living by where the county hospital is now [Los Angeles County-

University of Southern California Medical Center]; we had Germans, I would say, around the Griffin Avenue area. And then, where I was born and raised there on Thomas Street, oh, there were all sorts of people. And we all grew up together. We all went to the same schools. The blacks, the browns, the yellows, all of them all went to school together; there was no difference. There was none of this so-called class distinction called "minorities." And we all grew up together, we were just red-blooded American kids growing up.

VASQUEZ: Was there any perceptible discrimination or isolation of any group?

MACGILLIVRAY: No. That did not exist. You've got to realize that, in those days, people did not have a lot of money. And there was not television and radio to any great extent. And a neighbor was a friend. You knew them by name. You'd go over to their house for a cup of coffee. And all the kids played together; we'd play kick-the-can in the streets and we would build little race cars

and go down the hills in the race cars and whatnot. None of us had any money to buy bicycles. But we were, well, we were good friends. But I must admit, the kids that lived up in Happy Valley, which was up on Lincoln Park Avenue, they were what we thought, or what we called, the "mean kids." Because they had somewhat of a gang attitude, which the rest of us didn't.

VASQUEZ: Was it any particular group that lived up there, any particular [ethnic group] . . . ?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, it was a group. But they weren't real mean. But they just congregated together. And of course, the policemen in those days rode horseback. And it was a good life. It was a good life. It'd cost you a nickel to go downtown, but who had the nickel? We'd walk downtown. It was only three miles. And I guess, if you went to the picture show it'd cost you a dime. And you always opened the back door and let the other kids sneak in.
[Laughter]

VASQUEZ: You spent the Depression in Los Angeles?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes.

VASQUEZ: What was your perception of the Depression in Los Angeles or in California as compared to the rest of the country?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I didn't know anything about the rest of the country. But I don't think the Depression in California was as devastating as it was elsewhere. I remember as a kid, there was a policeman that lived across the street from us. And they used to pick up the "bums," as they called them, riding the railroad cars into Los Angeles. But I recall if they weren't picked up by the police, they would knock on your door and ask if they could clean up around the place so they could have a meal. And they weren't panhandlers as we know them today. They were willing to go to work.

We had an awful lot of influx of people from Oklahoma, and we called them "Okies"; there was a class distinction, I'd forgotten about that. But they were assimilated in short order, and they all were eager to go to work. They were rebuilding the L.A. River, the WPA [Works Progress Administration], and

they were hiring young people to go there--or anyone--to work there. The CCC [Civilian Conservation Corps] camps were available to young people who wanted to go into forestry.

VASQUEZ: Was there a perceptible stigma attached to working for the WPA or the CCC camps?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, no. Heck, people were so happy to have any kind of an income that they could generate. There was no stigma.

VASQUEZ: Was your family especially hard-hit by the Depression?

MACGILLIVRAY: Was our family hit? No, because my dad worked for the city.

VASQUEZ: So he had steady employment, security?

MACGILLIVRAY: He was in the top echelon in the Park Department. So therefore, he was not devastated by the economy, more or less. He lost a lot from his being involved in one of the savings and loans that went under. But he was a firm believer that if you couldn't pay cash for anything, you couldn't afford it. And thank God that rubbed off on me, because that's the way I've lived since that time.

I don't recall any of our neighbors being destitute, because they all seemed to work. The man across the street from us, whose son and I grew up together, worked for one of the steel companies down on Alameda Street. And he later became a chiropractor. And as a chiropractor, a doctor, he did very well. And his son became a chiropractor.

VASQUEZ: What was his name?

MACGILLIVRAY: Von Posh, Jack Von Posh. And his dad's name was Leo. And then, his grandfather, Helvy, worked for the water and power company [Los Angeles City Department of Water and Power]. And he was some type of engineer, I guess, electrical engineer or something. And he was of no great problem.

The next door neighbor to us was Jay Ward, and he was the photographer at USC [University of Southern California]. And the people that lived on the other side of our house, the [Edward and George] Rushtons, they were railroad company employees. And they worked all through the Depression. And Jo Vanola, I've forgotten just exactly. . . .

Well, she was a widowed woman. But her son was a C P A here in Santa Barbara, with whom I sat on the city council back in the forties. And you know, it's really a very small world when you come right down to it. [Laughter] One finds that out as one goes through life that way.

VASQUEZ: What did you perceive to be the change in attitude, and how do you remember it, towards Japanese-Americans as a result of Pearl Harbor? Or were you even in the city after that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I was in the navy shortly thereafter. And I used to play on the Santa Barbara city rugby team, called the Santa Barbara Barbarians. And we had Taka and Toki Uneda that played on the rugby team with us. And there were a bunch of Japanese that were in college with us. And I resented the fact that they were interned, because I felt that they were every bit as good a red-blooded American as I was. And some of the guys, of course, went into the army and served over in Europe during the war. And we're still good

friends.

You know, we did not have the animosity that I can recall. Maybe there were a lot of people that did. But I did not seem to associate with those particular type of people that resented this and resented that.

VASQUEZ: What would you call it? A war hysteria, racism, nativism? What would you call it that went on in that period against the Japanese?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I think the reason they singled out the Japanese over the Germans [is that] they could be readily identified, because they looked a little different than we did. And I think that that was the impetus that prevailed at the time, that "Doggonit, you're Oriental and you're no good." Maybe that was their attitude. That wasn't my attitude, but that must have been their attitude.

Now, with [the matter of] fighting the Japanese, heck, I felt the only good Jap was a dead Jap. [Laughter] But he was the enemy. He wasn't a citizen of the United States. Just like . . .

VASQUEZ: And it clearly was easy for you to make that distinction?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, definitely. I could, anyway. And I think most of my buddies felt the same.

VASQUEZ: Why do you suppose many people couldn't?

MACGILLIVRAY: I think it was the news media, communications, the constant pounding of the fact that "the Japs did this," and "the Japs did that." Because you were Japanese here in the United States and [even though] every bit as much an American citizen as the next guy, you picked him out because you could recognize him as a Jap. A German who [committed] the same type of atrocities over there in World War II and in the European theater, hell--pardon the expression. You could be a German, and I wouldn't know that.

VASQUEZ: So you think it was their physical characteristics?

MACGILLIVRAY: I think it was just the, yeah, the look.

VASQUEZ: So you got out of the service, you discovered that railroad ties were a good way to construct homes, a profitable way, and you started a business here in Santa Barbara?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. I went into the construction business.

VASQUEZ: What year was this?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, that was in. . . . Well, I got my license, my contractor's license, in 1948, if I recall correctly, after I had built our first house. And then I borrowed money on that and built our second house, bought property and built a second house. And after about four houses, we had enough working capital [so] that we could work on our own. Because I did not have any credit. Because everything I had purchased, everything that [Mary E.] Dee [MacGillivray] and I had purchased after we were married, we paid for.

VASQUEZ: Even the properties, the houses?

MACGILLIVRAY: Even the property on the houses. Because during . . .

VASQUEZ: You didn't move [into a business] until you could lay down your own capital?

MACGILLIVRAY: We could just. . . . Well, we saved enough money in World War II that we had, I think, thirty-five hundred bucks. That was a lot of money.

VASQUEZ: Yes, it was.

MACGILLIVRAY: I think we paid eleven hundred dollars for a lot overlooking the water. I was always taught: buy location, location, location.

VASQUEZ: Which means?

MACGILLIVRAY: Which means that if you buy the . . . Well, just like here. Everybody wants a view like this. But how many can have a view like this? And so we bought, when we purchased land. . . . Like even today when we're buying land, we buy locations that we know are going to enhance in value rather than go down.

We want an area where there is what I consider to be elbow room, where the next-door neighbor is not right on top of you. Living in an apartment house would be just like being in jail as far as we're concerned. Because we haven't lived that way.

VASQUEZ: Space and freedom are related in your mind, is that it?

MACGILLIVRAY: That is correct. That is correct. And, of course, when I went into the construction business, people were moving en masse to California. Ex-servicemen that had gone

home, they didn't like the climate, so they moved back here. And as they moved, there was a greater demand for housing, greater demand for business.

I started specializing then in commercial structures. And I built a lot of the stores, a lot of them. And I learned that you can earn more money sitting in a restaurant, because you're seen, and a guy would come up and pat me on the back and say, "Hey, Don! I've just bought this piece of property. Will you build on it for me?" So I'd go out and get a set of plans--if I didn't draw the plans--I'd go out and get a set of plans drawn, bring them to him, let him assess them and say, "This is what I want," or "That's what I want," do everything the way he wanted it.

Then we'd build the building for him. He'd tell his friend that I did this for him and it cost him X number of dollars. The next thing you knew, I had another job. It just kept multiplying. And the only reason I ran for the city council was I got mad at

city hall.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well . . .

VASQUEZ: You were on the city council since 1947, is that right?

MACGILLIVRAY: In '47. I was getting a little bit of the runaround, although they were most cooperative. But I felt they could become a little more so. So I ran for the city council and was elected. They paid me fifty bucks a month. After my second term--they were two-year terms--after my second term I felt that I could not afford to spend two and a half days working in city hall when I should be out producing money for myself. So I got off the city council, and one of my buddies on the city council decided he wanted to run for mayor. So I supported him.

VASQUEZ: Who was this?

MACGILLIVRAY: That was Floyd Bohnett. His son [Newell Bohnett] was a marine aviator while I was a naval aviator. Anyway, I supported Floyd. The next thing I knew, he appointed me to the airport commission. I served on that for six

years. I think it was six, four to six. Then, another friend of mine, [Edward L.] Ed Abbott decided he was going to run for mayor. So I supported Ed, and he continued me on the [Santa Barbara Municipal] Airport Commission.

VASQUEZ: What kinds of things were you responsible for and could you accomplish on this commission, the airport commission?

MACGILLIVRAY: The development of the airport, the planning for the future, the growth of the area, and the demands that would be met, made and met by the airport as we grew. Because in those days all we had were the what they called Lockheed Loadstars and the DC3s.

Then we knew we were going to have larger aircraft, because after the war the DC4s were coming into existence. So we acquired more property and built longer runways. Of course, we took over the airport after the marines left and built it in to enhance the municipal use rather than military use.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about the annexation of the airport

to the city of Santa Barbara.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, Jack Ricard was our mayor at the time. He felt that the airport should be a part of the city. So he, being an attorney, knew ways and means of achieving that. So what he did is he took a strip of land--or a strip of water--two hundred feet wide and went up the coast to the airport site, came into the airport and annexed all of the airport lands into the city. Which I thought was a very smart move.

VASQUEZ: Was it legal?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, yes. It was highly legal; everything was done correctly.

VASQUEZ: Was it ethical?

MACGILLIVRAY: I would say, yes, it was ethical to this extent: because at that time, the county was not overly enthusiastic about developing the airport. There was no great development in the Goleta area just at that time. But as you know, today Goleta exceeds in number of people as that of the city of Santa Barbara. And eventually . . .

VASQUEZ: All owed, in large part, to the University

[of California, Santa Barbara], is that right?

MACGILLIVRAY: Pardon?

VASQUEZ: Owed in part to the university.

MACGILLIVRAY: The university, of course, that was still in the county. But that was part of the marine base at the time. And that was acquired by the university people. And part of that, all through the workings of the editor and publisher of the [Santa Barbara News-Press], [Thomas M.] Tom Storke. He owned quite a bit of the property out there, also.

VASQUEZ: Was his newspaper influential in getting support for the annexation of the airport?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, yes. Yes.

VASQUEZ: This was the Santa Barbara Independent, is that right?

MACGILLIVRAY: That's right. No, Santa Barbara News-Press.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about the influence of Mr. Storke in Santa Barbara affairs.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, [Laughter] the best way that I can put it is: What was good for Tom Storke was good for the people of Santa Barbara.

VASQUEZ: Is that the way he felt? Was that the way

most people felt?

MACGILLIVRAY: I believe that's the way most people felt.

VASQUEZ: Why?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, when you have a one-newspaper town and a man who had the stamina and the ability to express himself in the newspaper the way he wanted you to do things, he was the head. And he. . . . Well, look where the television station is . . . [Tape recorder off]

VASQUEZ: Is that the KYET?

MACGILLIVRAY: KEYT. He owned all that property at one time. And he decided that it should all be developed. So he just went ahead and put the roads in and everything else--whether the city liked it or not. And it was done. It was all for the good of the city, but it was all for the good of Tom Storke, too. I do not criticize the gentleman disrespectfully, because he was good for the community. Believe me, his life was here. This was it. And he was quite an influence in the state.

Because if you'll recall, he was appointed to the U.S. Senate for a short

period of time. And he was a very close friend of the governor [Frank F. Merriam]. They all came to him. I thought he was a real asset to the community. I'm just sorry we don't have something like that today.

VASQUEZ: What is it that's missing?

MACGILLIVRAY: Pardon?

VASQUEZ: What is it that's missing among people that have the kind of resources that he had? A sense of community commitment? What?

MACGILLIVRAY: The lack of community spirit and understanding of what really was to transpire in this area. Today, it's all criticism rather than projection for the betterment. To me, unless you have a positive outlook and a position direction to move in, you're not going to get there. You've got to have, I think, an aggressive. . . . Like when I grew up, it was a "can-do nation." We've flip-flopped; we are now a "can't-do nation."

VASQUEZ: What happened?

MACGILLIVRAY: I wish I knew. I don't know.

VASQUEZ: Do you have any ideas at all, theories of your own?

MACGILLIVRAY: I think. . . . Well, I wish that I could put my finger on what I consider to be the cause. But it's been just, I would say, a period of transition from knowing your neighbors and an open line of communication and feeling respect for one another that, to a certain degree, we have lost today. And I would blame much of it on television.

VASQUEZ: Really? Why?

MACGILLIVRAY: Why?

VASQUEZ: What does it do?

MACGILLIVRAY: You don't know your next-door neighbor. You sit at home and you look at the "boob-tube," as I call it. And you have instant knowledge of what is going on anywhere throughout the world. And you're more intent. Have you ever gone to a friend's house and they leave the TV set on? And they're looking at the set, they're not looking at you? And you could get up and leave and they wouldn't even know you're gone.

VASQUEZ: It's becoming a national cultural trait, isn't it?

MACGILLIVRAY: It's something. Whatever it is, it's

something.

VASQUEZ: Who benefits by that, do you imagine?

MACGILLIVRAY: I don't know.

VASQUEZ: But not the country?

MACGILLIVRAY: Not the country. This is what worries me about the leaders of the country today.

Before, we used to get the working stiff to run for public office. Today, we get the guy that can make the best impression on television.

VASQUEZ: Let's come back to that in a little while. But let's go back to your years on the city council. How large was the city council when you served?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh. Well, there were six councilmen and a mayor. It still exists the same. In those days . . .

VASQUEZ: Who were some of the people that you served with. . . . I'm sorry, go ahead.

MACGILLIVRAY: In those days, it was a ward system; you served a certain, a particular area, of which we had six wards. And you were beholden to those people in that ward.

VASQUEZ: Is it [elected] at large now, the council?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, the council, there's still six. But they're elected at large, yes. And I feel that there is too much of a concentration in one particular area where people say, "I want to serve on the city council. And I've got more money in this area. And so therefore, I think by going to the newspaper and going onto the television and going onto the radio, I can get good coverage."

When I first ran, I rang every doorbell in the ward and asked for their vote. That is not as prevalent today as it was then. Walking, ringing doorbells, and talking to people, you get a feeling towards the person and they get a feeling towards you as to whether they like you or don't like you. I think we've lost the people contact.

Like, there was one young fellow named [Fred] Vega who's running for the city council here now. He was an L.A. fireman. And that's what he's doing; he's ringing doorbells. He's going around and asking people for their vote. But can you imagine walking around to every home in the [Santa

Barbara] community? That's impossible. But if it was a ward, an area where maybe there was only two thousand homes, or three thousand homes, you can walk that and talk [to those people].

VASQUEZ: There's a movement, as you know, across California to get [back] into district elections rather than at-large elections, for local [municipal] bodies.

MACGILLIVRAY: May I say, I support that. I support it wholeheartedly. Because there you get the pulse of the people. Not the majority of the people of the city, but those that you definitely represent. Granted, you work in concert when you're on the city council, at the council chambers during the meeting. But at least you can express what the people in your ward--or your district, as in Los Angeles--are feeling and thinking. I think you can make progress that way.

VASQUEZ: In the four years that you were on the Santa Barbara City Council as a councilman, before you went on to be mayor, what were the main issues, what were the burning issues of the

day?

MACGILLIVRAY: Growth.

VASQUEZ: Growth?

MACGILLIVRAY: Growth.

VASQUEZ: It's still very much an issue in Santa Barbara, isn't it . . . ?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, to me . . .

VASQUEZ: Or do you think it's gotten out of hand?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. See, we tried to plan for future growth in the city. We tried to afford the increased need of the police department, the increased demands by the fire department, the growth of our city parks, the increased needs of the recreation department. We had to figure out how we were going to balance all of this and still maintain our roads, our sewage, our airport, our harbor, and so on and so forth.

See, we're unique to a great extent. We have all of these various sundry items within this municipal government that a lot of governments do not have. And we, in those days, tried to make sure that nearly every department to some extent was self-

sufficient. And in so doing, then we could continue on.

Because just trying to exist on property taxes in a city, you can't do it. That does not earn enough money to make the payroll for the police and the fire department. So you have to worry about sales tax, and of course, all of the gratuities you get from the state and the federal government. You put them all together in a basket, and that's how you budget your money for the next year, in anticipation of income.

VASQUEZ: Many towns or cities that grow and depend on the amenities of a tourist trade, much as Santa Barbara has, sometimes finds itself with segments of the population that don't share in the wealth or in the resources of that. Has that been a problem in Santa Barbara?

MACGILLIVRAY: Very definitely, very definitely. When I was mayor here, I wanted to make this the [most] tourist-attractive city of the West Coast. You know who beat us out?

VASQUEZ: Who?

MACGILLIVRAY: San Diego.

VASQUEZ: Why?

MACGILLIVRAY: Because they were aggressive in that field. When I was mayor here, we were pursuing that. When I left, they turned around.

VASQUEZ: Were they afraid of growth? Maybe they were afraid of the growth that San Diego experienced.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, may I say, we are much more limited to the amount of growth that we can have than San Diego.

VASQUEZ: Just by geography?

MACGILLIVRAY: And to me, I would rather see the tourists come in, spend their money, and then go home, than to turn the tourist away completely. We haven't turned him away completely, but we're not advertising like we used to about the beauties of Santa Barbara. Because we're scared to death

VASQUEZ: That they [tourists] won't go home?

MACGILLIVRAY: . . . that they won't go home. But we're limited as to the amount of growth. We're limited by many reasons: one, land space; two is water; three is disposal. To me,

another thing that is not a good conducement to great growth is the fact that we are, to a great extent, land-locked by our accessibility. We have only [United States Highway] 101 that goes through the city going north and going south. And it's a bottleneck. So therefore, we have much planning to do in preparation to get people in and people out. And we're not doing that.

VASQUEZ: Perhaps that is the result of somebody's planning?

MACGILLIVRAY: Pardon?

VASQUEZ: Perhaps this is the result of somebody's planning. Perhaps some like that . . .

MACGILLIVRAY: The negative planning?

VASQUEZ: The negative planning.

MACGILLIVRAY: The negative planning, that's right. In other words, the attitude is, "I'm here. Now, you stay out." And that's wrong.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about some of the people that you remember in city government when you were on the city council, or later when you became mayor, who also served in the state legislature as you did. People, say, like

[Assemblyman] Stanley [T.] Tomlinson.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, Stan was an attorney--still is, although he's retired now. I remember when he first ran for the state legislature. He was eager to serve. I thought that he had served very, very well while he was in the legislature. He retired out of the legislature after a very short term and became city attorney. He was the city attorney while I was mayor. Very able, very adept, and was a good servant of the people.

[Alvin C.] Al Weingand, he and I were in the naval reserve together. He was a restauranteur and a businessman. He served this area very, very adeptly. But when it came to the redistricting--and I'm trying to remember what the senate seat number was, the Twenty-fourth District was it?--the joining of the Ventura and the Santa Barbara Counties as one, Bob Largomarsino . . .

VASQUEZ: It was San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara, wasn't it? Or was it Ventura and Santa Barbara?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, it was Ventura and Santa Barbara. Bob

Largomarsino had been the mayor of Ojai and he also was their senator at the time. And there were a greater number of people in the Ventura area than in the Santa Barbara area. And so, therefore, Al was unseated.

[End Tape 1, Side A]

[Begin Tape 1, Side B]

MACGILLIVRAY: Al knew the people so well, and he knew so many people from being in the restaurant business. Well, he was an amicable person; people liked him.

VASQUEZ: How about people like [John J.] Jack Hollister?

MACGILLIVRAY: Jack Hollister, of course, you've got to realize, he's [from] a great historical family.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I guess you know the city of Hollister. And they were early performers in the history of California. And of course, they have the great Hollister Ranch out at the Point Conception area. And then the Hollisters lived right in the Santa Barbara area. I guess they intermarried into the old

Spanish families in some way or another. Because they were great landholders. They were excellent citizens because they liked the people. That's the beautiful thing about ol' Jack Hollister: he was a guy that got along very, very well with the people. And he did a good job for us in Sacramento. Of course, I don't understand why J. J. [John J., III], his son, has not gone into politics. [Laughter] But he wants no part of it, I guess.

VASQUEZ: I plan to ask him that sometime. He's not part of this project, but I met him, and he does seem like the kind of person that would do well in politics.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, he's a very congenial, nice guy that can get along with people. He's a hard worker. When he tackles a job, he really does the job thoroughly. But there is such a thing as wanting to be able to afford to keep that which you have. And [when] you go into government, your income is reduced so greatly that maybe you can't afford [it].

VASQUEZ: Well, we've found out recently that [at

least], perhaps in some cases, your income is not reduced, but quite the contrary.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, may I say this: it depends on what you were doing before you were elected to public office. If you were a schoolteacher, you're a lot better off, or if you are an attorney that's just getting started in life and you're on the low rung on the ladder; you go to the state legislature, you have very definitely an increase in income. But don't forget, if you go in at an early age, you're not much qualified to do anything after you get out of there, just being a legislator. And no one in their right mind is going to hire you if you don't have experience in the business that you're going to go get involved in.

VASQUEZ: What if you have contacts with people that you made as a result of your stay in Sacramento? Can that be parlayed into . . . ?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, again, if you had been a practicing attorney prior to going into politics, and you maintained your law firm or became a part of a law firm during your stay in the

legislature, then I think you can hack it. But just to sever yourself from the legislature and expect to go out into the field of business, I don't think you're going to be as successful.

Now, if you go into lobbying work, that's another category that you can get ahead in, simply because you know the people that are members of the legislature. In fact, the majority of the lobbyists that I knew when I was in Sacramento had all been either former senators or former assemblymen. But that had no appeal to me whatsoever.

VASQUEZ: Why? Some of them were quite successful.

MACGILLIVRAY: Some of them are very successful. But I just. . . . Unless I'm a part of the first team, if you want to put it that way, I don't want to play.

VASQUEZ: And what, to you, is the lobbyist? It's the Third House, but . . .

MACGILLIVRAY: The Third House, yes. There is where some of my best friends came from, really, when I was in the legislature. People that we still

associate with that were lobbyists when I was in government. Many of them had been in city government, as well as state government, prior to going up there. Many of them had been businessmen. We all spoke the same language. But you take a person that has not been in business and has not had to meet payroll, you know, that's something else again.

VASQUEZ: What is it about having to meet a payroll that seems to make people feel that it gives them a sense of responsibility, a sense of perspective, the sense that allows them to be successful in life? I've heard this so many times before, it's an old expression: "When you've had to meet a payroll, you have built a foundation for . . ."

MACGILLIVRAY: Simply because [Laughter] hours are of no consequence. You work until you have amassed enough so you can afford it. You know, people that are working for you are depending upon you to produce so that they can be assured of their weekly income. And you cannot divorce yourself from your business to

any extent and be successful. Because you have too great and too grave a responsibility because others are dependent upon you. That gives you a different outlook on life. It gives you a much greater responsibility.

Okay?

VASQUEZ: Let me shift grounds, not a whole lot, but a bit. You're a Republican.

