

California State Archives
State Government Oral History Program

Oral History Interview

with

DAVID DONALD MULFORD

California State Assemblyman, 1957-1970

April 11, 1988, June 26 and 28, 1989
Oakland and Walnut Creek, California

By Timothy P. Fong and
Ann Lage
Regional Oral History Office
University of California, Berkeley

RESTRICTIONS ON THIS INTERVIEW

None.

LITERARY RIGHTS AND QUOTATIONS

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 Regional Oral History Office, University of California at Berkeley.

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

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

or

Regional Oral History Office
486 Library
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

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

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

David Donald Mulford, Oral History Interview, Conducted 1988 and 1989 by Timothy P. Fong and Ann Lage, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, for the California State Archives State Government Oral History Program.

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 issues of the state of California. They include members of the legislative and executive branches of 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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTERVIEW HISTORY i

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY iii

SESSION 1, April 11, 1988

[Tape 1, Side A] 1

Background in Oakland, California, military service, education, music, insurance business--Leading bond campaign for Oakland schools--Special election to the assembly, December 1957--Starting out in the assembly, addressing issues of compromise and integrity--Republican party politics: Senator Knowland, Governor Knight, and the right-to-work issue.

[Tape 1, Side B] 12

Republican legislators vs. party leaders--Evolution to a full-time legislature, Unruh's contribution--Chair of Republican party caucus, 1963-1970--Unruh's lock-up of Republican legislators, July 1963.

SESSION 2, June 26, 1989

[Tape 2, Side A] 21

The assembly in 1958--Governor Goodwin Knight--Mentors, Joseph Knowland, Ruth Watson, Luther Lincoln, Donald Doyle--Speakers Lincoln and Ralph Brown--Discipline, merit, honor, and dignity in the legislature--More on Unruh's lock-up of Republican legislators, an impetus for Republican unity--Job as caucus chair.

[Tape 2, Side B] 33

Choosing party legislative leadership--Caucus role in avoiding Republican party conflicts--Bringing political reality to volunteer party organizations--Campaign costs and purchasing influence--California Republican party convention, 1964--

Handling ideological differences within the party--Byron Rumford--The caucus position on the fair housing issue--Mulford's upbringing in East Oakland.

[Tape 3, Side A] 46

Governor Brown, Sr., and the legislature--Recalling Reagan's early campaign for governor--Receiving a historic desk from Reagan--Reagan and the legislature, a learning process--Reagan disarms an angry Unruh--Monagan as speaker--Representing the University of California in the legislature--Working with Senator Miller and university lobbyist Corley to pass the university's budget--University President Clark Kerr's approach.

[Tape 3, Side B] 58

More university issues, and the importance of a nonpartisan approach--Reaction to disruptions on university campuses, 1964-1969--University students and faculty and Mulford's defeat.

SESSION 3, June 28, 1989

[Tape 4, Side A] 68

Marriage Counseling Act--Environmental concerns: air pollution, Lake Tahoe, open space in Berkeley hills--Maintaining ties with constituency--Full-time legislature, 1966--Funding Bay Area Rapid Transit--Reapportionment--Job training for minorities--Relations with the media--Changes in election campaigning.

[Tape 4, Side B] 81

Unsuccessful campaign against Ken Meade, 1970, and Fortney Stark's "rotten politics"--Proper salaries for legislators--Entertaining foreign dignitaries as California's chief of protocol--Assessing Governor Deukmejian--International Host Committee--California Medical Assistance Commission.

[Tape 5, Side A] 94

Negotiating and reviewing Medi-Cal contracts with hospitals--Problems of limited resources for health care.

INTERVIEW HISTORY

Interviewer/Editor

Timothy P. Fong

Assistant Editor, University of California at Berkeley State Archives
 State Government Oral History Program
 Media Project Director/Producer, California Tomorrow
 News/Public Affairs Coordinator, KNBR Radio
 M.A., California State University, Hayward (Public Administration)
 B.A., California State University, Hayward (Human Development)

Ann Lage

Principal Editor, University of California at Berkeley State Archives
 State Government Oral History Program
 Principal Editor, assistant office head, Regional Oral History Office, 1994-present.
 Interviewer/Editor, Regional Oral History Office, in the fields of natural
 resources and the environment, university history, California political history, 1976-
 present
 Chairman, Sierra Club History Committee, 1978-1986; oral history coordinator, 1974-
 present; Chairman, Sierra Club Library Committee, 1993-present
 Postgraduate studies, University of California, Berkeley, American history and
 education
 B.A., and M.A., in History, University of California, Berkeley

Interview Time and Place

April 11, 1988

Session of one hour

June 26, 1989

Session of two hours

June 28, 1989

Session of one and one half hours

Sessions took place in Mr. Mulford's offices in the Montclair district of Oakland and in Walnut Creek.

Editing

Ann Lage checked the verbatim manuscript of the interview against original tape recordings; edited for punctuation, paragraphing, and spelling; verified proper names and prepared footnotes.

The editor sent the transcript to Mr. Mulford in October 1989, and encouraging reminders from 1990-1995, but he had not edited the interview before his death on March 20, 2000.

The interviewer/editor prepared the introductory materials.

Papers

Mr. Mulford's papers are deposited at the California State Archives and at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University.

Tapes and Interview Records

The original tape recordings of the interviews are in The Bancroft Library, University of California at Berkeley. Records relating to the interview are at the Regional Oral History Office. Master tapes are deposited in the California State Archives.

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY

David Donald Mulford was born in Oakland, California, where he graduated from Roosevelt High School. He received his B.A. in 1939 from the University of California, Berkeley, and served as an army lieutenant in the European and Pacific theaters during World War II.

After the war, Mr. Mulford produced shows and booked bands in San Francisco and worked in the family insurance business. He was first elected to the California State Assembly in 1957 where he served as Republican caucus chairman and as a member of the Ways and Means Committee. He left the assembly in 1970 and became the protocol officer for the city of Oakland and the state of California. He was also a member of the California Medical Assistance Commission and continued as a partner in his insurance firm.

Don Mulford was married to Virginia Mulford for fifty-seven years and they had two sons and two daughters. Mr. Mulford died in March 2000 at age eighty-four.

[Session 1, April 11, 1988]

[Begin Tape 1, Side A]

FONG: Could you give me your name?

MULFORD: My name is David Donald Mulford.

FONG: And your current occupation?

MULFORD: Well, I would presume that I am retired, but I am chief of protocol of the state of California, appointed by Governor [George] Deukmejian. I serve on the California Medical Assistance Commission. I am an insurance broker, although not particularly active these days. I am chairman of the board of the International Hosts Committee of California, a nonprofit corporation.

FONG: And you were a member of the California State Assembly from 1957?

MULFORD: To 1970. Nineteen fifty-seven to 1970.

FONG: And before then, had you held public office?

MULFORD: No.

FONG: Could you tell me a little bit about your background, where you were born?

MULFORD: I was born in Oakland, California, went to the Oakland public schools and the University of California at Berkeley. I received my commission as a second lieutenant in the infantry in the army. When I graduated, I immediately went on active duty, and then came back in 1940, theoretically to be on active duty for one year, but the war was on and I got home six years later.

FONG: So you served in Europe?

MULFORD: I served all over the world. I was in the European-Middle East theater, the Asiatic Pacific theater, the American theater.

FONG: Now, you said you went to UC Berkeley. What was your degree there?

MULFORD: A.B. I majored in political science.

FONG: After you got out of the military, what were you doing then?

MULFORD: Well, I wanted to be an attorney. I entered the first post-World War II class at Hastings [College of the Law] and finished a year. I think it was a year. But I was married during the war, children were coming along, and you couldn't give them [the family] away. So I ran out of money, and I had to withdraw from Hastings and go to work.

FONG: Did you work in the insurance business?

MULFORD: No. From there, I went to work for the Music Corporation of America [MCA] in Beverly Hills. I was head of the band and act department. We booked bands. I produced shows; we did quite a bit with name bands and with name attractions. I was responsible for the talent. I had a staff of about twenty-five people. My territory was from Vancouver [Canada] to Mexico.

After a couple of years with MCA, an interesting situation occurred. Television was discovered. Overnight almost, the name band business was history, and the name attractions in hotels pretty rapidly went out of business. The television business began to boom, and I remember the basic, elementary shows at the beginning on black and white film, and that's where the talent then began to emerge. Rather primitive type of entertainment, compared to what we see now.

FONG: And then after that?

MULFORD: Well, after that, I left Beverly Hills and came home. My parents were not well, and I took over the family insurance business, and I was in that business for some time.

FONG: You were a musician, if I recall.

MULFORD: Yes. I worked my way through the University of California with my band. I had to work to get through school. I played trombone. So I started an orchestra in my freshman year, and by my last year at the university, I had several bands going.

FONG: Was it difficult for you to leave the music industry?

MULFORD: No, because it was not meant to be the ultimate goal in my life. It was a means to an end, as I indicated. I really had dreams of becoming an attorney. And it's interesting that I have four attorneys in my family. My two sons are attorneys and my two sons-in-law are attorneys.

FONG: How long were you practicing insurance before you became a member of the assembly?

MULFORD: Well, I was elected to the legislature in December 1957. I was in the insurance business during most of the time that I was in the legislature, where I served between 1957 and 1970.

FONG: How did you become involved in politics?

MULFORD: That's rather interesting. I had not been [involved in politics]. In fact, I wasn't even sure if I was a Republican or Democrat. I had been involved in the war for six years following college. The assemblyman from what was then the Sixteenth Assembly District--the numbers have changed due to reapportionment --but the assemblyman was Justice [Thomas W.] Tom Caldecott, a native of Alameda County. His father was a well-known political person, had been chairman of the board of supervisors in Alameda County, and [his father] was a druggist in Berkeley with an excellent reputation, very well known and a good political name. Tom Caldecott and I served in the same regiment, the Thirtieth Regiment of the Third Division for a while, and then I went in a different direction, and he went in a different direction. He had the rougher time of the two of us; he was in Normandy on D-Day.

Anyway, he was elected to the assembly, and Governor [Goodwin J.] Goodie Knight appointed him to the bench. He made him a judge, and that left a vacancy in the district which included one-half of Berkeley, including the University of California, about one-third of Oakland, and all of Piedmont. That was before it was reapportioned.

Prior to that occurrence, my very young children were walking several blocks to attend the Chabot School, and they were attending school in portable classrooms that leaked, badly in need of roofs and repairing. Well, I was a

member of the Dads' Club and my wife was president of the Parent-Teachers Association, so we were interested in improving the school conditions. It was obvious that the Oakland school system needed some money. They needed some bonds. Well, the bonds had been defeated a couple of times, and the last time we had all worked. . . . The young parents, and all of us were veterans, of course, veteran families. We were anxious to have these things corrected. We were told at our Dads' Club, PTA meetings, that "we don't know what's going to happen now." The Board of Education was wringing its hands and, all in all, in my opinion, there was a lack of aggressive action by the political leadership in the city concerning these bonds.

We felt that it could and must be done. So as a result of that meeting I attended--I used to have red hair, and an aggressive action that went with it--I sounded off at a meeting, and the next thing I knew, I was elected the chairman of the bond campaign for the Chabot School area. Then we went to a city-wide meeting, and I sounded off again. I just felt that those of us who had come home from the war deserved better than we were getting in our schools. I frankly was very unhappy about leaky roofs in these portables, and we should organize and get on with this bond issue.

Well, the first thing I knew, I was the city-wide bond chairman. I went to the publisher of the *Tribune*, who was then Joseph [R.] Knowland; he exercised a lot of influence and had an excellent reputation for leadership in this city with his *Tribune* newspaper. I talked with a wonderful man by the name of Charles Howard, who was politically very important here. He was the head of the Republican Finance Committee. He was a source of money.

After these meetings, Mr. Knowland and Mr. Howard said, "You go out and organize the city and don't worry about the money. We'll get the money for the campaign." In those days, it was less sophisticated than now. We didn't even have polls or anything like that. We put up some cardboard signs and we had some ads in the newspapers, but we spent an awful lot of time ringing doorbells and walking the streets. The city was much different then, much more

conservative and, I would say, much older than it is now. There were a lot of grandparents in these houses.

We won. We won the campaign. Barely--it was a difficult fight. We barely won, but we were all elated over that. So the bonds were passed, and the school system then went on to do some rebuilding and repairing.

Well, just about that time, Tom Caldecott was appointed to the bench, and the Republican party came to me and asked, in view of my leadership in connection with this bond campaign, would I consider running for the legislature? I suppose I should have given it more thought, because the salary was a huge \$500 a month.

FONG: It wasn't a full-time job at that time?

MULFORD: No. We were up there six months one year, and the other time we went up for thirty days for the budget session. We were paid five cents a mile of transportation to Sacramento one way, and to come back once we were given another five cents per mile. Compare that to the money that these people receive now, and it's a striking difference.

Anyway, I thought it would be a good idea, the more I thought about it. I wasn't thinking straight at the time, I think, because financially it was a disaster. Almost all the legislators who were then serving were having financial problems. But we did, and we were elected, again a close vote, in December of 1957.

FONG: Let me get a bit of the background before we go much further. Now the bond issue that you were talking about, what year was that?

MULFORD: I think that was 1957, earlier in the year. I don't remember the exact date.

FONG: And that bond issue was basically to get more money for the Oakland public schools?

MULFORD: It was exactly for that reason, to do some construction and reconstruction work.

FONG: Now the person who had mentioned it before, Charles Howard. He was with the Republican Party Finance Committee?

MULFORD: He was the chairman of the Republican Finance Committee in Alameda County.

FONG: Was he a public official?

MULFORD: Well, he was, I would say, a volunteer. He never ran for office, but he was a most distinguished individual. He was very wealthy. He was head of the Howard Terminals that the estuary used to serve the ships coming in, even, I think, back in the days when the sailing ships came in, the fishing fleet that used to go to Alaska. He, with his family, provided a real service. And it was, I think, recognized as a very successful business.

FONG: And getting on, you said that the Republican party asked you to run for office, and you said you didn't give it much thought. But what were some of the things? What were some expectations? What were the thoughts that were going on in your mind as far as public service or what you wanted to do for the community of Oakland?

MULFORD: I think I was motivated by a sincere desire to improve the situation. I had been unhappy about the political leadership that I observed in connection with the bond issues. If we were able to win, why couldn't the other people win? What was wrong with this situation? So I guess I was impatient, like a lot of young people, to improve the situation, particularly with a young family. And it was not a full-time position at all. I felt that we could do it; we could serve within the time frame that we saw. That subsequently when we got up there and we became deeply involved in so many measures, deeply involved, it was sort of. . . . In Washington, it's called "Potomac Fever." They get back there in the Congress and they forget a lot of things, and they become deeply involved and dedicated to the political problems, and it's easy to get trapped into that situation.

FONG: So let's talk about your campaign for assembly. You said it was not as sophisticated as it is today. Did you have a particular strategy, or how did you . . .

MULFORD: No, I didn't worry much about the campaign. I was told by a delightful lady, Ruth Watson, who was chairman of the Republican Women in Alameda County, to walk the streets. Being a novice, I should walk the streets, shake hands with everybody, ring as many doorbells, go to as many coffee hours, go appear in

front of as many organizations that sent invitations that they would generate. The Republican party in the county hired a professional campaign manager, and he has gone from there to make quite a name for himself. His name is [William] Bill Roberts, and Bill Roberts is nationally known as a very capable campaign strategist.

He moved into our headquarters, which was in a vacant store in Berkeley. He moved in there and lived there during the whole campaign. I must say we worked very hard, and the wonderful people who were my supporters worked equally hard. We had a wonderful organization. We worked from day till late at night.

FONG: How long was the actual campaign? Several months?

MULFORD: Oh, no. I would guess a couple of months, maximum. It's sometime back; I don't quite remember. But it wasn't too long.

FONG: Who was your competition at that time?

MULFORD: A judge, Winton McKibben.

FONG: What party?

MULFORD: Well, he was a Democrat, of course.

FONG: I just wondered if there was a primary.

MULFORD: He was a Democrat, of course. There was no primary; it was a special election. Judge McKibben was the nominee of the Democratic party. And he conducted a very decent, hard-fought campaign. I have great respect for Judge McKibben. It was a narrow victory. It was very close. I think the margin was 177 votes out of 23,000 votes cast, as I recall. The record can give you that. But he then went on into the judiciary, and had--and has--enjoyed a very distinguished career as a judge.

FONG: What were some of the issues of your campaign? How did you distinguish yourself from him?

MULFORD: I haven't the slightest idea, when I think back. I think it was more of a popularity contest. We shook hands, and I remember a number of people--Democrats--would ask me if I was the same Don Mulford who had a band at the

Athens Club and on campus, and at the Claremont Hotel, and at Hoberg's Resort and the various resorts. And we played Sweet's Ballroom, where all the name bands played. We played all those places. I think we were among the leaders, if not the leading band in that particular time. And I know that that got me a lot of votes.

We weren't debating too much on issues, as I recall. It was more of a popularity contest. But going in new, I was a novice. I hadn't the slightest idea what many of the issues were about, as I recall, if they raised them. And it would be ridiculous to expect me to. I could give you a few thousand words about World War II, but [Laughter] not on issues.

FONG: The image that I have, and correct me if I'm wrong, is sort of like a "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington" when you talk about a novice coming in, not knowing the system or the structure or the process, which I would like to get into a little later. Did you have this idea of, "Hey, I'm going to come in and make a few changes here"?

MULFORD: No, not at all. I had no preconceived notion of what I was going to accomplish, except to represent my constituents. I felt very dedicated to the hard-working people who worked for me, and very grateful to them. And I was determined to do that. I also had an equally serious determination about integrity in office. I'm rather proud of the fact that after all those years with so many problems that have occurred with other people, we haven't had any public outcry about any of my activities, and I think that is something of which I should be proud.

FONG: So let's talk about your first time in office, going up there. The image that I have now, and I tend to think I'm fairly knowledgeable about the legislature now, a lot of the politicking going on, compromises, wheeling and dealing.

MULFORD: Well, there's a difference between compromising and wheeling and dealing. Compromise is part of the political structure. One legislator will have this position; another one will have that position. If you're going to achieve the passage of a bill, it's the art of compromise, they call it. You have to get together and change a word here and change a word there in order to obtain the

votes that you need. Now that's different from people who have paid a lot of money to help elect somebody coming in and using influence and pressure and saying, "We contributed so much money to your campaign; we expect you to give us a vote."

I had one lobbyist early on, and the lobbyists do a good job, incidentally. Without the lobbyists, I think our legislators would be seriously uninformed. But I had a lobbyist come in and see me who had contributed some small sum to my committee. I didn't know about it; I had nothing to do with the money, didn't want anything to do with the money. And I certainly didn't take any money personally. I felt that was a good way to get into trouble.

But he had made a contribution for this organization, and he threatened me. He told me that if I didn't give him a vote, he'd see to it that I wouldn't come back. Well, I threw him out of the office. Before I got through with him, I had him fired. I went to the other legislators; I was very serious about that. Making a threat to a legislator in my opinion is a pretty low situation. He lost his job.

So I think my reputation was established early on to not fool around with this redhead, because he's going to call it as he sees it, which is what I did. I've never been known to be particularly tactful. If I believe in something, you'll know my position, and that's it.

FONG: So when did this particular incident happen? The first year, or the first term in office? Do you recall?

MULFORD: Yes. Let's see; I was elected at a special session in December, and my first legislative session was in 1958. That was the budget session; I think we were there for thirty days.

FONG: When you mention about you're a person who says what you mean, means what you say, was there any particular difficulty in sort of the political process of compromising? Because, for example, there are positions that are very different from yours, more, I assume, on some of the bigger issues, that you had to work around. Is there any tension in yourself?

MULFORD: No. I don't recall any particular pressure. If I agreed with the issue, I'd vote for it. If I didn't, I wouldn't. Many time, I was the only "no" vote. That's something I think we have to live with as an individual. If you can't think and act that way, you shouldn't be up there. I think we should not, and I certainly did not, lose sight of the fact that a lot of people voted for you to represent them. You were, in fact, their eyes and ears politically, as those issues came. And you made your decision based on your judgment, or sometimes lack of judgment. We certainly made mistakes on occasions. But that's why we were there.

FONG: Did you see a tension between, for example, representing your constituency and, say, issues for the good of the whole of California? Were there instances that there were tensions between those concerns?

MULFORD: Well, I'm not quite sure I know what you mean on tensions, because I don't deal with tensions. I voted, as I say, as I understood the issue.

FONG: What was your main concern, the constituency you were representing in Oakland and Berkeley, or the overall state of California? Or do you see there was a difference there? Because there may not be.

MULFORD: Well, I think your question is a little bit ambiguous. What you're saying is, on what basis did you vote?

FONG: Who did you feel you were most responsible for?

MULFORD: Well, I think that's a fundamental question. I think the responsibility primarily is to the party that put you there. But that doesn't mean they own you. Sometimes I voted against the party's. . . . I'm talking about some of the elements within the party who would send letters, and they were totally unrealistic. That's why we spend a lot of time down here appearing in front of partisan groups, the young people's and women's groups and that sort of thing, trying to explain. Many times, the people, "we the people," don't understand what is happening up there. They will erroneously attack a legislator's position, and then the legislator has to do his level best to explain to them why they voted that way.

It may be that the governor, in this case with Goodie Knight, who was a Republican. . . . I served under Republican and Democratic governors. In this case, he was a Republican, and he was a middle-of-the-road, I guess, to liberal type. He didn't satisfy everybody, and he was the victim of a very serious mistake, in my judgment, of the larger Republican apparatus when Senator [William F.] Knowland roared into California and decided he was going to be governor. He pushed out Governor Knight. That was a very serious, terrible thing that happened to the Republican party. I don't think the party ever recovered from it.

FONG: Could you talk about that a little bit more? What were the dynamics in there? What was your involvement?

MULFORD: Well, my involvement was only just as one of the Republicans. I was not in favor of this power play that was going on, but I was very new and only one voice. I certainly didn't like it. But that was an interesting lesson in power politics.

FONG: Could you be a little more specific? What were the dynamics going on? What was Senator Knowland going after?

MULFORD: Well, Senator Knowland [son of Joseph Knowland] was one vote away from becoming the president of the United States, as you know. He was the majority leader in the United States Senate, a very distinguished political person.

FONG: Who was very helpful in your career.

MULFORD: Well, he espoused some issues that were wrong. The right-to-work, for example, I think had more to do with his defeat than any other issue, and many of us saw this. Many of us represented people who belonged to unions. Organized labor brought thousands of workers and millions of dollars in here to defeat that issue. He was told, as I recall, by his own father to get off that right-to-work issue. But he was a very stubborn man, and he rode that issue.

Well, there's a good example of. . . . He may have his own ideas, but we weren't going down in flames because of his, in my opinion, erroneous position. That issue, be that as it may, caused a lot of damage. Organized labor is very

big in the state, at least at that time it was very big. I think it's weaker now than it was. So he came in here and just announced he was going to run for governor, and rode right over the objections of an incumbent Republican governor, Goodie Knight, and forced Knight to then pursue the nomination for United States Senate. And of course he didn't prevail, and Governor Knight had to withdraw. I don't mean withdraw. He could not run for the governorship, and the senatorial race was not successful.

FONG: So there was a power tension there. How did you feel about that? Going in, like you mentioned before, your main responsibility is to the political party. You mentioned that earlier.

MULFORD: Yes, but I didn't like what I saw, as a legislator. We were on the firing line up there, the assemblymen and the senators of the Republican party. I didn't like what I saw. But we didn't have enough strength. The leadership of the Republican party in those days was controlled by a lot of people with a lot of money, and certainly a more powerful organization than we knew. We were pretty low on the totem pole.

[End Tape 1, Side A]

[Begin Tape 1, Side B]

FONG: You mentioned "we" were on the low end of the totem pole. Who are "we"?

MULFORD: The Republican legislators.

FONG: Within the California legislature, you mean?

MULFORD: Within the Republican framework in California. At that time, the party leadership included many wealthy people, people who controlled the purse strings.

FONG: Who were not elected officials?

MULFORD: Who were not elected officials, oh, yes. And different from now. You see, now, Speaker [of the Assembly] Willie [L.] Brown [Jr.]. I'm *amazed* to see that. They raise millions of dollars; they transfer funds among the various individuals. None of that existed at all. In fact, the campaigns were much, much cheaper to

conduct. But nevertheless, there was still some influence exercised by the financial people for the legislators. Money always carries some voice.

FONG: It sounds like, at least while you were in office, that the elected officials were more--correct me if I'm wrong--like foot soldiers, in a sense.

MULFORD: Oh, no. No one . . .

FONG: I'm not saying that you were told what to do, necessarily, but you had mentioned that there was a hierarchy of decision making.

MULFORD: Well, I think I should clarify that. The party structure in those days was much stronger than what I have seen recently, although I understand the pendulum is swinging back. The party structure, which consisted of the leaders of both parties, these people had an awful lot of influence within the framework of the various assembly districts and the senatorial districts. Also, the volunteer organizations, the Republican State Central Committee, those people worked hard at the job. There's a lot of influence there.

FONG: One thing I want to get into is your evolution into the party leadership, because it sounds like when you were coming into politics, as you mentioned before, you really weren't sure if you were a Republican or a Democrat. But you got involved with the Republican party, and you moved up fairly steadily. Before we talk about that, I just want to get a little more information about the office, your office structure at the time when you were first elected. You mentioned you were just part time.

MULFORD: Well, the office structure. . . . I guess there's nothing lower than a newly elected assemblyman. We were given a small office. I had, as I remember, one secretary, and that was it.

FONG: None of these legislative aides.

MULFORD: None of that. That all occurred while I was there. In fact, I was involved in helping create some of it, because I felt it was very necessary.

FONG: Let's talk about that, then. You had mentioned before, you say the transition. You were part of that transition from a part-time legislature to a full-time legislature.

MULFORD: The leadership for that came from [Speaker of the Assembly] Jesse [M.] Unruh, a very, very capable legislator. I didn't always agree with him. As a matter of fact, sometimes we were violently opposed on certain issues. But I've always respected the job that he did. We went to national conferences. And there was another very, very able Democratic legislator, Assemblyman [Jerome R.] Jerry Waldie, who later served with distinction in Congress. He was the majority leader and then he went to Congress. Jerry Waldie was a very, very capable individual.

There were some strong people in the legislature in both parties in those developing years. We didn't have caucuses that are as refined as they are now. I had something to do with helping organize the caucuses so we could get together and have some collective thinking.

FONG: You mean the party caucus structure?

MULFORD: Yes. Well, wait a minute. Not party, legislative. In the assembly and in the senate. The party structure means to me the California Republican Assembly and the State Central Committee, that sort of thing. We're not talking about that. We're talking within the framework of the legislature.

FONG: Could you talk about the evolution from the part-time to the full-time legislature? What was your involvement with that?

MULFORD: Well, Unruh was involved in trying to professionalize the legislature. He felt they were underpaid and, of course, he was right. Five hundred dollars a month is ridiculous. Because it soon became apparent to me that the job required far more time than I had been led to believe when I was asked to run for office. I was finding that I was sacrificing an awful lot of material wealth to serve the people of the state while I was trying to pay for the shoes for my children. I felt that Unruh was on solid ground with that.

We went to some national conferences. One was called the National Conference of Legislative Leaders. I'm not sure of the exact date, but he was an early officer of that, and it's now a very powerful organization. In fact, I think

all legislatures in the United States have been strengthened due to Unruh's leadership.

FONG: How long was the process of developing this idea of a party caucus into a solid proposal, and the implementation process?

MULFORD: I don't remember the time schedule. I think it was a gradual evolution. The postwar problems were beginning to present themselves; we were beginning to see issues that had not appeared before that required more partisan consideration. I don't even remember when I was elected caucus chairman. I know that when I became involved in the fight on the floor when we were locked in, that had a lot to do with my serving as caucus chairman. I served seven years as caucus chairman, and I was not interested in any other position, although it had been discussed with me, running for this job or that job. I was still operating part time with my insurance business at home, without much backing. So I really didn't have the desire to go into some other area. I had an opportunity to run for other offices, but it didn't attract me. I did not want to spend my whole life in the political arena.

FONG: So the transition from a part-time to a full-time legislature? How did that affect, essentially, your life?

MULFORD: Well, I found myself in the middle of it. Instead of planning to serve just a short time, I was there, well, December of '57 to 1970. So it affected my life. If I look back, I don't think I would have done it again. I think I would have spent more time making some money.

FONG: Obviously, you had to be in Sacramento quite a bit.

MULFORD: Yes. Then we became full time, and we were in Sacramento quite a bit of the time. I think that was a mistake. I sacrificed time with my family. They were growing and of school age, and I think that was a big mistake not being home more to be with them.

FONG: When did you become caucus chair of the Republican legislature?

MULFORD: I'm not quite sure. See, I left in 1970. About 1963.

FONG: Up until that time, do you think it was just your performance that brought you up to positions of leadership? Or was there more than that as far as just your negotiating skills, your speaking abilities, your drive for the right issues? What was it about you that put you in that type of position?

MULFORD: I think I was an aggressive legislator, but I think what brought it to a head was the fight with Unruh on the lock-in, when he tried to. . . . If you will read that book, *A Disorderly House*,¹ by former Assemblyman and Senator [James R.] Mills, a very capable writer, I think it would be a good background for this interview. I was present during all of that story. The controversy between the two of us--I disagreed with what he was doing and I told him so. It was pretty much of a nose-to-nose confrontation. I was deadly serious about it. I thought he was trying to manipulate us. On that particular occasion, he was a bully. I have great respect for some of the other things that he has done. But on that particular occasion, he was a bully. He locked us up.²

We had one member of our caucus who had a bad heart condition. I wanted cots brought in. In fact, I did request them from the National Guard. He wouldn't let them be brought up. The fellows were sleeping on the floor and on desks. And that angered me very, very much. And it angered the rest of the Republicans. And in that book, he states that that was a big mistake on his part. He went off, according to the story, at least I thought he was under the influence of alcohol when he came back. It was a very tragic incident. But it brought us together. The news media came in and I remember *Life* magazine flew in a team from New York. That, as I recall, was the beginning of the cohesiveness of the Republican caucus, even though we were in the minority all the time I was there except for two years when Bob [Robert] Monagan, a very able legislator, was the speaker.

1. James R. Mills, *A Disorderly House: The Brown-Unruh Years in Sacramento* (Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books, 1987).

2. July 30, 1963. A.B. 80, Budget Act of 1963, 1963 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1050.

But the rest of the time. . . . So we were operating on a minority, weakened position, but we were tough. We're seeing history repeat itself, in my opinion, up there now, with the Gang of Five plus the minority Republican caucus. I personally think there are going to be some changes within the next very few months.

FONG: There's a newspaper clipping. Here, I'll dig it out. It did talk about the *Life* magazine article. Something about Jesse Unruh has the legislature in his hip pocket, something like that? Do you recall that?

MULFORD: No, I don't recall that. He may have thought he did, but I am not at all sure that he thought he did, not unlike some other speakers who may have been receiving publicity. [Laughter]

FONG: Ah, here it is. September 27, 1963. "Mulford blasts magazine story on 'Big Daddy' Unruh." [*Oakland Tribune*]

MULFORD: Let's see it. [Pauses while looking at article] Well, that's a true article.

FONG: I just remembered when you talked about the *Life* magazine, and I know there were big conflicts with Jesse Unruh.

MULFORD: Well, we weren't in his pocket. He might have claimed that, but we certainly weren't. We had some very able legislators, brilliant. Many judges came out of our group in those days, many leaders in business elsewhere. They were a great team.

FONG: So out of the adversity, essentially, of being a minority party, being locked up in the session over the budget, that was what brought the Republicans together?

MULFORD: I think it strengthened both the Republicans and the Democrats in the caucus activity; in other words, collective action. There used to be. . . . For instance, in the senate, when I first went up there, that was a club. It didn't make any difference if you were a Democrat or a Republican; if you were in with the senior senators in the state senate, you could get anything. In fact, they had their own clubhouse across the street above some stores, where they had their own bar and played cards. The senators were a very powerful group in those days. It wasn't based on partisanship at all.

In fact, when I went up there, I was told by an old hand to go in to call on certain senators, and "make sure that you pay your respects and be nice." I said, "Well, I will. I'd like to know who they are. But that's as far as I'm going to go." [Laughter]

I think that the caucus development has been very healthy for this state. It gives us a vehicle. Not us, it gives the legislators who are there now a vehicle within which to work.

FONG: So up until then, it was pretty much, it sounds like, a free-for-all.

MULFORD: That could apply to certain issues. I would say it was less organized, would be a way that I would describe it. You couldn't turn to some particular structure and expect to get some support. You had to run around independently, obtaining support for a particular bill. As I recall, you didn't see many collective positions.

Now, the party structure, that is the central committee of the Republicans or the Democrats, they exerted pressure on the legislators, and correctly so. They had certain issues that in convention they would take, and then they would want these issues to be implemented into law by the legislator. So to that degree, I think the caucus was a step forward. It gave us an opportunity to discuss pro and con internally within our own group, without necessarily having to bow to any external pressure. I think it created a better opportunity for leadership among the legislators.

FONG: Now, to be caucus chair, did you evolve to that position or was there an election?

MULFORD: There was an election. Oh, yes. That is an elected position, as is the leadership. The Republican and Democratic majority and minority leaders are elected. It's the number-two post in the structure.

FONG: You were elected. Were there other people running, wanting that position as well? It's a very powerful position.

MULFORD: Only one. I had it for seven years. Only once one member. . .

FONG: Was that [Assemblyman] John [V.] Briggs?

MULFORD: Briggs, yes. Briggs announced he was going to run, and I said, "Well, be my guest." He didn't have the votes.

FONG: So up until then, you were pretty much clearly a leader in the Republican party.

MULFORD: [Laughter] I'm not sure anybody wanted it.

FONG: Why? Why wouldn't anybody want it?

MULFORD: A lot of work. There was a lot of work to it. This was pretty much the administrative backbone. The leadership, the structure and the general leadership of the party, rested with the elected leader, as it should. I tried to, and did, make it into an administrative post where we had a lot of paperwork, a lot of work to arrange meetings and that sort of thing. We had to make sure we were communicating as we should.

FONG: I want to ask you a two-part question; that's the last question I have for today. Being caucus chair, what were the things you liked the most about that position? And what were the problems? What were the difficulties in that particular position?

MULFORD: Oh, I enjoyed very much the responsibility to my fellow members in the caucus. I enjoyed that role. I liked the work that was involved. Of course, we sat in on the Rules Committee. It gave us some opportunities to work on the inside on decisions that weren't necessarily partisan. There are a lot of issues that are collective issues; both parties have to agree in order to get on with the day's work. I enjoyed that part of it. It also gave me an opportunity to become acquainted with other leaders in the Congress, as our leadership did. So to that degree, it was an experience that was worthwhile, I thought.

FONG: What were some of the major difficulties in your position? Because it seems to me, even though you're essentially coordinating the efforts of Republicans in your own party, whenever you get more than two people together, there are disagreements, and some people get to be more stubborn.

MULFORD: I didn't sense that. I actually was pretty much of a quarterback when controversy arose. I went into districts up and down the state; I did a lot of campaigning for our people. Some of them would get themselves in trouble for

some actions, and I would go down and appear before their central committees and tell them what a great job they were doing. So I didn't have any problems to that degree, or I would have quit the post.

FONG: That's true. You were there for quite a while.

MULFORD: Seven years, yes.

FONG: OK. I want to stop right now, and I'm going to turn off the tape and then I'll just talk to you a little bit more.

[End Tape 1, Side B]

[Session 2, June 26, 1989]

[Begin Tape 2, Side A]

LAGE: Last time, you talked about how you got into politics and your activities on the bond issue in Oakland. So we want to start out right now with coming to the legislature, how you found it. You were new to the political process. Could you say in a general way how you learned the ropes? Was there a mentor?

MULFORD: I was the product of a special election, so that singled me out for attention by the Republican party. They were pleased that a Republican emerged as the victor. There were just the two candidates, Republican and Democrat, and it was a hard-fought campaign. But I emerged as the victor, so when I went to Sacramento, I was well received by the Republican caucus--which wasn't a caucus then--the Republican organization of the legislators, as well as Governor Knight. Goodie Knight was the Republican governor. So I was taken under their wing, and that's where I began my on-the-job training.

LAGE: There wasn't a formal caucus, but was there a cohesiveness among the Republicans in the legislature?

MULFORD: Yes, I believe so. I have no reason to think that there wasn't, as compared to now, for example, where you see such divisiveness.

LAGE: Within the party?

MULFORD: I think now there's far more emphasis on labels than there was then. The leadership in the senate, for example, these were long-standing state senators, and the party label didn't mean very much. If you knew the senator, you got legislation. If you crossed the senator, sometimes it was blocked for reasons that were never really disclosed. It was sort of an old school ties, old friend

attitude. Now, you have a tremendous divisiveness among those who follow certain degrees of liberalism or certain degrees of conservatism. I don't applaud that. I think that is a barrier.

LAGE: When you first went to the legislature, you mentioned that Knight welcomed you. Do you remember any particular meetings with him?

MULFORD: Yes, I remember the first meeting; he didn't even know my name. I was introduced to him as the new Republican assemblyman from the Bay Area who had won the special election. He kept calling me "Assemblyman, Assemblyman," and eventually, he discovered my name pretty soon.

LAGE: Was there a close relationship with the governor? Not just with you, but with the legislature in general?

MULFORD: Not as close as it was with Governor [Ronald] Reagan. I worked very closely with Governor Reagan because, of course, by then I was caucus chairman and my duties required it. But Governor Reagan was, and is a . . . He operates on a highly personalized basis, which makes it easy to work with him. It's almost disarming because, while he's doing that, that doesn't necessarily mean that he's in agreement with everything that's going on, but it makes it much easier.

Goodie Knight was very friendly. "Hail fellow well met," outgoing sort of a fellow; he would pat somebody on the back. I enjoyed that relationship, but sometimes we wondered to what degree he had really interested himself in some of our programs as we became a little more experienced up there. I liked him immensely. He worked very hard at the job. Keep in mind, he was a lieutenant governor for many years, and he campaigned all the time. He went from the top of California to the Mexican border. He would appear at any type of celebration, which I applaud. It's hard work. But it eventually resulted in his being elected governor. I liked him very much and I felt he was a good governor. He was a victim of terrible treatment by the Republican hierarchy when he wanted to run for another office.

LAGE: Were you involved in that at all?

MULFORD: Just on the outside looking at it. This had to do with Senator Knowland coming here. Senator Knowland returned from a very comfortable berth as the Republican leader in the [United States] Senate and returned to California and just plunged right into the campaign, and it pushed Goodie Knight aside.

LAGE: I assume you had some connection with the Knowlands here in Oakland.