MACGILLIVRAY: Um-hmm. [Affirmative]

VASQUEZ: But you weren't always a Republican. Or were you always a Republican?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, no, no. I was a Democrat up until the time [President John F.] Jack Kennedy made the statement [that] the steel company executives were irresponsible people because they wanted to raise the price of steel five dollars a ton. That was all brought about by the fact that the unions had just negotiated an increase in salary. Jack Kennedy's attitude, to me, was that it was wrong to earn a profit.

VASQUEZ: That's what you read in what he said?

MACGILLIVRAY: That's what I read into what he said. And I said, "If that is the attitude of the

Democratic party or the Democrats, I no longer want to be a Democrat. I'm going to change my party." And that's when I became a Republican.

VASQUEZ: Had your family been Democratic, traditionally?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, yes. My mother and dad were both Democrats. In fact, I worked for Democrats for public office up until that time. I started out in high school working for them.

VASQUEZ: And all through up until the 1960s?

MACGILLIVRAY: Right up till . . .

VASQUEZ: And it's this notion of profit and the right to profit and the right to private enterprise that made you change your [party affiliation] . . .

MACGILLIVRAY: That is correct. That was my attitude. And again, [Laughter] it was a responsibility of mine to make sure that I had the money to pay my carpenters on Friday afternoon. And I had to make a profit. If I didn't make a profit, I wouldn't be in business and those people wouldn't be working for me.

VASQUEZ: So you feel there's a deep sense of

responsibility that goes along with making profit.

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, you have to. You definitely have to worry about the other person.

VASQUEZ: What about the profit we see being made today where there is not that concern? I'm thinking about some of the stock-brokering and junk-bonding and . . .

MACGILLIVRAY: May I say that is one field I don't understand. I've never. . . . I have not been interested in it.

VASQUEZ: It functions under the guise of the free-enterprise system and [in fact] the epitome of the free-enterprise system.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, that's why, if you want my honest opinion, I have not a great deal of faith in our stocks, or even in our banks. Because of the liberal attitudes of many. You can loan, loan, loan, but how are you going to get paid, paid, paid? And I know every time I fly back to Washington, D.C., which is every month, I fly over Dallas. I land at the Dallas/Fort Worth Airport. And I can understand and see why the savings and loans

have gone under there. Because they've built beautiful roadways on the ground with nothing built around them. They start nowhere and end nowhere. But they were all funded by some savings and loan to some smart developer who walked off with the money and left the savings and loan with a can of worms.

VASQUEZ: You seem to imply that planning is necessary.

MACGILLIVRAY: Definitely. I learned early in life that you plan your work and work your plan.

VASQUEZ: Why does planning have such a negative connotation in this country, especially among conservatives, and especially among Republican conservatives?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I don't understand how they can be against planning. Because, you know, planning is just plain groundwork. You get into your car, if you look at an empty tank on your gauge, and you're going to San Diego, you'd better plan on stopping at a service station right away. Or else you're not going to make it. It's that simple.

VASQUEZ: Let me change tracks now. Do you think that serving in local government prepares you for

serving at the state or national level? Is it a good training ground?

MACGILLIVRAY: Absolutely. Because there you get the basics of the needs of the people and the wants of the people. You learn that there are so many factors in the maintenance of a city, and your city is government of, by, and for people. And there you get the very basic rudiments of government that can be expanded upon when you go to the state. You also learn that you have to rely on local government to actually make things work.

VASQUEZ: Why has there grown such a breach between state and local government in the state of California?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, my honest opinion . . .

VASQUEZ: If they're such building blocks--and it makes sense, what you're saying--isn't there this terrific breach that we see now between state and local government?

MACGILLIVRAY: Because we have elected people to public office . . .

VASQUEZ: At what level?

MACGILLIVRAY: In the state level--that are, to a great

extent, all attorneys. And to some extent, schoolteachers. They know exactly what they've read between the bindings of a book. In the most, they have not had to --as I go back to the old basics--not had to meet a payroll. They think that the dollar bills are unlimited. Which they are not.

I can only take so many dollars away from you in taxes before you no longer want to work. The incentive has been taken away from you. The whole thing in life is to live as comfortably as one can. The only way you're going to live comfortably is to work hard to achieve that which you need to live at the degree or the level that you want to attain for yourself. No one's going to give you anything. And this ideology that is played by top echelons of government, "We've got to give more to the welfare, more. . . ." The more you give welfare, the more you'll do away with the incentive of people to achieve something better.

VASQUEZ: Some people say that [government] bailing out auto companies and bailing out banks is a

form of welfare. Does that undermine incentive?

MACGILLIVRAY: May I say, that's paying bail, in my assessment of it. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Explain that to me.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, you place your trust in me, as a banker, to make sure that your money makes money so you can get interest. Because that interest, accruing. . . . Say, for an easy example, if you made 10 percent a year, if you left that in the bank for ten years you'd have doubled your money. All right, see, that money is working for you; that's the idea of banking, is money making money. How do they make the money? They make a loan to you. If they're paying you 10 percent, they've got to make 14 percent. Because their overhead is going to cost them 2 percent out of all of their dollar bills that have earned money. And then they make money on the 2 percent. [Laughter] That's how they pay their million-dollar-a-year salaries to their [corporate] heads. All right, that's the common sense. But if you take a

banker that will loan to a person, or persons, or corporations, or developers, that have a very bad record of repayment, they're giving your money away. That's just like. . . . Well, I shouldn't say stealing, but it's mishandling of your funds. And that, to me, is just like bail-bond money; if you skip on your bail bond, somebody's got to pay that money.

VASQUEZ: So we're paying bail.

MACGILLIVRAY: So you're paying bail, that's right.

VASQUEZ: For people who are committing at least unethical . . .

MACGILLIVRAY: That's right.

VASQUEZ: But many of those people will never see jail.

MACGILLIVRAY: That is right.

VASQUEZ: Why?

MACGILLIVRAY: [Laughter] I don't know.

VASQUEZ: Let me ask you one more question for the day: Why did you decide to go into state government? Why'd you decide to run?

MACGILLIVRAY: All right. I was mayor of Santa Barbara. Ronald [W.] Reagan wanted to become governor. A friend of mine, Pier Gherini,

introduced me to Ronald Reagan.

VASQUEZ: What year would this be, 1965?

MACGILLIVRAY: 'Sixty-six, wasn't it? Or '65? When . . .

VASQUEZ: He was elected in 1966.

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, it was '65 then. He introduced me to Ronald Reagan. And Ronald Reagan said he wanted to be governor. I asked him a very stupid question: What makes you think an actor can take over the government? His reply to me was that he was elected to head up the Screen Actors Guild and they were practically defunct. He'd turned it around and put it into the black. And it served the senior actors and actresses well, or it guaranteed them a certain degree of solvency in their senior years. He said if you can please a bunch of actors you can please anybody. [Laughter] That sold me, and I supported him. Then he asked me to run for the legislature because he needed the forty-first vote.

VASQUEZ: This was after he was already governor.

MACGILLIVRAY: This was after he was governor.

VASQUEZ: What did you do in his campaign for

governor? How did you support him?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, they asked if I would serve as area chairman, which I did. My wife and I served, along with others [Eldon Haskell and (Mrs. Charles) Doodie Taylor]. And we worked very hard for him. He was, of course, elected governor. Then, after he'd served his first year or so, he found out that without a whole team working for him it was awfully hard. It would be just like the Dodgers getting a bunch of players from San Diego or from the Angels to come over and play on their team. You know, so what? They didn't care whether they won or not. Well, that was Reagan's problem; he didn't have the Republicans on his team. So when I went up there, it gave him the forty-first vote, which he needed. That gave him the majority. It didn't last long. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: No, it didn't.

MACGILLIVRAY: But for two years he took a deficit state and turned it around, and we were in the black. And he was the . . .

VASQUEZ: Which is the way you like to do business.

MACGILLIVRAY: He ran it like a business. See, he was smart enough to realize that he did not have the answers. So he went to private enterprise and borrowed leaders from private enterprise to spend two years of their time in Sacramento helping to guide this government and to run its operations. Which they did.

VASQUEZ: Give me examples of where you think this was most successful, in what agencies?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, our highway department [Department of Transportation] was one. [Food and] Agriculture was another. You know, agriculture is our number one business in this state.

VASQUEZ: People forget that sometimes.

MACGILLIVRAY: We provide 50 percent of all of the foodstuff to the United States. If we don't have people with working knowledge from agriculture running agriculture, we're in deep trouble. And again, that's where planning comes. If you don't plan on building dams, you're not going to have enough water and resource to grow vegetables with. And vegetables grow people. And water

provides chasers. [Laughter] But no, it's a fascinating life. It's very, very interesting.

VASQUEZ: Why don't we stop here for today and we'll pick it up again tomorrow?

MACGILLIVRAY: Okay.

[Session 2, August 9, 1989]

[Begin Tape 2, Side A]

VASQUEZ: Mr. MacGillivray, in our first session yesterday we went over some of your personal background. But there was one item that I didn't flesh out, and that was when you got married, and your wife's name, and your children.

MACGILLIVRAY: I was married on the Fourth of July of 1943, That's the day I lost my independence.

[Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Was there a particular reason you were married on the Fourth of July?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, that was the only day I could get leave. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: [Laughter] You were still in the service, then?

MACGILLIVRAY: And our first child [Sandra Dee MacGillivray McGraw] was born in Chamblee, Georgia, on March 31, 1945.

- VASQUEZ: And who would that be, Sandra?
- MACGILLIVRAY: That was Sandra, Sandra Dee. And then our boy [Jock MacGillivray] was born on August 2, 1947, here in Santa Barbara.
- VASQUEZ: All right. I wanted to get that out of the way before I forget it. We were about to get into your first campaign. You were telling me that the reason that you decided to run for the state legislature and leave your mayoralty was because Ronald Reagan approached you, I think through an intermediary or personally.
- MACGILLIVRAY: Both; both.
- VASQUEZ: Before we get to that, I wanted to just get at something else. At the time that, or right before the time that you decided to leave the mayorship, there was a city charter change which instituted a city manager, which, I guess, weakened the mayor's office.
- MACGILLIVRAY: Very definitely.
- VASQUEZ: Tell me the impact of that and who were the motivators?
- MACGILLIVRAY: The League of Women Voters. They felt that more good would come from a city manager than

from a mayor. See, we had tried the city-manager form of government way back, oh, right after I left the city council. And it proved then to be a failure.

VASQUEZ: Why?

MACGILLIVRAY: Because a city manager, in the most, is one who likes to build an empire. They still do.

VASQUEZ: As opposed to mayors who are what?

MACGILLIVRAY: Mayors are subject to what the people want, and therefore, they are more responsive to the people. The city manager is only responsive to the city council, and the city council is purely a part-time operation. The city council is not, well, today, business-oriented. A city manager can, more or less, talk his way into anything he wants to do. Like when I was mayor, I had one assistant and one secretary. Today, the city manager has a big office full of people.

VASQUEZ: Is that a function of the nature of the office or the growth of the city?

MACGILLIVRAY: Personally, I feel that it's the feeling that they need all of the people they can possibly get in order to make an impression on the

people that they're really doing something. I was a firm believer that we should take the money that would normally go to hiring people to buy material, that we could take the people that are already employed by the city and keep them working full-time, producing. And it works. We paved, I guess, ninety-eight miles of streets, repaved ninety-eight miles of streets while I was mayor.

VASQUEZ: Were you a full-time mayor?

MACGILLIVRAY: I was a full-time mayor.

VASQUEZ: What was your salary, do you remember?

MACGILLIVRAY: Seven hundred [dollars] a month for the first two years. They raised it to a thousand [dollars] a month the second two years, the second term. The third term. . . . They had changed to a city-manager form of government, but fortunately enough I picked the man that was going to be the city manager . . .

VASQUEZ: Who was that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Petrie.

VASQUEZ: What's his first name?

MACGILLIVRAY: Cliff Petrie. And he and I worked in concert. He did not have a big staff; he had

himself and a secretary. Between the two of us--I no longer needed an administrative assistant--so he and I worked in concert. And we still were able to produce.

VASQUEZ: You hired him by yourself without the council?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, no. I went up to San Francisco and interviewed him. In fact, we interviewed quite a few people. Cliff seemed to be the most able of the group. So I recommended him to the council. . . . In those days, the council had a great deal of respect for their mayor. We hired Cliff, and he did a very excellent job.

VASQUEZ: What year would this be?

MACGILLIVRAY: What year did we hire him? 'Sixty-seven, I think it was. Right after they changed, the council thought that we should follow what the directions of the people, what they wanted. So we took [Wallace] Wally Wills as an interim city manager. Of course, Wally and I had been friends for many years anyway. We put him in that job, put his office right next to mine. Wally used my

secretary [Mary Aguiastapache] along with me. And see, Wally, when I first knew him, was working in the engineering department. That goes back to when I was a city councilman. I had a great deal of respect for Wally, and he was capable. Then when we hired Cliff Petrie, he took over the office Wally had. I think he still used Mary Aguiastapache as the secretary, because she was my secretary. Because it really wasn't that much added work for the city manager. I was still working full time.

VASQUEZ: Did you feel it was a draining of your stature or a diminishing of your stature, to be working alongside a city administrator?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, not really. Because, again, you've got to realize, I was in on the ground floor of hiring him. I felt that if we worked together that we could be quite productive.

VASQUEZ: But you didn't become solely a figurehead overnight?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, no.

VASQUEZ: As mayor you still liked the job?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, I enjoyed the job. But I would no more

run for mayor today than anything, simply because the mayor is very innocuous.

VASQUEZ: There was another change, and that was that Santa Barbara went from a ward system to an at-large [electoral] system.

MACGILLIVRAY: That was the most grave mistake. Again, that was . . .

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that. What was your role in that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, may I say, the first time that the League of Women Voters put that up on the ballot, I opposed it, and the people of Santa Barbara went with me.

VASQUEZ: What year was that?

MACGILLIVRAY: That was at the end of my first term, so that would be '65. Then when they brought it up again in '67, I said to myself more or less, "If the people want it, I'm not going to say one way or another about the city-manager form." Which I didn't. And it went through.

VASQUEZ: The at-large, you're saying?

MACGILLIVRAY: Pardon?

VASQUEZ: The at-large elections?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. Well, that and the city-manager form of

government. Both of them were in together. I still think that, as I explained yesterday, I think that the ward system or the councilmanic district system is by far a much more effective form of government than councilmen-at-large.

VASQUEZ: More democratic?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, they're more responsible to the people that elect them that way. They are much, well, they're evenly distributed throughout the city then, rather than all coming from a fairly select area.

VASQUEZ: Do you think it's more difficult for special interests to get an inordinate amount of power under the ward system than it is under an at-large?

MACGILLIVRAY: No. You know, the people, when they elect a mayor from a particular area to represent a district or a ward, they feel camaraderie with their representative. They feel that they are much more closely related to him. Therefore, he is more responsive, or she is much more responsive, to their wants, needs, and desires. They reflect what their district

wants. Whereby, if it's a city-at-large election, no one has any responsibility to any one particular area.

VASQUEZ: So accountability really suffers.

MACGILLIVRAY: So the accountability, I don't say there is any today. And that's why, in my estimation, everything is piecemeal and not producing in the best interest in the greatest number of people. At least, that's my anticipation or figuring of it.

VASQUEZ: Okay. Let's get to your first election to the assembly. The district, tell me about the Thirty-sixth Assembly District.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, the district was comprised of all of Santa Barbara County and the south-most section of the County of San Luis Obispo. It went up to Shell Beach, and then due east to the Kern County border. It was a fascinating and interesting, diversified district.

VASQUEZ: Demographically, what was it like?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, be more precise.

VASQUEZ: Income, the type of employment people were involved in, ethnic composition, that sort of thing.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, of course, the largest city was Santa Barbara.

VASQUEZ: Mm-hmm, [affirmative] that was the bulk of the population.

MACGILLIVRAY: That was the bulk of the population. Santa Maria was the next largest city. And then, of course, we had Arroyo Grande, Pismo Beach, Lompoc, and Carpenteria, of course. They were of similar sized communities, all in a growing stage, and very, very diversified.

Pismo Beach was somewhat of a resort area where people from Kern County and Fresno and all the [San Joaquin] Valley would move both in the winter and the summer because of the weather. And it was only a short drive of maybe two and a half, three hours, four hours at the most.

Santa Barbara was. . . . We were hoping to build it into a big tourist-attractive city.

Lompoc was having growing pains because of the aerospace industry at Vandenberg [Air Force Base].

Carpenteria, of course, was always

dependent upon to a great extent their tourist trade because they called themselves the "world's safest beach." Although they raised an awful lot of avocados, lemons, a few oranges, and became quite a flower center. It was the infancy of the flower business.

Of course, Santa Barbara is so diversified. It has the oil, it has the cattle ranches, turkey and chicken ranches, today it has a lot of wineries, raising an awful lot of grape. . . . But that was in its infancy when I was representing them.

VASQUEZ: Was it predominantly Republican voter registration, is that right, throughout the district?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, in order to. . . . The greatest deterrent to my existence was Isla Vista, the University [of California, Santa Barbara] out there.

VASQUEZ: Already then?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. Well, see, [President Richard M.] Dick Nixon had just. . . . On my second term, I think, in office, Dick Nixon had just given

the eighteen-year-old the right to vote . . .

VASQUEZ: Mm-hmm, [affirmative] that's for your second term, right?

MACGILLIVRAY: . . . and they were predominantly Democrat. And they were having the insurrection, the burning of the bank and the destruction . . .

VASQUEZ: We'll get to that more along.

MACGILLIVRAY: Okay.

VASQUEZ: So that was the district. A conservative district, would you call it?

MACGILLIVRAY: I would say not necessarily a conservative district, but a working district.

VASQUEZ: A working district. It was less than 50 percent Democrat registered?

MACGILLIVRAY: I think it was, yes.

VASQUEZ: How in the world did your predecessor, Winfield [A.] Shoemaker, get elected? He was a pretty liberal fellow. A strong liberal, as a matter of fact.

MACGILLIVRAY: You know, in those days, partisan politics did not play as predominant a role as it does today. And he had a good gift of gab . . .

VASQUEZ: He was a civics teacher from Lompoc, wasn't he?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, he'd been a teacher, I think, in Santa Barbara as well as Lompoc. And that's where he was; he was teaching in Lompoc when he was elected to office. I think he still maintained a residence in Lompoc. I'm not sure.

VASQUEZ: Why did you think you could defeat him?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I felt [it was] a twofold thing. Number one, I'd been on television most every night . . .

VASQUEZ: As mayor?

MACGILLIVRAY: As mayor. An awful lot of people knew me. Wherever I went people would recognize me and say hello. Number two, when the governor asked that I run because he needed the forty-first vote, I felt that if anyone could beat him or unseat him that possibly I could because of the identity. So I chose to run.

VASQUEZ: You didn't think that a conservative wave that seemed to be sweeping the state had anything to do with a setting that might make you more likely to defeat him?

MACGILLIVRAY: No. Because in reality. . . . What was it? It was only forty-one votes out of the eighty

seats, only forty-one Republicans. So I would say it was pretty well balanced in the state at that time.

VASQUEZ: The Republican party, for the 1968 election, targeted a number of districts--and that was one of them, wasn't it?

MACGILLIVRAY: Mm-hmm. [affirmative]

VASQUEZ: To try to unseat the Democrat? Was there quite a bit of campaign funds forthcoming from the party?

MACGILLIVRAY: I don't recall.

VASQUEZ: Your campaign cost around fifty thousand dollars, which at that time was a healthy sum of money. How did you raise that, do you remember?

MACGILLIVRAY: Through donations, I guess.

VASQUEZ: What was the role of Spencer-Roberts, the firm Spencer-Roberts, in your campaign?

MACGILLIVRAY: The Republican party hired him to write all of our advertising campaign . . .

VASQUEZ: Was it effective?

MACGILLIVRAY: It must have been. I was elected.

VASQUEZ: [Laughter] What were the issues that you tried to raise, do you remember?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, I don't recall.

VASQUEZ: Looking back at some of the press clippings, I noticed that you set as your goals for your first election, lowering the cost of government, moving towards greater tax reform, welfare reform, bringing narcotics under control, and supporting law enforcement. Do you remember those things?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well. . . . Yes. We were just getting started in the latter years of my being mayor, seeing the advent of an increased use of drugs by the youngsters. I felt that there had to be a greater and more strict control of drug dealers. You know, it was awfully hard to convince people that there was the movement towards a greater usage of drugs. The more free they became, the more users we had in the younger group. As far as balancing the budget, if you will recall, the budget was completely out of balance. We were overspending our income. Being a businessman and being the mayor, I knew that we had to live within the means of our income. That, to me, demanded a great deal

of cooperation with the leadership. His intent was to balance the budget . . .

VASQUEZ: The governor's?

MACGILLIVRAY: The governor--and live within the means of our income. I felt that was a tremendous challenge. It was achieved because of a majority helping the governor. Where we're somewhat in the same dilemma today. A majority of both houses is Democrat with a Republican governor. But he is able to balance the budget and still have a reserve because of his line-item veto. I think that'd be great for the federal government if they'd ever give that to the president. We could balance the budget and get out of the deficit-spending area.

VASQUEZ: And yet, during the Reagan administration here in California, some of the largest budgets in state history were implemented.

MACGILLIVRAY: That is true. But we had the income there from all of the increase of business in the state and . . .

VASQUEZ: Do you think that perhaps part. . . . I'm sorry, finish.

MACGILLIVRAY: Go ahead.

VASQUEZ: Well, when [Edmund G.] Pat Brown [Sr.] was governor, there was a lot of money coming into the state and, of course, a lot of spending in education, water, social programs. Could it be that by 1968, by the end of his second term and the first term of the Reagan administration, some of that revenue had diminished and that was part of the problem? Or do you see it more an ideological problem . . .

MACGILLIVRAY: No, no. The revenues were increasing. And if you'll look historically, Reagan increased the educational budget every year.

VASQUEZ: Mm-hmm, that's true.

MACGILLIVRAY: But we put greater demands on the state employees to be a little bit more productive.

VASQUEZ: Was there a pronounced problem in that area at the time that you were elected?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, may I say, you can produce only what your leadership wants you to produce. And Reagan went out into the business field and acquired help from big business, by utilizing their leadership for two years, and then they

would go back to doing their business. See, they took a tremendous cut in income to work for the people.

That prevails even today. It's sharing your knowledge with the people in order to make things better for them. Like in welfare I felt, and I still feel, that if you're a recipient of welfare, you should. . . . First of all, if the government sets a goal as far as a minimum of income to be above the poverty level, it has been and still is my feeling that if you are a welfare recipient and you know that you can get more money from welfare than you can earn from working, you're not going to work.

But, I'm a firm believer, if those people work, and then the state makes up the difference between their income and just a little above poverty level, that's the way it should be run. Then we're not going to be feeding the millions of dollars that we are to people that are nonproductive.

VASQUEZ: Some would argue that what welfare does is that it maintains people at the poverty level

and doesn't let them out of the poverty level

. . .

MACGILLIVRAY: No, no. [Laughter] Because if you get more money out of welfare by not working, you're never going to be productive.

VASQUEZ: What about the alternative, raising minimum wages?

MACGILLIVRAY: May I say, my first involvement in minimum wage was when I was building some building on State [Street] here in Santa Barbara. And the man next door had the American Dry Cleaners. He was hiring senior citizens, paying them a dollar an hour. They would work two or three hours, and they'd make their two or three dollars, and then they'd go home. They were all retirees. But it got them out of the house and gave them some money. I remember his lament when the minimum wage was raised, I've forgotten just exactly what it went up to.

VASQUEZ: I think it was \$1.25.

MACGILLIVRAY: But he had to let some of those people go, simply because he could not afford the extra twenty-five cents. That, to me, was a

disservice to the people that were willing to work for that, and take that extra buck home. Because maybe that made the difference of putting ice cream on for dessert or no dessert at all.

So I felt that we could not afford to press the minimum wage. Now, you know, we've just increased the minimum wage again. I'm looking at my neighbors on their ranch. Where they had fourteen or fifteen people working before the last raise went through, now they have ten.

VASQUEZ: As a result of the raise in the minimum wage?