MULFORD: I had connections with everybody. I was very close to the Knowland organization, particularly Joe Knowland, who was the publisher of the [Oakland] *Tribune*, and was a very strong supporter of mine and a very, very wise man. He was along in years, but I would have meetings with him all of the time when I'd come back from the legislature. He'd close the door and shut off the phone, and then we'd visit. As publisher of the *Tribune*, which was a very powerful paper at that time, he wanted to know what was going on, and I wanted him to know what was going on. He was a strong supporter of mine, and I wanted him to have information from me that he could accept as being authentic, which I felt was helpful to the causes to which I was subscribing.

LAGE: You were feeding him information. Was he also feeding advice to you?

MULFORD: Yes. He would give advice, and I welcomed it. He had served in the Congress of the United States. He was highly regarded in this state. I was very fond of him. I respected him immensely, because from the very beginning he was helpful to me. He went out of his way to be helpful to me, and I appreciated that. I appreciated all the help I received, and there were a good number of Republican people who helped me at the beginning, when I knew nothing at all about politics.

LAGE: Do you want to mention a few who did try to show you the ropes?

MULFORD: I think one name, Ruth Watson, probably not known to many people. but she was my campaign manager. She was a leader among the Republican women and she was tough. She was killed, unfortunately, in an automobile accident. It was a tragedy because she had a rare ability as a political leader. She fought for me and she covered things in connection with campaigns. It was an irreparable loss.

LAGE: She was a local person.

MULFORD: Yes, she was a resident of Berkeley. Her husband is still alive. He was seriously injured in the accident and recovered, I understand is now remarried and living in the area. I haven't seen him for many years. But Ruth Watson was a very, very special lady.

LAGE: Anyone in particular in the legislature who may have. . . . I mean, the fact that you rose so quickly to be a leading figure in the party there . . .

MULFORD: I received much support from the speaker then, [Luther H.] "Abe" Lincoln, who was from Oakland. I had known Abe Lincoln. He was a businessman in Oakland for a number of years prior to the legislature. Not well, but we became acquainted. [Assemblyman Donald D.] Don Doyle, former assemblyman from Contra Costa County. These people immediately surrounded me with assistance and support and advice and counsel, and that, of course, was the beginning of this team that eventually resolved itself into a strong Republican caucus.

LAGE: What kind of a speaker was Abe Lincoln? We think of the Unruh speakership and sort of forget about what came before.

MULFORD: I can't very well compare him with anybody else, because my exposure to him was only one more term, and I was learning the ropes. He was, as far as I was concerned, an excellent speaker. He was very close to Goodie Knight, Governor Knight. He conducted the house in a very professional manner. I saw other speakers use a heavy hand now and then, but I felt he was fair. Of course, I'm very prejudiced. I liked him; he was my friend.

LAGE: Sure. How about [Ralph M.] Brown, the next speaker?

MULFORD: The best description I could give you of Ralph Brown was that he was a gentleman, absolute gentleman, even-handed in his conduct of affairs, a quiet-spoken man. I felt in his way he was very, very effective. He didn't have to use a heavy gavel or use muscle like Unruh did during his entire term as speaker. I had great regard for Ralph Brown. He was a Democrat. There's a good example of party labels not necessarily having to be used to affect things. Ralph Brown was a leader, and forget about Republican or Democratic. If it

was a solid issue, if it was good for the people, he was in the forefront of trying to get that measure passed. I applauded that, and I think it had a bearing on my own philosophy and attitude that issues do not necessarily have to be measured as liberal or conservative or with labels. I don't like that. I don't think that you accomplish good government by putting labels on everything that comes along.

LAGE: On the other hand, you were involved in this move to make the party more disciplined, it seems to me, in your role as caucus leader.

MULFORD: No. I don't use the word "discipline." I was in the war for six years, and I saw discipline.

LAGE: It was different.

MULFORD: I felt, when I got into politics, that the measures should be determined on the merit, and a fair, traditional debate, proper research, opportunity to express opinions and ideas, to spell them all out and then go to a vote. I don't like pressure; I never did. I resented the pressure that we were subjected to. So the word "discipline" is unacceptable to me. They were always trying to put discipline on me on various things, and I consider myself pretty much of an individual. I have red hair, and I guess that's the way I operated. I think I operated with a basic belief in integrity, and my reputation stands after all these years. I was known for a man of integrity. My word meant something.

[Stephen] Steve Bechtel, a very distinguished citizen in Oakland and a very dear friend of mine whom we lost just a short time ago--a great loss to this country--told me something one day. He said his father had told him years ago, when they were starting this huge, successful business of theirs, "If you can't trust a man's handshake, what good is his signature on a contract?" You know, there's a lot of truth to that.

LAGE: It sounds like it is. Was that a problem in the legislature? Was that a change that occurred while you were there, that you couldn't . . .

MULFORD: I don't think it occurred while I was there. It's changed since I was there. Your word was your bond when I was in the legislature, both with the lobbyists, who are very necessary, by the way. . . . I think that many people do not understand

the importance of a lobbyist. They're expected to be honorable people. They deal in huge sums of money; that's the name of the game. But if you are solid enough to work objectively with these people, they can be of huge benefit. There were five thousand measures a year. We couldn't even read all of them. You have to have advice and counsel from all the sources that are open to you.

LAGE: Were there particular lobbyists that you found most reliable or worked most closely with?

MULFORD: Most of them were, but I threw one out of my office one day who wanted me to vote a certain way. I told him I wasn't going to; I didn't like this bill. I tried to be up front with these people, and I did vote against it. He came in and threatened me. He said, "You'll never be back." I threw him right out of the office. He was fired three months later. I let the word known that I never wanted him back in my office and he'd get thrown out again if he walked in. I didn't respond very easily to threats.

LAGE: He threatened to work against you in a campaign?

MULFORD: That's exactly what he said. His exact language was, "You won't be back." I said, "You may not be back," as he went out the door.

LAGE: Would you want to mention who he was lobbying for?

MULFORD: No, no. He was fired three months later. No one's heard from him since.

LAGE: So this wasn't the ordinary way the lobbyists operated?

MULFORD: No. The ordinary way up there is that. . . . Like, you and I are sitting here and discussing matters. You expect to be treated as a gentleman and as a lady, and you act accordingly. That of course, is the ultimate, and that's what we hope to see with our elected representatives.

I deplore the procedures now, where four-letter words are used on the floor and where they scream at each other and call each other names. This is disgraceful. In that legislature and in the Congress of the United States, there are always a number of young people, students, from the smallest up to college students, and they're seeing democracy in action for the first time, most of them. When I became caucus chairman, I went before the Rules Committee, on which

I served ex officio with that position, and I said, "I think we should tighten up our operation, have some dignity, have some respect," and Ralph Brown had a lot to do with that, because that's the way Ralph Brown acted, and Abe Lincoln. That's the way they both acted as speakers, with great dignity. I said, "The men should keep their jackets on. They should keep their feet off the desks."

We only had one assemblywoman in those days, a lady by the name of Pauline Davis, from northern California. So there weren't as many ladies as there are now, assemblywomen. But we shouldn't be reading the newspaper on the floor. So off the floor, we had very comfortable lounges where we could go and get a cup of coffee or if we wanted to catch a nap. Sometimes in night sessions, you got very tired. All that was done off the floor. The Rules Committee supported that. Both sides of the aisle, the Democrats and Republicans, agreed with that. And while I was there, I was very proud of that. You could go on the floor and you could bring your children in or bring your wife in, and you'd see ladies and gentlemen conducting themselves as they should, as responsible elected representatives of their communities.

Now, it's totally different. I deplore it. I go up there. I have the privileges of the floor, so I can go in, and I stand and listen. It's just unfortunate that these people do not use more dignity in the conduct of their affairs.

LAGE: But you didn't see that change occurring while you were there, am I correct?

MULFORD: We did change it by vote of the legislature, the senate and the assembly.

LAGE: You changed it to more dignity.

MULFORD: It wasn't too bad. The fellows would take off their coats and that sort of thing. Of itself, that's not too bad. But I felt it would be stronger if we could look like ladies and gentlemen, our jackets on and not put your feet on the desk. That's a minor. But now, you go up there sometime and just listen to the language on the floor of the legislature, the way they yell at each other. One assemblyman threw a book at another one not too long ago. That's deplorable.

LAGE: Let's talk about the Unruh speakership. He came in in '61, after Lincoln and Brown. Was there an immediate change in the way things were run?

MULFORD: Oh, yes. He was a huge man, I think I want to say three hundred pounds. He was brilliant in maneuvering, but I didn't care for his way of doing business. He used muscle; he used force. Or he would maneuver around. I didn't care for the way he conducted himself as speaker. I was never a supporter of his.

LAGE: He did have some Republican-appointed committee chairs.

MULFORD: Oh, sure.

LAGE: And did they cooperate with him?

MULFORD: Yes, some did.

LAGE: By that time, you were caucus chair. You came in in '62.

MULFORD: By that time, we had two organized caucuses, and I played a role in organizing the Republican side.

LAGE: Can you say anything about how that occurred, how the caucuses came together?

MULFORD: I think we were organized out of self-defense, because he started to play real muscle politics, and our people were being pushed around in pretty good shape. The majority leader on the Democratic side was a very distinguished, very able, very brilliant debater by the name of Jerry Waldie. He's a friend today. He has my highest regard today. We worked closely together trying to make things happen with less rancor, with less strife, and he was a good man. He was a balance. Of course, he was a solid Democrat, as he should be. That was his responsibility. But when we had the famous lock-in, which was triggered by Unruh and me . . .

LAGE: Yes. Let's talk about that in more detail.

MULFORD: Because I wouldn't bend to Unruh a minute. Waldie and I, at two or three o'clock in the morning, were trying to get this thing resolved, because I had some people in the caucus who had heart problems; we had some elderly members. I ordered the cots from the National Guard sent over, and Unruh wouldn't allow them to be brought up on the floor of the legislature, which I thought was despicable. So we were locked in. But at least, these men should have been allowed to have an opportunity to sleep on a cot.

LAGE: Do you recall how the lock-in actually came about?

MULFORD: Oh, yes. We wanted some information from Unruh on a matter. I think it had to do with an education item in the budget. I forget the details.

LAGE: The school finance bill.¹ You wanted to know the terms of . . .

MULFORD: We wanted to know what was in it, and Unruh refused to tell us.

LAGE: Before you voted for the budget.

MULFORD: There was a maneuver. I don't remember the details, but there was a maneuver that was to be part of a bigger plan. Unruh was a brilliant tactician; there's no question about that. He had a national reputation for being a brilliant leader, and I give him credit. I respect what he accomplished. I don't agree with it, but I respect what he did because he was good at it. He organized the National Legislative Leaders Conference, and he was a chairman or president of that for a number of years.

He had a lot of influence for improving the legislative importance across the nation. Legislatures were not particularly strong in a number of the states. You had strong political party leadership in certain states. The party leadership never dominated the legislature while I was there, and I don't think it does now. But I'm not as close to it. So I give Unruh credit for that. Anyway, he refused to give us the information.

LAGE: Do you recall if you and your fellow Republicans were using this as a point to stand against Unruh? Or were you really very concerned about what was in the school budget?

MULFORD: We stood against Unruh every time he opened his mouth. [Laughter] But our caucus wanted information, for some reason, on this education measure, and I went to Unruh. I was the one that triggered it. He acted in a very cavalier manner, refused to give us the information. I was echoing the position the caucus had taken. This had all been debated by the caucus. I said, "If we don't get this information, you're not going to get a vote on the budget," and he

1. A.B. 888, 1963 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 2163.

needed our vote, of course, to prevail, to move ahead. He said, "All right, we'll lock up the legislature." He had the authority to do it, and he ordered the sergeant-at-arms to lock the doors. One of our men climbed out the window. [Laughter] It created quite a flap.

No one thought it would go as far as it did. But we were determined, and that's what caused the Republican caucus to jell, to come together as a team. It really was a very, very fascinating experience because as a loose-knit group, we suddenly realized we could stand up to him. There's a book that has been published that I recommend. It's called *A Disorderly House*, written by former state assemblyman and senator Jim Mills.

LAGE: I took a look at that, and it is fascinating, but it doesn't give what was going on on the Republican side. Mills doesn't know.

MULFORD: That's factual, and I recommend it to anybody. During that period, it's the best book I have found.

LAGE: But in the particular case of the lock-up, he was only guessing what the Republicans were doing. Do you have any clear recollection of how you were able to keep all the Republicans in line?

MULFORD: It wasn't a matter of keeping in line, it was a matter of consensus. Everybody appreciated the position we were in. When you're in a minority position, you'd better stay together or you die, you fail.

LAGE: But you had some Republicans who were serving as chairmen of committees, and Unruh thought he could control their votes.

MULFORD: That's right. And those men had guts enough to say, "You can take your committee and get lost." This was a big breakthrough. See, he'd been able to induce some Republicans to go along with him--in other words, using that chairmanship as a device. Our people really measured up. I was proud of all of them; I was proud to serve with them. Because it was the beginning of a whole new procedure up there.

LAGE: This particular lock-up?

MULFORD: Because ever since that time, the caucuses have been meaningful.

LAGE: That's interesting. Now, relations with the press were very good during that lock-up, and you were the person who was the spokesman.

MULFORD: *Life* magazine flew out their photographers from New York. They came in from all over the country.

LAGE: The press, apparently, appreciated the Republican stance.

MULFORD: Unruh said himself he never thought he'd ever see anybody that would stand up to him. That's a direct quote out of that book. When he said that, he meant the whole Republican caucus. We just had a sense of collectiveness, I guess, a little sense of power. Being in a minority position, we had so few opportunities to assert ourselves collectively. I guess everybody figured, let's go on this one.

LAGE: That book also makes quite a deal about Unruh's drinking. Was that something you saw as interfering with his performance in other things?

MULFORD: That was his personal problem. The grape was distributed up there and it's still distributed, and that's an individual matter. I don't comment on anybody's personal life. I deplore these stories that come out, telling about the personal activities of public officials. If people are so stupid as to get themselves in an embarrassing position, they're running the risk of public criticism. But I don't comment on that. That's an individual's choice.

LAGE: I just wondered if there were cases where it interfered with his performance.

MULFORD: Well, if somebody's drunk, he can't think very clearly, but I have nobody in mind. I don't think I can recall that I ever saw anybody drunk on the floor of the legislature, regardless of what others have said. I really do not remember seeing anybody really under the influence of liquor on the floor.

LAGE: Anything else about that lock-up?

MULFORD: Yes. It was fun.

LAGE: I wish we could record your smile. I can see you remember it with amusement.

MULFORD: You must realize, this was the first time that our minority group had any strength, that we could prevail.

LAGE: Did that change things then?

MULFORD: Yes. From that moment on, the caucus then realized that, even though we were in the minority, we found a new feeling of togetherness. I think it strengthened the whole Republican party in the state of California out of that. I know that all of us were invited all over the state to talk about it. There was a great deal of national public interest about it. Here's this group of people in the minority, and yet they were able to stop the whole legislative process. We finally won out, you know. We finally prevailed. And that was pretty history making. So I enjoyed it.

LAGE: What was your actual job as caucus chair?

MULFORD: The leader of the whole operation is the minority leader or the majority leader. The number two spot is the caucus chairman, which I happened to enjoy. I had a business to look out for, and a large family, and I really enjoyed that position because I didn't have to spend more time than I could, and it was something I enjoyed. Actually, it was to organize and hold the meetings and disseminate information, cooperate with the leader. Bob Monagan was a very capable leader of our party, and he went on to become speaker, of course, very capable man.

LAGE: Were you in a position of trying to persuade Republicans to stay in line on particular issues?

MULFORD: Oh, yes. We'd call these meetings and then we'd thrash it out. We'd have good, vigorous debate in those debates behind closed doors that get a little vigorous. Everybody had different opinions. See, after all, a legislator's a winner. The people up there have all won campaigns, and there's a great deal of power attached to that. So everyone had an opinion; they expressed the opinion. Our objective was to "let's keep it all in here and go out as an effective force." We didn't always accomplish that, but it was fun trying.

LAGE: Was there any system of rewards or punishment used against Republicans who wouldn't stay in line?

MULFORD: Not by us. Unruh punished people. He'd give them broom closets for offices and that sort of thing.

[End Tape 2, Side A]

[Begin Tape 2, Side B]

LAGE: Let's just repeat that last statement [which was not recorded]. You mentioned you didn't really have anything to give, being the minority party.

MULFORD: It is true.

LAGE: Were you ever under consideration for minority leader? Was that anything you sought?

MULFORD: No. I was not interested. Don't misunderstand me. I'm not presuming that I would have been elected. But we all got together and decided. . . . Bob Monagan wanted to be the leader, he was capable and qualified, and there was no opposition to him. We elected him unanimously. I was elected unanimously. I served for seven years. Only one time did someone run against me, a man by the name of Briggs, and he was defeated. And all of our other groups. . . . We worked collectively.

We campaigned for it. I visited with every one of the members. I remember George Deukmejian, when he first arrived in the legislature. I asked him for his vote, and he said, "You've got it," and he stayed with me. When he ran for governor and attorney general, I worked very hard for him. I remembered he was loyal to me.

LAGE: That's the way things work.

MULFORD: That's right.

LAGE: This time when you were caucus chair was a time of a lot of upheaval in the Republican party in California.

MULFORD: Yes, there was, and not a little of it was caused by the return of Senator Knowland into California to run for governor, pushing out Goodie Knight. That was a mess. We had, then, the Republican Assembly, a very conservative element of the Republican party, was very strong in those days. There was a lot of confusion. I won't call it confusion; there was a lot of competition.

LAGE: What role did you play in that? It seems to me that you had quite a role.

- MULFORD: As a caucus, we didn't get involved in that. The members of our caucus included different degrees of Republican philosophy, but I never recognized that as any particular problem in the legislature.
- LAGE: They all worked well together?
- MULFORD: Supporting candidates for office is one thing. That was outside, in connection with the election: selection of candidates and supporting them, and the platforms, and going to the Republican convention, and maneuvering to get certain amendments on there, and different groups wanted to prevail. That didn't come into the legislature. We weren't about to get ourselves fractionated when we were small enough as we were, in the minority. I'm sure it influenced some of the votes of some of the members, but it didn't become a real heavy issue.
- LAGE: Was that something you had to work at, to keep these party conflicts out of the legislature?
- MULFORD: Yes. To work at it--how to answer that would be that we tried to measure the various bills on the merit of the bill. This amount of money for schools--you don't save money being in a majority position--how much money for the University of California. Every measure is different, you see, and that's why it's a big mistake. A number of the people in California who are very sincere, whether Republicans or Democrats, about politics, but they have a tendency to try to measure government by political labels. It doesn't work. All it does is cause a lot of problems. I've seen it. I've attended all the meetings you want to name from any type of label you want. I've spoken before most of them, and some of them are so unrealistic.
- LAGE: In the research I've done, I saw that one of the roles you took was in going to these--shall we call them the volunteer party organizations?
- MULFORD: That's right. I worked with all of them. I belonged to all of them. I belonged to every volunteer party there was.
- LAGE: Do you have any recollection of particular points when . . .
- MULFORD: There were different groups. There was the Republican Assembly, which is still alive, at one time a very powerful organization. Now they seem to be involved

in a lot of fighting. I just saw the other day where they banned some former president, because she voted some way. That's ridiculous. There are more Democrats than Republicans in California, and all you have to do is learn how to count. And to the legislators what I'd say, "We suggest they learn how to count." There are a lot of dedicated people, but when they don't understand political reality, that's the reason we're in the minority. Everybody gets in these fights from some of these organizations, and they pick up their marbles and go home, which just weakens the party all that more, so it doesn't make sense.

LAGE: Was this a message you tried to take out to these groups?

MULFORD: I sure did.

LAGE: How did they receive it?

MULFORD: I tried to bring political reality. Some of them agreed and some would give me a lot of static, but I don't think anybody changed anybody's mind.

LAGE: It's described as a time when the conservatives sort of took over the Young Republicans and the United Republicans of California.

MULFORD: Yes, that occurred.

LAGE: You yourself seemed to support a lot of these conservative candidates, and yet you were not in support of the labels?

MULFORD: I was looking at electability of a candidate. I think I'm a political realist. When I first ran for office when I was asked to run, I didn't know what label I had. I had just come from a war. I hadn't been involved in politics at all. When I started to see these labels, I was a Republican. And they started to say, "What kind of a Republican?" I said, "What are you talking about? You have to stay together when you're a minority, if you're going to prevail." To this day, I'm sure there are a lot of people who don't understand that. I don't think it's too wise.

LAGE: Did you have fears, as it seemed some of the Republican assemblymen did, that there was going to be a John Birch [Society] takeover of the party organizations? Was that one of the concerns at the time?

- MULFORD: Not my concern, because I didn't agree with some of the positions that I was hearing about, and I knew that it would be impractical in the legislative arena. See, again, we're talking about a basis for electing candidates to office.
- LAGE: So that was your concern. Did the caucus chair get involved in election campaigns?
- MULFORD: As individuals, not collectively. Now they do, though. Now they raise thousands of dollars. Don't forget that the difference between the cost of campaigns between then and now is huge. You're talking millions of dollars now. In those days, if I got a five- or ten-dollar contribution to my campaign, that was nice. Nowadays they're talking about thousands and thousands of dollars.
- LAGE: Incredible. Did you raise any money for individual candidates or make campaign appearances?
- MULFORD: Did I raise money for other candidates?
- LAGE: For Republicans running for office in other areas.
- MULFORD: I didn't raise money for them. I was trying to survive myself. I was in a very controversial district, which included the University of California, of course, when there was all that trouble. But Unruh said it I thought very correctly when he said, "Money is the mother's milk of politics." He's absolutely right, and all you have to do is look at the present-day campaigns. The trouble of some of our people who are the subject of FBI [Federal Bureau of Investigation] investigations right now is money. Money: How was it used? Was there influence? A great deal of questions. Look at the speaker of the House of Representatives in Washington, [James] Wright. He's out of office because of a question involving money, and the Congress didn't like the way it was handled.
- LAGE: Is it your impression that legislators now are being held to a stricter standard than they were?
- MULFORD: No, I think a much looser standard. I think there is a very definite need for tightening up, raising standards, reducing the cost of campaigns, reducing the whole financial picture. Now I know anyone hearing that who's in the political

arena--and I'm not trying to be a Monday morning quarterback--they'll scoff and say, "Well, it costs so much more." I think there's truth to that. Television is so much more expensive. We didn't have television in those days to worry about until it came in. Yes, we did have television, but it wasn't as sophisticated as it is now, I guess is the way I want to say it.

LAGE: It wasn't used so much then.

MULFORD: There's no doubt about it; money is the problem.

LAGE: [Assemblyman William T.] Bill Bagley has been interviewed by our office.

MULFORD: He's going on the [University of California] Board of Regents, you know that?

LAGE: I heard that, yes.

MULFORD: He's very close to the governor, and a brilliant man. Phi Beta Kappa. Bagley is one of the interesting people in the legislature, and he was when I was there. He used to sit right behind me.

LAGE: He tells about the '64 California Republican convention and says that you and he and, I guess, others were involved then trying to keep the platform from becoming a platform you couldn't run on. Do you recall that?

MULFORD: Yes, we did. There was a great effort. I think it was a very conservative element. I don't know whether it was from the Republican Assembly or what group, but I know there was an effort made to put some amendments in the Republican platform that would have almost tied our hands as legislators, again, with this unrealistic attitude of government.

LAGE: Do you remember what the issues were?

MULFORD: No, I don't remember the issues, but I remember that the question was, how are we going to solve this? Bagley, a brilliant strategy man, and [Assemblyman John G.] Jack Veneman and Bob Monagan, good solid people. One of the procedures was, we knew pretty well which buses were leaving and which airplanes were leaving, so we waited until much later in the afternoon when most of these people had to go home, and then, when we went to a vote, we knew we had enough votes on the floor of the legislature.

LAGE: So you postponed the vote until . . .

MULFORD: Is that the one where [Caspar W.] Cap Weinberger was chairman? I think Weinberger was chairman of the Republican party.

LAGE: In '64, yes.

MULFORD: He was attacked by a lot of conservative elements as not being conservative enough. Well, Weinberger's one of the most brilliant men--and he's a close personal friend--I've ever seen in the political arena. Of course, since that time, his very distinguished career speaks for itself. Look at the job he has done. Knighted by the queen [Elizabeth II of England], even ahead of President Reagan. I'm very, very fond of him, and I respect him very much. But he has been good for this country, and he was good for the state at that time.

LAGE: Could you tell me a little bit more about the kind of operation he ran?

MULFORD: Weinberger, when he's in front of crowds and groups, has a rare ability to measure the crowd, and he knows how to react accordingly. A man of great personal integrity. As I say, quite brilliant. He speaks well. I think one of the best proofs of that, as he brought his public career to a close--he's now publisher of *Forbes* magazine--was the fact that he seemed to have the respect of the press all across the nation. I ask, how many national leaders can you name who have that great respect? Not too many, by comparison. So I think that speaks for itself. He was right then, and he was right all the way through his career.

LAGE: Was he able to keep the respect of all the different branches of the Republicans at that time?

MULFORD: As long as he had the votes, and we were his votes. You keep respect if you stay in office, and we were a pretty hard-headed group protecting our leader; he was our chairman at that time. Yet, there will be people sitting here who would hear that who would just disagree violently. "He was too liberal; he was too this or that." This label business, it's political suicide. You just look back at the number of people who have been defeated, Republicans.

I'll give you the best example was when United States Senator Knowland ran on the right-to-work issue. He was told by his father, I'm told, not to use that issue. I know that organized labor brought millions of dollars in here and

many, many, many, many workers from outside the state. They covered this state. I remember that campaign very, very well. All on one issue, right-to-work. That's the main issue that caused Knowland, in my judgment, to be defeated. And he was a very powerful man at one time.

LAGE: Maybe too ideological?

MULFORD: Well, when he made up his mind on something, he was pretty forceful in trying to exercise his own ideas.

LAGE: You seem like you were a person who could cross between the conservative groups and the more liberal groups that I associate Bagley and Veneman with. You, for instance, supported Senator [Barry M.] Goldwater [conservative candidate for Republican presidential nominee, 1964].

MULFORD: I worked according to my belief on the issue and the people. First of all, I had to respect the people with whom I was working, Bagley and those people. Veneman, I went down and walked in the snow in Modesto when he ran for the assembly the first time. Imagine snowing in Modesto?

LAGE: No.

MULFORD: It did. We rang doorbells. We were all pretty idealistic, too. We had a lot to learn about politics, but we called it as we saw it, I think based on our sense of good government. Most of our people, all of them, I can't think of anybody who wasn't a very sound citizen. I respected every Republican with whom I worked, and most of the Democrats, for that matter. There were a few that bothered me because I thought they were unfair; they were unfair to the people of the state of California with some of their procedures, using the muscle. I didn't care for that because the people suffered.

I have four children, I have six grandchildren. The children and the grandchildren in the state today are dependent on those people in the legislature and in the Congress who are making decisions, and that's a responsibility and an obligation that those people have to think about them, and to think in terms of making this state stronger and greater, making our democracy work.

We only have to look at China. I've been in China; I've met a lot of their leaders and was a guest of the Chinese government when I was over there. You look at the mess over there.¹ It not only makes you sick, it makes you angry that some old men can do what they're doing. I know a lot of these young people who are over here studying, the Chinese students, their hope for tomorrow. It makes me angry because all of that unrest leads to doors where leaders can come in who aren't thinking in terms, as far as I am concerned, of what is best for peace throughout the world.

Anybody that's been in a war. . . . The strongest pacifists in the world are those who have been in a war. These people running around with stickers, "Vote for Peace," and so forth, a lot of them were heading for Canada when Vietnam came. Without opening that bag of worms, but nevertheless, the war was there, and it just seems to me that we're part of a great nation, and I think the people who are elected to lead the nation have a very strong responsibility to act accordingly. I get upset when I see the violation of what I think is a very moral obligation when they're sworn in. It's not enough just to swear to support the constitution, but they're supposed to take action to take care of these young people coming along. That's an important role.

LAGE: A little more sense of what's good for the state.

MULFORD: It's an important responsibility. I call it having some guts, call it as you see it. That's why I admire Goldwater so much. I think Goldwater's one of the greatest statesmen in the history of this nation. You never had to worry where he stood. You didn't have to agree with him every time, but he was there. He was honest enough to call it as he saw it. I knew him fairly well, and I watched him work, with great respect.

LAGE: Was that Goldwater-[Nelson A.] Rockefeller campaign [1964] in California very divisive for the party?

MULFORD: I think it was.

1. This interview was shortly after the Chinese government's suppression of student dissent in Tiananmen Square, June 1989.

LAGE: How about the legislators? Did they take sides?

MULFORD: Some of the legislators were on one side, and some of the legislators were on the other, but that didn't hurt us in our legislative work.

LAGE: It didn't keep you from working together.

MULFORD: Oh, no. Of course not.

LAGE: But it seemed to keep the party from working together.

MULFORD: Bagley, for instance, worked very hard for. . . . I think he was one of the chairmen for Rockefeller, for example. I worked very hard for Goldwater. I was not against Rockefeller. I admired him and liked him. But I felt that Goldwater gave me more satisfaction in what I thought I wanted to see in the White House.

LAGE: What about the campaign previous to that, in 1962, for governor, [Joseph C.] Shell running against [Richard M.] Nixon? Joe Shell had been an assemblyman.

MULFORD: Well, you're talking about the primary, when Shell took on Nixon.

LAGE: Right.

MULFORD: That was a philosophical race. Shell has always been identified with conservative elements. He played football with distinction at USC [University of Southern California].

LAGE: Did you take a stand in the primary?

MULFORD: Sure. I worked with Nixon. I knew Nixon from the first day he ran for the Congress. I thought Nixon was a brilliant politician, and if it weren't for Watergate, I think we'd have seen a lot of things differently in this nation. One of those tragedies. I knew Nixon. We still correspond.

LAGE: How did you know him so early on?

MULFORD: From California, Whittier. He ran for the Congress. He campaigned up and down, and I'd see him at the convention. I got acquainted with him and I liked him. He was always very fair to me and he was very helpful to me. Nixon is a brilliant politician, a brilliant strategist. He made mistakes, he's in disgrace, but nevertheless, that's how I feel about him.

LAGE: OK. Let's move on a little bit here. Here's an issue that I think you're going to remember: the Rumford Act. That was the Rumford Fair Housing Act.¹

MULFORD: I know, I voted for it.

LAGE: Right. I know that.

MULFORD: I worked with [Assemblyman W. Byron] Rumford. It almost got me recalled by the Republicans.

LAGE: Really?

MULFORD: Rumford and I used to commute. We'd go up on the first of the week, and then we'd drive back.

LAGE: So you drove up together in one of your cars?

MULFORD: Right. First of all, he taught me about the black men, the problems he had had growing up, having no money, coming from a black family and so forth, and he gave me quite an education. I even belonged to the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People] one time. I didn't like the leadership, the way it was going, and I don't think they were objective enough. But I learned a lot from it.

Rumford brought up this measure, and I said, "You know, the Republicans aren't going to go for this." This was then a philosophical conservative issue, of course. But the more he explained to me his attitude and the problems, I decided he was right and I voted for it. I got in all kinds of trouble with the party, but I still think that I was right.

LAGE: The party was pretty actively opposed to that.

MULFORD: They sure were.

LAGE: Then there was the recall. Proposition 14, the recall of the Rumford Act.²

MULFORD: Yes.

LAGE: So when you say "the party," who do you mean?

MULFORD: There are two parties. You have a Republican party, a Democratic party.

1. A.B. 1240, 1963 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1853, 1963.

2. Proposition 14, November 1964.

LAGE: Who got on your back? The Republican Central Committee?

MULFORD: I thought they all did, at the time. [Laughter] I thought they were all after me.

LAGE: People locally here in the district?

MULFORD: All over the state. I had letters that they put a campaign on to tell me how stupid I was to want to support fair housing for minorities; I had a lot to learn.

LAGE: There was quite an active lobbying on that issue.

MULFORD: Oh, yes.

LAGE: Realtors and the whole group.

MULFORD: But there again, that proves my point. You have to call it as you see it. I happened to think that minorities, the issue is still with us. Minorities have to have housing. Do you think we're solving the problem by letting these people sleep in doorways? Of course, we didn't have narcotics as heavy as it is now. But look at the people in the doorways. I saw a demented man the other day grab a woman crossing a street in San Francisco. She broke away. But we're going to see violence in the streets, I think, even more than it's happening now. There are a number of these people who should be put away. They're mentally disturbed. Yet I don't see the money coming to handle it. I think we're in trouble in this state. We're going to have to change some of our laws and get some money to solve some of these problems. This idea that we can't raise taxes--we're going to have to raise taxes. We've got to.

LAGE: You don't sound like a Republican.

MULFORD: I'm not? I am a Republican, so I sound it. This is right.

LAGE: But raising taxes is such an emotional issue that we don't talk about it.

MULFORD: We'd better start talking about it, unless you want more violence in the streets. Unless you want the increasing murder number in the state to keep on going. Talk with law enforcement. Well, I'm not in public office, but nevertheless, I thought I called it as I saw it; I'm not going to change my mind now.

LAGE: Anything else you can tell us about Rumford? How did you happen to begin commuting up to Sacramento?

MULFORD: He represented half of Berkeley and I represented the other half of Berkeley, and we just got acquainted. He was a true gentleman. His wife, Elsie, is a very, very fine lady. I've been in their home, and I enjoyed his company. He was a pharmacist. He ran for the Congress. It broke his heart when his own party ran another man by the name of [Jeffrey] Cohelan against him for the Congress. It broke Rumford's heart. He wanted to go, and I think he should have gone. Cohelan did a good job. But that was their own internal politics within their party. I thought it wasn't much of a reward for a man that had done a good job, because he had been in the legislature a long time. He was highly regarded up there. He was very much a gentleman.

LAGE: This is just to refer more to the state leadership. Gaylord [B.] Parkinson was also a leader in the Republican party. Did you have any dealings with him?

MULFORD: He was elected chairman [of the Republican State Central Committee, 1964-1967]. How much of a leader is the question. He had his problems.

LAGE: Did he hold the same position as Weinberger at another time?

MULFORD: Yes.

LAGE: But you didn't find him as strong a leader?

MULFORD: No.

LAGE: On the issue like the Rumford Act, how did the caucus deal with that?

MULFORD: I really don't remember. I would guess that we were probably divided.

LAGE: So that wouldn't be an issue where the party would try to get everyone together.

MULFORD: I think the Republican party was strongly against it, officially. I think it was, as I recall. That's a long time away. But within the caucus, I think it was a divided issue. Again, you call it as you see it.

LAGE: That's right.

MULFORD: I remind you, you also have to think in terms of your district. I had a number of minority people in my district who talked with me and lobbied me about this. I went to their homes, and they convinced me, as Rumford did, that this measure was necessary. Well, if you're going to be honest with yourself, you'd better vote as you see it. Otherwise, you shouldn't be there.

LAGE: You mentioned to me when we met informally last time about your own upbringing and how it colored some of your views, where you grew up and all. Do you want to put some of that on tape?

MULFORD: Sure. I was born at the corner of Fifth Avenue and East Sixteenth Street, which is now Foothill Boulevard. My father worked on the streetcars. I went to Franklin Elementary School. When we moved to Ninth Avenue--I spent most of my younger life at Ninth Avenue until I went to college--I went to Roosevelt High School in East Oakland. I was student body president there.

LAGE: What kind of neighborhoods were those at the time? What ethnic groups?

MULFORD: White middle class, working type people. It's almost all black now. As we went farther out in East Oakland, a heavy Italian, Portuguese population. Those areas are gone now. In fact, I played trombone. I worked when I went through college with my band. I used to play in a Holy Ghost band when I was fourteen years old, Twenty-Third Avenue and East Twelfth Street, and that was all wiped out with the freeway.

LAGE: Holy Ghost band. Was that a . . .

MULFORD: Well, the Holy Ghost celebration, which is a Catholic religious celebration that the Portuguese celebrate in Portugal. We'd play music that was original manuscript from Portugal. We would get out in the morning and walk around the streets, and the people would come out like they did in the old country. The priest was there, the ladies with their black shawls, and then they'd go on up into the church for the mass, and then we would go into a basement where they have wine. I was fourteen years old; they gave me a Coke. But they'd have wine. They had about a twenty-five-piece band, and everyone was Portuguese, the musicians were.

After the mass was over, everyone would come out and we'd go in the back of the church, and they had the yard all set up with picnic type tables with butcher paper, cardboard plates, and they had these Portuguese native dishes: stew and all that, and more wine. I'll never forget, this little clarinet player, he'd have quite a bit of wine, and when he was through with lunch, he had had all of

the stew plus the bottom of the cardboard plate plus the butcher paper. You were looking at the bare wood. [Laughter] He'd had quite enough wine. Then he'd play his clarinet all afternoon.

[End Tape 2, Side B]

[Begin Tape 3, Side A]

MULFORD: I guess economically, we were substandard. The families were all working people. But they were, in my opinion, honest, decent persons. They all went to church on Sundays; they would go out to Emeryville to watch the Oakland Oaks play baseball. I don't think too many went to college from that community; many of them entered the police department and the fire department. But as far as I was concerned, they were darn good citizens.

LAGE: Now how did you happen to get into the college line?

MULFORD: Because I wanted to go to college. I always wanted to be a lawyer.

LAGE: I see. Do you remember the motivation for that, or the example?

MULFORD: Sure, my own sense of wanting to be a lawyer.

LAGE: But there was no particular family pressure?

MULFORD: No, my father [Inaudible]. I always like to debate and I've always talked a lot, so I wanted to be a lawyer. When I came home from overseas after the war, I ran out of money; I had to quit. My two sons are lawyers, and my two sons-in-law are lawyers.

LAGE: You made law.

MULFORD: That's right. I told them that they're making money out of the bad laws we put through.

LAGE: I'd like to get a little bit more into Reagan's governorship and how the legislature dealt with him, and you in particular. Do you still have energy to continue here?

MULFORD: Sure.

LAGE: OK. First of all, we didn't talk about Governor [Edmund G. "Pat"] Brown [Sr.]. We talked about Knight. And then for a good part of your career, Brown was governor.

MULFORD: That's right.

LAGE: Do you have any observations on how he dealt with the legislature?

MULFORD: Well, Governor Brown was a friendly fellow. I think he always wanted to be considered as a friendly fellow. I've always thought that Unruh dominated him, although I'm not sure that Governor Brown would consider that a compliment. But I think Unruh did really have such an organization in the legislature that he did dominate Governor Brown. He was a pleasant fellow and he always wanted to be friendly with people.

LAGE: Was he highly partisan in terms of how he would deal with legislators?

MULFORD: Well, I always had the opinion that he was kind of reacting; rather than leading, that he was reacting. The partisanship came out of the legislature, in my judgment.

LAGE: Let's talk about the transition to the Reagan times. Had you been a Reagan supporter for some time?

MULFORD: As caucus chairman, I was invited to go to Los Angeles to meet with his "kitchen cabinet," some of whom have died; one just died the other day.

LAGE: Was this after the election?