MACGILLIVRAY: As a result of the minimum wage increase. Now, to me, that's doing a disservice to an awful lot of people that would otherwise be employed. And they're now scrounging for any kind of work that they can get.

VASQUEZ: Because people's profits are not maintained at the level that they need to be?

MACGILLIVRAY: That is correct. Everything is getting so expensive today. When you consider your overhead cost per person working for you is getting so prohibitive today, it's a

tremendous worry. For instance, I'll give you an example of just how overhead costs.

My son was in the making of garden aprons, garden tote bags, catch-alls and whatnot for picking up your cuttings and carrying them to the disposal area. He finally quit business because he was having to buy product liability insurance which exceeded his income. So he just collapsed his business. And that put an awful lot of people were doing the sewing and the cutting of the aprons and the tote bags, etc., out of work. To me, that was somewhat of a disservice.

VASQUEZ: Yet how is that related to minimum wages, the level of wages? This is a rather wealthy industry, insurance.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, all right, but the minimum wage, the minute you raise the minimum wage, you're raising your insurance costs, all the rates go up. The higher the income, the more the rate is, the more the matching funds are, and everything else. The minute the minimum wage goes up, so does the price go.

But, don't forget, we're in competition with foreign products, and the foreign product does not have the same problem. They can undersell us and under those. . . . I'm not for a government subsidy, believe me. Because I believe in free trade. Because free trade, eventually, builds up to a point where all people are equal, then, as far as production is concerned. You'll have a greater, more effective balance of trade operation. Of course, that's getting away from this. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Yes, let's deal with your first term. So here you were, a newly elected assemblyman. You arrive in Sacramento. What's your orientation? Who orients you, who guides you?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, the first meeting I had with the Republican body was a luncheon that all the members that were there could attend.

VASQUEZ: All the Republican members?

MACGILLIVRAY: All the Republicans. And they indoctrinated me into the workings of the assembly. They told me about all the various committees.

They told me that we would all vote for a Republican, in this respect: we had a majority, and so therefore the Republicans could elect a speaker. In turn, the speaker then appoints all the chairmen of the various committees. And we "requested" the committees upon which to be seated.

VASQUEZ: Was this something that the Republican leadership suggested to you, or did you decide what committees you wanted to work on?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, no. They gave me a list of all the committees, and they explained exactly what each committee's job was over the years. Because I had been in local government, and business, and had been working somewhat in transportation and much of the committee operations there, I chose those committees. I don't recall, but I got onto several of the committees that . . .

VASQUEZ: You were on [the Committee on] Local Government that [Assemblyman] John [T.] Knox chaired.

MACGILLIVRAY: Jack Knox was chairman. I had been a mayor, so I knew something about local government.

I don't know whether I was put on [the Committee on] Housing and Urban Development at that time . . .

VASQUEZ: No, I think you were on the [Committee on] Natural Resources . . .

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, Natural Resources.

VASQUEZ: . . . that George Milias chaired at the time.

MACGILLIVRAY: Who?

VASQUEZ: George Milias.

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, yes. George Milias, yes, from up there, just below San Jose.

VASQUEZ: Yes, Los Gatos, I believe. You were also on [the Committee on] Labor Relations that Walter Powers chaired.

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, yes. Walt Powers, he was a Democrat, but he was a very effective leader. Very effective. I was on Labor Relations because, again, I'd been an employer and I knew that aspect of the operations. I thought we were very successful in that.

VASQUEZ: Do you remember any particular legislation that you . . .

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, no.

VASQUEZ: A.B. 591--and I know this is unfair to throw

bills at you this late in the game.

[Laughter] But A.B. 591¹ had to do with terms of employment. And that came out of, I think, that committee. Do you remember what that was about?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, I don't.

VASQUEZ: We'll come back to some legislation. But I want to deal with two things first of all. Your impressions of the leadership. Now, the leadership had gone from [Jesse M.] Unruh to [Robert T.] Monagan when you were there.

MACGILLIVRAY: Mm-hmm. [affirmative] Well, let me regress a bit. I thought Jesse Unruh was a very firm and aggressive leader. He knew where he wanted to go and he knew how he was going to get there. Because he had the power. Bob Monagan took over, and if I had been in his shoes--I look at the game of politics somewhat as a spoils system--I would have done as Jesse Unruh had done. I would have appointed all Republicans as chair and

¹. A.B. 591, 1969 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 1537 (1969).

Democrats as vice-chair.

Because, let's face it. After I had been there for a while, I found out that if you are a chair of a committee, when it comes to election time, it's amazing how much money you can raise for your particular party.

VASQUEZ: From whom?

MACGILLIVRAY: From lobbyists and special interest groups and whatnot. I think that's being brought out quite vividly just at the present with [Assembly Speaker] Willie [L.] Brown [Jr.]'s position of responsibility.

VASQUEZ: Was that as common knowledge then, do you think?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, sure. That was common knowledge then, it's common knowledge now.

VASQUEZ: Do you think it was held in as much disrepute as it . . .

MACGILLIVRAY: No, I don't think so. See, we did not spend the great amounts of dollar bills that are being spent today. Today, I couldn't afford to run for public office.

VASQUEZ: Well, your first campaign cost approximately \$50,000. An average assembly race now is

anywhere in the \$250,000 to \$300,000 range.

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes.

VASQUEZ: It was expensive for the time. But it would be relatively inexpensive today. Does that get in the way of a good, democratic selection of representatives, do you think, elections costing that much money?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I'd rather just take the money and to heck with the job. [Laughter] Because you're not going to earn that much as an elected official. No, I like the idea that they're going to say you can only spend X number of dollars, period. And go out and talk to the people more. Ring doorbells. Because that's what we did. We rang doorbells in every section of the district. I had what we called the "MacGillivray girls," and we walked up and down the streets ringing doorbells and asking for votes. We couldn't afford too much [time] on the boob tube. We couldn't afford a great deal of radio coverage.

VASQUEZ: You didn't use the local television station?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, yes, we used it to some extent. But not

anything comparable to what they're doing today. Because we didn't have that kind of money. I'm a firm believer that if you raise X number of dollars, you spend X number of dollars; you don't spend beyond what you have raised. If you do, you're then doing nothing but fund-raising in order to pay your debts.

VASQUEZ: Well, that's the criticism of contemporary officeholders in Sacramento, that they get to Sacramento and their first day in office they begin raising money either to pay their present debt or raise money for the next campaign.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, to me. . . . Of course, I have a different outlook on life as far as serving the people. I believe it's a privilege to be elected by the people to serve them. I believe that you in turn should turn around and be a servant of the people. Do as much as you can to make a better place in which to live. I feel that as much today as I did then.

VASQUEZ: So then a public servant or a politician, elected official (whatever term you want to

use) should expect to have to make sacrifices while he's in service?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, may I say, that's inherent with the job. Because you're not going to make any money at it. In fact, the first time I broke even was when I went into the state legislature. The rest of the time it was money out-of-pocket.

VASQUEZ: As mayor?

MACGILLIVRAY: As mayor. And as city councilman. But when I went into the state legislature, for the first time in politics I broke even.

VASQUEZ: In other words, you weren't losing money for being in politics.

MACGILLIVRAY: I wasn't losing money for being a politician.

VASQUEZ: Did your business suffer as a result of you being in the assembly?

MACGILLIVRAY: I closed down my business.

VASQUEZ: Did you?

MACGILLIVRAY: Because I felt there'd be a conflict of interest. When I became mayor I quit construction. Because I hired the building inspectors and directors and everybody.

[Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Now, in your first month in office, Santa Barbara suffered the worst floods in fifty years and one of the most disastrous oil blowouts.

MACGILLIVRAY: Yep.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I remember leaving Santa Barbara to go back to Sacramento. And we were up to the floorboards of the car in water going up. And luckily, the [California] Highway Patrol had put posts in the center of the road. So we could head for the post and go around the post and go up to the next point. Santa Barbara had some tremendous floods. We got the governor [Ronald Reagan] to declare an emergency for this particular area. He came down and looked over the various flooded areas, specifically, I would say, in the Carpenteria area, where they had a more devastating. . . . Well, it was all devastating.

Up there on Olive Mill Road, the mud came down in tremendous volume. Well, in all the areas. The airport was underwater. We

were in deep trouble--deep water. But, as everything goes to sea, it finally ended up in the ocean. And then we had the oil blowout.

VASQUEZ: Before we move onto that, is that what prompted your A.B. 1391,¹ which is the Flood Control and Water Conservation Act? You raised, I think, a one-cent tax to have a fund for disasters here in Santa Barbara?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, I've forgotten. I guess at the time it was necessary, and so we introduced it. Oh, that's quite a few years ago. I don't recall all of it.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about the oil blowout, because I want to talk about that oil.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I remember this. We had the oil blowout, it was a Union Oil [Company] platform just right out here. A friend of mine that I had gone to college with, who was the mayor of Bakersfield, [Mayor] Don Hart, his inlaws had an airplane, a big twin-engine

¹. A.B. 1391, 1969 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 258 (1969).

plane. He was, I think, in Sacramento at the time. He wanted to know if I'd be interesting in flying out over the oil spill. I said, sure, I'd like to see what the cause was and what devastation it was doing.

You could see just a gigantic slick surrounding the oil platform. Eventually, it came in to the shore. But this again was caused by human error. If they had followed the rules and the regulations that were set forth for drilling. . . . See, Union had contracted with this outfit to drill. I guess the guy was trying to cut corners . . .

[End Tape 2, Side A]

[Begin Tape 2, Side B]

MACGILLIVRAY: . . . tried to cut corners. And he was caught. And it caused a real problem. But I admire what Union Oil did. They came ashore and cleaned the beaches and all of the rocks and everything, all along the south coastal shores here. And it was cleaner then than it was before.

Because when I was a lifeguard down on

East Beach back in the late thirties, I remember, I always carried a can of kerosene and a rag to wipe the tar off my feet, because of the seepage of oil all along the coast here. All of that has been done away with to a great extent by the removal of the oil pressure by these oil islands out here.

But I was at the time trying to keep them from drilling in the channel until such a time as we had a much more strict control over not only the state drilling, or the drilling of oil on the state lands, in the state tidelands, but also the drilling of oil in the federal waters. I felt that there should be people policing the operation to make sure that no corners were cut. Because man's expertise is great enough that we can keep from having those problems, providing, however, that we pay strict attention to it. And eventually, they have come around to that.

VASQUEZ: But it took a while, didn't it?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, it did. It took a long while.

VASQUEZ: Let me ask you this: You were at loggerheads

with a federal administration of your own party in trying to get local jurisdiction over some of the federal oil leases to try to control that drilling. In June of 1969, you issued a press release expressing great dissatisfaction with President Nixon's Dubridge Commission recommending that it was okay to continue drilling. Tell me about that. Here you were, a Republican, a conservative Republican, trying to get a conservative Republican president to listen to a local problem. What kinds of problems did that put you in?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, it didn't put me in any problem. Because I still feel, regardless of who is at the helm, they have to have some direction, and they have to know the facts. You know, leaders, unless they're told, don't know what's going on. I felt that we should alert these people who are pulling the strings and telling people what to do that there should be a much more strict supervision and control over the operations before we allow them to go out and willy-nilly drill for oil.

- VASQUEZ: You had Secretary of the Interior [Walter J.] Hickel out here, didn't you?
- MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. We even had Dick Nixon out here.
- VASQUEZ: Were you satisfied with the response you got from the administration?
- MACGILLIVRAY: I don't think totally. Because I felt that we had to become more predominant in our demands to assure a greater degree of safety than they had. I assume now that they have come around to that because of the problems that have arisen. Because this wasn't the only oil spill; they've had other oil spills.
- VASQUEZ: But you took a very aggressive stance on this: You and Senator [Robert] Largomarsino passed legislation that, for the first time, expressly put fines, dollar-amount fines or jail-time fines on polluters.
- MACGILLIVRAY: Well, then people understand. You know, [slaps hands] you can get slapped on the hand, but that doesn't stay with you very long.
- VASQUEZ: But one of the bills, S.B. 947, I think it was, was a \$1,000 fine. Is that any more than a slap on the wrist for an [oil company]

. . . ?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, no. But it was the beginning. You know, May I say, legislators, you have 120 legislators up there that you have to sell [on legislation]. Well, let's say 41, you have to have at least 41 in one house and 21 in another house.

VASQUEZ: You need 62 votes.

MACGILLIVRAY: And if you don't have that, you've got a dead issue. You cannot take a gigantic leap the first time, because you'll never get off the ground.

VASQUEZ: I noticed that, I noticed that. At first, you passed legislation that made it a \$1,000 fine. And then pretty soon you had another bill that made it a \$6,000 fine. Is that what you're talking about?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yeah. You know, you climb steps. It takes a awhile for people to assimilate. And also, it takes time with patience to sell your product. I can't come to you and sell you a Cadillac when you can only afford a Ford, or you're only thinking of a Ford. But when you're thinking of a Cadillac, then you will

buy a Cadillac. That's the same way in legislators' minds. You can't . . .

VASQUEZ: Who are the hardest people to sell on trying to fine polluters or to reign in or bridle the oil companies? Would somebody, say, representing Richmond [California], for example, be hard to sell on something like that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, don't forget, they are much more adept at lobbying than an elected official. An elected official can be lobbied. But you know, I'll give you a bit of history. If I came to you with my bill, you'd turn around and say, "Well, listen, I've got a bill coming up. How are you going to treat that?" And it became a bartering system. It may seem all peaches and cream, but you know, you've got to give in order to receive. And this is the way of getting legislation through. A lot will deny that, but those are the facts of life.

VASQUEZ: You trade, horse-trading?

MACGILLIVRAY: Absolutely. In other words, "You pat me on the back and I'll pat you on the back. If

you don't pat me, I ain't gonna pat you."

[Laughter]

VASQUEZ: You're right. Some people [who are] even retired from politics deny that that's the way it happens. And yet, in more candid interviews, I get that kind of an explanation more and more. Tell me about another piece of legislation that you were involved with. That was making the eighteen-mile stretch of 101 a scenic route.¹ Was that a tourist-oriented bill, or was that for slow-growth? What was the thinking on that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I don't recall that particular. Was that [Pacific Coast] Highway 1?

VASQUEZ: One, yes. I'm sorry.

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, well, yes. Well see, [Highway] 1 goes up the coast from Gaviota right on through all the way up the coast through Carmel. We did not, a group of us, did not want that scenic beauty violated by too much growth. You know, we still owed the people a degree of beauty, but with not overselling our

1. A.B. 152, 1969 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 727 (1969).

project. Because I fully realize that the public owns more than 51 percent of the land in California. We cannot continually buy, buy, buy more land and take it off the tax rolls, because we can't afford it. On both sides of the picture. The state, the counties, and the cities can't afford it simply because we lose too much in taxes. See, your property tax operates your cities and your counties to a great extent, and the sales tax. But by making that a scenic beauty highway it is much more protected than otherwise.

VASQUEZ: Is there a dilemma, on the one hand, wanting to attract tourism to a place like Santa Barbara, which almost inevitably leads to development, and on the other hand trying to limit development? Does that put you in a quandary?

MACGILLIVRAY: Very definitely. Limiting development is not doing the young people a service. I think I told you this earlier.

VASQUEZ: Why?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, because the more you limit development,

the more expensive the developed land becomes. The more expensive the developed land becomes, the greater the rents become, the higher the cost of sales. Both run hand in hand; the higher the sale, the greater the rent or return on your investment. Believe me, your income does not go up when you're limiting development as quickly as the cost. Eventually, only the people that have a good savings can afford to live there, where the person that has no savings can't afford to live there.

VASQUEZ: So it really limits young people's ability to buy homes?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, the best example is Santa Barbara itself. Los Angeles is getting that way with their high cost of building. To me, it's a disservice to the young. We people that own our land, it doesn't make any difference. But to the people that don't own their land, it makes a heck of a lot of difference as to the style of life that they are going to enjoy living.

VASQUEZ: Another area in which you were--and still

related to oil--that you were active in passing legislation had to do with removing old oil well casings. Did your experience and your career in local government help you in working with local supervisors and local governments?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, definitely.

VASQUEZ: How?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, because if we worked in concert, we could move forward. If there was animosity and distrust, you got nowhere. Down in the Summerland area, that used to be a major oil field when I was a kid, all out on the ocean, [There are] still the pipes protruding up from the bottom.

My being a lifeguard down there on East Beach, I knew the great amount of swimmers that would swim in that particular area, plus the fact that the water skiers were skiing in that area and whatnot. And you could get killed on those at low tide. So it behooved us to get money, the funds, in the tidelands in order to go in and cut those off below the ocean bed, cap them so they would not emit

gas and oil seepage, and clean up the area so it, too, could have a future. And if you'll go down there now, you'll see it's developed.

VASQUEZ: And the cost was shared between local and state government, were they? Or was it strictly a state government . . . ?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, mostly oil money from the leasing of the land, the tidelands. We utilized that for the cleaning up of that particular area. And it works out very, very well to the best interests of the greatest number of people. That is, who like to go to the beach, and like to yacht or boat, whether in a rowboat or a sailboat or windsurfer or whatever. At least you're not going to kill yourself on a piece of pipe.

VASQUEZ: What do you think was your greatest accomplishment or frustration, whichever the case, in your first term?

MACGILLIVRAY: [Laughter] Trying to adjust myself to not being in a very productive enterprise.

VASQUEZ: Why wasn't it productive?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, we were spending a lot of money on things that I knew would not produce any good

end product and . . .

VASQUEZ: For example?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, let's go back, I'll give you an example. [Laughter] Well, this involved the courts as well as the legislature. I got the governor to say that welfare recipients should work in the parks or the municipalities in the counties, cleaning up the parks. We started that in San Luis Obispo.

Some smart attorney took it to court, and the judge decreed that it was beneath the dignity of the person on welfare to have to go out and rake leaves. So that was cut out. Yet, we can hire gardeners to go out and rake the leaves. But it was beneath the dignity of a recipient of welfare for doing that. Oh, there were just. . . . I cannot pinpoint the frustrations that I had. But there was so much of what I considered to be waste.

For instance, we were interested in the development of, to a great extent, low-cost or low-income housing. And that would be in concert with the federal government and the

state government too. They would move into an area, remove the low-income people from the land, raze the buildings, and rebuild the new buildings. The people that were evacuated were not allowed to go back in the area. You had to be within a certain income bracket in order to qualify to get into the darn thing. And that, to me, was a disservice to the people that we removed. I felt that if we were going into low-income housing, if we removed you, we removed you only temporarily and put you back in this new unit.

VASQUEZ: Did you have a problem with your Republican colleagues with that?

MACGILLIVRAY: I had problems with everybody. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: You're not sounding like a conservative when you're talking about bringing those people back.

MACGILLIVRAY: No. To me, you have to be realistic about it. You cannot say, "I'm a Republican, I'm a conservative." Or, "I'm a Democrat and I'm a liberal." You've got to look at what is in the best interests of the greatest number of

people. To me, that's the American spirit. And if you're going to serve, that's the spirit you'd better have. At least, I think so. Whether it's that way or not, that's something else again.

VASQUEZ: Let's talk about your 1970 race for the assembly, your second race. You ran against Kenneth Palmer.

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, Ken Palmer, yes.

VASQUEZ: Now, you won.

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes.

VASQUEZ: But your margin of victory was less than 2,000 votes, almost 10 percent of what it had been the first time. Why?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, because if you'll recall, Nixon had changed and made available the eighteen-year-old vote. And the only reason I won the race is because Santa Maria came to the front and supported me. That offset the votes from the Isla Vista area.

VASQUEZ: So the eighteen-year-old vote in Isla Vista made that much of a difference in your district?

MACGILLIVRAY: Very definitely. Because I was involved with

the. . . . The first time we were called in Sacramento, and Dee and I jumped in the car and came down, and I went out with the chief of police [Alfred Trumbley] out to the Isla Vista rioting area. I'm trying to remember whether that was the time they burned the bank or . . .

VASQUEZ: No. Nineteen seventy is when you had the bank burning. In 1969 you had some large demonstrations, antiwar demonstrations, and you were pretty vociferous on your opposition to that.

MACGILLIVRAY: Very definitely. I feel that when you go to school, you go to school.

VASQUEZ: In fact, I think you addressed the assembly in support of [S. I.] Hayakawa.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I believe that when you go to college or go to school, you go to learn. You don't go to make waves. You're too young to know what is going on in government and the world.

VASQUEZ: When do you start making waves? If you're eighteen years old and you can vote, when do start making waves?

MACGILLIVRAY: When you can vote.

VASQUEZ: But now, they were eighteen and they could vote.

MACGILLIVRAY: All right. But they were making waves not against the government, but against the banking institution.

VASQUEZ: Well, that's in '70. Let's talk about 1969 when the demonstrations were against the war, against federal policy . . .

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, well, against the war, the Vietnam War, yes. Well, let's see, I'm trying to remember if that's the night I got gassed from tear gas. I think yes. The first time was to remove the students off the campus.

VASQUEZ: That's when you took the position that 10 percent of the militants could very easily be removed and should be removed so that the other 90 percent of the students should go on about their studies and get an education.

MACGILLIVRAY: That is correct. I don't remember making that statement, but that's the way I feel even today, that people go to school to learn, to find out what the facts of life are all about, and to be able to express themselves well, and to handle a job when it

is given to them, or they finally land one.

VASQUEZ: And minorities, oppositional minorities then have no rights while they're in a minority opposition?

MACGILLIVRAY: Not for destruction of property.

VASQUEZ: How about for "disruption of business as usual," as the expression was then used?

MACGILLIVRAY: You know, taking it out on the business community is not the answer. I think that if you don't like what your government is doing, you go to those that are elected to public office and tell them what you don't like. But you don't go and destroy property. And out there, they were throwing rocks, destroying property, etc. And the next time. . . . Or, when. . . . And I think that was the first time, and we were having to use gas to get them off the campus. And that was the night I got a real good whiff of tear gas. And it was, it was . . .

VASQUEZ: Did you ever go on campus to address the concerns of the students about their opposition to the war?

MACGILLIVRAY: I don't think I was ever asked.

VASQUEZ: I know you had a difference of opinion with the student body at the university as to who was being invited as speakers. You felt that too many leftists were being invited and not enough . . .

MACGILLIVRAY: To teach?

VASQUEZ: No, to speak.

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, to speak, yes.

VASQUEZ: Your name was also raised in a case regarding Professor Maurice Zeitlin from the University of Wisconsin, who had had his confrontations with the regents there. He had been invited as a visiting professor for a year. And eventually, his contract was annulled and there was a lawsuit involved. He teaches at UCLA now, by the way. [Laughter]

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, they also had another guy from Chicago that they hired that I raised holy cain about.

VASQUEZ: That would have been William Kunstler who was the attorney for the Chicago Eight. He came and spoke, and there was a demonstration that got out of hand as a result of it.

MACGILLIVRAY: That's correct. And if I remember correctly,

Chancellor [Vernon I.] Cheadle, who was a very good friend of mine (and he lives right down below us here). . . . I went and told him, I said, "We cannot afford to hire these people that are causing disruption in the educational system." And he says, "I have nothing to do with the hiring of professors. It's up to the Academic Senate." That was his reply to me. And whether it's right or wrong, I did not pursue it. But I felt that if we know a person is a dissenter, I don't think that we should--who has shown elsewhere that we've had a disruption in our educational process--that we should not hire the man in our particular area.

VASQUEZ: This country was founded by dissenters.
Where do we come into conflict . . . ?

MACGILLIVRAY: That is correct. But they were dissenters in this respect: they were dissenters because of taxation, not because of molestation. And I still say, like in gun laws today, I say, "Look, if we hadn't had guns then, we'd still have had judges wearing wigs."

But see, it is not a close parallel. That is, in my mind. If you're a dissenter and you don't like it, you run for public office. And there you stand on your platform and tell the people what you think is wrong. I don't think you should go out and get a lot of young people disenchanted with their government because just of your ideology.

VASQUEZ: Well, what about if those young people feel that lives are really being cut short by a war that is going nowhere and solving nothing and producing nothing, and their lives are at stake?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I concur. If you're not going out to win a war, you don't go to war, period. I thought the Vietnam War was a very sad situation. We should not have been involved in that.

VASQUEZ: Why?