MULFORD: Before the election. This is when they were looking around for a candidate. As a matter of fact, I was supposed to be the candidate for lieutenant governor, and I'd had a lot of eye surgery, and I just decided not to run. I felt it would take too much time out of my insurance business. So I've had seven eye operations: I've had two cataracts and five detached retinas. I've lost the sight in my right eye; I can only see in my left eye now. I had all this vision trouble and in those days I was wearing these horrible, thick lenses; they looked awful. That plus the time element, I just decided it won't work. So we . . .

LAGE: When you say you were supposed to run, had someone approached you to run?

MULFORD: Well, yes, it was all pretty well set up. I was very active in the old Republican party. So we went to [Robert H.] Bob Finch and we brought about his nomination, and he did become lieutenant governor. And he went on with Nixon to become a cabinet member back in Washington [D.C.]. Anyway, I was

invited to meet with the kitchen cabinet in Los Angeles. I didn't know Reagan before that time. I had met him a couple times, but I didn't know him. They said it looked like they were going to support him and cause him to be nominated. This was real power politics because they were all millionaires. It was really well orchestrated.

LAGE: Had you had a relationship with any of them before?

MULFORD: Yes, I knew some of them. I'll show you a picture here. [Walks into another room] This is where he really got started. This is the California Republican Assembly, the CRA convention. It was in Sacramento. Anyway, he gave them a real stem-winder of a speech, and I remind you that it was a speech for Goldwater at the convention which caught the attention of these people. I was the master of ceremonies; I was the chairman of the committee. He gave this talk, but I had never heard him give a talk before.

Before that, he had given a speech at the national convention. I'm not sure of my dates. But as you know, he's known as the Great Communicator. And after eight years in Washington, he still came out with an all-time-high image.

LAGE: Were you impressed at that occasion at the state convention?

MULFORD: Very much so. I asked him for a copy of the speech, although I never got it. I thought, "That's a great speech." But he brought them right up out of their chairs. That was the beginning of his campaign. He came to my house. I briefed him there on the University of California.

LAGE: This was during his campaign?

MULFORD: During his campaign, yes. He worked very, very hard. He didn't know much about the political, but it didn't bother him too much. He had his set speeches--we used to call it the speech--and the press knew he was going to give his speech again, so . . .

LAGE: They didn't have to take notes.

MULFORD: Everything he did made sense; he was a natural.

LAGE: So when the kitchen cabinet said they were going to support him, did you sign on to support him also?

- MULFORD: They wanted us to know this was going to be their candidate, and so the caucus talked about it. Naturally, when the man emerged as the candidate, everyone went to work.
- LAGE: Did you go to work before he emerged as the candidate? Did you take on any assignments?
- MULFORD: Well, I had no reason to, because I was really not involved in that. When you're dealing on that level, you're really talking about big money. That had to be settled first--who's going to pay for all this? My interest was in the lieutenant governor's race.
- LAGE: Finch wasn't a Reagan man.
- MULFORD: He became a Reagan man somewhere along the line.
- LAGE: OK. Let's talk about how Reagan was with the legislature.
- MULFORD: When he arrived. . . . As a matter of fact, he was sworn in at one minute after midnight. I stood right next to him. Then we all walked down to his office, and he sat down behind his desk. The desk was really beat up; this is the desk.
- LAGE: Oh, that we're sitting next to now.
- MULFORD: Do you see where the elbow is there?
- LAGE: Yes.
- MULFORD: Brown used to put his foot there and he had a big hole in it. Then Governor Reagan put his hands there and said, "Well, there we are." The desk was really beat up. We talked. Then the next day they called the legislature to convene, and I had to go down with Bob Monagan, our Republican leader, and with Jerry Waldie--I think he was part of the escort group--we went down and got him. He had his speech on these three-by-five cards, and he still uses them. And he gave a terrific speech.
- LAGE: This was to the legislature.
- MULFORD: Yes. He had never been on the floor of the legislature, as I recall.
- LAGE: Let's finish up about the desk. How did you happen to inherit his desk?
- MULFORD: Well, of course, being caucus chairman, I worked very closely with him. One day, not too long after he arrived up there, we were talking about what the

program was going to be for the day and he said, "Nancy doesn't like this desk. She wants a Mexican motif." And she did. She brought in some Mexican-type desk and chairs. She decorated the place. Lots of good taste. I said, "What are you going to do with this desk?" He said, "I'm going to throw it out to scrap lumber. Don't you think it ought to be that?" And it was really pretty beat up. I said, "I could use it." He said, "Do you want it?" I said, "Sure." But I said, "I'm going to go up and type out a letter where you give it to me as surplus state property." He said, "OK." I went right upstairs, typed out the letter, and I have it, signed by him.

So then Breuner's Furniture Company in Sacramento, they were fraternity brothers of mine, so they sent over several men and they took it and tore it down and rebuilt it. And you can see it's a beautiful desk: nine feet wide, six feet deep.

The day I left the legislature and moved everything out after I left the legislature, that morning--I think it was a Saturday morning--the press came in and they knew that this was a historical desk. This desk served Governor [Earl] Warren, Governor Knight, Governor Brown, Governor Reagan--four governors. So it's very historical. To bring it in here, I had to use a crane to get it out of my office building before. So it's very heavy. So they said, "What are you going to do about that desk?" I said, "Well, I'm going to take it." I didn't tell them I had this letter signed by the governor. So they thought I was trying to steal it. I'll never forget it; it was about ten o'clock in the morning.

[Edwin] Ed Meese was the chief of staff, then, for the governor. So that's a historical. . . . I knew what they were doing. So the press thought, "We have a story: Mulford is going to steal a desk." I called Meese; I said, "String 'em along for a little while, and then I'll come down and bring down the surplus letter." He knew all about it. He said, "OK." So they went down there, and he said, "I don't know what he means. He's taking a desk?" He was playing the role out. They got a big story; they were really going to expose this. So I walked down and I put that under their nose. I said, "This is surplus property

given to me by the governor, and it happens to be the governor's signature."

There went their story. [Laughter] But I was looking for something that would be sensational.

LAGE: It's a great desk. You had to think carefully about where you were going to move your office to have this desk fit in.

MULFORD: That's true; we had a heck of a time getting it in this room here. We can't move very often. Look how far it goes. It's a great work desk. And over there on the side, you can see that panel; all the telephones all over the United States were hooked in there, just the little levers. I don't have it; I just have the wood base in there. But the size of the drawers are huge; they're great drawers.

LAGE: Practical. Back to Reagan and the legislature. I've always heard that the first couple of years he didn't really know how to work with the legislature, didn't work very well with them. Would you agree with that?

MULFORD: Yes. I think that there was a learning process. He had his own program. He would not consult with the legislature as we felt he should. We kept telling him and telling him. Finally, he had to begin working closely with us. I'm not being critical of him. It's just a fact of life he was not working with us the way he should.

LAGE: Did you have a lot of contact with him, attempting to educate him?

MULFORD: Oh, yes, almost every day.

LAGE: So he did keep in touch.

MULFORD: Oh, we communicated; we were back and forth, but he would take action on his own, and we'd find out about it by reading about it in the papers sometimes.

LAGE: So even though you were in touch with him almost every day, you didn't necessarily know what he . . .

MULFORD: It was a learning process, in my own opinion. I would not be critical of him because he was our leader, but . . .

LAGE: Do you remember any particulars on it?

MULFORD: No. It was a long time ago, a long time ago.

LAGE: How about understanding this need that you have of compromising to get things accomplished? Was he understanding of that?

MULFORD: Well, I'll give you an example of a story involving Unruh that I think spells it out, which was a learning process for him. Unruh told me one day that the budget wasn't going anyplace until he met with Reagan, the governor, which was Unruh's right as the speaker; he should. And Waldie, and [Assemblyman Robert] Bob Crown, who is now dead, who was the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. I kept telling the governor, "They want to see you about this." And the governor kept saying, "Well, well . . ." stalling them.

Finally Unruh told me--I knew he was angry--"The budget isn't going to go anyplace. Everything is stopping right now till I have this meeting." He had a right to it, and the governor was wrong. So I relayed this to the governor. I went down and saw him and said, "You've got to see them or you're not going to get a budget or anything else. And he's got the power to do it." So the governor said, "You really think I should see him?" I said, "Yes, I do." "OK, set it up."

Now we come down, and Unruh is so excited in his eyes. He's really angry. They're all angry. They feel they've been insulted and so forth. And in a way, they had been ignored in a rather cavalier manner. There are two offices. One you come in where this desk was, in the outer office, then you back to the inner sanctum, which is very beautifully furnished. Well, the governor came out by the door. Now I'm coming in with Unruh and I'm kind of standing back. I had told the governor, "The guys are mad, and you'd better appease them." In they come.

Meanwhile, Unruh is being very profane coming down the stairs. He's going to tell him. The governor meets him as if nothing was amiss. He says, "Hello, Jesse; hello, Bob," and so forth. Big smile. You know, that charm he has is four-carat gold. He said, "Say, by the way . . ."

You know, the history of the governor is stories. I know people in California and all around us in Washington who would get right into him by the

telephone because they had new stories. President Reagan, Governor Reagan loves stories; he tells them masterfully. So he stops everybody--they're angry--and tells them a funny, funny story, very funny. So they start laughing. Then he follows it up right away with another story. Here's the master showman at work. After two or three stories, he's got them in his hand and he's saying, "Oh, by the way, Don says you want to talk with me about something." [Laughter] I died. Here everybody knew what was going on, and he said, "By the way." Well, all the steam had gone, the rancor had disappeared, and they can't get mad all over again. So in a few minutes, he resolved everything, just by his masterful timing, his mastery of telling stories.

I had lunch with him the other day in San Francisco with several fellows. We were together for two hours. He'd been up giving a talk in town. All we did was tell stories. He hasn't changed a bit. And he topped everybody.

- LAGE: This is an actual thing that people could get right through to him in Washington if they were known to have some good stories?
- MULFORD: That's right.
- LAGE: That's great. So he at least brought Unruh around on that occasion.
- MULFORD: Yes, he did. I would say it was the art of compromise.
- LAGE: Were there particular people on his staff that you worked with, or that the legislature worked with?
- MULFORD: Well, he had a chief of staff and we would work with them, of course, because he had to call the signals. But he was pretty much of a hands-on governor.
- LAGE: So you did work directly with Reagan. As much as with his staff, would you say?
- MULFORD: We had regular meetings with him, with our Republican group. I've got a lot of pictures around here with him and the group.
- LAGE: Now in '69, the Republicans got control of the legislature, or the assembly.
- MULFORD: That's when Monagan became speaker.
- LAGE: Right. Did that change things measurably?
- MULFORD: Well, it changed things. We were in control, theoretically.

LAGE: How did Monagan operate as speaker?

MULFORD: He was a good man. Monagan was capable. He was our leader, of course; we were very proud of that.

LAGE: Did he have a different style from Unruh in his leadership of the assembly?

MULFORD: Oh, yes. Monagan's a gentleman. And he knew how to preside with an even hand.

LAGE: How did he deal with assigning committee chairs and working with the Democrats?

MULFORD: I felt very fairly. And don't forget, too, that we'd all been there for a while. We knew each other pretty well by this time. Monagan was, I thought, a good speaker. But we didn't know how long he was going to stay speaker. Don't forget, we were in the minority party, and there's always tomorrow with elections, you see. And I'm sure he thought of that before making decisions. You have to look down the road a little bit.

LAGE: Oh, I see. He probably couldn't take as partisan a stance because there's . . .

MULFORD: No, Monagan is a pretty competitive individual. He used to play baseball in college and all that. I have respect for him; I thought that he handled himself very well.

LAGE: After the first couple of years when Reagan seemed to get more tuned in to how the legislature worked, did you see a change?

MULFORD: Oh, yes. We worked more closely. We had more meetings and more discussions of matters.

LAGE: About issues that were coming up.

MULFORD: Right. We were flying blindly for a while. I could be wrong in this, but I think he was dealing more with the kitchen cabinet and with the party apparatus than the caucus. I think he was dealing outside; he'd have these conversations with these people. And they were talking to him; he was getting a lot of input.

That's an interesting point. If my memory is correct, he was getting input from outside from these people, and I told you that in our previous caucus years, we didn't have too much of a problem with input; we pretty much called things

as we saw them. It didn't make too much difference when Brown was governor, you see. But I think that there was a definite change there when he realized he was bypassing us. There was some rancor among some of our members. And rightly so: we were literally having our hands tied.

LAGE: Rancor among the Republicans?

MULFORD: Because he wasn't working closely enough with us. But it all developed.

LAGE: Was there any kind of crisis that brought a change?

MULFORD: No crisis, just an educational process.

[Interruption]

LAGE: How are you holding out? I thought we'd turn to the next topic, which would be the University [of California], which is a big topic. Are you getting tired of sitting here?

MULFORD: Well, I was going to let you go about five minutes to twelve, because I've got an awful lot of work to do.

LAGE: Yes, that's fine. Well, shall we try to get started on the university then?

MULFORD: Sure.

LAGE: I do have you signed up for interviewing on Wednesday, and we can finish up.

MULFORD: That's all right; I've got it.

LAGE: I wanted to not just talk about the university when the troubled times occurred, but go back to the beginning of your term and talk a little bit about how you represented the university, what the attitudes in the legislature were before that controversial period of FSM [Free Speech Movement]. The university was in your district.

MULFORD: Correct.

LAGE: Did that give you a special role vis-a-vis the university?

MULFORD: Yes, because I carried their budget. That was a primary responsibility, to get the budget through and to defend the university. The arch competitors were the state colleges.

LAGE: I see. They were kind of a rising force then.

MULFORD: Very, very ambitious and very anxious to become state universities, which I wouldn't buy. I still believe there should only be one state university system, the University of California. Now you can go down the street. . . . You can go to San Francisco, you'll see the University of Podunk. Some little educational plant where they're teaching people to cut hair, they use "University." That demeans our university. . . . I think we have a great university system, and that's the way it should be.

LAGE: You'd been a graduate at Berkeley?

MULFORD: My wife and I are graduates of Berkeley. My two boys graduated from Stanford [University] and Hastings College of Law, which is the official law school of the university. My two daughters went to UCLA [University of California, Los Angeles].

LAGE: Now, you carried the budget. Who did you work with?

MULFORD: [James H.] Jim Corley.

LAGE: Jim Corley, who was . . .

MULFORD: Vice president for business.

LAGE: But he also was the legislative representative, lobbyist, for the university.

MULFORD: He was directly.

LAGE: How did he work with the legislature?

MULFORD: Jim Corley, in my opinion, is one of the finest men I've ever known. He used my office as his office when he came up. He was a true gentleman. He'd spent his whole career at the university. He made his letter on the track team, and he went to work for the university. We got along very, very well. And interestingly enough, too, State Senator [George] Miller, the father of present Congressman [George] Miller [Jr.], he was a Democrat and he loved Jim Corley. So there was the combination. Now here's your bipartisan support--bi-house support, both houses. And believe me, when Miller and I got together, we were a pretty tough couple defending the university. I don't know whether they remember that or not. Just like Miller and I saved BART [Bay Area Rapid

Transit], for example. We worked very closely together, and two different parties, two different houses.

This spells out what I said an hour ago. Good politics, good government, comes from enlightened politics when you sit down. There was no room for partisanship: "Don't talk with him because he's a Democrat." You hear the conservatives talk like that. That's nonsense. If you want to get something accomplished, you'd better work out how to do it. He and I would meet at seven o'clock in the morning for breakfast, figure out what the schedule was. My first role then would be to get the support of the caucus.

See, the senate in those days worked together as buddies. I told you, the buddy system. I think it's different up there now; I don't know.

LAGE: But in the assembly, you would try to get the caucus support for the university budget?

MULFORD: Always. That was my base of operations. And then also, don't forget we had a number of Democrats in the assembly that went to Cal, so it wasn't exclusive. I don't want to imply that our Republican caucus was 100 percent for Cal; we had Stanford and USC [University of Southern California] and so forth there.

LAGE: Did that make a difference among the legislators? If they went to Cal, were they more likely to support the budget than if they went to the private university?

MULFORD: Sure. Cal had great support from all of its own.

LAGE: Did the budget get looked at on a line-item basis? Did they make objections to certain expenditures, or was it just sort of approved?

MULFORD: No, it was a line-item attack. Being caucus chairman, I was on the Rules Committee; I was on the Finance Committee, the Ways and Means Committee. It took many, many, many hours to. . . . And there was opposition. Southern California, USC, for instance, is a private college; the private universities were trying to get state money too. Huge caucuses still exist for the education dollar. But my responsibility was to carry that budget, and I did carry it.

LAGE: How would you approach people that you were trying to persuade?

MULFORD: We sat down and talked to them. If they had any problems, they'd let you know. They usually came to be on the basis of. . . . Because I had the budget and I'm going a lot of different directions with different special interests. They'd come and say, "Well, what about this? What about that?"

LAGE: Were compromises made at that level on the university budget?

MULFORD: If Jim Corley agreed to it. Corley was the quarterback. And if not that, then we'd have to try to line up the votes.

LAGE: How did the governor come into play here? Was the university budget part of the governor's budget, do you recall?

MULFORD: That's a good question. I forget.

LAGE: When we met before, you pointed out . . .

MULFORD: Yes, it was in the budget.

LAGE: So the governor had signed on to it. When we met before, you mentioned that [University of California President] Clark Kerr didn't work through Jim Corley.

MULFORD: Clark Kerr came up--this is during the time of Pat Brown--and he would go in and communicate with Brown directly, bypass Corley.

LAGE: And Corley used to have that role himself?

MULFORD: Sure. Corley would come into my office just heart-broken because it pulled the rug out from under him; it was demeaning to him.

LAGE: You mean he wouldn't even be included in the conversation?

MULFORD: No. He was in my office when they were talking. I don't have much respect for Clark Kerr, and that's on the record, and he knows this.

LAGE: Did that make it harder to deal in the legislature, or did it not affect it?

[End Tape 3, Side A]

[Begin Tape 3, Side B]

LAGE: I was asking if it made it . . .

MULFORD: Well, Pat Brown couldn't do much about the budget till he got it from the legislature. We were in the negotiating period. So Clark Kerr negotiating with Brown directly, in my opinion, was an absolute violation of the legislative process. He should have been sitting in our office talking with Jim Corley and

with Miller and myself, because we were developing the budget before it went to the governor. What his thinking was, I don't know and I don't care. But in the final analysis, it didn't go anyplace until it got passed and approved by the legislature, both houses and both parties. So it wasn't very much legislatively.

LAGE: So did this feeling that you had about Clark Kerr come before the difficulties on campus? Were you not happy with Clark Kerr?

MULFORD: I felt he was tremendously unfair to Jim Corley, because I experienced Corley's sensitivity to this whole thing. However, that's all history.

LAGE: Right. That's why we're asking about it. Do you recall any specific . . .

MULFORD: Excuse me. I would also point out that Miller and I did a pretty good job, because about six months after I left the legislature, the state colleges became the state universities.

LAGE: That seems like it was one of the major conflicts about the university, this fighting to keep the state colleges . . .

MULFORD: Well, the University of California didn't want the state colleges to become a state university system.

LAGE: And that happened right after you left?

MULFORD: Right after I left.

LAGE: You really held the line on that one. Were there other controversial aspects of the budget that you can recall? Did people look at how much time a professor spent teaching versus research, and how much money went to the library?

MULFORD: I don't recall that in detail; I really don't.

LAGE: You don't remember particular issues that were fiery ones?

MULFORD: Money was the big issue.

LAGE: It was a big budget.

MULFORD: It's bigger than ever now.