MACGILLIVRAY: Why? I don't believe that it is our business to go anywhere in the world unless we're invited. Like right now, I don't believe we should have any troops in any foreign

countries. I believe our troops should be right here in the United States.

VASQUEZ: What about the notion that a country as powerful and a system as powerful as ours needs to have security in parts of the world where our national interests are at stake?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, if we are invited by the nation that wants us, and we feel it is in our best interest, then I believe we should have some latitude of entering into it.

VASQUEZ: Even if there's opposition from the American people?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, again, this is government of, by, and for people. And if the American people don't like the idea, they'd better doggone well tell their congressman and their president that they don't want to get involved.

VASQUEZ: Isn't that what happened in the Vietnam War? That a pretty good number of the American people made their . . .

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, but your Congress didn't hear.

VASQUEZ: Why was that?

MACGILLIVRAY: I don't know. We weren't forceful enough as a people.

VASQUEZ: That is exactly the argument that young people were making, "We're writing our letters to our congressmen, we're calling our congressmen, we're asking for meetings, we're having teach-ins, and nothing changes. Therefore, the only recourse that we have is to disrupt." Valid? Not valid?

MACGILLIVRAY: It's illegal to disrupt.

VASQUEZ: So we are constrained within the law.

MACGILLIVRAY: Absolutely, by the law. This is a government of law. And the people are the law, really. People enact their laws.

VASQUEZ: Let me take you a step further. What happens if the laws are wrong? It has happened.

MACGILLIVRAY: Then we change them.

VASQUEZ: By the approved system, by the . . .

MACGILLIVRAY: Through the system that we have accepted through the constitution. And you know, nothing happens immediately; it all takes time. Just as I explained earlier, that you have to really work. . . . Now, I don't know of a legislator that would have gone along-- that is, in the state--with the Vietnam operation. And I don't understand how. . . .

Well, our first involvement was under [President John F.] Kennedy. Then we had an increase in the involvement under [President Lyndon B.] Johnson. And because of the dissension of the people and the lambasting that he took from the news media, he chose not to run for a second term.

And then, if you'll recall, [President Richard M.] Nixon ran down the war, and we pulled out of Vietnam. [The] reason I assume was that the people just didn't want to be involved, period. And he had the message. And it was at no time a win proposition. If it had been a win proposition, we'd have directed our generals to go in there and just annihilate them. But that was never, in my recollection, the order. And that's the way with any involvement that we have had since World War II. We've had a no-win decision.

VASQUEZ: Why do you think that is?

MACGILLIVRAY: Lack of good, sound, strong leadership.

VASQUEZ: Do you think [President] Harry [S] Truman was a good leader?

MACGILLIVRAY: You better believe I do. There were two

great presidents in my lifetime. One was Harry Truman, the other was Ronald Reagan.

VASQUEZ: What's the essence of that good leadership?

MACGILLIVRAY: Red-blooded Americanism. It was taught to them, and they believed it.

VASQUEZ: What are the components of "red-blooded Americanism"? If you were invited to a high school civics class or a junior high school civics class, how would you transmit that to students? As a teacher, I face that every day.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I would go back to the beginnings of the United States. We felt that we wanted a degree of freedom, a decision of choice, and we fought the British to achieve that. We were in the Spanish-American War, it was fought in Cuba, if I remember correctly, and Teddy Roosevelt was one of the officers down there, as I recall. And we were to put down some type of dictatorship element that was going to be detrimental to the best interests of the United States . . .

VASQUEZ: Spanish colonialism, at the time.

MACGILLIVRAY: Is that what it was? I've forgotten right

offhand. And we felt that in the best interest, it would be right for us to [be] involved. If you'll remember, the outgrowth of that was, "Speak softly but with a big stick." And that was the degree. . . . The outcome of that, actually, was . . . [pause]

VASQUEZ: Let me ask you this. Another outcome of that was the Roosevelt corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, which basically made us a policeman in this hemisphere. And we took upon--in those words--we took upon ourselves the right to police and intervene in any country of Latin America where we were not satisfied with the way things were being done. That's another outgrowth.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, may I say, that was an interpretation taken on by the administration. But I don't believe that was ever the intent. One thing--not to get off the subject--but "intent." When I first went to the state legislature, the judges here in Santa Barbara County had me to a luncheon. And they asked that whenever I submitted a bill I, as a preamble to the bill, have the intent of what the bill

was supposed to do. Because they would make the determination in a court case from the intent of the bill and not how it was written. Because no two attorneys write the law the same.

VASQUEZ: Let me go back to something you were saying earlier, then. Wouldn't that be kind of difficult to reach a compromise in that bartering system we were talking about if you lay out intent? Isn't part of the language of legislation foggy for a purpose?

MACGILLIVRAY: Like I've always said, there's always a loophole. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: [Laughter] An intentional loophole?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I would say to a degree it may be intentional. But the intent actually alleviates much of the concern of your judges as to what you wanted to achieve when you introduced the bill. And they could read that. . . . Of course, don't forget, a judge interprets the law the way he wants to. And through that interpretation he creates law.

VASQUEZ: Right. Some don't like to admit that sometimes, but yet . . .

MACGILLIVRAY: But it's fact. And that's why they liked the idea of the intent. Then it gave them a much more broadened spectrum as to how much leeway they had on either side or their decisions.

VASQUEZ: How did that request or that kind of discussion with judges impact or affect the way you wrote legislation, consequently?

MACGILLIVRAY: That I introduced?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

MACGILLIVRAY: Every bit of my legislation always had the intent therein to help the judges and also to refresh me as to why the bill was introduced. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Let's continue discussing the incidents at the college [University of California, Santa Barbara], at the university in Isla Vista. In addition to your opposition to the activities, and as a result, you introduced a bill, A.B. 1576,¹ which would give campus police the right of hot pursuit in trying to get at people that were disrupting, I guess,

1. A.B. 1576, August 21, 1970, died in committee.

or dissenting on campus. What was the intent on that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, their sphere of peace officer status was limited to a peripheral edge around the campus. And once they were beyond that they had no jurisdiction whatsoever. They could call in. . . . Any peace officer can call either the city or the county or the state for an assist. But you cannot readily depend upon them to be there when you need them.

So therefore, my being an ex-police officer, [I] realized that for them. . . . To some extent they're state police. They then would have the power, if they were in hot pursuit, to make an arrest. Plus the fact, they would then be covered by the state's protection over their action. But if they stepped beyond their so-called line that was drawn around the peripheral edge of the university, they were on their own. It was just like a citizen's arrest then.

VASQUEZ: And you felt this was necessary to do for what?

MACGILLIVRAY: To give them protection. It's just like you

working for the state. As long as you are doing something for the state you have a degree of protection. But the minute you step beyond that, you have nothing. Unless you're covered by insurance. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Another offshoot or another area in which you responded to events at Isla Vista was passing legislation, or introducing legislation--in this case, A.B. 1349,¹ which would reimburse the county of Santa Barbara the \$400,000 and the city of Santa Barbara the \$12,000 in additional police costs.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, when the riots happened, they had to call in all of their off-duty personnel. In fact, they had to call everyone in. We had to bring the National Guard in. And in so doing, how can the counties and the cities on a very fixed budget, not necessarily with any surplus of funds, afford that type of an operation and still give the type of protection to the general public that the public is paying for?

1. A.B. 1349, August 8, 1970, died in committee.

VASQUEZ: And you think the state is the one that should foot that bill?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, it was a state university, wasn't it? If it had been at the city college, that would have been something else; the state wouldn't have been touched. That's a local problem. But that out there is a state problem.

VASQUEZ: You got support from Governor Reagan for that, didn't you?

MACGILLIVRAY: I don't know, I've forgotten.

VASQUEZ: Did he assist on that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, he supported our position on that.

VASQUEZ: Do you think it might have been a different case had he been a Democrat?

MACGILLIVRAY: I don't think so, in this respect: Don't forget, we're all working for the people. And this was a state problem because it happened on state grounds. And so therefore, I believe whether a Democrat or whether a Republican had introduced it, it would have been assimilated and expedited. I think it would have gone through.

VASQUEZ: Let me now go to something else. During the

Pat Brown administration there was a great concern for the need to establish some kind of regulatory or oversight agency to protect the coast.

MACGILLIVRAY: Mm-hmm. [Affirmative]

VASQUEZ: There was a call for a coastal commission.

MACGILLIVRAY: Coastal commission, yes.

VASQUEZ: Under Governor Reagan you had the same thing, but you had no funds for such a thing, initially. What was the difference in the way that you think the Brown administration and the Reagan administration saw the need for a coastal commission?

MACGILLIVRAY: The coastal commission, as I remember it under Brown, was quite officious; they denied the people the right to develop their property along the coast. Theoretically, they were telling people, "We will not allow you to build on your property unless you give a ten-foot easement across your property down to the water," or down to the beach, or down to the rocks, whatever. And this was not in the best interests of the intent of property ownership. If the state wanted that land,

they should have bought it; they should not have had a club over your head to say, "You can't do this unless you do that."

VASQUEZ: Eminent domain wouldn't apply here?

MACGILLIVRAY: Eminent domain would have applied if they had used it. You see, there's two beautiful things about eminent domain. Through eminent domain you are compensated for your land, plus the fact that your tax on what you are paid is less than if you had just sold it willingly. So if eminent domain had been used, I don't think there would have been the argument nor the resistance to the coastal commission. But they agitated and irritated so many people who were landholders on the water that the coastal commission, as far as I was concerned, could have been done away with totally, with no harm done. Also, I felt it was an infringement of local jurisdiction. I believe that the counties and the cities had the jurisdiction over the development of their resources.

VASQUEZ: In a number of areas that we've discussed, including the Isla Vista question, and

reimbursing local government, and calling in [state] government assistance, and in this case, there's a tension between local rights or local control and state control. Has your thinking changed at all in this as a result of serving in the state legislature?

MACGILLIVRAY: I still believe that control is by far the best control you have over the development of your particular properties. I disagree with much. . . . Well, not much. But I disagree with a lot of the concepts that they are applying today. But I'm not necessarily in the majority.

VASQUEZ: When you say "they," you mean the coastal commission?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, let's just go through your planning commissions. I resent what they are doing much of the time as of late because of the harm that they're doing to our youth. They are denying them the same opportunity that I had to acquire property and to live and to build and to exist on your own property. They're putting such . . .

[End Tape 2, Side B]

[Begin Tape 3, Side A]

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, to give you an example, what they're doing down in front of us here. They had to hire two Indians to sit in their car all day long while the bulldozer was scraping the surface of the earth because they thought maybe there might be some Indian artifacts there. That cost the kid that's going to build down there \$18.50 an hour for each person sitting there doing absolutely nothing for three days. You know, [Laughter] that's a lot of money that you have to put out for nothing.

VASQUEZ: Well, some people would argue that that has a great symbolic and even religious meaning for a group.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, historically, if you go back and check the number of Chumash Indians that we had in this area, there were roughly around what, four hundred?

VASQUEZ: Well, there's controversy about that.

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, there's controversy. But, my God, everywhere you look around here, you have to

hire them now to sit on the job site while they're scraping the earth. There's more population here today than in the history of man. But how can they have been on every foot of ground that we have here today? That's my question.

VASQUEZ: Does this conflict, then, with your notion what government should do and what is best for the greatest number of people?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. But I don't. . . . The greatest number of people happens to be the people of the city. . . . And whether they're young or old when they're going to build a house on their property and they happen to find, say, a bone or two on the property and they say, "They're Indian bones, you shall not disturb that." And then will the state or the city or the county buy that property from you for what you paid for it? No. So you sit there with a piece of hollow ground.

VASQUEZ: Undeveloped.

MACGILLIVRAY: Undeveloped. And you're paying taxes on it. Is that in the best interest of the greatest number of people? I don't think

so. It's doing no one any good.

VASQUEZ: Let's move to another area of discussion, if we might. That has to do with, again, 1970. What was your role, if any, in the 1970 gubernatorial race between Governor Reagan and former Assembly Speaker Jesse Unruh?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, Jesse didn't run for governor, did he?

VASQUEZ: Yes, he ran for governor.

MACGILLIVRAY: [Laughter] I don't remember that. I remember him running for mayor.

VASQUEZ: He also ran for governor.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I think Jesse was a good man. But I don't think he would have been that good.

VASQUEZ: You don't think he would have made a good governor?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, I really don't.

VASQUEZ: Why not?

MACGILLIVRAY: He was, to a degree, somewhat dictatorial. I don't think the people would have accepted that. I don't believe they would have accepted him as governor because of that. Because he was a very positive person; he knew where he wanted to go and what he wanted

to do. He didn't care how he got there as long as he got there. I had a healthy respect for that man because he knew what he wanted. I think that he turned this legislature around from a part-time legislature to a full-time, productive legislature. But now I think we've gone, to a degree, overboard. See, we used to. . . . What is it? How many weeks? One year and . . .

VASQUEZ: They had sessions in alternating years.

MACGILLIVRAY: Alternating years, I've forgotten . . .

VASQUEZ: With budgetary sessions in between the regular sessions.

MACGILLIVRAY: But it was a relatively productive government. See, Jesse was a planner and a projectionist in his mind. He saw the growth of California. He saw the requirement for leadership and direction, and he gave a great deal of assistance in that. But he became a very, very powerful person up until Reagan, until we had the forty-first vote.

[Laughter]

But I had a lot of respect for the man. He still handled himself well as the

minority leader. Then [Bob] Bobby Moretti took over as the leader.

VASQUEZ: How would you compare them as leaders of the assembly?

MACGILLIVRAY: Bobby Moretti against?

VASQUEZ: Jesse Unruh, both Democrats.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I think Jesse was more involved in everything that was going on than Bob Moretti. Bob Moretti was a real nice guy. But I think Jesse Unruh was more, more of a leader than Moretti. Of course, Bob Monagan, just between you and me, he was relatively weak. I told you this yesterday, that he was just a nice guy. He still is a nice guy. I have nothing against him.

VASQUEZ: What is. . . . Go ahead, finish your thought.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I've forgotten what I was going to say.

VASQUEZ: Oh, I'm sorry. What are the qualities that you came to believe were necessary for someone to be a good speaker of the California Assembly as a result of your experience?

MACGILLIVRAY: A man that could recognize where we were going in this state, anticipating what we had

to have to further its continuing growth, and to enhance the economic well-being of the people of the state. That, to me, is the type of leadership that we needed in the assembly. The senate, well, I don't think They're powerful, but I don't think they have the same concerns about their people as the assembly has.

VASQUEZ: Why is that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, they have so much more. And to a great extent, they have the next-to-final say-so on what we in the lower house were doing. Sure, they originated many bills, but their bills were quite similar as to what we had . . .

VASQUEZ: And often coauthored, we might add?

MACGILLIVRAY: Sometimes we had our coauthors in the senate and the assembly. So we worked in concert that way. But, like I say, the senate did not get as involved as the assembly. Because we in the assembly were a little bit more nosy than those in the senate. If we had natural resources problems, many times we assemblymen would go to the site to find out what the problems were. So we would be more

conversant with what the solution could be, where the senate just did not take the time, nor did they have the time, to do what we did.

VASQUEZ: Why is that? The larger constituency, or a longer term?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I think both played a very important part in that. Because don't forget, a senator had twice the amount of area that an assemblyman had. And what [Laughter] may be good for this hand or may be terrible for that hand. And he was caught in the middle. But we assemblymen, we represented just this particular area. And if we had the problem in this particular area, we could really go all out for it for the people in that area, where the senator may have to straddle the fence. I don't say that they did, but that to me would be the teeter-totter of the whole operation.

VASQUEZ: Continuing on this notion you raise about terms, there have been efforts to extend the term of the assembly to four years and make it the same as the senate. It's been

rejected by the voters in the initiative process.

MACGILLIVRAY: With a maximum amount of time serving?

VASQUEZ: No, not the maximum number of terms, but the term itself. In other words, you have a two-year term for an assemblyman and four for a senator. Do you think it would be better to have equal number of years in each term, the four-year term at the lower house?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, when I was in, I would say no. I thought two years was plentiful. But today, with the cost of running for public office and constantly being involved in fund-raisers--you're more interested in raising funds than you are producing a good environment in which to live--and I think that there is some degree of need to lengthen the term and lessen the requirement of time for running for public office.

But I also feel that there should be a certain time that you can exist in any particular job, both statewide and federally.

VASQUEZ: You think there should be limits on the number of terms someone can serve?

MACGILLIVRAY: I believe that, yes. You see, we're now making careers out of being legislators. And I believe that the minute you make a career out of being a legislator, you lose what the people really want.

VASQUEZ: Which is?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, they want good representation, they want good correspondent capabilities of working with their legislator. I think that if you feel that you're going to be a career legislator. . . . You know, it's proven that once you're elected to public office, it's pretty hard to get you out.

VASQUEZ: Yes, nowadays incumbency is a problem. In fact, it's being referred to as that.

MACGILLIVRAY: That's right. And so therefore, I think that they have a tendency to become more complacent so they don't make waves. To me Well, it's just like the riots out here we discussed earlier. That brought to people's attention what was going on. We may have been able to achieve [changes] other ways, but that was the most spectacular because they got tremendous coverage.

VASQUEZ: And it worked?

MACGILLIVRAY: And it worked. But I don't say it's right.

VASQUEZ: There is a pattern that is emerging--I'm not saying it's a pervasive pattern, but you're seeing it more and more--and that is young men or women--mostly men, though--becoming interns for an assemblyman, and then moving on to staff member in that assemblyman's office, then becoming an administrative assistant for that assemblyman, and before you know it, they are the incumbent. Some people refer to it as inbreeding; other people refer to it as a very effective and efficient of training high-quality, highly capable administrators and legislators. What's your feeling about that?

MACGILLIVRAY: That's all well and good, gaining experience only as far as legislation is concerned. But if you don't have a very broad background of involvement in, again, I go right back to business, community affairs, etc., you may think you're qualified from just past experience. But you're not conversant with all of the things that are going on in the

minds of the people. I think that you've got to get people that have been rubbing shoulders with others to find out what their concerns are.

Because, you know, it's awfully easy to get divorced from people. Because when you're up there in the legislature, when you go out to dinner, you go out to dinner with either special interest groups or lobbyists. You're not talking to the rank and file. And to me. . . . That's why I bought an airplane, in fact, so that I could spend more time in the district. I used to drive home, back and forth every weekend from Sacramento. That was fourteen hours in that automobile.

VASQUEZ: You never had a home out there [in Sacramento]?

MACGILLIVRAY: I had an apartment.

VASQUEZ: Did you stay up there part of the time?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, we stayed there Sunday night, Monday night, Tuesday night, Wednesday night. Thursday, when we got off of our committee hearings, we'd run out to the airport--I

finally bought an airplane--and I'd commute. It'd just take two hours to come home. Then I could work with the people. On Fridays I could visit the city halls of the various cities in the district. I could go out and talk to people and find out what their concerns were. Sunday afternoon, I'd go out to the airport, jump in the airplane, two hours later I was back in Sacramento.

VASQUEZ: Would your wife go up with you?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, yes. She was with me all the time.

VASQUEZ: Did you find that having your wife with you made you more or less effective than the guys that were up there by themselves and . . .

MACGILLIVRAY: May I say, you don't play when your wife is with you. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Does it make you more or less of an effective legislator?

MACGILLIVRAY: I would say that. . . . You've got to realize, wives talk to wives. And it's amazing how much you can learn from wives. Because the wives can parrot what their husbands have been saying during their conversations. They can come home and say,

"Hey, listen. George was thinking about this and that and the next thing." You get to thinking, well, maybe there's some sense behind what he's thinking about. You start paralleling your thoughts that way. And again, it's because of the conversation, the intercourse that they're having from one to another over a cup of coffee or something like that. It really is productive. It's amazing the number of wives--well, they have the PALS Club--¹ well, how good they were for us, as well as to us. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Why don't we stop for today and I'll talk to your wife about the PALS Club?

MACGILLIVRAY: Okay.

1. PALS was the legislative wives' organization founded in 1919 and of which Mrs. MacGillivray was a member. See discussion in this interview on pages 229-32.

[Session 3, August 10, 1989]

[Begin Tape 4, Side A]

VASQUEZ: We were talking about your views of the experiences and the kind of background that good legislators should have. Do you want to finish your thought?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, as I referred to earlier, I feel that it is best to have some experience in working with people, possibly as an elected representative, prior to going to a higher position as a representative of the people. Because there you can express the views of the people that you have served in the lower echelons, such as a commissioner, a councilman, a mayor, a supervisor, before going on up into the hierarchy of politics and government. If you have a working knowledge and background, I think that you can do a much more productive job than you could do otherwise. I was going to use the

simile of going to college to become a schoolteacher. You remember, you had to do student teaching for a period of time, so a teacher could work along with you and give you pointers so your expertise could be more enhanced through the use of knowledge that has been accumulated over a period of time. That is one basic way of making a better teacher or a better politician. I think it's all basic.

VASQUEZ: Tell me, when you went to the legislature, did you have a mentor? Did you see cases where you had young or new legislators being given advice, being guided, given guidance by more experienced or older legislators?

MACGILLIVRAY: Once you're elected to public office, it seems that all of a sudden you have all of the knowledge, and you don't need prodding.
[Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Is that right?

MACGILLIVRAY: They come up with grandiose ideas and they forget that people have to pay for their ideas. And everything costs money in politics. You can't just willy-nilly pass a

bill without the realization that someone's going to have to pay for it. I think that is our major problem, nationally as well as statewide and locally. Many of the people that we elect to public office today are not well enough informed as to how the money is raised to operate government. And let's face it, the only way we can raise it is through some form of taxation.

VASQUEZ: Is this what you found in the assembly in the early seventies, that you had people in there who had no sense of the fiscal aspect of social policy?

MACGILLIVRAY: You know, I think it was during my tenure in office that we finally started passing bills whereby they either required funding or did not require funding. And that was attached to the bill, "No funds necessary," or else funding was mandatory. And in that manner I think we started to make some of the legislators realize that their bills, in the main, would cost money. Because we could sit up there on our bench and adjudicate certain things that city governments and county

governments should do but with no funding [provided]. And then it left the poor, low-echelon peoples in government--county and city, as well as special districts, etc.--far afield trying to figure out how they were going to meet the expenses incurred by such legislation.

VASQUEZ: Did your background as a councilman and a mayor come in handy in that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Amen! Amen!

VASQUEZ: Were there others that served in the assembly when you were there who had also had local experience, and did you support one another?

MACGILLIVRAY: There were quite a few of us that had local government experience. But it's amazing, I would say the majority did not. It's amazing also, I would say a great majority had not been in business.

VASQUEZ: Did you find. . . . Go ahead.

MACGILLIVRAY: I found that the most of the membership was made up of attorneys, schoolteachers, and, well, various other peoples, but predominantly attorneys.

VASQUEZ: I've had interviewees tell me one of the

problems with California politics in the legislature is, "There's just too damn many attorneys up there."

MACGILLIVRAY: That's the problem.

VASQUEZ: Is that your feeling?

MACGILLIVRAY: As I see it and I think it . . .

VASQUEZ: Why does that pose a problem?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, let's see how the events have turned in the last, say, since World War II. I would say up until the sixties it was not. . . . Every time you did something you were not sued. But today we have so many laws--and if you visit an attorney's office you will see it's a library now, no longer an office, all of those books are laden with laws. No matter what you do there is a law that says you can't do it, in the most. It just opens the door for people and attorneys to sue their friends and neighbors and others for a breach of the law.

VASQUEZ: Do we have too many laws in California?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh [laughter] . . .

VASQUEZ: The California Code is one of the largest in the world.

- MACGILLIVRAY: I would say that how a judge can determine what is correct and incorrect, as I said yesterday, I think that the judges today are creating as much law as the elected legislators because of their interpretation of the law. So I don't know.
- VASQUEZ: This gives me an opportunity to ask something that I find interesting. How do you feel about the way that we make our judicial appointments? That is, judges become judges because of a political connection. A governor makes them a judgeship, not because they necessarily have the qualifications-- whatever that means. But, do you think that's a good way?
- MACGILLIVRAY: Well, when you have an LL.B. and you have passed the bar, you are qualified to become a judge.
- VASQUEZ: Technically. But I'm wondering if the wisdom and the demeanor and. . . . What's the word that I want? I wonder if there isn't something more to being a judge and making the kinds of decisions about people's lives and about social issues that they have to

make just because they technically pass a series of exams. Is there more to it than that--temperament?

MACGILLIVRAY: You know, let's go back in history. Many of our most notable judges in the past were not attorneys, were not lawmen. They were just appointed to make a decision as to what is morally right and what is morally wrong. And then, as we became a more sophisticated people in this country, and more people attended law school, we started to change the requirements for being a judge. In fact, it was just within the last twenty years--or less than that. . . . A low judge on the totem pole used to be just anyone . . .

VASQUEZ: You mean the municipal judge?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, no. I'm trying to recall what they called them then . . .

VASQUEZ: Justice of the peace?

MACGILLIVRAY; Justice of the peace. There was not a requirement that you be an attorney. But during the period of time I was in the legislature they changed that, much to my chagrin. Because I recall a very good friend

of mine [Jack Wullbrandt] who was a plumber who served as justice of the peace. He did a beautiful job. I thought he did a great job. But the attorneys actually had to a great extent taken over the legislature, and decreed more or less that in order to be a judge of any sort you had to have a law degree. So I don't know. I don't care what profession you're in, you have good ones and bad ones.

VASQUEZ: But the process by which judges become judges, it's a form of patronage, isn't it?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, in some areas a judge has to be reelected, except to the Supreme Court. Well, let's see, I guess there are a few other courts that they don't have to be elected to.

VASQUEZ: The court of appeals.

MACGILLIVRAY: Court of appeals, etc. But for a municipal court judge or a superior court judge or a state supreme court judge, they're in an elected capacity.

VASQUEZ: You think that takes care of . . .?

MACGILLIVRAY: To some extent. But usually the incumbents

go back year after year after year, or term after term after term. Unless there is harrassment on the part of the news media. [Laughter] So don't trip up the news media if you don't want undue publicity.

VASQUEZ: Do you think that in recent years--there's been criticism I wonder if you agree with-- that the courts have been overly politicized?

MACGILLIVRAY: To some extent I agree with that. But in the main, a person, when they become a judge--at least, the ones that I know--they have a whole new directive in life and a whole different outlook as far as law is concerned. They have to be very studious and they have to do an awful lot of homework on a continuing basis.

I know one of my friends that was a judge, a former mayor. My gosh, his wife used to lament all the time that all he did when he came home was just read, read, read court cases. And you know, a judge has to read decisions rendered by other justices so that there is a continuity of the interpretation of the law. So it's a

continuing student's job, more or less.

VASQUEZ: Do you feel that judges should have to worry about changing and varying public opinion in making their decisions? I'm thinking, for example, of the case we had here in California recently of three supreme court judges who were removed from office, Rose Elizabeth Bird and Cruz Reynoso, etc. In the case of Ms. Bird, on the surface it seemed people were upset with her position on the death penalty and crime. But at another level it's been said that, basically, Republicans were angry at her because of the way she handled the 1981 reapportionment, which Republicans in California didn't like, and consequently there was a vendetta. That's one point of view about politicizing the court.

MACGILLIVRAY: The people were disenchanted, I don't think so much about the reapportionment as they were the fact of the death penalty stand. And if you'll recall, twice in the last few years the people have voted to enhance the death penalty. The supreme court chose not

to follow the people's wishes. And let's face it, the people really, in the long run, in the overall pictures, set the trend for law. In this case, the supreme court justices chose not to follow the people's desires and the people reacted and relieved them of their positions.

VASQUEZ: You've always been a supporter of the death penalty, haven't you?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, very definitely. I am a firm believer that history has shown those who have killed people and have not been put to death turn around and kill more. I'm of the opinion that you have to. . . . Well, that's been historic. If you'll look right down from the beginning of time, if you were a bad guy you were killed, [Laughter] there was no two ways about it. Or you were banished.

VASQUEZ: So why here in California did we do away with the death penalty?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well . . .

VASQUEZ: California's always been a pretty conservative state.

MACGILLIVRAY: Why did we do away with the death penalty?

VASQUEZ: Mm-hmm. [affirmative]

MACGILLIVRAY: I believe it was a modern trend of thinking for a while, that we should be a kinder, more gentler people. We found that by being such people that we were being trod upon, and we made a reversal of our thinking.

VASQUEZ: What was your thinking when you, a number of times, presented legislation that would provide for life imprisonment without possibility of parole? Since the death penalty had been overturned, were you trying to make a stronger statement?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, we had to have something that would be a deterrent to the increasing rise in crime rate that we had. But no matter what we have done, we haven't seen a reduction to any great extent.

VASQUEZ: Some people argue that in the states where the death penalty remains in force that, in fact, it hasn't been a deterrent.

MACGILLIVRAY: It has not been a deterrent?

VASQUEZ: Those kinds of crimes for which we institute the death penalty haven't been significantly reduced.

MACGILLIVRAY: But you know, the human being, if they are beaten over the head enough, go someplace else. And you're not going to go to a place where retaliation is assured. Forty-eight states have forty-eight different. . . . Or fifty states now have fifty different interpretations of what they should do to their people that break the law. And California happens to be now one of the states that thinks the death penalty is the way to go.

I think if we had a death penalty that was universal throughout the United States, it would be somewhat of a deterrent to crime. Somewhat. But believe me, I don't think we're ever going to get rid of crime. There's going to be someone doing something to somebody at some time.

VASQUEZ: Some argue that when you seek retribution for crime like that, all that you're doing is punishing the symptoms and not getting to the causes of the disease, that the causes are social, and the forms of economic and social inequality. What's your feeling on that?

MACGILLIVRAY: I don't necessarily agree with the overall social problems. I would say there are a lot of people that have problems that they have grown up with, as a way of life, that figure they'd pick up a gun and shoot somebody. The best example today, we've seen an increase in shootings. If you will watch the television, the child sits in front of the television and he watches these people shooting one another. They assume that that's the way of life. I just read the other day where one kid picked up his dad's gun and shot his best friend. Unintentionally. He thought that was the way to do it.

VASQUEZ: I think there are something like twenty-two killings per evening of programming on an average night. Now, might that be something that could be addressed as a deterrent?

MACGILLIVRAY: They're doing that now, I think, in Congress, trying to get them to change the amount of killings that are on television. Remember, quite a number of years ago the film industry had to set up a board to determine what was acceptable and what was not acceptable. That

has fallen somewhat by the wayside today.

Because of that, we have it on television. Because television is nothing more than shooting a movie and putting it on TV. They don't. . . . Well, some of the shows are original, but I would say "Wise Guy," and "Miami Vice," and all of them are shot on film and then shown on TV. And that kind of violence is assimilated by the people that are watching it. Well, I was reading-- and I don't know whether it's factual or not --but I was reading of the number of beatings that take place immediately after some of our major fights are shown on television.

VASQUEZ: Is that right? Mm-hmm. [affirmative] There is a connection?

MACGILLIVRAY: There is a connection.

VASQUEZ: Let me ask you another question. Now, you go to the California state prison system and you look at the inmates, the population, and you have an almost inverse proportion of so-called minorities as the majority in schools and universities. Why is that?

MACGILLIVRAY: I can't answer that. I don't know.

VASQUEZ: It is a tough question.

MACGILLIVRAY: If I studied a little, maybe I could give an answer, but I just don't know.

VASQUEZ: Let's get into another area in this same realm. One of the biggest debates, or one of the debates that raged while you were in the legislature, was the continuation of California's exclusionary rule of evidence, on providing evidence for convictions. And you pretty regularly came out in support of law enforcement, on the opposite side of those like [Assemblyman] Alan Sieroty, for example, that argued that the exclusionary rule was necessary to protect the public from sloppy policework. Have you changed your mind on that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I was a policeman when I was in college. When I became a policeman, they gave us a badge and a gun and put us in the field with another policeman, a senior. And he was our teacher. Today, we go through a police academy. And in that manner, we teach the policemen and the policewomen the right way and the wrong way to conduct your

business as a policeman. We have to be, or the police have to be very careful today with what they say, how they act. Because they are subject to a great degree of comment by the news media for conducting themselves in a very poor manner. And they can be fired.

VASQUEZ: Or even held liable?

MACGILLIVRAY: Or held liable, right.

VASQUEZ: Is that wrong?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, it's not wrong. Not if they breach the principles of what law enforcement really is for. Because, after all, we have to live under the law, or the police have to live under the law just as much as everyone else. Just because they have a badge doesn't mean that they're free to do anything they want. They have certain procedures that they have to follow. If they breach those, then they should be admonished or punished.

VASQUEZ: Let me now turn to more specific parts of your political career. In 1972, when you ran for your third term, you ran against a young man, Gary [K.] Hart. It was a race that was very close. You won by 616 votes. Why was

that so close?

MACGILLIVRAY: Again, we had a reduction in the district. And we had an increase in students at the university. And I felt that. . . . Well, in fact, we had to come over, say, about 68,000 total votes in order to offset them [at the university]. And you know, that's not easy. With the reduced size--and in fact, it was just the county of Santa Barbara then--we had that to try and offset. He was a very young man and was appealing to the young people.

VASQUEZ: There were also a number of issues--and let's go over them--that might have made a difference. One, you very vocally opposed eighteen-year-olds having the right to vote.

MACGILLIVRAY: Mm-hmm. [Affirmative]

VASQUEZ: Why was that, and have you changed your mind on that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Have I changed my mind on that? No. I still think the eighteen-year-old is too young. He is not experienced enough, nor is he implanted as yet in the area that. . . . Well, for instance, the University of

California [Santa Barbara] in Isla Vista. If they vote in concert, they can actually, in the most, put bond issues across that the property owner has to pay. They're here for maybe an average of two to three years in a university. What is the turnover rate, about every two years?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

MACGILLIVRAY: All right. They're here today and gone tomorrow. And what they do today is very lasting for another twenty to thirty years, as far as bond issues are concerned.

VASQUEZ: For local residents?

MACGILLIVRAY: For local residents, that is correct. Now, if they were confined only to major elections, such as national elections, then I would say, well, all right. But not for local elections. I think that we've got a grave problem.

VASQUEZ: But what about eighteen-year-olds that are residents of Santa Barbara?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, if you'll look, when that first was passed, lots of eighteen-year-olds voted. Today: "Eh, what's the use?" That's their

attitude and they're not voting as they did several years ago when it was first a new ice cream cone, more or less. I still think that there is an awful lot of learning, basic learning, that they have to adjust to prior to casting their ballot.

VASQUEZ: The argument that young people countered your position with at the time was perhaps an emotional one, but I think a rather compelling one also. And that was, "If, at eighteen years old, we're old enough to die for this country in the wars or military actions that this country involves us, we should be old enough to make decisions about the political system." What is your rejoinder to that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, [Laughter] again, I go back to historic events. The youth have always fought the battles. I would like to see that reversed, I would like to see the old guys--[Laughter] the old people going out and fighting on with the young--have their day. But that's not going to happen. Just because I fought in World War II doesn't. . . . Of course, I was

in my twenties then. But I don't feel that fighting gives me any more justification and qualification for voting than not fighting. I think that it's a patriotic duty that if your government wants you to perform on their behalf, you shall perform.

VASQUEZ: Should you also have a voice in deciding what performance is required?

MACGILLIVRAY: You will have. But don't forget, you are now in a learning process. When you are in the services you are mingling with many people that you would never have otherwise met. You get a much broader spectrum of what your country is all about. I think because of that background knowledge, you become a much better and more qualified citizen when you do reach your majority, so you can vote.

VASQUEZ: There is another issue that was brought up at the time and that gave you some problems at Isla Vista: that had to do with your criticism of those who opposed the Vietnam War at the same time that your own son went to Canada to avoid military service, and that was thrown at you as a sign of hypocrisy or

of privilege. What was your response to that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, he made a choice. Of course, he was in the National Guard, and why he left I did not, could not, understand. But he was out at the university going to school there, and it seems like all of his buddies decided that's what they were going to do, and so he went with them. That was his choice. I thought it was wrong. I still think it was wrong.

VASQUEZ: Did he suffer consequences for that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, yes. He had to follow through with the law. He's still living in Canada. But he came back to the United States when the government, when the Congress passed the law that they had to do certain things. So he came back to the United States and performed, and then went back to Canada to live.

VASQUEZ: Was that a painful experience for you?

MACGILLIVRAY: Very much so. [pause]

VASQUEZ: Let me change [topics]. . . . Were you less effective in Sacramento as a result of that last election, winning the election by such a

small plurality?

MACGILLIVRAY: May I say, you win a race, you win a race. I don't care whether you're an athlete or what. If you cross the finish line with the ribbon across your chest, you've won.

VASQUEZ: You didn't let that deter you?

MACGILLIVRAY: No. Because that's the facts of life. There is only one winner.

VASQUEZ: You were targeted in that election by the state Democratic party. In fact, Speaker Moretti even made a public announcement that you were one of the people that they wanted to turn out.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, again, Bob and I were friends, Bob Moretti. But he was a Democrat and I was a Republican. They wanted to become a much stronger unit than they were. And so they felt that with Isla Vista and with the way that they had redistricted that I should be unseated. Didn't work.

VASQUEZ: Do you remember John FitzRandolph?

MACGILLIVRAY: John who?

VASQUEZ: FitzRandolph, the chief-of-staff for Speaker Moretti.

MACGILLIVRAY: No.

VASQUEZ: In your public statements, you referred constantly to the "bossism" of Bob Moretti. What did you mean by that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, if you will recall, I stated earlier that. . . . We Republicans had the majority. We felt that we should have some Democrats as chairmen of committees. Bob Moretti didn't feel that way. He felt, as I feel, it's a spoils system. When you're the captain of the team, you have team players that work with you in concern to achieve the goals that you set forth. You don't want those in opposition to be playing on your team. They can be second-in-commands, but they're sitting on the sidelines, only in case the frontrunners step aside momentarily can they fill in. Bob Moretti was a taskmaster that way. That, to me, was "bossism."

VASQUEZ: So it isn't as derogatory a term as it is political rhetoric?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, it's political rhetoric. Because Bob, like I say, was a friend of mine. All the

guys were friends. Let's put it this way:
most all were friends. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Doesn't that spoils system theory, though,
fly in the face of people who want to get the
best players to perform the best tasks for
the people?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, it does.

VASQUEZ: Don't you want the best quality people in
charge of things?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. That is the ultimate. But you're not
going to get it. Because there are certain
obligations that you have to follow through
with. People that work with you to achieve
your goal, you have to reward them. There
may be another person that would be much more
qualified, with a better background, to carry
through, but that person that was the more
qualified was not working on your team.

So therefore, you're not going to
disrupt those. And I'll tell you, there is
no easier way to make a person disgruntled
and uncooperative than to have him give his
all, and then when you achieve what he has
helped you to achieve, for the achiever to

ignore the help that got him there.

VASQUEZ: Not to reward him?

MACGILLIVRAY: Not to reward, that's right.

VASQUEZ: Give me an example of when in California politics or in your particular career you saw that, that kind of disgruntled individual or series of individuals because of that. If you can think of a case, especially of Republicans.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, let's go back to Bob Monagan.

[Laughter] He's the one that appointed Bob Moretti. Bob Moretti was a tennis player, a very close friend of Bob Monagan's. And Bob, because of the close friendliness, appointed him to a position of great responsibility [chairman of the Finance and Insurance Committee]. [Laughter] And it took Bob Moretti just two years to unseat Bob Monagan.

VASQUEZ: Was there disgruntlement in the ranks of the Republicans?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, we talked about it. We all worked together. But we talked about the fact that it was a spoils system and we should put the people of the same party in as chairmen while

we are in the leadership classification. If you will look up there today, you don't think Willie Brown is going to put a Republican in charge of a particular committee.

VASQUEZ: Well, Willie Brown came to power as a result of being able to reach an agreement with, among others, [Assemblywoman] Carol Hallett and other Republicans.

MACGILLIVRAY: That is correct. [Laughter] Because there was a division within the Democratic party. And he had to reward some of them for their assistance. But if you will note over the years, those that were paid off by particular appointments to particular committees have drifted away. And Willie is the boss. There is no two ways about it. Even if you'll note the dissention that was there--what?--last year or the year before.

VASQUEZ: The Gang of Five?¹

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. And you'll notice that they're no

1. Refers to five Democratic assemblyman who defied Assembly Speaker Brown's authority in 1988: Gerald Eaves, Rusty Areias, Steve Peace, Charles M. Calderon, and Gary Condit.

longer a part . . .

VASQUEZ: They're marginalized.

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes.

VASQUEZ: So what you're saying is that it's a legitimate criterion, partisanship, for rewarding and for placing people in positions of responsibility?

MACGILLIVRAY: When you're playing partisan politics, it has to be.

VASQUEZ: Is there a case in which partisan politics hurts the people of the state, though?

MACGILLIVRAY: I would say there could be. And possibly there is. But I'm out of the picture now to a great extent. I'm not on a day-to-day basis with them, so I cannot comment on that, really.

VASQUEZ: Let me ask you this, then. Do you think the parties should be stronger than they are?

MACGILLIVRAY: No. And I'll tell you why. I'm a first-generation American. And though we have a party system, I think for the good of the nation that we've got to think of the nation and not the party. Maybe I'm naive. But I still have a firm belief that I'm proud to be

an American and I feel everyone else should be just as proud. Because you can visit any other country in the world and you're very happy to get back on this soil.

VASQUEZ:

Let me ask you some questions regarding some of the issues that were important to you when you were in the legislature. Let me preface this segment by saying in 1970 there was one issue that stood above all issues in terms of the amount of time and attention and rhetoric it involved in the California legislature. It was the environmental issue: pollution, air quality, smog, and what have you. One of the proposals that was continuously raised was taking gas tax funds and using a portion of them for pollution-control programs. You opposed that consistently. Why?

MACGILLIVRAY:

Because the gasoline tax was earmarked to develop highways to help cities and counties maintain their roadways. The monies that we raised for that through the gasoline tax were earmarked solely for that purpose. I did not want to see that violated in any way.

Many of us realized that the state of

California was in a tremendous growth situation. Unless we planned and developed our means of moving people from A to B and back from B to A--that is, through roadways--we were going to be remiss in our responsibilities to the people. I felt that any removal of gas . . .

[End Tape 4, Side A]

[Begin Tape 4, Side B]

MACGILLIVRAY: . . . And I still believe that, that we should not violate the gasoline tax funds as they are today to be diverted to other uses.

VASQUEZ: What was your proposal for solving air pollution and other environmental problems?

MACGILLIVRAY: You know, I'm a firm believer, what man can do, man can undo. We can develop engines that are less polluting, we can develop ways and means of cleaning fossil fuel exhausts in our plants.

VASQUEZ: Why don't we do it? The companies . . .

MACGILLIVRAY: All right. Well . . .

VASQUEZ: . . . tell us it's not profitable.

MACGILLIVRAY: May I say, it's amazing how many deaf ears there are to that. When I was on the

National Highway Traffic Safety [Commission] here just a few years ago, we were always having spills of toxic wastes on the highways. I recommended--and it seems like recommended to deaf ears--that when a toxic material was formulated, that prior to its development and use that the inventor, or the scientist or whatever, the chemist that came up with the toxic material, at the same time he would come up with one that would detoxify it. I thought it was relatively simple. Because they knew the ingredients. If they were smart enough to put them together, they should be able to take them apart. I believe, you know, again, whatever man can do, man can undo.

VASQUEZ: Your party, the Republican party, has been less than aggressive. . . . And in fact, the EPA [Environmental Protection Agency] was to some degree gutted during the Reagan administration. How do you reconcile that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I'm right now against the Environmental Protection Agency in this respect: They are after the factors rather than before. See,

you've got to create a problem, and they immediately will find you. They don't come up with the solution. To me, that was not the intent of the Environmental Protection Agency. They were supposed to come up with ways and means of solving the problems rather than creating greater problems.

VASQUEZ: One of the means that the mandate for their action gave them was the latitude to enforce certain guidelines and certain rules against toxic elements. You've got to stop the pollution as well as try to find solutions for what's already happened, don't you?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, see, they took the enforcement segment as their goal, not the solution element. You know, it's much easier to enforce than it is to solve problems. The best example I can give you right now: your Environmental Protection Agency is curtailing the crosstown freeway development because of things that we did fifty or a hundred years ago.

Our city dump used to be down underneath where the freeway is going. Now, because of the polluted soil, it's costing the taxpayer

of the state of California millions of dollars more to remove and detoxify the soil. But it's been sitting there for years and years and years, and no one's been aware of it. No one has cared whether anything has been done about it because it's been hurting no one. But because we're doing a certain thing. . . .

Well, I'll give you another example. You mark my words, within the next three to five years we're going to be paying five dollars a gallon for gasoline. Simply because 41 percent of our service stations have been closed since 1980. And why? Because of the Environmental Protection Agency. You go by where a service station was yesterday and you will find an orange fence around it with a great excavation. They're having to transport that soil from there someplace else and refill that after the Environmental Protection Agency or the health agencies have determined that the soil is no longer toxified. You're going to pay for that. And you know, again, as I said,

why do we not come up with a solution rather than an assessment?

VASQUEZ: One of the elements that seems to be missing in your analysis is the responsibility of the companies or the corporations that caused that pollution. Don't they have a responsibility? Shouldn't they be made responsible for that, at least in part?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, all right. Let's go back a few years. I remember when I was a kid when we bought fruit, vegetables; the vegetables had bugs in them, and the fruit was somewhat rotting, etc. Over the years, we have come up with chemicals that kill the bugs before they get into the vegetables and keep the fruit from rotting while it's in transit to the place where you and I buy it.

But today, we're saying all of that is bad. That's causing a real pollution problem. If everything is so bad, why have I lived so long? I listen to people say that the smoke in the air is causing a layer in the ozone that's going to cause a tremendous heating of the earth surface. I listen to

others say that that's a lot of baloney, all they have to do is check the records--which we've only been keeping for about a hundred years--check the records and you will find that you have your peaks and your valleys therein. And they will go on and on and on.

Now, don't get me wrong. I believe, again, that when we develop a new plant for making gasoline that we have the scrubbers and all of the other materials mandatory prior to the operation of the manufacturing plant, that all of that be intact prior to operation. That can be done and solved beforehand, not after the fact.

VASQUEZ: But oil companies argue it's not profitable to do that.

MACGILLIVRAY: Baloney! You check and look at the new refineries; they're coming up with the latest methods available.

VASQUEZ: But they didn't do it on their own. The oil companies didn't do it on their own; they were forced to do that by public pressure through agencies like the EPA.

MACGILLIVRAY: All right. But again, they were forced to do that in this respect: because of the people's demand that they do that. You know, you're not going to change your way of life until someone takes a stick and tells you you better change it or else. Because you've become accustomed to doing something over a period of time, and you're not going to change unless, like I say, somebody takes a stick and say, "You change!"

But if we set up. . . . Well, it's just like driving down the highway. We've set a speed limit of fifty miles an hour in areas, sixty-five miles an hour in other areas, fifteen and twenty-five miles an hour. But how many people follow that rule? Every once in a while you see a person pulled over who is going maybe ten or twelve miles or more faster than he should have been. But if you will note, the majority of people in a fifty-five-mile-an-hour zone are doing at least sixty, and in a sixty-five-mile-an-hour zone are doing at least seventy.

So you know, the manufacturers are no

different than the average guy. We're told we have to live within certain parameters. But all of us seem to move out beyond that allowable parameter, just. . . .

VASQUEZ: So you have to make sure you enforce those rules?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, it's like I, I don't know whether I told you this or not, but I'm a firm believer that if we are going to have a law that says, "Thou shalt do this," that we're going to have to hire a person to watch that other person follow the rules and the regulations.

VASQUEZ: If people follow the rules.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, we can set rules and regulations. But I believe that when we are developing things For instance, building a house. It used to be that we could use 2' x 4' studs. Now some of the cities have gone to 2' x 6' studs because they want more insulation in order to keep the homes warmer, so we don't have so much heat loss. We want double-pane windows rather than single-pane windows. That is all well and good.

But how far are we going to go before we

price ourselves out of the ability to build ourselves a home? We've got to adjust our sights into the reality that we can put certain demands on people for certain things. But beyond that, they cannot afford them.