LAGE: And were the issues partisan in nature regarding the university?

MULFORD: No, they were pretty much an alma mater foundation. No, I wouldn't say it was partisan. And it never should be. A university should be far above partisanship. Again, it's proof of my point that most of the legislation, in my opinion, that the

legislature has in front of it should not be judged on a partisan basis. You have partisanship, and you have parties to send people to the legislature, but there the legislature should resolve itself into an analysis group, a debating group, a governmental group, that operates across the board, and not on pure party labels. Because neither party has a monopoly on brains; neither party has a monopoly on ability. It's all the art of compromise to get work done. These are complex measures we have up there.

LAGE: Yes, they are. In the early sixties, when student unrest started to manifest itself and the students became involved in civil rights activities and whatnot, how did that change the legislature's relations with the university?

MULFORD: Well, now I think we get into an area of individual philosophy of legislators. Here is where the philosophy of some that were absolutely against the Vietnam War, and you had liberal versus conservative. It really was quite a mixture. I myself was never concerned about the Vietnam War. That wasn't my particular concern. That was handled by the president of the United States, by the Congress of the United States. Having served six years in World War II, I had the feeling that if we're in war, you've got to support the government and go on from there. So I never got disturbed over all the. . . . I resented very much the violence in the streets and all that.

My primary concern with the university problems--and I've been erroneously attacked without any reservations: front page, TV. In fact, just the other day there was a write-up, and they accused me of having something to do with advocating that the university sell the People's Park. I wasn't involved with People's Park at all. I couldn't care less what they do with the People's Park. That's up to the university; it's their property.

But I objected, not solely because of my own conclusions, which was one of the reasons, but I received a substantial amount of mail from parents protesting the intrusion of these street people into the classrooms was interrupting the educational process. That was the primary objection that I had. I really couldn't get very many people to pay any attention to me on it.

- LAGE: Before we had that real disruption on campus, there were some issues where things were getting fiery. People were concerned about Communist speakers on campus, and they seemed to be concerned about students taking part in civil rights demonstrations. Now this is before the FSM. Do you remember those times?
- MULFORD: There were objections. I got all kinds of mail from all over the state on that. That transcended any partisan labels: you got into philosophy, you got into patriotism, you got into supporting government.
- LAGE: Hugh Burns was a Democrat.
- MULFORD: Hugh Burns was then the president pro tem of the senate. He was a very conservative individual. He was also chairman of the Senate Un-American Activities Committee. I think he did a great job. He documented a lot of things involving the Communist apparatus in those days. I read a lot of his books; it's well documented. People agreed and a lot of people didn't agree with him. There was a lot of turmoil in those days.
- LAGE: And there were some efforts to pass laws forbidding Communists to speak, for instance, on campus.
- MULFORD: I think there were.
- LAGE: That isn't something that you were active in?
- MULFORD: I don't think I was involved in the Free Speech Movement. Again, I get back to my basic premise. I objected to interrupting the educational process on campus for whatever reason. I guess that's because I'm a father and I didn't like the idea of interrupting those classes. If they wanted to object, there was plenty of room in the street or wherever they were, but stay out of the bloody classes. And I objected to the professors allowing them to come in. I went before the Academic Senate. I warned the Academic Senate.
- LAGE: Did you talk to them?
- MULFORD: I sure did. I went before the Academic Senate with Assemblyman Frank Lanterman, who represented the independent colleges. He was a graduate of USC. We told them, "If you don't protect the" I think I said "sanctity of the

educational process, you're going to have the people of this state come down on you financially like you never expected."

We were ignored. They treated us like dirt. And sure enough, shortly after I left the legislature, you saw what happened to the budget. The state colleges became state universities, more money for the state universities. Not that they don't play an excellent role; my advocacy was the University of California. Right now, the community colleges have a measure in the legislature giving them a guarantee that students of the community colleges when they finish those two years have a guaranteed entrance in either the state university or the University of California. That's wrong. Now that's politics in the educational process. I could tell you about a lot of parents who are second and third generation University of California whose children are not getting into the university because of the minority efforts and all that sort of thing. It's not right.

LAGE: Do you think there's more politics in education now?

MULFORD: I sure do, and I think to the detriment of the university system.

LAGE: Some of this FSM stuff was set off, I've heard--I'm not sure this is right--as a result of the Republican convention [in San Francisco] in '64 when a lot of Republican students were active on campus, for Rockefeller and Goldwater, that controversy. Do you have any recollection of that, whether they were . . .

MULFORD: Well, I know that Rockefeller came on campus. I don't know whether Goldwater did or not.

LAGE: I've heard that that kind of activity [young Republican groups] which was kind of ironic--was one of the reasons that there was pressure on the university to get the student tables off of Sproul Plaza [which set off the Free Speech Movement protests].

MULFORD: That sounds to me pretty much like a maneuver to put the blame on the other side. I would challenge the validity of that charge. That's a pretty good tactic: you do the trouble, you blame it on somebody over there.

LAGE: That's nothing you have any knowledge of, that some of the top Republicans wanted political activity off the campus?

MULFORD: I don't recall that. I wasn't involved in it. I know that they did have tables with advocates of certain candidates. But I would disagree that it was the Republican activity which triggered the Free Speech Movement. I would disagree with that entirely. Don't forget you had some Communist leaders in the United States out here involved. You know that, of course; that is a fact. If you do the research, you'll find out. I was with the FBI in those times and I was shown pictures of these people standing right there, and they flew in from all over the United States. But if we talk about it now, people say it's just like the big-lie technique out there in China, that it never existed. But it did.

LAGE: So you were kept fairly well informed.

MULFORD: I was informed.

LAGE: And who did you get your picture from, of what was going on on campus?

MULFORD: I was informed. I knew what was going on. The police had informants on the campus; the FBI had informants on the campus. The Un-American Activities Committee with Burns had people on the campus. It's all documented; there's no question about it. But I'll ask you now to try to find any of the written reports of the Un-American Activities Committee. They've all been stolen out of the libraries, by design; they've all disappeared.

LAGE: Even out of the state archives?

MULFORD: I don't know about the state archives, but I'm talking about the public libraries.

LAGE: That's interesting. What was your understanding of why the campus blew up in '64 with FSM? Do you see it as more of an outside . . .

MULFORD: Well, I think it was lack of leadership from the top. I've always felt that. [President of the University of California] Robert Gordon Sproul, in my opinion, is one of the most distinguished educators in the history of the universities of the United States. I believe when this problem broke out at the first, if Clark Kerr had come down and taken hold of this thing and exercised some leadership. . . . Not unlike what [President of Stanford University Donald] Kennedy did the

other day. Kennedy's office was infiltrated; they came in there; they took over, etc., etc. And he was shocked. Kennedy is a liberal educator. He's very controversial in certain areas. But you know where he stands. And so what happens? Kennedy has them all arrested, and now they've all been fined, put on probation. Some of them may not even come back to the university. That to me was leadership. To allow them to get away with that is just asking for more and more and more.

I talked with Clark Kerr the first night. He was up in his office, and I said, "Get down here and take hold of this thing. This is totally out of control." I was angry because I could just see all this spreading.

LAGE: What was his response? Do you remember specifically how he . . .

MULFORD: Yes. He said he wasn't coming down. We parted company at that point.

LAGE: Did you have any further . . .

MULFORD: Oh, sure. Every time I saw him I would tell him. I didn't respect his lack of leadership. Eventually he was fired by the governor of California.

LAGE: Do you remember how other legislators responded? I'm just kind of surprised when I was reading through some things and saw that [Assemblymen] Willie Brown and John [L.] Burton and a William [F.] Stanton spoke to an FSM rally, seemingly in support.

MULFORD: Sure, you'd expect that.

LAGE: Did that carry through the debates of the legislature?

MULFORD: Sure. You must understand that those were philosophies that they had. Stanton was a very liberal legislator.

LAGE: They were liberal, but . . .

MULFORD: You can't read more in it. I'm the proof you can't read anything more into it than that.

LAGE: OK. Do you read anything more into it?

MULFORD: I stand with what I've said. They were very liberal and their attitude. . . . This is Stanton I'm talking about, was just very liberal in his judgment of those matters. I think all those issues really tore apart the legislature. All of that

transcended any political labels. You had Republicans and Democrats alike going off into all different directions. It became a very confused issue. Don't forget you had free speech; you had Vietnam; you had university on campus, off campus . . .

LAGE: You had ethnic studies, Third-World students unrest.

MULFORD: That's right. It really was a . . . You had people like Abbie Hoffman [radical activist, 1960s-1970s] and who's the man up there now? The husband of [actress Jane] Fonda?

LAGE: Oh, [Assemblyman Thomas] Tom Hayden.

MULFORD: Tom Hayden was involved with a group. You had all different philosophies.

LAGE: So this was just seemingly a reflection of greater diversity in the legislature, as well as on the campus?

MULFORD: Well, we really should remove it from the legislature, because these people were actually reflecting their own philosophies and their own thoughts, and the thoughts of their constituents and the thoughts of the people of the state. The state was blown wide open with protests. In fact, the nation was. It caused the removal of [President] Lyndon [B.] Johnson. So it really was quite a bit bigger than the legislative scene. That's one issue that transcended the legislative process, no question about it.

LAGE: You said you briefed Reagan on the university problem. Can you remember what you told him and what kind of response you got?

MULFORD: I just told him what was happening from my viewpoint.

LAGE: Do you think he dealt with matters in a way that you were happy with?

MULFORD: He sure did.

LAGE: Did you have contact with Alex Sherriffs, who was Reagan's education advisor?

MULFORD: Yes, I knew Alex Sherriffs. Yes, we communicated.

LAGE: Any comments about him and his way of operating?

MULFORD: No. I had no problem with him.

LAGE: How about [Berkeley] Chancellor [Edward] Strong? Did you communicate with him?

MULFORD: Yes. They all knew my position. Don't forget, the legislature was still in session; I still had a budget to get through.

LAGE: That's right. How was it trying to get the budget through in those times?

MULFORD: Controversial.

LAGE: A major job?

MULFORD: Yes, it was hard, all right.

LAGE: What legislation did you introduce regarding student unrest? Wasn't there something called the Mulford Act¹ you introduced?

MULFORD: There was just one measure that I recall. I was asked by Jim Corley. . . . To back up, I told Jim when they were going into these classes, "Why don't you throw these bums out of here?" He said, "We have no laws. It's public property. We have no law to remove them. We have to let anybody come in." He asked me to put in a bill that would give them authority to remove undesirables off the campus, and I did. That was called the Mulford Act. I understand it's still in existence. It's been amended a couple times, but it's been used.

LAGE: Do you remember the year when that was passed?

MULFORD: It was during when all this mess was happening.

LAGE: Anything else about the university?

MULFORD: It's a great university. In spite of all the problems, it's still a great university. I wish they would get a better football team, though. [Laughter]

LAGE: That's a perennial problem. After Kerr left, did you feel leadership was better at the university? Did you know Harry Wellman [acting president of UC, after Kerr's dismissal] well?

MULFORD: Oh, I knew him, but not well.

LAGE: You didn't work closely with him.

1. A.B. 534, 1969 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1424.

MULFORD: No. I really haven't had any intimate contact once I left the legislature. I think the university had--by far, it was the main reason I was defeated, no question about that. They wanted it. They really campaigned to get me out.

LAGE: Not the university as an institution; you mean the students?

MULFORD: I mean the students and the faculty and those who were hostile to me anyway. That *Daily Cal* became an anti-Mulford sheet during the whole campaign. They didn't bother with the truth; they just let it fly. Just like this article in the [San Francisco] *Chronicle* the other day about the People's Park. One story I heard that I was in the helicopter when they were flying over the troops. Totally false; I wasn't even on the campus. [Laughter] I didn't get involved in any of that; I wasn't involved.

LAGE: Where do they pick these things up, do you think?

MULFORD: A little thing called propaganda. You call a man a son of a bitch, you know, and someone's going to believe he's a son of a bitch; it's just that simple. You know the old story, a drop at a time. My name is mud out there to a number of people. Not immediately, but it's still. . . . It's unfortunate because it leads people to believe certain things happened that didn't.

LAGE: Yes, well, this will give you a chance to set the record straight.

MULFORD: Whoever is; no one's going to use it.

LAGE: Well, it's going to be used by scholars and researchers. So it may not set the record straight in the *Chronicle*, but in other. . . . Well, during that People's Park controversy, did you have any role in that?

MULFORD: No! Not at all.

LAGE: You didn't get involved with the . . .

MULFORD: My God, with tear gas and troops on the street, and violence--I'd be insane to get in the middle of that. I'd get hit in the head.

LAGE: OK, let's wind up for the day. I think we have the university taken care of. Anything else you want to add?

MULFORD: It's a great university.

[End Tape 3, Side B]

[Session 3, June 28, 1989]

[Begin Tape 4, Side A]

LAGE: Last time we talked about Republican party politics and we talked about university issues. I thought we'd talk about other issues you were involved with in the legislature today. Is there a particular area of legislation or a particular piece of legislation that you're most proud of?

MULFORD: Well, I think the general areas of interest, first, was in public health. I was on that committee for some time. I've always been interested in that, and I'm on the California Medical Assistance Commission now. We spent a lot of time trying to improve the health conditions by legislation.

LAGE: Did this have to do with reorganizing the health delivery system under Reagan?

MULFORD: Well, it's just the general subject of serving on that committee. Then I was very interested in the quality of air. I was named the Air Conservationist of the Year. I'm glad it wasn't "hot air conservationist." But I received that award.

LAGE: And was that for a particular piece of legislation?

MULFORD: Yes. Oh, there were several pieces of legislation. We really worked on that for some time. Then another piece of legislation was, I was the author of the Marriage Counseling Act. Prior to that time, there was no legislation controlling the qualifications of marriage counselors. A friend of mine had a very disastrous problem with a marriage counselor, and his wife left him. I looked into it and found out to my amazement that there was no regulation for it. So we made a two-year study statewide of marriage counselors and found out that there were a lot of quacks, a lot of people holding themselves out as marriage counselor, particularly in Los Angeles. You paid ten dollars, and they gave you

a glass of sparkling wine and called it champagne, then they went upstairs with a woman who was equally troubled, went to bed, and that was supposed to be marriage counseling. I was shocked.

So now in the state law of California, we have qualifications. You must have certain qualifications. You must have certain educational qualifications. And now I'm very pleased to learn just the other day that many of the judges in the state, if not most, in divorce contests where there are problems are referring them to marriage counselors before the judges make a decision. I think that's very constructive; I'm very proud of that.

LAGE: You mentioned a two-year study. Was this a special committee?

MULFORD: Yes. I forget which committee it was, but we received an appropriation from the legislature and we studied it for two years.

LAGE: You had a staff?

MULFORD: Yes. Well, it was not much of a staff. We didn't have much staff in those days, not compared with what they have now. We had a secretary that took the notes of our hearings.

LAGE: But you didn't have an investigative staff?

MULFORD: No. We did it ourselves. We did the work.

LAGE: That is quite a change.

MULFORD: We went down and held hearings, did the research--big difference now.

LAGE: Did you work with another legislator on it?

MULFORD: Well, the people who were on our committee. I forget. [Assemblyman Lester A.] Les McMillan was the assemblyman who was chairman of the committee. I forget the name of the committee. But we would hold hearings around the state; people who were interested in it would participate.

LAGE: Do you remember the approximate year of that legislation?¹

MULFORD: No, I don't. It's in the record.

1. A.B. 3216, 1965 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1506.

LAGE: That's an interesting one that hadn't come up in my research. What about environmental concerns?

MULFORD: Well, as I say, the air conservation was of particular interest.

LAGE: I came across the Mulford-[Assemblyman Thomas C.] Carrell Act.¹ That must have been one of the important air pollution acts.

MULFORD: That was it. He was a Democrat and he was an auto dealer. We were interested in smog and the gas from the automobiles, the exhaust.

LAGE: So were you going in the direction of controlling automobile exhaust?

MULFORD: We did; we pioneered that.

LAGE: Do you remember the sources of opposition to that? Was there a strong lobbying effort against it?

MULFORD: The automobile industry talked about the expense of it.

LAGE: You also mentioned efforts to save Lake Tahoe.

MULFORD: Yes, I have always been interested in that. We went to Tahoe and made some surveys up there. In fact, I gave a bottle of water and the algae that I'd taken off the bottom of the lake. I gave it to Governor Reagan and I said, "This is what's happening." Tahoe, in the early years, you could see all the way down to the bottom it was so clear. I've been away from the subject for a number of years now, but I think there's a very strong organization to save Lake Tahoe that is in existence and I think they've done very constructive work.

Anyway, I gave this bottle to Governor Reagan and he gave it back to me the next day and he said, "I've tried this, but I think I'll stay with martinis. This water gives me the hiccups." [Laughter] I have that in his handwriting. A great sense of humor. But he agreed with it. We had some good support from the governor.

LAGE: Did that result in the legislation. . . . The cooperation between Nevada and California was an issue then, I think.

1. Mulford-Carrell Air Resources Act, 1967 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1545 (California Health and Safety Code, Section 39000).

MULFORD: I forget what happened. It was all constructive. I'm not sure of this, but I think we had a problem with Nevada, and I'm not sure what it was.

LAGE: The details of the legislation are in the record. It's your memories about who you worked with. Were you under a lot of pressure from constituents on environmental issues?

MULFORD: Well, pressure only to the degree that they brought these matters to my attention. The pressure depends on what you want to do with it. I didn't worry too much about pressure; if I thought it was a good issue, I would run with it. If I didn't, I would try to explain to them why they were wrong. On Tahoe, there were a great many property owners in my assembly district who had property at Tahoe. They were very concerned about it and they let me know of their concern. I went to Tahoe; I looked at the lake. Excuse me; I have to take this call.
[Interruption]

LAGE: Now we're back on. We were talking about environmental issues, and we were talking about constituent pressure, which I think is an interesting topic.

MULFORD: Well, I have to reject "pressure," because people can give me their recommendations and advice, but I never did respond very favorably to pressure; I'm not a pressure type. If they can convince me of their problem, then I would enthusiastically support them; if I didn't agree with them, I wouldn't. I didn't ever feel I had to bend to pressure.

LAGE: You were in office during the time of the "Save San Francisco Bay" campaign.

MULFORD: I don't remember that issue at all.

LAGE: Setting up the Bay Conservation and Development Commission?

MULFORD: I may have, but I don't remember.

LAGE: That was one where there were a lot of buses to Sacramento, a lot of people involved.

MULFORD: I don't remember being involved in that.

LAGE: Other environmental issues?

MULFORD: Well, one of the environmental areas that I helped save was the open space behind the deaf and blind school at Berkeley. There was a huge amount of

space, and it still is open, although I think it's been sold. But I learned it was going to be sold to some builders, and I took some officials up there, and we blocked it. We blocked it in the legislature so it couldn't be sold. I forget what's happened to it now, but . . .

LAGE: I think it's a regular open-space district, a preserve of some kind. I remember hiking up there and seeing signs that it was a preserve. Were there neighbors who came to you and let you know about it?

MULFORD: No, it was my own idea; I knew about it. I was very much a supporter of that school. I was very upset when they moved the school down to the Fremont area, because these youngsters in Berkeley had an opportunity to be near the University of California; they could go down and see the city at work.

I like those youngsters; they were handicapped, and they were very courageous. They were good athletes. I worked very closely with them. In fact, I think I got the money for their swimming pool, as I recall. But I didn't want that open space to be turned commercial, because at that time I didn't know that they were moving the school. And now it's very interesting that the university. . . . That school was changed and the students were moved out because it was allegedly an earthquake hazard. And it's interesting now that the University of California has it, and it's filled with students as a dormitory, but I haven't seen anything more about the earthquake hazard. I often wonder who was manipulating what.