I look at the people of California. We have more vehicles than we have licensed drivers. And those cars, in the most, are out on the highways. We have trucks that transport our produce and our vegetables, etc., and our merchandise to outlets. You drive a car. You have a big car you drive, one man to a car, or one person to a car. And that's California's way of life. What we're trying to do is trying to get carpools to get more people in one vehicle than we have.

But you know, we have become accustomed to a lifestyle that when you want to go, you want to go. You don't want to wait for Joe or Charlie or Bill. You want to go right now. We're going to have to adjust our way of life. And that's where you come into it, the educator. You're going to have to start

teaching your people, and planting seeds in their minds, to be more acceptable to the needs of tomorrow than that of today.

VASQUEZ: At the same time that I've got my students, say, for an hour a day, three hours a week, the television advertisers, the automobile advertisers have them for maybe twenty-two hours a week.

MACGILLIVRAY: [Laughter] That I concur with. Well, maybe You know, there is somewhat of a requirement that there has to be so much educational material and information material placed on radio and television. I haven't necessarily seen it on television, other than PBS [Public Broadcasting System]. But on radio I hear advertisements about various aspects of living. But who listens to them?

VASQUEZ: Well, when they happen, public service announcements usually happen at 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning.

MACGILLIVRAY: [Laughter] Okay.

VASQUEZ: And the reason for that is because there is no profit in public service announcements. There is profit in selling air time

to the big oil corporations or to the big automobile manufacturers. But getting back to the question of enforcement, if the EPA isn't going to enforce standards on pollution, who is?

MACGILLIVRAY: Enforcement is only one segment of their responsibilities. Their responsibility is not solely enforcement, it's solution.

VASQUEZ: You're arguing that the attention was put on enforcement and not enough on solving the problem?

MACGILLIVRAY: That is correct.

VASQUEZ: So say they come up with solutions. How do you get the oil companies to comply, to put those solutions into effect?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, you know, the oil companies are not the bad guys in all respects. They're just as eager to come up with a solution. Because they know their longevity is in balance with demand. And they also recognize that their longevity is dependent upon whether or not their image is one of being a good American, to put it that way. And if we continually harrass them in such a manner that's

derogatory to their well-being, that's going to hurt them. So they're not out, no businessman is out for bad publicity.

If they can show that they are now starting to make a turnaround and improve their operations--it's not going to be done overnight, it's going to be taken, it'll take a period of time--but if they can show publicly that they are trying to conform and bring about a change, the people will go along with them. Because people know you can't make change just flip-flop; that's not the way of life.

VASQUEZ: One of the charges, or one of the criticisms that was made during several of your electoral campaigns, and one that Gary Hart was able to use effectively, was that you were too pro-oil. Why was that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Pro-oil? I'm pro-anything, in the main.

VASQUEZ: Pro-"the oil company," I guess is what I'm saying.

MACGILLIVRAY: All right. Well, let's face it. If we do not produce the oil in our country, we are subject to OPEC [Organization of Oil Export-

ing Countries], OPEC's control. That was quite vividly brought out in the seventies when we ran out of oil, or gasoline. We're going to have the same thing tomorrow. Because 50 percent of all of our gasoline is imported from the OPEC countries.

One of these days they're going to coagulate their game, and they're going to squeeze us--just like they did several years ago--and we're going to be wondering, "What has happened?" And we will not have the capabilities initially. It'll take us a period of time to regear and get everything working in concert to be productive to take care of the shortage of gasoline and fuel oils. That's going to happen.

VASQUEZ: Do you think the oil companies are good American citizens?

MACGILLIVRAY: I think so. Because in the majority, they're owned by the Americans.

VASQUEZ: Do you think they have the welfare of the American people in mind?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, from their product, they're doing what the Americans want.

VASQUEZ: Why is it that as soon as the OPEC boycott or the OPEC pressure on the United States ended as a result of a market glut and a whole series of other things, oil companies stopped developing alternative sources of fuel?

MACGILLIVRAY: Simply because our manufacturers are still manufacturing the type of engines that uses that particular type of fuel. If you will note, we in the state government today are trying to come up with new, clean fuel capabilities for automobiles.

VASQUEZ: And the biggest opponents are the automobile manufacturers. Why?

MACGILLIVRAY: It requires a tremendous change of direction. You know, it's awfully hard [Laughter] after you've been doing one thing for, say, pretty close to a hundred years to turn around and change your methods. If you historically go back to the steam [engine] car, I don't see why we're not back there now.

To me, that was a tremendous way of propulsion. It took very little to heat up the water, to bring it to steam. It took

fossil fuel, believe me. But it still was a clean operation. The same way with electric cars. I think we can develop electric cars in the very foreseeable future. But we're going to have to generate electricity. And we're going to have to get away from the idea and the ideology that atomic energy is bad.

You can go to most every other country in the world and you will find atomic plants right downtown producing electricity. But not in the United States. There are a few here, but not many. Our publicity has made it out to be very dangerous. But you go to Italy, you're lucky if you can have one light bulb on because they have no atomic energy plants there. So therefore, they have very little electricity, and no way of making it.

VASQUEZ: Let's change tracks here for a little while. And let's go back to the 1970s. What effect do you think that Watergate had on California Republican politics and public opinion?

MACGILLIVRAY: It was devastating, devastating.

VASQUEZ: Give me examples of how.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, right after the Watergate and when Nixon left office as president, [President Gerald R.] Gerry Ford pardoned him, and at that time, it was bad business for a Republican. He had very little to stand on. And your Republicans were somewhat ashamed of what had happened. It was just a Democrat heyday.

I know I chose not to run for another two-year term. Because I had served in every office that I had been elected to a two-year term. And it was a bad year for Republicans, other than [Robert] Bob Largomarsino. And I was not elected to public office, thanks to the people.

VASQUEZ: How did you try to counteract, as a Republican, the public opinion about Republicans and Watergate?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, I don't think I tried to broach that subject at all. I don't recall, but I figured performance was what the people were going to judge a person by.

VASQUEZ: Is that what happened in your 1974 race for the state senate?

MACGILLIVRAY: For me?

VASQUEZ: Yes, you were soundly defeated.

MACGILLIVRAY: I felt that what I had done was acceptable to most. But I had to work in the Ventura [County] area, where I was not very well-known because I was not on TV very much.

VASQUEZ: But Ventura's a notoriously, or popularly--or whatever term you want to use--conservative area.

MACGILLIVRAY: Not really.

VASQUEZ: Really?

MACGILLIVRAY: Not really. Because Largomarsino, I think, was the. . . . See, [Assemblyman Ken] McDonald was a Democrat, and he was a very good friend of mine.

VASQUEZ: Ken McDonald?

MACGILLIVRAY: Ken McDonald. And he was a businessman. He and I saw eye-to-eye on so many issues, and we were, again, close friends. He lived in Ojai. And Chuck Embrach ran from Ventura, and he was elected. He only served, I think, what, one term? He was defeated by a Democrat.

VASQUEZ: Why were you defeated by Omer [L.] Rains by

such a large margin?

MACGILLIVRAY: I think it's because of Watergate.

VASQUEZ: What were the issues, as you remember, in that campaign?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, I don't recall, really. I think the Watergate was so top-heavy there that that was what it was.

VASQUEZ: How much do you think it had, the Watergate and the fall after Watergate, had to do with the 1974 Fair Political Practices Act?

MACGILLIVRAY: What it had what?

VASQUEZ: How much do you think it had to do with Proposition 9, the Fair Political Practices Act of 1974?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, I really don't recall.

VASQUEZ: Why did people in the state feel it was necessary to constrain lobbyists' efforts and to force political candidates to reveal and to disclose where they were getting their funds?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, that was just another ploy by others. You know, people don't realize what a lobbyist's job is. Don't forget, if there is a lobbyist on one side of the picture,

there's a lobby on the other side of the picture, or the subject, whatever you want to call it. And a lobbyist is a person that will come to you and tell what they think the bill is all about. Then you will hear the opposition. Personally, I thought lobbyists were a necessary item. Because that way, you got a perspective from both sides as to what they thought the bill was all about. It gave you a chance to assess the bill much more comprehensively than you would otherwise just by reading it. Because you're getting two different interpretations then. And let's face it, everybody that goes to Sacramento. . . . If you went to Sacramento on an educational subject, you're a lobbyist. Not a paid one, but you're a lobbyist. So I don't see anything wrong with lobbying. I am concerned with the great amounts of money today that are given to candidates through political organizations such as lobbyists may be part of. But in the most, I think they do good. All you hear is the bad.

VASQUEZ: Let me ask you this, then. Do you think that

the reforms that came out of Prop. 9, out of the Fair Political Practices Act and the Fair Political Practices Commission, have done any good?

MACGILLIVRAY: I don't think so. I think it's seen by the amount of monies that are generated today much more so than ever before in the past. I know I just received a letter that--I'm on a board [Contractors State License Board] in the state--said over a period of a year, you have received fifty dollars in expenditures as far as buying your lunch or your dinner is concerned, you have to write their name down and the amount down. I wonder how many are really following through with that. I honestly can't tell you. Because I buy as many people dinners as they buy me dinners. Like I may take you out tonight and spend fifteen dollars for a dinner. For you. Fifteen dollars for me, fifteen dollars for your wife, fifteen for my wife. But if I did that twice, I'd have to write it down. And how many of us pay that much attention to that?

- VASQUEZ: Well, I think there perhaps is the notion that public servants and public officials have to account for the kinds of gratuities that might lead to the way they make decisions, being affected. Is that fair? Is that unfair?
- MACGILLIVRAY: Well, when I was. . . . Just as I left the legislature they put the deal through that if they spent over ten dollars, you'd have to write it down and say who it was and what it was for. It's nice if you want to keep books. But you mean to tell me that I'm going to sell my vote to you for ten dollars or twenty dollars? You know, I think . . .
- VASQUEZ: No, but you might for ten thousand [dollars].
- MACGILLIVRAY: Now, that's something else again.
- VASQUEZ: Well, at one point there's a threshold, isn't there? And it was lowered all the way to ten dollars.
- MACGILLIVRAY: You know . . .
- VASQUEZ: What is the threshold, then?
- MACGILLIVRAY: I don't know what the threshold would be. But I would assume that if you gave me a car that that would be out of reason, because

you're a lobbyist or an interested party in a particular piece of legislation and you give me a car or something like that. I was told when I first became a city official that if I took one dollar, or was given one dollar, to do a certain thing, that there was only one place I was going to go, and that was San Quentin.

VASQUEZ: Tell me that story about your brothers, your Masonic brothers.

MACGILLIVRAY: All right. Well, when I first went to the state legislature, they had a luncheon for me. Well, for all of us that were brand new.

VASQUEZ: For the Masons?

MACGILLIVRAY: The Masons, yes. And each one of them raised his plate, put his hand under the plate, then put it under the table. I looked under my plate to see what was there and there was nothing there. And they said, "We want to teach you a lesson. There is nothing under the plate." They also reiterated what I already knew, that if you take a dollar, and it's proven you have taken a dollar as a public servant, there's only one place you're

going, and that's San Quentin. And I think we all acted under that knowledge, that it was not the thing to do, to take a buck.

VASQUEZ: Today in Sacramento, and for the last year or so, there's been a very highly publicized federal investigation, called an FBI sting,¹ and you've got now at least one senator under indictment. Is there more corruption, more conflict of interest in Sacramento today than when you were in office?

MACGILLIVRAY: I did not know of any when I was there, and I don't know of it today, other than what I read. I don't take the newspapers because they're so biased. [Laughter] The only time I use newspaper is when I light a fire.

VASQUEZ: How do we insure honest public officials who make our laws and to stay honest?

MACGILLIVRAY: I think it's the way we're brought up originally, from the time we're a child till we reach our maturity. If we are accustomed

1. In 1988 the FBI launched an investigation into influence peddling by California state legislators which went on for over two years and resulted in at least one indictment.

to taking things, we're going to take things. If we're not accustomed to taking things, we're not going to take things. I think it's a matter of education. I don't know. I can't see people that are in public office setting themselves up to ridicule and to the possibility of being involved in unlawful activities. I cannot see why some people would want to do that. But I guess they do. None of my friends that I know of did.

VASQUEZ: Could it be that perhaps we're just more aware, more interested, there's more attention being paid to [cases of] conflict of interest than there used to be?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I would say that today, with the right-to-know attitude of our news media, that they're trying to be on top of everything, they're snooping, asking questions, and coming up with the information that's printed. And then people, everybody knows.

VASQUEZ: Is that wrong?

MACGILLIVRAY: No. I don't say it's wrong. I do think it's wrong if they're telling secrets that are of

national importance or state importance. But to reveal people that are disobeying the law that are in the public light, I don't think it's wrong.

VASQUEZ: In this last [presidential] election, early in the campaign, a Democratic candidate, Gary [W.] Hart--not your local Gary [K.] Hart, Gary W. Hart--his campaign was derailed because of newspaper reporting of a liaison, or what was an alleged liaison, with a young lady. Some people criticized the media calling that "keyhole journalism." And some people have argued that politicians are being expected to live up to standards that no one can really meet. What's your sense of that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, of course, I'm very old-fashioned on that. I figure that if you're married, you're married, and you're not supposed to be running around with other women. I don't see anything wrong in going out to dinner with another person on a friendly basis, but beyond that, no way. Of course, I'm a prude when it comes to that. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Well, do you agree with that characterization

of "keyhole journalism," or was that legitimate journalism?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, I thought that that was stooping pretty low. He must have crossed the journalist at some time or another and the guy. . . . You know, a politician's way of life is, "You never get mad, you get even." And I assume that the news media happens to be the same way. If you cross a newsman, he's out to get you.

VASQUEZ: You seem to cast the news media as the adversary of the politician in all that you've said.

MACGILLIVRAY: No, I don't think they're the adversary of the politician. I think originally they used to print news, now they're creating news. I recall once I was playing golf with a newsman who had a byline for one of the major newspapers. And we used to play golf at 6:00 in the morning.

VASQUEZ: Who was this? Would you care to give me his name?

MACGILLIVRAY: I won't give you his name, though. And the frustrations that he took out on that poor

golfball so early in the morning [because] when he read his column in the newspaper it was not as he had originally written it; it was how it was rewritten. I wonder how much of the news is fabricated rather than factual. Every once in a while you see in the newspaper a retraction or something. But it's not out on the front page, it's hidden in the back pages someplace. I am very much concerned about that, but there's not much I can do about it.

VASQUEZ: Let me ask you one more question. Some call reapportionment, or redistricting, the essence of politics. The Republican party here in California more than once has supported the notion of some kind of a blue-ribbon commission to do redistricting, to take it out of the hands of the legislature. What's your sense on that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, whether it's done by a blue-ribbon committee or commission I don't think is of major concern to me. I think it all can be done by computer, if you want my honest opinion. [Laughter]

- VASQUEZ: Like the Rose Institute [for Local and State Government] does at the Claremont Colleges, which has computer simulations?
- MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I am not aware of those. But I assume that they take the population make up and the terrain make up, etc., and put it into the computer and come out with districts.
- VASQUEZ: How would Republicans fare under such a method, do you think?
- MACGILLIVRAY: I don't think that's important.
- VASQUEZ: Really?
- MACGILLIVRAY: I think a district should be drawn so that the representative can rotate through the district with a degree of ease, rather than trying to figure, "Is that side of the street in my district, or is this side of the street my district?"
- VASQUEZ: But isn't the object of redistricting to make sure that for each party, to make sure that districts are drawn so that they're better represented, that is, that they have a better chance of getting the most people into office? Isn't that the objective?
- MACGILLIVRAY: Well . . .

VASQUEZ: The spoils system, if you will.

MACGILLIVRAY: [Laughter] Maybe I'm different in my attitudes towards that. I believe that your districts should be drawn in such a manner that partisan politics is not a part of it. I believe it's for the benefit of the people that it should be drawn. I remember when they were talking about drawing the lines for the Thirty-sixth [Assembly] District in those days, that they were going to bring a two-hundred-foot-wide strip of district from Bakersfield to encompass the University of California at Santa Barbara, [Laughter] to get those people out of my hair. And I said that was wrong. I thought that . . .

VASQUEZ: But that was your greatest nemesis.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, that would have been the greatest thing for me that could have happened. But it was wrong. Why should we do something like that to perpetuate one person in public office? I don't believe in that. I believe either you're good, or you're not very good, or maybe there's someone better. And let the best man win. That's in everything in life,

like an automobile race. The best car wins-- and the best driver. But not necessarily the best driver. If you've got a good machine you're going to win. And it's the same way in politics; if you've got a good group working with you . . .

[End Tape 4, Side B]

[Begin Tape 5, Side A]

VASQUEZ: So in politics, the best man always wins?

MACGILLIVRAY: No. The best man does not always win.

VASQUEZ: As a result of your experience in the California legislature, what did you come to learn about politics in the American political system that you may not have known before?

MACGILLIVRAY: When I went to the legislature, it became a partisan political force that we had to contend with. And it was a constant regrouping of the structure of your operations to assure your reelection. What worries more and more in politics is the fact that once we become an elected official, we feel that we should continue to be an elected official. And we're working as a politician all the

time rather than as a representative of the people. We're trying to perpetuate ourselves in office. We become very theatrical in much of our operations. And honestly, I don't like that.

I feel that when you are a representative of the people, you have a challenge to work on their behalf and do the best that you can to parrot their thinking as their representative in the body on which you sit. But when you become so highly political, you have lost your contact with the people. And that is worrisome to me because they're not out working amongst the people to find out what the thinking is.

Of course, you have your administrative assistants that are to help you with that particular issue. But that does not always work. They're more confined to the office trying to [Laughter] politicize everything that you're doing so that you can be reelected. Because it's a survival directive on the part of many of your staff. Because they know if you're out of a job, they're out

of a job. And they don't like that idea. So I don't know. I think our redistricting on a political basis is wrong.

I believe that either a commission of judges or just a good university computer operation, or anybody with a computer operation that can punch into the computer the facts of the area, or of the whole state, and come up with eighty districts for the assembly and forty for the senate is the answer to the subject matter.

VASQUEZ: Now, when you were defeated in 1974 and you left public office, what did you do politically? Did you get out of politics altogether?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, I went back temporarily into construction. While I was on [Committee on] Housing and Urban Development, I listened to the lament of so many people about the fact that there very few low-cost rentals. So I took it upon myself to organize a group of people. We raised funds and we built low-cost rentals. I built, oh, maybe, let's see, a hundred or so units, and found out that I

had erred in my direction, that . . .

VASQUEZ: In what way?

MACGILLIVRAY: The lack of respect for the property by the renters. It was so easy to break and ruin property. I finally gave that up as a bad deal. And then, of course, I built my home. Then the governor appointed me to the contractor's board in the state.

VASQUEZ: Which governor?

MACGILLIVRAY: [Governor George S.] Deukmejian.

VASQUEZ: I'm sorry, to the contractors . . . ?

MACGILLIVRAY: To the Contractors State License Board, CSLB, on which I still sit. Then when Reagan went back to Washington, he asked me if I wanted to go back, and I said no. And he said, "Well, we'll . . ."

VASQUEZ: When was this, in 1980?

MACGILLIVRAY: Right after he was elected.

VASQUEZ: Did you work on his '76 [presidential] campaign?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, yes.

VASQUEZ: what was your role?

MACGILLIVRAY: I've forgotten. Either I managed the area or was a . . . I've forgotten.

VASQUEZ: How about the 1980 [presidential] campaign?
Did you work on that campaign?

MACGILLIVRAY: I worked on all of his campaigns.

VASQUEZ: And you were saying, he asked you to go back to Washington. As what? Did he offer you an appointment?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, he didn't say anything in particular. I said there was nothing in Washington, D.C., that I wanted. Then he put me on the National Highway Traffic Safety [Board], and then I'd go all over the United States on various . . .

VASQUEZ: The safety board, right?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. And I was working on. . . . Just like in the state, I introduced a seat belt law that fell flat here. And I worked on the federal end of it to get safety belts mandatory, and wanted to improve our highways so they would become much safer.

VASQUEZ: Were you successful in that?

MACGILLIVRAY: To some extent. We laid a criteria and we talked to. . . . You learn through communications. We would talk to the various state people and come up with ideas that we

would pass on to the Congress and through the Department of Transportation, [Secretary Mary] Elizabeth Dole. And then, just prior to his leaving office, oh, a couple of years ago, he put me on the National Capitol Planning [Commission].

VASQUEZ: And what is your function there?

MACGILLIVRAY: We plan the growth factor for the needs of the District of Columbia and the abutting counties of Maryland and Virginia on how our increase in population is going to put a greater demand on the need for more housing and more office space for congressional [use]. We also handle all of the monuments and development of parks. It's a very fascinating, interesting job. I sit with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Interior, the head of General Services [United States Senator] John [H.] Glenn of the Senate, [Congressman Ronald V.] Ron Dellums of the Congress, [Washington, D.C.] Mayor [Marion] Barry, a couple of other appointees of the president, and myself. I'm the only one on the commission that lives

outside of the District [of Columbia] environs.

VASQUEZ: So you travel to Washington quite a bit?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, I go back the first week every month, and sometimes more, if necessary. It's fascinating because the background that I've had I'm now fully utilizing on the preparations for growth factors in the district.

Oh, it's been going on for years, since 1926, the commission has been involved in all of this. It's preparing for tomorrow. That is exciting, because I use California, like we're 27 million strong and we, in our projection for growth in this state, by the year 2020 we will have 40 million people. Well, 40 million people means 80 congressmen. And if we grow and we continue to be 10 percent of the population of the United States, look what we're going to have to do in the District, in Washington, D.C., as far as office space and housing for our elected officials. And that's what our job is to do, is to plan and to project what our require-

ments and needs will be.

VASQUEZ: Are you optimistic we'll be able to meet the challenge?

MACGILLIVRAY: May I say, I'm optimistic. But we're going to have to change some of our thinking in order to bring it about. We're going to have to figure out ways, better ways of people-movers, of getting you from A to B and back from B to A. I learned much of this when I was on the transportation commission, or committee, in the state legislature when BART [Bay Area Rapid Transit] was first developed. I worked with them. During our conversations and meetings with them we came up with many solutions that have not been put into play yet, and that's been quite a few years. I've been to Disney World in Orlando [Florida] to look at Epcot [Center], which, in my estimation, is one of the finest projections as to what cities will look like in the far, distant future.

We should utilize all of that fact finding and projections that have been put into existence today to form our opinions on

how we're going to achieve those goals. It's fascinating, it's fun. But to try and sell it, that is the next thing. Because it falls on deaf ears, mainly because it's costly. But it's cheaper to do it today than it is twenty years from now or fifteen years from now.

VASQUEZ: You have a hard time of convincing people of that, do you?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, definitely. Definitely.

VASQUEZ: Is it because we've become a nation with a crisis mentality; we don't take on problems till they are crises?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, [Laughter] I would say the simple deal is just like I said yesterday or the day before, of a person getting into his automobile to go to, say, Los Angeles, and he sees that he has a quarter of a tank of gasoline. And he'll say, "Well, when I get to Thousand Oaks, I'll fill up." Well, his mind is wandering when he gets to Thousand Oaks. And the next thing he knows is that he's stalled in the middle of the freeway. And people become very irate. In fact,

[Laughter] many will want to run over him.

Well, you have to realize that that's the fact of life. A good planner would fill his tank before he leaves, but the majority of people don't do it until it's either a very immediate necessity or else it's too late, they're stuck. That's the problems that we're seeing in our growth factor in the state of California. The growth factor is overrunning our ability to keep up with it. Simply because we're not planning for tomorrow.

VASQUEZ: Now, you've had an opportunity to serve at local government, state government, and now, at the federal level. Which has been more rewarding and more satisfying for you?

MACGILLIVRAY: Local government by far.

VASQUEZ: Why?

MACGILLIVRAY: Because you're working at home, you're working with the people. When you have perplexing problems, you can call in your fellow citizen and say, "Hey, here's the problem. What's the solution in your mind?" You can bring in several and get

their aspects of solutions and make a determination. There, it's a cooperative operation; you're not divorced from the people themselves.

But the minute you go to the state you're another step removed. And when you go back to the federal government you're practically completely removed. Except from, I would say, the lobbyists. How many people can go to Congress and see what's going on? Very few. How many people go to the state capitol? Not too many. You take your kids up there to show them what their capitol looks like. But in the cities you can walk into the city hall or you can walk into the county court house. And the county court house is farther removed than the city hall. But in the city hall the people have a chance to go in there and vent their problems. And you're working with the people that way. Whereas you go up the ladder, you're getting that much farther removed.

VASQUEZ: From the people?

MACGILLIVRAY: From the people.

VASQUEZ: Mr. MacGillivray, thank you very much for
this interview.

[Session 1, August 9, 1989]

[Begin Tape 1, Side A]

VASQUEZ: To start this oral history, could you tell me something about your family background?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I was born in Corona, California, on June 17, 1920. I'm a native Californian. I was born at my grandmother [Hattie Dunham]'s house, she was a practical nurse, and we lived there for a couple of years. Then we moved out to Norco, which is a little town outside of Corona. My dad had a little ranch out there for a few years, and then we moved up to the high desert, to Victorville, California.

VASQUEZ: What was your father's name?

MACGILLIVRAY: Bertrum Dunham.

VASQUEZ: And your mother?

MACGILLIVRAY: My mother was Eloise Archer Dunham.

VASQUEZ: Was she also a native Californian?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, they were born in New Jersey. She lived in Texas for a while when they were

married. But I don't think she was born there. I should look up the family tree and find out for sure.

VASQUEZ: When you were growing up, did you have much of a religious upbringing in your home?

MACGILLIVRAY: We went to Sunday school every Sunday and we attended the Methodist church in Victorville. It was a small town. There were only 5,000 people, so most everybody was friends, and the kids all went to Sunday school together and [to public] school together. We played together and we fought together.

VASQUEZ: What did your father do?

MACGILLIVRAY: My father was a chemist. He graduated from Stanford, and the reason we went to Victorville was that he got a job as the chief chemist in the Victor Cement Plant. My mother was an English teacher before they were married, and she taught at the old UCLA campus on Vermont Avenue, which was the state normal school at that time.

VASQUEZ: Would she commute all the way to Los Angeles, or is this when you moved to Los Angeles?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, we didn't move to Los Angeles. This was

before they were married.

VASQUEZ: She didn't teach again after she was married?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, no she didn't.

VASQUEZ: Were you a good student?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, I was a good student, I was an "A" student.

VASQUEZ: What were your favorite topics?

MACGILLIVRAY: I liked math, I liked science, and I liked English. I liked most subjects. The only thing I didn't like was chemistry!

VASQUEZ: Did that have anything to do with your father's work?

MACGILLIVRAY: I don't think so. It was just chemistry. It was the same thing when I went to college. Chemistry was very difficult for me, and my dad knew it so well that it was very difficult for him to explain it to us. So I had a tough time with chemistry. It was strange to go into medicine after that. But I didn't have any trouble with any of the other subjects.

VASQUEZ: Were you involved much in social activities apart from academics or student government?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. I was a class officer almost every

year. Ours was a four-year high school at that time and it was a small high school.

VASQUEZ: What was the name of the high school you graduated from?

MACGILLIVRAY: Victor Valley High School. I was in all sports; tennis champion of the school, one of the diving champions of the school, girls basketball, girls volleyball, you name it, I was in it. And I was into school plays and in the glee club and we had a trio that sang.

VASQUEZ: You were pretty active!

MACGILLIVRAY: I was very active!

VASQUEZ: You were valedictorian of your graduating class?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes.

VASQUEZ: Who in your childhood do you remember had the greatest impact on you in terms of your social or political ideas? Did you have much political discussion at home?

MACGILLIVRAY: We didn't. I was not involved in politics really, per se, during high school at all, or even college, actually. We didn't discuss a lot of politics. It was during the Depression, and my folks were strong

Republicans. So they were really not too happy with some of the programs of [President Franklin D.] Roosevelt. In fact, they really didn't think much of Roosevelt. As far as myself getting involved, I don't think kids in small towns or large towns were quite as politically active in those days.

VASQUEZ: It sounds like you had a pretty idyllic childhood.

MACGILLIVRAY: I really had a great time.

VASQUEZ: Did the Depression affect your family much?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, we were very fortunate. It affected us like it did everybody, but we didn't have the problem with breadlines and things because my dad was a salaried man, and even though his salary was cut, at least we knew he was employed.

VASQUEZ: How many were there in your family?

MACGILLIVRAY: There are three children. My sister is two years older than I am. Her name is Rosalis [Dunham] and she's an artist. And my brother Harold [Dunham] lives here in Santa Barbara. In fact, he was in the construction business with [W.] Don [MacGillivray] for

awhile.

VASQUEZ: Then you went to nursing school, is that correct?

MACGILLIVRAY: I came up here to go to college, Santa Barbara State College. It was a teachers college at that time. I was going to be a physical education teacher. Four of us, best friends, came up here from Victorville to go to college, and we all lived together. We were all going to be teachers, and most of them did.

VASQUEZ: How did you end up in nursing school?

MACGILLIVRAY: I don't know. I just did one year as a physical education teacher and decided I wanted to go into nursing. I don't remember anybody influencing me that way at all, and I don't remember meeting any of the gals from the nursing college. I just decided I would, so I applied and had the support of my folks. Of course, you had to pay for your nursing education. So I went to college one more year, and then I entered Knapp College of Nursing down by Cottage Hospital.

VASQUEZ: How did you meet your husband?

MACGILLIVRAY: I was already in training. He had waited two years to come up from Los Angeles for his brother [Alexander J. MacGillivray] to finish high school. He worked one year to help his mother [Maud Davies MacGillivray]. Then another year. So that by the time he was up here I had already entered nurses' training. One of my best friends met his brother and they started going together. She thought I should meet Don and make it a foursome, so she introduced me to Don one night over spaghetti dinner. We met and we started going together. We had a stormy courtship! We argued all the time! But we didn't argue after we got married.

VASQUEZ: When did you get married?

MACGILLIVRAY: He had already gone in the service and we had been engaged for a year. We were engaged in 1942. We were married July 4, 1943. I had to finish training, so he came out from where he was stationed in Atlanta, Georgia. He flew out and just about didn't make the wedding.

VASQUEZ: Is that right?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. In wartime, unless you had a priority, you couldn't fly on airlines. He kept getting bumped by people with a higher priority. They didn't feel getting married was a high priority, so he finally got a ride, and he kept calling and saying, "Well, I'll be there, but I'll be late!" He got stranded someplace in Texas and he had his own parachute with him.

VASQUEZ: So was he going to drop into the wedding?
[Laughter]

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, right! [Laughter] That's the way he could get a flight. He got a transport flight out because he had his own parachute. So he got a military flight out and kept calling and saying, "I'll be late, I'll be late." The rehearsal, of course, was on Saturday evening. That was the time when, if you had your blood [test], you could get your license in one day. But you both had to be there to pick up the license.

Well, he didn't come and he didn't come, and my dad and I went down to the city clerk in Los Angeles because we were going to be

married in Los Angeles. There was a nice little lady there, and she said, "You look like you're pretty honest, but, you know, you can never trust these sailors 'cause they always stand up their gals!" But she said, "I'll tell you what I'll do. I'll take the license home with me." She was really nice. "And if he gets here by 5:00, I'll consider that it's for real, and you can both come over and sign it."

Well, of course, at 5:00 he called me that he was in Los Alamitos or Long Beach or someplace, and he had to get clear up to L.A.. I had to call her, and she said, "Well, don't break your necks, don't get killed in an automobile accident or something. I'll wait for you." So it was about 6:00 before we got the license and had the rehearsal that night.

VASQUEZ: So it was a real ordeal to get married?

MACGILLIVRAY: So it was a real chore! But I think that was the way with wartime marriages. They weren't planned, they were . . .

VASQUEZ: They weren't anticipated . . .

MACGILLIVRAY: For sure!

VASQUEZ: Did you continue in nursing after you got married?

MACGILLIVRAY: I didn't during the war, no, not when I was with Don.

VASQUEZ: You went back east where he was stationed in Georgia and then in Florida as a trainer.

MACGILLIVRAY: Right. Our daughter was born in Georgia when we were there. Her name is Sandra Dee [MacGillivray-McGraw].

VASQUEZ: And your son [Jock MacGillivray] was born here in Santa Barbara. What happened after the war? Did you come back to Santa Barbara?

MACGILLIVRAY: We came back to Santa Barbara. Don had actually thought he might stay in the navy, in the flying end of it. We came back on leave and we were driving through Gila Bend, Arizona. We stopped there, and we were in a restaurant. I think the name was the Tank & Tummy House. Anyway, it was one of these big buildings built with railroad ties, and on the walls was a big bridge beam. It was a real rustic place. Don took one look at that and he said, "I'm going to get out of the

zavy and I'm going to go home and I'm going to build a railroad-tie house." So I said, "Okay."

VASQUEZ: It sounded good to you?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. I didn't care, whatever he said. So we came back to Santa Barbara. At that time, I think [he was stationed] in Banana River, Florida. I don't know where he was discharged. Then we came out [to Santa Barbara] and looked around for property and found this lot up on the Mesa and started to build a railroad-tie house.

VASQUEZ: How did you buy a piece of property just coming out of the service? Had you saved that much money?

MACGILLIVRAY: He got flight pay, and so we had saved it. Actually, we were probably very lucky. We had saved a couple of thousand dollars or something, so we bought this lot for eleven hundred dollars on the mesa. I think the fellow [who sold it] about two weeks before had paid five hundred [dollars] for it. But that's the way things were going then, too.

He [Don] had all this training in sheet

metal and building, so he just made connections and talked to a fellow and said he wanted to build a railroad-tie house. He told him where he could go down to the foreman of the railroad yard of the Southern Pacific [Railroad]. We made a contact there and he said, "Well I [have] got some railroad ties but they're down in Chatsworth. If you can get them up here you can have them for \$35.00 dollars or something like that." So that was the basis for our first house. We worked on it together, just like we have all of them.

VASQUEZ: You helped build it?

MACGILLIVRAY: I helped build it. I pounded those nails. We built the garage first, and we had a lot of fun in that because we had no indoor plumbing. We had a little potty for our Sandy, who was a baby. You couldn't do it today because of health codes. You know, people wanted to help out in those days, but you couldn't do it now. There weren't a lot of neighbors in the area, so it wasn't anything that lasted for a while. We built

the foundation of the house, put the plumbing in first, and covered it over with these little newspaper mats. So we at least had plumbing facilities.

VASQUEZ: And you were involved in the actual building?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh yes, I held up the railroad ties. The railroad ties were the foundation, plus they were also the studs of the house. So I'd be there holding up the railroad ties, and he'd be pounding the spikes in and, yes, I became a pretty good carpenter. I could have been a contractor, I guess, by the time I finished learning all the ins and outs of the construction business.

VASQUEZ: Did working side by side on a physical project like that produce a greater equality in your relationship?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I think so. We just didn't know any different, I guess. If we wanted to do something, we both pitched in and did it, and it's been that way all along.

VASQUEZ: Even when he was in politics?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes.

VASQUEZ: We'll get to that in a little bit. So then

did he go right into building homes and contracting? How did he make a living?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well let's see. We were building our house. He was going back to school to finish college. He wanted to be a teacher and he was taking business law. I don't know what all he was taking. So I went back to work at the hospital half a day, and he would watch the baby while I was working. In the evenings we would build and he would go to school.

VASQUEZ: Did he work at anything?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, he first started the ice cream business.

VASQUEZ: His own business?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, his own business. He got a little pick-up, and he had this big box, a frozen box on the outside, and he would just drive it around with this little bell like the Good Humor Man. All of the kids would rush out and buy ice cream, and he did real well. Honestly, even in those days, twenty dollars a day was a good profit. We made a lot of profit. And he liked ice cream. That's why he went into the business. But, oh gosh, I

got so sick of ice cream!

And then he did so well he got a little motor scooter and he put a cold box on the outside of that, and he hired a young man who needed work. He drove one [vehicle] and Don drove the other and they covered more area. From there he got a bus, an old bus, and he put shelves in it, and he had fruits and vegetables and some canned goods and ice cream--a moving grocery store. He drove all around, mainly on the Mesa, because there weren't any markets up there.

At that time, the Mesa was considered not the best place of town because it was undeveloped. There were old oil fields up there. There was still some and farming and stuff. So he just went from house to house and sold all these things, and everybody loved it, and we ate very well! We ate all the leftovers. And then, in the meantime, we were building, too.

VASQUEZ: Your house.

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes.

VASQUEZ: That became the foundation of a business,

then? Tell me about that.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, from then he got his contractor's license, and he started building small things for people. And it became a very good business. I did all the bookkeeping. If he made a bid, I would check it over and be sure nothing had been forgotten. We worked together on that too, as we worked together on everything. Then our son was born. I didn't work anymore.

VASQUEZ: You didn't work anymore?

MACGILLIVRAY: At the hospital.

VASQUEZ: You were telling me you kept up your nursing license?

MACGILLIVRAY: I kept up my nursing license because I was proud of it and I didn't want to let it go. In fact, that was my one big lobbying job in Sacramento, because I didn't want to see gals who were not working lose their license. Every other profession one could go into had what they would call an "inactive license." If you were a contractor and wanted to go out of business, you could keep your license, but it would become inactive. But a nurse lost

her license. So I did a little lobbying on some of Don's friends in the legislature when we were up there so that now I have my inactive license. And if I want to reactivate it, I just have to go through a recertification, a refresher course.

VASQUEZ: Did your nursing ever come in handy?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. I worked a little while after that. Then when Don was ill, when he had his aneurysm, I took one of the nurses' shifts at night and took care of him. Then, of course, I took care of him after he came out. I had to drive him for quite a while.

VASQUEZ: How long ago was this?

MACGILLIVRAY: Let's see, he was thirty-five at the time, so that would have been in the mid-fifties. The children were small. It was really traumatic on them. You never realize until later how much things like this affect children.

I remember Don's mother was very good. She came up and stayed with the kids and helped us out a lot. One of the main reasons that he wanted me to keep my license was that his mother was widowed when [he and his

brother] were only thirteen and eleven, and she had no profession at all to fall back on. So that was difficult.

VASQUEZ: So he supported you in keeping your license?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes.

VASQUEZ: How long were you in the construction business before you got involved in politics?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, he was in the construction business until he was elected mayor in 1963. When he was on the council, that was not a full-time job, that was a one-day job. At that time, it was a ward system. Everybody knew him in his ward because that was where he had his ice cream and his food business. He knew everybody, and he said, "I'm going to run for council." I think he spent five dollars or something like that for running for council.

VASQUEZ: Were you supportive of his going on the city council?

MACGILLIVRAY: Sure.

VASQUEZ: What did you see in it?

MACGILLIVRAY: I don't know. I just figured if Don wanted to do it, that was fine, you know. I didn't even know what politics were, and I would not

want to be a politician. I don't see how in the world they can sit through all those dull meetings.

VASQUEZ: But being a politician's wife, that you could contenance?

MACGILLIVRAY: I could go along with it, but like I say, as long as he was doing it, that was fine!

VASQUEZ: Did you see any benefit that accrued to you as a result of his being on the city council? Either to the family or to the business?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I don't think that there were any benefits to the family. We had a lot of fun experiences, probably experiences that we wouldn't have had in any other area. I think this is very true of politics. You get to meet people that you wouldn't meet any other way: you do have experiences that you wouldn't have in any other way. I think the advantage would be that you meet more people and make more contacts, but I think people in service clubs probably have that same advantage.

VASQUEZ: How about your kids? Did they like it?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, at that time they were too young. I mean, we were doing PTA and we were [involved in] things like that.

VASQUEZ: Did being a city councilman's wife in the city of Santa Barbara open doors to you at all?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, no.

VASQUEZ: It was no big thing?

MACGILLIVRAY: No big thing. We were so young I guess it didn't matter. He was only twenty-eight years old when he was first elected, and at that time we were too interested in earning a living and raising the children. Like I say, I was involved in PTA all the time and supporting them and taking them to their games. We were always [among] the parents that took them wherever. Most other mothers and fathers didn't, but we did.

VASQUEZ: Tell me what you remember that you liked about being the mayor's wife?

MACGILLIVRAY: Don probably has told you that being the mayor of a city like Santa Barbara was one of our best experiences in life.

VASQUEZ: Why?

MACGILLIVRAY: I don't know. We had such a good time. There again, you meet so many different people. And as the head of the city, of course, everybody came to him. If you had dignitaries that would come into town, we had a lot of opportunity to meet them. [Alan] Shepard came in after he was the first astronaut, and we had a big dinner for him. We were able to get involved in things like that. So that was one of the advantages. One of the disadvantages was that it took a lot of time from our family. But we were again very lucky because Sandy had graduated from high school, so she was away at college. Jock was still in high school and, in retrospect, I think probably that it took some time from him that would have been better spent with him.

VASQUEZ: Why do you say that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I don't care if a child is sixteen, seventeen, or eighteen, I think they still need family, and we were out so much. Many evenings he would say, "Oh, not steak again?" Because I was always trying to get

something easy for him to fix for his dinner, and I think maybe that might have made him more independent, maybe a little sooner than he should have. I don't know.

VASQUEZ: Does he have any regrets that you know of?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, I don't think so. We laugh about it now.

VASQUEZ: Were you a close family?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, I think we were. Don is not a real demonstrative father, but he has the values that they can look up to. And those values have never changed. They were values that they could recognize and depend upon.

VASQUEZ: What was your role in the campaigns when Mr. MacGillivray ran for mayor? Did you participate at all?

MACGILLIVRAY: I walked precincts with him just like he did, and knocked on doors. In fact, we even had the kids doing that! Well, Jock, because Sandy was away at [college], but Jock did some of that, too.

VASQUEZ: Did you have any extended family here in Santa Barbara?

MACGILLIVRAY: We had cousins here.

VASQUEZ: Did they get involved?

MACGILLIVRAY: No.

VASQUEZ: Just the nuclear family?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, because my brother went back to school at [University of California] Berkeley and then came back [after he] graduated.

VASQUEZ: What is your brother's name?

MACGILLIVRAY: Harold [Dunham]. He went to school there and then came back down here and stayed with us for a while. In fact, they had their first baby in this railroad tie house. They were staying with us at the time.

VASQUEZ: Is that house still standing?

MACGILLIVRAY: That house? That house will always stand! The rest of Santa Barbara could blow away and it'll still be there!

VASQUEZ: So when your husband came to you and said, "I've been asked by the governor and others to run for the state legislature," what was your impression? Were you excited?

MACGILLIVRAY: Actually, yes. It was the next step. It was time, because the city government had changed from a strong-mayor system that he [Don] liked and [where he] could accomplish things, into a city-manager-type system. He was very

frustrated.

VASQUEZ: You sensed that he was frustrated?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, because after you've been the administrative head as well as titular head of a city, and then you have the administration part of it taken away from you, which was really his forte . . . He liked to accomplish things and he saw things to accomplish.

VASQUEZ: Was he a good administrator?

MACGILLIVRAY: He was an excellent administrator. One example: the city streets, you know now how they come and throw a little stuff on and they patch them. Well, he had a plan. He went to the street department, the [Southern California] Edison Company, the gas company, the water company, and he said, "Okay, these streets are going to be done. You do your work first. Plan it so that all this work that you're going to do underneath the street is done first. Then we are going to come in to pave it." So that they didn't pave a street and then immediately start tearing it up for lines.

Very simple things, but he had the foresight, and he still has, to see this and to direct it as the administrator. Of course he had that power, and so he did accomplish a lot for the city of Santa Barbara. I don't think there's an election that goes by that somebody doesn't say "Oh gosh, I wish you could run again, Don!"

VASQUEZ: Is that right? Still to this day?

MACGILLIVRAY: Really, really.

VASQUEZ: Did your income and your business suffer as a result of his being mayor?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, our business suffered greatly, because of course, as administrator, he hired and fired people in the Building Department. He could not continue as a general contractor. It would have been a conflict of interest. We had built some rentals in the meantime which was the way we were able to afford politics.

VASQUEZ: Afford politics, is that the way you saw it?

MACGILLIVRAY: That's the reality of it, because they paid the mayor only \$700 a month. And even though you were a guest a lot of times for dinner, that didn't pay the water or electricity

bill, and the children's dental bills and things like that.

VASQUEZ: Did you feel that it was worth it while you were going through that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh sure, sure.

VASQUEZ: So here he was now thinking of running for the state legislature. What was your reaction?

MACGILLIVRAY: It was good timing. The children were both graduated [from high school] and both away at school [college]. Our daughter was married, she was married when Don was mayor. So it was a good time for us. It was lucky for me because I could go with him.

VASQUEZ: Did you look forward to it?

MACGILLIVRAY: Sure. It was a whole new experience.

VASQUEZ: What was your role in his first campaign in 1968?

VASQUEZ: Well, I ran the office and I walked and walked and walked. We had to cover the whole area, and we drove and drove and drove, because at that time the [Thirty-sixth Assembly District] included part of San Luis Obispo County and all of Santa Barbara

County.

VASQUEZ: What made you think that he could defeat [Assemblyman] Winfield [A.] Shoemaker?

MACGILLIVRAY: I don't know. They just thought Don had very good coverage as mayor all over the area, and Republicans at that time needed support for Governor [Ronald W.] Reagan.

VASQUEZ: When you say "they," whom are you talking about?

MACGILLIVRAY: The state central committee of the Republican party, which is where most [candidacies] start.

VASQUEZ: Did they help you with fund-raising or funds for the campaign?

VASQUEZ: They helped, they sent down advisers for the campaign, what do you call them, political consultants.

VASQUEZ: Spencer-Roberts was involved in this campaign?

MACGILLIVRAY: Spencer-Roberts did most of the advertising work.

VASQUEZ: Do you remember more or less how much that campaign cost?

MACGILLIVRAY: I am thinking. The first one was, like,

\$60,000. I don't remember, I know it's in the records. But I do know that the main thing Don said was, "If you want me to run, I will run, but I am not going to put in my money." And he didn't. He said, "If it's worth the party's time to help me run, fine, but I'm not going to go into debt. I'm not going to run a campaign that's in debt." So if they didn't give him the [financial] support, he [wouldn't] spend [his own money].

VASQUEZ: Is that the way it turned out?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes.

VASQUEZ: The party picked up the tab?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, they did. It just cost us our time.

VASQUEZ: What were the issues that your side raised in this campaign?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I think the main issue was the gun law.

VASQUEZ: Assemblyman Shoemaker was a rather liberal Democrat who had taken a strong position on gun control, and you think that was the main issue?

MACGILLIVRAY: I think that was the main issue of that particular campaign.

VASQUEZ: Did you have the feeling that Governor

Reagan's popularity and the already perceptible conservative wave in California politics would help your husband's campaign?

MACGILLIVRAY: I don't remember thinking that, but I'm sure that's what happened. Politics is 99 percent timing.

VASQUEZ: Is that right?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, not 99 percent. If you don't have a good candidate, 99 percent timing doesn't help you. But there's a lot of timing in politics. You can have the best man in the world, and if the issues aren't right and if the timing isn't right, you can lose a good man very easily.

VASQUEZ: But the vote [can be] won at the right time?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. And this was apparently the right time for him.

VASQUEZ: How does that jibe with being a leader, one who teaches or shows voters the way? Is there a contradiction between going into politics because you have an idea or a program and are going to lead the people to these ideas? Or is that naive, and is success based on a perception of what it is

people are ready to hear?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, of course I never thought of Don as a "politician." I think your latter statement, of saying what people want to hear, is what I consider a politician.

VASQUEZ: What was Mr. MacGillivray?

MACGILLIVRAY: Don was the first type. He was a leader who had ideas of what could be done and thought that this was the best way he could do it. This is the same way Reagan is. He had a dream of what he wanted to do. And he wanted to do it for the state, and Don wanted to support him in that way. When you get into government, from local government to national government, you don't have the same control because you are just one in a big group then. You're not one strong person like you are in city government.

VASQUEZ: How much of the decision to run was based on your support of Governor Reagan and of his programs, and how much was based on what you thought you could accomplish?

MACGILLIVRAY: You'd have to ask Don that. I think he definitely felt that this was the time to

move on to some program that would be bigger. He might be able to do more. He skipped county government and went straight to the state level.

VASQUEZ: Now, here you were an assemblyman's wife. First of all, let's take his political life. Were you an adviser to him?

MACGILLIVRAY: No.

VASQUEZ: Not even an informal adviser?