LAGE: That occurred after you had left office?

MULFORD: Yes, after. Well, it occurred after I left office, but it also occurred after they moved these students out. So I often wondered what long-range planning was involved for the university to obtain the property. I never knew the facts of it.

LAGE: How did you keep in good touch with people in the community? Did you continue to live here?

MULFORD: Yes, I've always lived in the area. You have to live in your district. I kept in touch with them by personal communication. On Saturdays and Sundays, I would visit with these groups. I worked hard at the job. I would attend

meetings at night when I would come down. I'd come down from Sacramento to attend meeting of groups.

LAGE: What kind of groups would you attend meetings of?

MULFORD: Oh, parent-teacher groups--all different civic groups that are in a community. With the deaf school, I met with the parents; I met with the faculty; I worked with the head man of the school. You just keep in contact by visiting these people. And they write to you. I got a lot of mail. Every legislator gets a lot of mail.

LAGE: The legislature became full time in '66. Did that make a difference with the way you operated?

MULFORD: Well, yes, more work; it took more time in Sacramento and less time to be on the job down here. Of course, it interrupted our business activities.

See, a lot of the legislators are not businessmen, per se. I can go right through the book--I read the book yesterday of the work background of the present members of the legislature, and I'm amazed that many of them came in as former supervisors, former attachés, former administrative assistants, resulting from this so-called full-time activity. I was involved in that from the very beginning with Jerry Waldie and with Unruh as part of the leadership team up there. We felt that we were a big enough state that we needed this.

I have a reservation now because to me it's a training ground for a lot of the members of the legislature, not that that's wrong necessarily, but I don't think we should get away from the butcher, the baker--that philosophy on which this country was founded. When the fathers of our country organized the first Congress, it was meant to be part time in those days, of course. And then they'd go back, and they'd go to their constituents. They had a hands-on knowledge of what the problems were in their community, in their districts. Here, as I look at this list of people in the legislature now--and I'm not being critical of anybody--I'm just saying the system makes me wonder if this is the best way to do it, instead of creating a training ground for professional legislators, if they shouldn't come in from the civilians that work in the community.

LAGE: You probably had a lot more ties in the community than people who came up as legislative assistants.

MULFORD: I certainly did. I was born in this area and made my living in this area. And I'm not so sure that we're necessarily on the right track to have full time, year-in and year-out. I think that perhaps there should be a change, a compromise in the time. You get up in Sacramento, it becomes a way of life, and you're not close enough to your people. I don't know; that's debatable.

LAGE: Well, I think it's something that has to be looked at, certainly. Let's talk about BART. That was a controversial issue that you helped a great deal with.¹

MULFORD: I sure did. George Miller and I had a lot to do with BART being accepted. I remember [Assemblyman] Leo [J.] Ryan, who unfortunately was a congressman who was killed in the [Reverend Jim] Jones [People's] Temple. . . . I can see Leo Ryan on the floor of the legislature: "The people of my county," San Mateo County, "are not going to vote for this boondoggle." He kept calling it a boondoggle. Because there had to be a tax in order to do it.

Well, the people in Contra Costa County, to their great credit. . . . the people in the outlying areas in Contra Costa County still haven't gotten service from BART, and they've willingly paid this tax all these many years. I understand now that BART is going to extend them the service, and they should have priority on the service before going to the airport or the ball field or anything else. But it was short-sightedness, in my opinion, on the part of San Mateo County.

We gave a lot of thought to the rail system going down, a spur going into the San Francisco airport, down around San Jose and coming up around southern Alameda County by Hayward, a spur to the Oakland airport, and making a circle. That was a goal that we had hoped for, and if we had done it at that time, we would have a tremendous transportation network at far less than what it

1. S.B. 2, 1969 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 24.

will cost now. It will be years, and of course, many millions of dollars more. I think eventually it will be done.

LAGE: It might be. That's the way the commute patterns are following.

MULFORD: Well, if you're going to get people off the highways. . . . Our freeways are choking right now. I never thought I'd live to see the day where you'd cross the Bay Bridge at two o'clock in the afternoon and see it totally choked with cars. It's hard for me to believe that, but it's here; it's a fact. So I think that mass transportation must have a priority and must be pursued, and it's got to be paid for. And I think the issue must be met by the people.

LAGE: From what I read, there was some partisan division on how to fund BART.

MULFORD: Oh, yes. It was debatable, as any major issue would be. But again, we worked it out.

LAGE: The Republicans wanted a sales tax, and the Democrats wanted a highway tax, or motor vehicles tax.

MULFORD: Yes, a gasoline tax, yes. There was a difference of opinion, but it was worked out.

LAGE: You described it to me as being very controversial. Was it a hot issue?

MULFORD: Well, there were a number of people objecting to it who weren't going to get that service. That had to be worked out. In most issues that become very controversial, eventually you'll find that the people who are objecting, for not receiving the service or whatever reason, usually have a problem of their own coming along, and they want your vote to support their problem. So this quid pro quo rule plays a very interesting and effective role in that exchange of trying to get big projects done. It's a matter of political philosophy usually on which they make their determination. But it's a matter of compromise.

LAGE: I know this is a long way in the past, but how would you try to get support for a measure like BART?

MULFORD: Well, first of all, I was dealing with a statesman, with George Miller, who was a state senator and was the leader in the senate. A strong, tough Democrat. I was a Republican, and I was a Republican leader. So we had two opposite leaders

working together for the common goal of getting this done in our community. We were representing our constituents, not unlike how George Miller and I used to work together on the University of California. That transcends partisanship. So in our areas of influence, we both were spokesmen trying to convince our own friends, our own partisan friends, of the benefit of our particular project.

LAGE: Would you lobby the senators, and the assemblymen?

MULFORD: Sure. We lobbied everyone who would listen to us. [Laughter]

LAGE: Did lobbying take place in a social setting?

MULFORD: No matter where we were: on the floor of the legislature, in the men's room, in the recreation room, or at a party. We lobbied all the time. It still goes on. Lobbying goes on all the time. It's just a matter of selling these people on the idea and eventually. . . . And from the objections and wholesale discussions, there were a number of changes that took place. But that's what legislation is about.

LAGE: Yes, compromise. Were you involved in reapportionment?

MULFORD: Sure, I was reapportioned, I think, twice. That's why I'm not in the legislature.

LAGE: You had mentioned to me that at one time they were thinking of moving your district?

MULFORD: They're always thinking of moving your district. Those, meaning the Democrats, who have always had control of the legislature except for a two-year period, and that wasn't during reapportionment. [Assemblyman, then Congressman Phillip] Phil Burton was a master. And Bob Crown. They used their skill at drawing lines and then used computers. Now it's a fine science. One of the ironies: I was asked if I wanted the University of California to stay in my district the last time reapportionment came. I was proud, being an Old Blue, to represent the university, and of course, that killed me because the university community mounted a real rough campaign to get me out of there. That was the main reason I was defeated, really, was the vote from Berkeley, the campus area.

LAGE: But did your defeat have anything to do with the lines of your district being redrawn? Were you given fewer Republicans in the district at some point?

MULFORD: Not too much, because I never did have too many Republicans in my district. They didn't have to bother. But what they did was to make sure that the status quo and that the university, knowing the university was very, very hostile to me for their conclusions, erroneously, on issues that they were incorrect. . . . But there was a lot of opposition. And don't forget the city of Berkeley and the university itself is a very liberal voting area. And then don't forget there was an eighteen-year-old vote that came in there too. And the young people, with whom I had no relationship, really. . . . It was easy to give them a reason to vote against me.

LAGE: What kind of relationship would you keep with, say, the mayor of Berkeley, the mayor of Oakland?

MULFORD: Well, it would depend on who the mayor was. The first mayors of Berkeley were Republicans, and they were good friends. We constantly communicated and visited with each other. This is true in Oakland. John Redding was the last Republican there. Then Lionel Wilson came in, who was a Democrat and a black, and they then had their own constituency and their own political programs. He and I weren't on the same wavelength at all politically. And Berkeley, Berkeley is well known throughout the world for what it is.

LAGE: Another area where you got involved was job training for minorities, drug penalties, and rehabilitation. Do you recall any of that legislation?

MULFORD: What was the question?

LAGE: I have reference to legislation that you worked on job training for minorities.¹

MULFORD: I supported that, working again with Rumford on that. I think it was with Rumford. But that's pretty obvious: if you don't give job training to minorities or to those that don't have an adequate education, they don't have a chance of pulling themselves up.

1. A.B. 1463, Human Resources Development Act of 1968, 1968 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1460.

LAGE: Of course, this period of time was the time of the Watts riot [1965] and a lot of fear about Oakland going up in flames.

MULFORD: I went to Watts. I saw those riots. I was a guest of the fire chief down there. I sat in on conferences in Oakland. Oakland came very close to going up in flames the same way. A lot of agitation. Don't forget in those days, too, you had the Black Panthers running around with loaded guns in the streets and a number of other acts of violence or near violence.

LAGE: Were there legislative remedies in Sacramento, any effort to make . . .

MULFORD: Oh, sure, there were attempts made to come up with remedies, employment and so forth. The subject was very carefully studied. And it's just as valid today. If a young man or woman does not have a proper education or does not have a base for self-support, they're lost, particularly with drugs. Today when they can go out and make thousands of dollars just for a few days' effort running drugs, I often wonder what the future holds unless they get hold of this thing. You're not going to tell a young man who has dropped out of high school and he gets \$500 a day working as a look-out for the drug dealer--you're going to have a difficult time convincing him that he should work for minimum wage. So the job of salvaging these young people is even more difficult today than it was.

LAGE: I'll bet you're glad you're not in the legislature anymore.

MULFORD: Oh, I don't know. It was a fascinating experience.

LAGE: What about relations with the media? We talked about Knowland and that you did have a pretty close relationship with him.

MULFORD: I think I had a good relationship with all the media. All the major wire services and the Bay Area papers were all represented by bureaus, meaning the reporters, in Sacramento. I worked with all of them. I can't recall ever having any real problem with the media. My rule was to level with them, tell them the truth, and give them a straight answer.

LAGE: Did you get good support come election time from the various papers, local papers, the Berkeley *Gazette*?

MULFORD: Yes.

LAGE: How about the San Francisco papers? Did they . . .

MULFORD: Yes. The *Chronicle*, the *Examiner*. I had their support. The last time I ran, I think the *Chronicle* may not have supported me. I don't remember. But during my active years up there, I had a good relationship with the press.

LAGE: Let's talk a little about the election campaign. You've had a lot of election campaigns.

MULFORD: I sure did.

LAGE: It must have seemed like you just finished one and . . .

MULFORD: I was campaigning all the time, every two years. That's why I don't think two years is correct. I think there should be more years for an assemblyman and a congressman, because they're campaigning all the time. I was campaigning all the time, every time I came down here. You asked me a few minutes ago about the meetings. Part of it was to keep your activity with your constituents alive, and that can all be put down to continuing campaigning.

LAGE: How did the actual election campaign, in the narrow sense, change over those years, from '57 to '70?

MULFORD: Well, first of all, it has become much more expensive; it's become much more professionalized.

LAGE: Even in the years when you were there; through '70 it became more professional?

MULFORD: Yes, it became more professionalized. And having to have a professional campaign manager, having to raise more money to pay for those services. When I first started in politics, we had the ladies from the women's Republican organization--Ruth Watson, I mentioned. If she were alive today, she'd be making a fortune as a campaign manager. She was a natural. She was tough, she was a lady, she was very capable, and she really was a fighter and she knew what she was doing. My whole campaign was in her hands.

They hired a professional when I first ran, Bill Roberts. He just passed away. Then he worked with [Stuart] Spencer, in Spencer-Roberts [campaign managers] in Washington, very close to President Reagan.

LAGE: Was Roberts local here?

MULFORD: No. He was from Los Angeles. He came up here, and they hired a vacant store, and he lived in the back of the store during my first campaign.

LAGE: So they hired him to come up and run that first campaign. And who's "they"?

MULFORD: Well, he gave the professional advice, but the nuts and bolts work and the leg work and all that was done by Republican women under Ruth Watson.

LAGE: And in later campaigns, who did you turn to?

MULFORD: Well, Ruth Watson was always my campaign manager until the very end, and with the volunteers. But we always had strong volunteer groups. I can't speak for how they do things now. Then of course, you had the sophistication and development of television and radio; you have more professional advertisement needs; it costs money to put ads up. That's big money.

LAGE: Did you do television advertising in your later campaigns?

MULFORD: No. We couldn't afford it for one thing, and secondly it wasn't that available to us in local areas, as it is now. Now you have all of these talk shows, programs. The billboards seem to have decreased in usage and they've gone into more radio, more television, as compared to billboards, which was one of our major expenses in the early days.

LAGE: Did you do door-to-door?

MULFORD: Very much. I think I've pushed the button of every house in the district. I really walked the streets. As a matter of fact, Bill Roberts--and I was very much of an amateur--said, "Just go out and shake hands with everybody you see, hand them your campaign card, and ring doorbells." So we'd meet early in the morning for coffee and just start down the street. And I had people working with me; they'd take one side of the street and I'd take the other. We worked until it was dark at night. Exhausting.

LAGE: How did you relate to somebody in such a short time and get your . . .

MULFORD: Because I'm a likable guy. [Laughter] I had bright red hair. And strangely enough, I worked my way through school with my band at Cal, and a number of people remembered my orchestra. They used to dance to my music at the

Claremont Hotel and the Athens Club. I played all of the spots around here. That got me a lot of votes, a lot of Democrat votes, because they remembered my band. They didn't care about my politics; they remembered my music.

LAGE: Those are the things that count sometimes.

MULFORD: Everything counts.

[End Tape 4, Side A]

[Begin Tape 4, Side B]

LAGE: Let's turn to the campaign in '68 and '70 against [Assemblyman Ken] Meade, who finally defeated you in '70.

MULFORD: I defeated Meade the first time, I believe, and then the second time he won. It got very nasty, and they built up the issue that I was against the University of California, which was an inflammatory type of campaign. That was a very unpleasant period in my political experience.

LAGE: It was something you hadn't been exposed to?

MULFORD: I really didn't know how to handle it. I've always been rather straightforward, I think; I've always tried to tell the truth. Congressman [Fortney "Pete"] Stark was brought in here. He wasn't a congressman then; he was a banker. He put out a smear sheet against me. I understood it cost \$1,500 to mail this smear sheet to every constituent in the district.

This is important to have on the record. I received some money from a man by the name of [Louis] Lou Lurie, who is the father of [Robert] Bob Lurie, who owns the Giants in San Francisco. Lou Lurie was a very wealthy real estate owner in San Francisco and a very dear friend of mine. He was a multimillionaire, and he used to give out money for scholarships for children of people who were involved politically and who weren't wealthy, and I qualified for that, as did Jerry Brown [son of Governor Pat Brown], who is the subject of this story.

Lou Lurie asked me about my children, and I told him I had one boy in law school, another boy at Stanford, and two girls coming along, and I was having a tough time financially. I really thought about dropping out of politics. He said,

"Well, I want to give you this scholarship." All of my children had top grades; they were all honors students. They had to be to get into a college like Stanford or UCLA, and they did.

Well, Stark got a hold of this and sent out a smear sheet and said, as I recall, "What promise did Assemblyman Mulford make to Lou Lurie in exchange for the money for the scholarships for his children?" The most disgusting cheap shot I've ever seen in my life. And when it was all over. . . . I was taken by surprise; I really didn't know how to handle it. I didn't have any press relations man or anything like that. I took my children in front of a press conference, which was ill attended--only two or three papers showed up--and they told them that they worked nights. My son worked nights as a night watchman attending the heating apparatus at Hastings Law School college, where he was student body president, incidentally, in his last year. My children said, "We work very hard to get through school," in addition to what I was struggling to get to pay the bill.

It was pretty much of a cheap shot and I've never forgiven him for it. He sent me a letter apologizing when it was all over.

LAGE: Stark did, or Meade?

MULFORD: No, Stark. Stark was the one that made the smear. He said he didn't mean to impugn my integrity and say I was dishonest. Well, that falls on pretty deaf ears. It was a cheap shot then and it's still a cheap shot. I have no use for the man.

LAGE: Do you think that had an effect?

MULFORD: Sure it had an effect. I got phone calls from people and I got letters. It raised an issue of integrity. And people are quick to jump on something like that.

LAGE: And there's not much time to defend yourself.

MULFORD: It was at the end of the campaign; the timing was beautiful. They knew what they were doing. So what happened, Mr. Meade went to Sacramento, and how long did he last? What ever happened to Mr. Meade? Where is he now, and

what did he do when he was there? Put him on your questionnaire and ask him what he accomplished. He didn't accomplish a damn thing, in my opinion.

LAGE: He wasn't there too long. Four years.

MULFORD: I think he was there one or two terms at the most.

LAGE: Any other thing you remember from that campaign? It was partly changing demographics . . .

MULFORD: I was ill at the end of it. I almost had a breakdown over the thing. I had worked all those years, fourteen years, trying to do constructive work, and to have something like that come along, primarily because of the shock treatment for my wife and children, my family. It was difficult to try to explain, to try to answer them. But they believed in me. I never really got over it; I never forgave any of those people. That to me is rotten politics of the worst kind.

That's one of the reasons I got soured on it. That's a reason a lot of people don't get into politics. Look at all these issues in the Congress. Here you have the speaker [James Wright] resigning; here you have one of the leaders of the present administration, and one of the congressmen back there resigning. The average person says, "Well, who wants to get into it? Who wants to take this beating?"

LAGE: What do you think about the salaries? There's a lot of talk that we should pay our legislators more.

MULFORD: We should. The highest possible salary should be paid, and maybe it might attract some people that get in there, other than what we have of people who have never held a job. There are a number of people in public office who have never met a payroll; they've never had a business. They've never been in the competitive arena for earning a dollar. I don't think that's healthy. I think that the issues that politicians have to face, you've got to have some experience on which to exercise a judgment when you vote. So I think that the whole thing should be changed.

I think certainly judges are underpaid. I never thought I'd see the day when judges were resigning, particularly federal judges and superior court judges,

resigning from the bench to go back to the practice of law, where almost overnight they start making substantially more money.

Don't forget that judges, as with anyone else, have families; they have children. And the cost of putting children through school is very, very heavy. I think it's a false conclusion by the people of this country and of this state and of this district that politicians should be expected to work for small sums of money. I think that's dead wrong, and I've always felt that. I was very active in getting the full-time legislation put in, and the salary changes. I supported all of that. If you're asking someone to devote his life to government, you should pay him so he doesn't have to worry about that. He shouldn't have to worry about the cost of his family and school and all of that, so he can concentrate on his job. And if you give a man a substantial enough salary, that will take care of it, together with proper retirement.

That has changed considerably from when I first went to work. When I was first elected, the pay for a legislator was \$500 a month.

LAGE: That was when the legislature was part time. Did you suffer financial loss because of that?

MULFORD: Oh, certainly I suffered financially; certainly I did. I often wonder why I was so stupid to stay on for so long. [Laughter]

LAGE: Now when you came back to civilian life in '70, did you go back to your insurance business or what?

MULFORD: Well, I had to start building it. I had paid people a substantial amount of money to manage my business. It was small. I didn't have time ever to develop new business. So I went back to that.

LAGE: And then how did you get into the protocol work? I'd like you to talk a little bit about that.

MULFORD: Well, I don't get paid for protocol, for one thing.

LAGE: Let's just start, though, with how you got into this kind of thing.