MACGILLIVRAY: Do you mean on issues and things that he'd be voting on?

VASQUEZ: Yes. Did he talk to you about your points of view? Did he elicit your point of view on things?

MACGILLIVRAY: I think probably only on issues that affected our district.

VASQUEZ: Did you try to keep up on the district?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, yes. Because when you have a two-year term and you're home every weekend; that's your life, and what affects the district is what you're interested in doing. Because they are the ones who elected you to do the job for them.

VASQUEZ: Did you live here in Santa Barbara? Or did

you commute?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, we rented our home and took an apartment. We rented an apartment here and rented an apartment in Sacramento. Then we drove down every weekend until he finally said, "Oh, this is too much." You know how the [Central] Valley is for fog. There were many, many times when we didn't know where we going because it was so foggy. So we got a plane and started flying back and forth and saved a lot of time.

VASQUEZ: What was your responsibility in terms of the district? Were there a number of clubs that you visited? Were there a number of people you had to keep in touch with? How did you divide up the work?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, of course, we have a lot of Republican women's clubs here, and as a legislator's wife you are asked to give talks to them, which I did when we were home. When we came home for the weekend, it was a matter of invitations to speak here and there and attend this and attend that. So we tried to cover the district. Whenever they had a

parade, we always had to ride in the parade. Whenever they had a festival, we always had to be at the festival, and that's how you kept in touch with your constituents. It's just politics.

VASQUEZ: Now, you were a member of a group called the PALS Club. Tell about the PALS Club.

MACGILLIVRAY: The PALS Club was really great for me, because when I went up there I knew Norma Largomarsino. [Robert] Bob Largomarsino was senator. I didn't really know anybody else, but they had the PALS Club. The letters [acronym] stand for Protective Association for Legislative Spouses. And it was formed long, long ago when the sessions were just part-time.

VASQUEZ: In 1919, I believe. Then the initials stood for Protective Association of Lonesome Souls.

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, Lonesome Souls, okay. That's what it was because they really were [lonely]. There was no permanency about it for [wives] like it was for us. Lots of the legislature brought their family. If they had children in school, they brought them up. So [in

those days] they were lonesome souls. But it's a common bond that we all had, and we had the same problems. Every political wife has the same problems, whether she's a Democrat or a Republican.

VASQUEZ: What are the problems?

[End Tape 1, Side A]

[Begin Tape 1, Side B]

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, politicians are a funny breed. When we first went up there, we got a kind of [orientation]. They took all the new gals and they . . .

VASQUEZ: Who's "they"?

MACGILLIVRAY: Let's see, who does this? I don't remember who did it. But all I know is that we went to these sessions and we had different people talk to us. We had a woman talk to us about etiquette and about how to get in and out of cars gracefully. I guess she thought we all came from the sticks or something. Not everybody who goes up there has had a political background, so this is great.

We also had doctors talk to us. They said, "Well, now, you know most politicians are

right on the border of being schizophrenic!
So either they are way up or they are way
down. Your job as a legislative spouse is to
bring them up if they're down, if they have
bad days and their bills haven't been going
right. If they get so that they think they
are pretty good, then it's your job to bring
them down to [earth] again.

VASQUEZ: So you were the "equalizers."

MACGILLIVRAY: The "equalizers," right! We didn't discuss
politics in the PALS Club. We really didn't
do any charitable work per se, because
everybody has their own charity, and you had
to stay away from that.

VASQUEZ: Why did you consciously not discuss politics?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, you had Democrats and Republicans'
wives in there, and it was just one of the
unwritten rules that it would tear the
organization apart if you made it political.

VASQUEZ: So the common bond was the social role you
were playing. Did friendship have anything
to do with it?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes.

VASQUEZ: How much?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, I think a lot of it.

VASQUEZ: I ask you that because, on the other side of the sexual barrier, for the men who were doing the legislating, many times it was friendship and not party labels or ideologies that made them capable of bonding. Was this the same case with you?

MACGILLIVRAY: No. There were Democratic wives that I became as close to as Republican wives. Probably not as many, and surely not the wives of ultra-liberals, because we just didn't think along the same lines. You don't build a bond when you don't have a common interest. But we also made very good friends with some of the wives of the lobbyists. At the time when we went up there, you could socialize with lobbyists and it wasn't a dirty word. It hadn't the stigma on it that it seems to have now, which is too bad.

VASQUEZ: This was before the Fair Political Practices Commission and the Fair Political Practices Act.

MACGILLIVRAY: And I never knew anybody who took disadvantage of it. I'm sure that some of

them did. We just didn't happen to know the ones who did.

VASQUEZ: When you were undergoing the orientation you spoke about earlier, were you warned about approaches from lobbyists?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, I don't remember them having anything like that for the wives. I'm sure the men did.

VASQUEZ: But you were never warned about that, approaches from a lobbyist or their wives? That they might really be trying to get at your husband or influence how he voted?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, I don't remember any of that.

VASQUEZ: Did you have any negative experiences with lobbyists or their wives?

MACGILLIVRAY: No.

VASQUEZ: Did you ever find incidents where wives knew what their husbands thought or planned to vote on, and these contacts might be a way of exchanging information [with lobbyists] without committing their husbands to anything?

MACGILLIVRAY: No. I know what you're saying, but the PALS Club was only for legislative wives. The

PALS and Gals clubs were for legislative wives and lobbyist wives [respectively]. We did have meetings together, but again, it was common knowledge that you really didn't discuss politics. It made for a much better organization for the women.

VASQUEZ: What were the stated goals of the organization, apart from supporting your husbands. Were there any projects that you undertook, any programs?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, because, like I say, you couldn't support one charity when everybody else has separate charities that they wanted to support. We went out to visit the nuclear plants. We didn't do all frivolous things, but we did have fun. We had a golf tournament every year, and that's where I started playing golf.

VASQUEZ: This was the only sport you hadn't played up to that point?

MACGILLIVRAY: That's just about right! That and skiing. When we were kids, we couldn't afford to ski. Yes, we started playing golf, and we enjoyed that a lot.

VASQUEZ: What was the benefit of the PALS to you as an individual?

MACGILLIVRAY: To get acquainted with other people. You all have a common bond to begin with, but actually it's a temporary thing. The whole thing is temporary, and so you have to have a nucleus of somebody to get acquainted with, and this PALS Club was that nucleus. It was great because you made friends when you were there. [Otherwise] during the week you were gone, and during the weekend you didn't have time to make a lot of friends in the area.

VASQUEZ: I suppose you still are in PALS? Once a PAL always a PAL.

MACGILLIVRAY: Right.

VASQUEZ: When you were active and your husband was in the legislature, who provided leadership within PALS?

MACGILLIVRAY: You mean, as far as the presidents and the officers? I think it probably was the senate wives who were usually the presidents.

VASQUEZ: Why? Because their husbands had longer terms?

MACGILLIVRAY: That's right.

VASQUEZ: Or [because the senate carries] more prestige?

MACGILLIVRAY: Probably a little of both.

VASQUEZ: Did they [senators' wives] act as if they had more prestige?

MACGILLIVRAY: I'm sure some did, sure.

VASQUEZ: Did the men have a tendency to be more snobbish?

MACGILLIVRAY: You're a senator or you're an assemblyman, that's the way it goes. But you are going to find that in every group there are some who think they are better than the rest. But I didn't see any real division as far as that was concerned.

VASQUEZ: Was there a parallel between the leadership positions that husbands held and those their wives held in PALS?

MACGILLIVRAY: No.

VASQUEZ: Women were pretty much elected on their own merit? So you didn't have the speaker's wife automatically being an officer?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, absolutely not. In fact, if I remember [correctly], while I was there I don't think any of the speakers' wives were officers. It

didn't automatically go with the territory.

VASQUEZ: What benefits did you get out of your association with PALS? I know that while your husband was in the legislature, it was a supportive network while you were staying in Sacramento. But when you look at the whole picture, what did you get out of it?

MACGILLIVRAY: Just PALS, or the whole experience?

VASQUEZ: No, just PALS.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, actually we made some friends that we have kept up with ever since.

VASQUEZ: That you would not have had otherwise?

MACGILLIVRAY: That's right. There would have been no reason or no way to meet those people otherwise. We really made some very good friends.

VASQUEZ: When you were in PALS and when your husband was in the legislature, were you close to the Reagans? To Ronald and Nancy?

MACGILLIVRAY: You mean socially?

VASQUEZ: Politically.

MACGILLIVRAY: Politically we were and the Reagans are not Let's see how can I put it. Governor Reagan really did not attend, like when you

are mayor, three or four dinners a night. I suppose he had the same number of invitations, I'm sure he did. But the Reagans have a life-style where they just don't do that. Even when he was president, they were home many evenings. This was just their life-style. And this was I'm sure . . .

VASQUEZ: A great deal more privacy than you would normally expect for a govenor to have?

MACGILLIVRAY: That's right. Every two years they had a party for all the legislators and all the legislator's wives at their home. Beautiful entertainment and a beautiful dinner. Usually it was the barbeque from Nipomo. They'd bring up [Robert] Bob Herdman. They were good friends of the governor, so he did that as a favor to them [the Reagans].

Nancy Reagan always attended. She didn't play golf, but she always came to the [golf tournament] luncheons afterward. She was always most gracious wherever she went. We were there just a few times for private dinners, at which they would have a group of legislators and their wives, a small group

for dinner. That was pretty much their social events. I flew down with her to Lompoc when they had some of the [Vietnam] prisoners of war that came back. I was invited to fly down on the same small plane that she came down on because this was the area Don represented.

VASQUEZ: Over the years did you become friends? You were pretty active in the Reagan White House, especially the Western White House.

MACGILLIVRAY: Actually, over the years we've become much closer.

VASQUEZ: It comes from politics rather than the personal?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. Don and I were chairmen for his [Reagan's] first campaign in Santa Barbara County when he first ran for governor.

VASQUEZ: Mr. MacGillivray mentioned that you, he, and another couple took on the responsibility for chairing that campaign here in Santa Barbara. But he couldn't remember that other couple, do you remember?

MACGILLIVRAY: Don and I were chairmen and there were three gals that were co-chairmen.

VASQUEZ: Do you remember who they were?

MACGILLIVRAY: The first one was Emily Wullbrandt. [The others were] Connie Huston and Marian Koonce. They were all very active in the Republican party. Don and I were chairmen and they were co-chairmen. Eldon Haskell was the treasurer, and, of course, Holmes Tuttle was always behind him. But this was more on a state level. I think he was the state treasurer or something. He was a fund-raiser for him [Reagan]. But Eldon was the one for Santa Barbara County.

Then in '76 of course, he lost, and in '80 we were still actively involved on this. Gee, I don't know which one of the gals was his co-chairmen. Then we were active, of course, in '84 in the campaign.

VASQUEZ: Before I go on, let me ask you this question. Were you ever involved as an elected official in the Republican party?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, no. Even at the time when Don was an elected officer I didn't even belong to a Republican women's club. There again, I just didn't feel like it was right for me to

belong to one club over another. We just were kind of unofficial members, I guess you could say, of all of them.

VASQUEZ: Unlike your husband, you've always been a Republican?

MACGILLIVRAY: I have.

VASQUEZ: Why?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I guess it's just because I believe the Republican philosophy of free enterprise. If you want it, you go out and work for it and get it. I don't believe in a welfare system. I just don't think that that makes a good person out of you. If you hand everybody [something], it's just like rich parents giving everything to their kids. They are not doing them a favor. I believe in helping people help themselves. But if you help them by giving them everything, you're not helping them.

VASQUEZ: Do you think it's the role of government to help people help themselves?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes.

VASQUEZ: Is it the role of government to help people, period?

MACGILLIVRAY: To help people help themselves, not to just dole out a bunch of money which never goes to the right place, anyway, not in half of these programs.

VASQUEZ: How do Republicans differ from Democrats in your mind?

MACGILLIVRAY: As far as I know of the Democratic philosophy you have got conservative and liberal Democrats. You have got conservative and liberal Republicans. So you can't brush it all with the same brush. But the Democratic philosophy probably does tend to go along more with government supporting people. They would pay for it rather than private enterprise doing it. I've seen too much of it where government programs just dole a lot of money to an organization and the administrators end up taking most of it. It really doesn't get down to the people that need it.

VASQUEZ: How do you feel about the recent exposures of what was going on in HUD [Department of Housing and Urban Development] during the Reagan administration, where large amounts of money were being taken by people who were

administering those programs--Republicans
many of them?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, I think it's wrong. When you dangle that much money in front of anybody, I don't care whether they are Democratic or Republican, independent or Peace and Freedom or what, personal greed is going to take over. I've never been in that position, but I would assume that if one had that much opportunity, it's going to take a strong person not to succumb to it.

VASQUEZ: Let's go back to the assembly. The first time out, Mr. MacGillivray won by 13,000 votes. The second time he ran he squeezed by with 1,500 votes. Why was that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I think part of it was that the people here didn't think he did enough on the oil issue. But the oil issue was very, very, very touchy here in Santa Barbara for a long time. There was a big element that just jumped in with both feet and made more of a political issue out of it than it probably was.

VASQUEZ: Why? Because the administration in

Washington was Republican and they weren't responding?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes.

VASQUEZ: As I read the record, Mr. MacGillivray tried both through legislative means and through other contacts with the federal government to get the Secretary of the Interior [Walter J. Hickel], and in fact, President Nixon himself to do something to stop drilling. He was very critical of the commission appointed by the president.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I think that was one issue on which he couldn't convince a certain element of the city he was trying to help. The other [issue] at the time was the eighteen-year-old vote. And that had a lot to do with it, I'm sure.

VASQUEZ: Why?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, because of the University [of California, Santa Barbara] area. [His] was not a popular stand at the university, by any means.

VASQUEZ: What was that?

MACGILLIVRAY: To be against the eighteen-year-old vote.

VASQUEZ: And he was against it?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes.

VASQUEZ: Do you know why?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, from what he said, he didn't believe that they actually had maybe the maturity to vote at eighteen. College kids are very easily influenced. But not only that. They should not vote in an area where they were not earning a living. They should vote in their home district. Santa Barbara kids should have been able to vote here. They would have an interest in what happened in Santa Barbara. But if you have 13,000 students that are going to be there for only four years, they don't care what happens after they leave. That's a dangerous situation.

VASQUEZ: Then in 1969 and in 1970, when there were demonstrations or riots on the Isla Vista campus, Mr. MacGillivray took some pretty strong positions against that sort of thing. Do you think that also hurt him?

MACGILLIVRAY: Probably.

VASQUEZ: By the time he ran for his third term, he won

by only 616 votes. And the next time, when he ran for senator, he lost. How did you feel about that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Naturally, it was a disappointment. You don't like to lose a campaign.

VASQUEZ: Why did he run for the senate?

MACGILLIVRAY: Because when he was mayor, it was a two-year job. When he was an assemblyman, it was a two-year job. When you run every two years, you are running all of the two years. He was just tired of it. He said, "If I can't run for a four-year job, I don't want to run anymore."

VASQUEZ: Did you encourage him?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, but it's hard. I mean, you give up a lot of your personal life for political life. Even in city government. And there again, I believe it was the best thing that ever happened that he lost. I think physically it added many years to his life.

VASQUEZ: What did you all do after he lost the race for state senator?

MACGILLIVRAY: Breathed a sigh of relief. After the initial disappointment. Don and I both believe that

whatever happens happens for the best. We were able to come back to Santa Barbara, which we wanted to do. We were able to stay here full time, get back to some of the friendships that we had had to put on hold all these years, and start rebuilding.

We had bought this property where we are now in 1960 and had not been able to do anything with it. When he was mayor, it was out of the city limits. When he was in Sacramento, we couldn't do anything. He wanted to build an adobe home, so we started on the adobe home.

VASQUEZ: Quite an impressive adobe home, I must say.

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I look back and I wonder how in the world did we ever do it?

VASQUEZ: Again, you were involved in building it physically?

MACGILLIVRAY: Physically, making these dumb bricks. Yes, every day we made two hundred bricks. We had two Mexican fellows that were dishwashers down at the the Talk o' the Town [Restaurant] at night. They came up here and helped us during the day. Some friends came up and

helped. They did the most hard physical labor. Don did most of it, and they helped us make all the bricks. Then we started putting them up brick by brick.

VASQUEZ: So when did you get back into politics?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, well then, let's see, that was '75 when we started this, and of course, [in] '76 we were back in when President Reagan first ran.

VASQUEZ: What was your role?

MACGILLIVRAY: That was when Don and I were county campaign chairmen.

VASQUEZ: Here in Santa Barbara?

MACGILLIVRAY: Then, of course he lost. Don was retired by then, or did he go back in the building business? No. At that time, our son-in-law worked with Don.

VASQUEZ: What was your son-in-law's name?

MACGILLIVRAY: Ex-son-in-law, Tim McGraw. They were in business together. We formed a kind of limited partnership, and they built some apartments, quite a few apartments in Santa Paula. We had some as rentals, because when you are in politics you really do not make money.

VASQUEZ: At least if you're honest.

MACGILLIVRAY: In honest politics you cannot make money.

VASQUEZ: Were you involved much in Republican party politics in the '76 and '80 presidential campaigns?

MACGILLIVRAY: No, not too much, because we were so busy building here.

VASQUEZ: Did you stay in touch with the Reagans?

MACGILLIVRAY: No. We kind of lost touch during those years. Then, in 1980, he came and asked if we'd help again, and we said, "Absolutely."

VASQUEZ: So you headed the [presidential] campaign here in Santa Barbara?

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes. And when he was elected it was a big thrill for all of us. We went back to the inauguration. We just believed so strongly in him, it was a real thrill. We just enjoyed it. Just before the inauguration they brought the staff out here for the transition. When he was inaugurated, they started what they called a [Western White House] staff office. There were people who were Republican campaign workers who would go in two or three hours in the afternoon as

volunteers.

VASQUEZ: Did you do this?

MACGILLIVRAY: I did. And there were a lot of others that did. Then there were some mix-ups in the office. You know, you have to be discreet, and some of them weren't discreet, and some of them didn't work out.

Finally, it ended up that they hired one of the local fellows as the kind of a liaison, and then another woman and myself were the only volunteers that they had at what they called the Western White House. It used to be at the Sheraton Hotel at first, and then it got so that the senior staff decided that they wanted to go to the Biltmore Hotel instead of the Sheraton Hotel. The Secret Service always stayed up at the hotel near the ranch. But they [the Biltmore] had all the drivers, they had all the news media, all the traveling news media stayed there, the press corps. So we had an office there for a long time.

VASQUEZ: Were you on salary by then?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, no. I was never on salary. It was all

volunteer work.

VASQUEZ: How about during the second administration?

MACGILLIVRAY: Same thing.

VASQUEZ: Volunteer?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, yes.

VASQUEZ: In the second administration, you took a more directive role in the Western White House, didn't you?

MACGILLIVRAY: Actually, by the second administration, we had moved pretty much moved the staff offices over to the Biltmore Hotel. And the paid employee had only been there for the first year.

VASQUEZ: Who was this?

MACGILLIVRAY: It was a fellow named John Koonce.

VASQUEZ: What was your responsibility in the second administration?

MACGILLIVRAY: Then it was pretty much my duty, a week or ten days before hand, to get all the rooms for the staff when they were coming out and order the furniture. We rented the furniture and ordered all the supplies. We kept all the supplies that we needed for the offices in boxes here in town between visits, because

it was too much trouble to ship them all back [to Washington]. He [President Reagan] was here so much. We rented equipment like copy machines and all that at first. Then it got so they brought their own IBM machines and their own computers.

VASQUEZ: And during all this time, [were your efforts] on a volunteer basis?

MACGILLIVRAY: All volunteer. You had to be there at eight in the morning because that was already eleven back east. Then maybe sometimes you left by six, if we were lucky, or maybe sometimes eight in the evening. Long days.

VASQUEZ: What was your husband's role in the [Reagan] administration?

MACGILLIVRAY: Don was what we called the gofer! No he called himself the gofer.

VASQUEZ: There are switched roles here!

MACGILLIVRAY: Yes, there was a little switch in roles, but he was very supportive. As I said, we always worked together, but he was very supportive. He would do a lot of the driving. If they had an event and they needed drivers, he always was one of those,

and he brought donuts down to the White House staff office every single morning. And boy, if he missed, he heard about it! And he was always bringing local fruits and things.

VASQUEZ: Which did you enjoy most? Being the wife of an assemblyman or being [assigned] to the Western White House?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, they are such two absolutely different roles that I don't think I could say.

VASQUEZ: Which was more fulfilling to you as a person?

MACGILLIVRAY: I think the White House job was much more fulfilling.

VASQUEZ: Were you sorry that it ended?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I was sorry in a way, because, there again, we had pretty much given up eight years of planning. I mean, everything was planned around the visits to the ranch when he [Reagan] came out. Like in February and Easter and the Fourth of July sometimes, usually holidays, you gave up a lot of your holidays, and then again almost three weeks in August, September, and then always Thanksgiving.

VASQUEZ: Was it worth it?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh sure, sure. We made such good friends, and we had some experiences that we wouldn't have had in any other way. I mean, we were asked to ride on Air Force One. That was a way of saying, "Thank you." Don's commission appointment from the President . . .

VASQUEZ: Commissioner for what?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, first he was appointed to the National Highway Safety Commission and then, after his four-year term there, he was appointed to the National Capitol Planning Commission, on which he is still serving.

VASQUEZ: Do you go back to Washington very often with him?

MACGILLIVRAY: Not too much anymore. I've kept kind of a scrapbook record and photograph album of those years. I've just finished putting them together, and we did have some good visits back there. We were invited once to a White House state dinner, which happened to be on my birthday, and it was so fun. As we went through the receiving line, they [the Reagans] both wished me a happy birthday. I said to Mrs. Reagan, "It's got to be the best

birthday present I've ever had." She said, "Oh well, I just thought I'd invite a few people in to help share your birthday!" She was so cute.

So that was a real thrill, because I got to sit at the table right next to the president, and Don got to sit at the table right next to Nancy Reagan. So we felt like we were real honored.

VASQUEZ: I notice from all the mementos in your home that you really appreciated all those things.

VASQUEZ: We appreciated, and they did too. They really did. We've gotten some really nice notes from them and I know that they appreciated all the hours that we spent. I don't think even the president would realize how much time people give to him. How could he? Because he had many other important things to worry about. But they do it. Everybody does it because they love him so much.

VASQUEZ: What did you learn about politics in all these years?

MACGILLIVRAY: I can always remember the very first time

that Don was elected mayor, because the city council years were just another job that he had. Jack Ricard was mayor, and his wife [Marian Ricard] called me up that night after he had won and she said, "Dee, you're going to have a ball." She said, "You're going to meet some of the nicest people and you're going to meet some of the biggest bums!"

VASQUEZ: Is that what happened?

MACGILLIVRAY: I think it's true! You know, if you go into politics, even as a wife, thinking that you are hot stuff and everybody thinks you're pretty great, you might as well forget it. Once you are out of office, you know, forget about it. They say, "Don who?" Not all, but it's true. Who can remember? I can't even remember half the people who were in the legislature at the same time unless I look back at the little handbook.

VASQUEZ: What's the downside of all those years in politics?

MACGILLIVRAY: The downside? I would say giving up a lot of your personal life. But then, this is really your personal life, probably your family

life. And like I say, we were very fortunate because our children were at an age where they weren't home any more. But I would imagine that if you had smaller children it would be very difficult, because it is a demanding thing. If you're not at their events, "Why weren't you," and if you are there, "How come you're not working in Sacramento?" That type of a thing. You can't win either way.

VASQUEZ: One legislator's wife whom I interviewed came to the conclusion that in politics you shouldn't get too close to the people, you shouldn't open up your lives too much, you should have a modicum of personal and private life. Do you agree with that?

MACGILLIVRAY: Oh, I think so. I think you can work both of them in.

VASQUEZ: If you were asked to give advice to a young wife of a legislator who was about to take office, what would it be?

MACGILLIVRAY: Well, I would say, go with him if he's going to an office out of your city. Take your family and go with him. Too many young

secretaries around! I would say, be as supportive as you can of him, really. But definitely be with him and be behind him. Because it's a tough job. You just can't please everybody. Be sure that he keeps true to his own principles.

VASQUEZ: Thank you very much for this interview.