MULFORD: Well, when I was in the legislature as one of the leaders up there, I was working with the governor to receive and host the various dignitaries who were visiting

the legislature. I sort of fell into it; I enjoyed it and felt it was an important role to take care of these people. No one else was paying much attention to it.

Let me go back for a moment to the Stark situation. Jerry Brown, Pat Brown's son who later became Governor Jerry Brown, received the same amount of money, the same scholarship, everything the same as I did at the same time.

LAGE: Were you able to bring that out at the time?

MULFORD: No one paid any attention to it. I had no reason to attack Jerry Brown; I merely mentioned that others had it. Jerry Brown received it, but I was the target. I wasn't particularly interested in attacking Jerry Brown; I didn't feel that was a correct thing to do. There was no reason for it. He hadn't done anything; he accepted the money. God bless him.

I mentioned it to him one time and he said, "Well, fortunately it was not an issue in my campaign." So you see the irony of some things.

LAGE: That's right; that's very ironic. So back to the protocol. As a legislator, you had been involved in protocol?

MULFORD: Oh, yes. Well, as one of the leaders up there for so long--I was caucus chairman seven years of the fourteen years, so I was in the forefront of the activities up there. And then when I left the legislature, Governor Reagan had two years more in his term and he said, "What do you want?" He was ready to give me an appointment. I was fed up with Sacramento. I was disgusted. I was ill, really. I didn't want any part of it; I was just fed up.

[Daniel] Dan London, who was the former managing director of the St. Francis Hotel, a very, very fine man, was acting in the role of protocol, but actually it was because he had a boat. He called it the *Golden Fleet*. They would receive dignitaries who came by the way of ships and that sort of thing. He was very active in the St. Francis Yacht Club. So when these people came, he'd help entertain them. Not like what we're doing now; it's quite different. He asked Governor Reagan to appoint me deputy chief of protocol, which Governor Reagan did. That's how I really started to get into it. Then when Governor

Reagan left, the mayor of Oakland asked me to be chief of protocol, and I was the first chief of protocol for the city of Oakland for several years.

LAGE: And was this all as sort of a volunteer?

MULFORD: Yes. Well, in order to pay. . . . We had no public funds, still don't. I organized a nonprofit corporation called the International Host Committee of California. People pay a fee to belong to that, participate in it. And we worked hard at it. It takes 90 percent of my time now. We work with every member of the consulate corps and all the dignitaries that come in.

LAGE: And it's all kind of an unofficial . . .

MULFORD: No, it's very official.

LAGE: It is official but not funded by the state?

MULFORD: It's official, but it's not funded; that's correct.

LAGE: Is that standard in all states? They wouldn't have a . . .

MULFORD: I don't know about any other states. There are very few chiefs of protocol in other states. California is the target. Don't forget, we're the largest state in the union. If we were a sovereign nation, we'd be number six in the world because of our trade and other actions. So we're in the big league when it comes to this. We're almost looked upon as a separate nation. I know the governor has often said that. We have to give consideration to our size.

LAGE: Have you worked closely with the governor's office?

MULFORD: Oh, of course. I don't do anything without the governor's knowledge and approval.

LAGE: Give me an idea, or an example.

MULFORD: I'll give you an idea. Two nights ago I went out to the airport to meet the president of Portugal [Dr. Mario Soares]. The plane was late; I got home at one o'clock in the morning. I met him; I received him on behalf of the governor. This very morning, the president of Portugal chartered a plane to fly to Sacramento to see the governor and turned around and came right back. There's no need for me to go up there. I've met him, and there's no need to take the time to go up there because it's just a two-hour show. Other times, we had

President [François] Mitterrand of France, the queen of England--I'll give you all the names that you want to mention.

LAGE: What would you have done for the visit of Queen Elizabeth? That was a major event.

MULFORD: We put on a luncheon for her in Sacramento. She flew up in the president's plane, and we met her with the motorcade and all the security, brought her into the capitol and put on a luncheon. She met the governor, spent some time with the governor, and with Prince Phillip. Then after that, she toured the capitol and then flew back to San Francisco.

LAGE: Do you work at all with their advance people?

MULFORD: Of course. All of the major visitors, of major prominence, they all send out advance teams. President Mitterrand sent out about three weeks in advance his chief of protocol from Paris and about fifteen people. It's very detailed. Every, every minute is organized, not only from security but from a programming standpoint. I'm involved in all of that, because after it's all worked out then I have to report to the governor for his approval of whatever the program is.

[Premier] Zhao [Ziyang] who just went out, has just been tossed out by Deng [Xiaoping] in China--we put on a state dinner for him. There's a picture of him on the wall. Do you want to see it?

LAGE: Yes.

[He goes to get the picture]

MULFORD: Most of the pictures I've taken [Inaudible], but here he is, right here. That's the man that's just been thrown out by China. That was the state dinner. That's [Michael] Mike Deaver there.

LAGE: That was '84.

[Inaudible conversation about pictures]

LAGE: There's [President Gerald R.] Jerry Ford.

MULFORD: Yes, Pat O'Brien. [Inaudible]

LAGE: We were just looking at some pictures of various dignitaries.

MULFORD: Oh, I've worked here for. . . . As far as names are concerned. . . . This year, for instance, we put on an annual dinner for the whole consulate corps, and then there's a big change taking place. The ambassador of Hungary [Peter Varkonyi] was here. The leader of Hungary [Károly Grósz] has just been tossed out. We put on a dinner for him. The ambassador of Yugoslavia.

LAGE: So you make the arrangements for these dinners, or your committee does?

MULFORD: Yes. Here's an interesting one. The Sultan Ahmad Shah, the sultan of Pahang in Malaysia, former king of Malaysia. He came with his wife last year and was here for five months while she was undergoing cancer treatment. She has subsequently died.

Károly Grósz, the prime minister of Hungary [General Secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party], was here. We put on a dinner for him. He's just gone out of business.

LAGE: Do you get a chance to talk to these people? Do you ever feel that . . .

MULFORD: I meet them at the place and I'm with them till they leave. Oh, yes.

LAGE: That must be quite an experience.

MULFORD: President [Paul] Alfonsín of Argentina, I met him and was with him for five days. He invited my wife and me to be his guest in Argentina, and we went. The deputy prime minister of Ireland.

LAGE: Do you feel that you need to kind of bone up on the country before you meet them, or is it just more of a personable . . .

MULFORD: No. We just wing it as they come in, and talk with them, whatever they have on their mind. They are primarily interested in what we're doing. They want to know about our state and about our activities. And they're all interested in developing and attracting trade.

President Alfonsín was a delightful person. We meet with all of the ambassadors that come in. There's the grand duke and grand duchess of Luxembourg right there. [Referring to picture] They're really a part of royalty in Europe. Delightful people. All of them have been delightful. Everyone I've met has been.

LAGE: You haven't had any experiences you wouldn't care to repeat, anything that went awry?

MULFORD: No. They've all been just very delightful. I've not had a single experience that would be looked at as an incident that would be unpleasant. You're dealing with the leaders of the world; they're surrounded with their people and tight security. They're all well educated and all very, very pleasant. It's really a marvelous opportunity to see how the other half lives.

LAGE: I'll say. I'm just thinking about protocol and how you address people. Is that something you . . .

MULFORD: Well, each person has a different title. Like the queen of England is Your Majesty, of course. Others may be Your Royal Highness. Others may be Mr. Ambassador.

LAGE: Are these things you just know, or does somebody . . .

MULFORD: Oh, I check them out with the State Department before they come to make doubly sure. Usually I know, but you never leave anything to chance. When I met the president of Portugal two nights ago, he's Mr. President. A delightful person. Very warm, very pleasant; spoke good English. We met him and escorted him to his motorcade and that was that. I gave him personal greetings from the governor, which has all been prearranged. And he was very pleased.

I remember one night we received word from the State Department that the president of Finland [Dr. Mauno Koivisto] was coming in here with his daughter. They'd been on holiday in Hawaii and down in Australia. He had a daughter about twenty years old, a charming girl. She reminded me of my own daughter, just full of fun. She came off the plane with a Hawaiian straw hat. But they got here about eleven or eleven-thirty at night, and they'd been flying. He was really surprised to see someone there greeting him, and very, very, pleased. He subsequently wrote a very nice letter to me and a very nice letter to the governor, to think that we would make an effort to welcome him to California and to the United States. Well, no one is going to suggest to the

president of Finland that he doesn't have friends in California. It paid rich dividends. I enjoy that; I enjoy the pleasant side of these things.

LAGE: How well do you work with Deukmejian?

MULFORD: Well, he's my teammate and friend. He and I first met when he came into the legislature. I was caucus chairman then, and we've been good friends ever since. The fact I'm his chief of protocol speaks for itself. And he has a lovely wife. Gloria Deukmejian is just a marvelous lady. She is a great first lady for this state.

I'm very proud and I'm very pleased that I've had the opportunity to work for them. I think he's been one of the strongest governors in the history of this state by far. He's a hard-working man, and he's extremely serious about things. And keep in mind, he's never had the luxury of having the political strength that it would have been nice to have, because Willie Brown and the opposition have the votes in both houses.

LAGE: When he first came into the legislature, would you have picked him as a person who would go ahead to high office?

MULFORD: Yes. He has a strength of character that shows. He's deadly serious; he's very, very serious. You have to get acquainted with him to even get him to smile. He came out of Long Beach, where he was the man of the year for the junior Chamber of Commerce down there, and we made him the Republican whip right away. From then on, he's always had a leadership role. I left the legislature, then he was elected to the senate, and he became the Republican leader in the senate and was there for a number of years.

He is one of the most, if not the most, highly qualified, from a political experience standpoint, of any man that's been governor. I don't know about the old-timers, but according to my memory. He served in the senate, then he served as attorney general, and we worked hard for his election as attorney general, and of course, we worked extremely hard for him to become the governor. He had a very difficult race as governor, because [Michael] Mike Curb, who had been lieutenant governor, was running for that job, and Mike

Curb had the support of the real conservative branch of the party. Deukmejian didn't have that popular support that Curb had with this other side of the organization.

George had to work very hard. And he's a quiet person and not flamboyant, although I think he's matured beautifully in the job. There's no question in my mind that an accurate description of him is statesman. He's developed a sense of humor, which I really didn't see early on. He tells jokes easily. That's a must, and I think President Reagan has had a lot to do with that, to be able to tell a story and to relax and smile. Very, very important. People don't want to see a dour person up there at the microphone.

LAGE: That's true, and yet if that's not part of your personality . . .

MULFORD: And it's tough; you have to overcome it. And I think this is what George Deukmejian had to do was to overcome that reputation in the beginning. I can understand it, though, because you're very serious about making a good impression. Sometimes it's an overkill.

I'm sorry he's leaving office, but on the other hand, I applaud it because I know that his wife, Gloria, will have an easier life. They still have children in school. And he's never really made any money. I think he's getting \$80,000 a year right now for a job that should pay substantially more than that. That's why I believe we should pay our leaders consistent with what other leaders are paid, leaders of industry, leaders of business.

If you want competent people; if you want people not looking for an extra dollar. . . . I think in the Congress, I don't support that at all where you go out and give lectures and get paid all these substantial sums. Let's pay it out of the public treasury what it should be worth and then forget all this nonsense of being paid this or receiving a substantial amount of money from lobbyists and then being asked to vote for one of their pet subjects. That borders very closely to, if not in fact, conflict of interest. I don't think it's right.

LAGE: Do you keep active--it sounds as if you do--in party politics, helping on election campaigns?

MULFORD: I do, depending on not so much the party now, since I left the legislature, but I work very hard for candidates. Ever since George Deukmejian has been in office, I've worked very hard for him, consistently, really, and now I'm working very hard for [U.S. Senator Peter B.] Pete Wilson.

LAGE: Anybody on the local level?

MULFORD: No, I don't get involved in the local. I contribute money, but I don't get out on the campaign trail for them. They don't need it. The local level is pretty well organized with the party apparatus.

LAGE: OK. Anything else on the protocol job you'd like to say?

MULFORD: I've enjoyed it immensely.

LAGE: Let me ask you about the way you get financial support for the office.

MULFORD: The members of our International Host Committee contribute to the nonprofit corporation, and that is the money that pays for the rent and for the two administrative assistants that we have.

LAGE: And do these host committee members get any benefit? Do they get to meet with foreign visitors?

MULFORD: Oh, sure. They do it. They are, in fact, the organization.

LAGE: No, I mean the people who contribute.

MULFORD: That's right. They have a reception; they get to meet them all the time. That's one of the main inducements to belong to this organization.

LAGE: Are they people who are interested in developing trade?

MULFORD: Yes, trade. Others are people who are just interested in meeting these personalities.

LAGE: Is it both northern and southern California?

MULFORD: No, just northern California.

LAGE: So is there a comparable southern California organization?

MULFORD: No place else in the world is there anything like it.

LAGE: That's very interesting. It's really just something that you made.

MULFORD: Something I created.

- LAGE: Yes. I'm surprised that others haven't taken up on your example. It sounds like a very good thing for the state.
- MULFORD: I think it would be.
- LAGE: Can you tell me a little bit about the California Medical Assistance Commission? You've been on that six years?
- MULFORD: Yes. Well, before that I was on the Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board. I was chairman of that. Then the legislature took the money away from us. They had a big fight internally. I was out of the legislature, but all I know is all of a sudden our money dried up, and we got nothing. So I resigned from that and the governor put me on this committee which receives an income. We administer about one billion dollars a year. The legislature established the law, and we conclude contracts for all the hospitals in the state of California.
- LAGE: For Medi-Cal patients?
- MULFORD: For Medi-Cal patients.
- LAGE: So the commission is responsible for overseeing the Medi-Cal payments?
- MULFORD: That's right. We're not political. Three of us are appointed by the governor, two are appointed by the senate, and two are appointed by the assembly. We work very closely together. It's a good organization. It's becoming tougher and tougher to do our work because AIDS [Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome] is out of control, and a substantial number of the patients on Medi-Cal have AIDS. Narcotics--mothers going in and having children with no prenatal care at all in a hospital. They usually go into an emergency room. This child is born, and they find out the child's mother has been on narcotics. The problems of public health in this state are staggering. I don't know where we're going, but we're working hard at it.
- LAGE: Now does your commission make policy?
- MULFORD: What do you mean, "make policy"?
- LAGE: Well, decisions about who will be paid how much.
- MULFORD: Yes, indirectly, because we negotiate the contracts with the hospitals. Each hospital has a separate contract, and they are precluded by law from telling the

other hospital about it, based on the factors of that particular arrangement when the contracts are negotiated. Hospital A cannot by law tell Hospital B what they're doing, to avoid collusion.

[End Tape 4, Side B]

[Begin Tape 5, Side A]

LAGE: Can you just give more general ideas of the work of the commission? The basic thing is negotiating the contracts with the hospitals?

MULFORD: We meet every two weeks and the primary responsibility is negotiating contracts with the hospitals. There are many hospitals in California.

LAGE: I'll say. And do you have a staff?

MULFORD: Yes, a big staff.

LAGE: So do they do the nitty-gritty work of the negotiating?

MULFORD: Yes, they do the nitty-gritty. And we have negotiators who are well educated and highly qualified people. Sometimes I think we're running a training ground for other health providers. The insurance organizations in California are called health providers; these are the people that have broad-based health plans, such as Blue Cross, Blue Shield, that sort of thing. They are growing. They in turn provide insurance, including Medi-Cal. That part of it, the Medi-Cal, plays a role in the relationship with our committee.

LAGE: I know there have been recent changes in how Medi-Cal reimburses hospitals.

MULFORD: Well, the recent changes are ongoing, which means that the negotiations for contracts are constantly changing, depending on the problems. And also, you have hospitals going out of business. The Oakland hospital here in Oakland, California, is in very serious trouble. I read in today's paper that they may be closing for a number of reasons.

LAGE: Sometimes they complain that they're closing because Medi-Cal doesn't give them enough money.

MULFORD: Yes, in their opinion they're not getting enough money. But we only have so much money. The money we appropriate is authorized by the legislature. We

answer to the legislature. They give us the umbrella of rules and regulations under which we must function.

LAGE: So they set up the basic policy.

MULFORD: That's right, and we implement it.

LAGE: And you implement it through your staff.

MULFORD: It's very detailed, and it's very far-reaching, because there has to be a knowledge of their programs. There isn't a hospital in this state that wouldn't love to have the whole budget for their use, but we have to apportion that money. And we treat the responsibility extremely seriously. You're dealing with the public health, you're dealing with people.

LAGE: And then do you review each contract? Is that the role of the commission?

MULFORD: Every year the contracts are reviewed.

LAGE: It must be extremely detailed work.

MULFORD: It is. I can show you. See all these papers? This is one week's supply of mail that has come in to read. The minutes. These are contracts that are going to be negotiated with various hospitals next week. That's just one week. So it is detailed, and it's involved, and requires a lot of time and effort and study.

LAGE: Why is it that each hospital has its own arrangement?

MULFORD: To prevent collusion for one thing. If all the hospitals could get together and say, "Well, we all want X dollars," we'd be out of business overnight.

LAGE: So you might have a different . . .

MULFORD: Well, each hospital has a different set of circumstances under which they work. They have different costs.

LAGE: Very complex.

MULFORD: Yes, it is. Even sitting on the commission is complex. We have to study, and we have to ask lots of questions.

LAGE: Do you have hearings? Do the hospitals come before you?

MULFORD: We have hearings every two weeks. And the hospitals come to us. Let's see. Let me see the program for next . . . [Looking through papers] Here it is.

Here's the minutes of the meeting. Now what hospitals? Well, we don't have the names of the hospitals here.

LAGE: Are there other groups that are interested parties? Do doctors or the CMA [California Medical Association] appear before you?

MULFORD: Yes, the doctors who are identified with the hospitals are very interested in what fees they're going to get. These contracts are very detailed, right down to what the cost is for open-heart surgery, etc., etc.

LAGE: So they're dealing with what the doctor will also receive?

MULFORD: That's right. Every doctor wants more money, deservedly so, understandably so. Buying these highly technical instruments, all the new treatment ideas. There's much progress, we're recognizing, in medical treatment. But we don't have enough money to do the whole job.

LAGE: Do you deal with issues like where should certain equipment be placed so there's not duplication?

MULFORD: Yes. Well, not only that, but is it necessary that a hospital next door to this hospital have the same type of treatment? These are very technical questions.

LAGE: I should say. What about the recent thing I've been reading about kind of setting priorities for health care? They mentioned that Oregon had set up a system where there would be priorities if we didn't have enough money . . .

MULFORD: That's in Oregon.

LAGE: But it's been talked about in California.

MULFORD: Yes, but we have our own problems.

LAGE: That's not something that's come before your commission?

MULFORD: Not in Oregon; we're only dealing with California. Every question pertaining to public health, though, comes across our desk.

LAGE: Right. Do you deal with the State Department of Health?

MULFORD: Oh, yes. Under them.

LAGE: You work under them?

MULFORD: They have their official sitting in our meetings. It's a team effort.

LAGE: And that's been a six-year appointment. Is that something you think you'll be . . .

MULFORD: I think it's only three years.

LAGE: So you've been on it three years.

MULFORD: Yes, I was reappointed.

LAGE: Anything else to say about that?

MULFORD: Well, I think it's very necessary, but I have a fear about the future because with the cost of health care treatment, I think we have some very serious problems.

LAGE: OK. Shall we close up? Is there any other area that we've missed or a thought that you've had to add?

MULFORD: Whatever you want. I thank you for your interest. I want to hear what jewels of wisdom I've enunciated.

LAGE: You're going to see it and get a chance to put more of your two-cents' worth in if you see an area where you want to add.

[End Tape 5, Side A]