

California State Archives
State Government Oral History Program

Oral History Interview

with

CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

California State Assemblyman, 1966-1972
United States Congressman, 1972-1996

July 22, 29, September 4, December 4, 11, 18, 1997
Glendale, California

By Susan Douglass Yates
Oral History Program
University of California, Los Angeles

RESTRICTIONS ON THIS INTERVIEW

None.

LITERARY RIGHTS AND QUOTATION

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

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

California State Archives
1020 O Street, Room 130
Sacramento, CA 94814

or

Department of Special Collections
Charles E. Young Research Library
P.O. Box 951575
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1575

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

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

Carlos J. Moorhead, Oral History Interview, Conducted 1997 by Susan Douglass Yates, UCLA Oral History Program, for the California State Archives State Government Oral History Program.



Bill Jones
Secretary of State

California State Archives
1020 O Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Information (916)653-7715
Administrative Fax (916)653-7134
Reference (916)653-2246

PREFACE

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

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

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

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

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

Oral History Program
History Department
California State University, Fullerton

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

Oral History Program
Claremont Graduate School

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

Oral History Program
University of California, Los Angeles

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

John F. Burns
State Archivist

July 27, 1988

This interview is printed on acid-free paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTERVIEW HISTORY i

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY iii

SESSION 1, July 22, 1997

[Tape 1, Side A] 1

Family background--Early religious involvement--
Influential teachers at Hoover High School in
Glendale, California--Family's political
affiliations--Enters University of California,
Los Angeles (UCLA) in January of 1940--
Impressions of UCLA--Joins the Reserve Officers
Training Corps (ROTC)--Writes a paper on the 1942
Fourteenth Congressional District election for a
college class--The need for politicians to have a
desire to serve--Political leaders during World
War II.

[Tape 1, Side B] 27

More on political leaders during WW II--Enlists
in the army--Serves at Camp Roberts and later in
the Philippines--Attends University of Southern
California (USC) Law School after the war--
Building a law practice in Glendale--Living
arrangements while attending law school--Shares
an office with Robert Ingram and Howard J.
Thelin--Decides to run for the Forty-third
Assembly District in 1966--Breakup of Moorhead's
first marriage and marriage to his second wife,
Valery Tyler--Obtaining local support to run for
political office--Campaigning for U.S. House of
Representatives in 1972.

SESSION 2, July 29, 1997

[Tape 2, Side A] 52

Works as a shipwright's helper at the California Shipbuilding Corporation during the summer of 1941--Builds houses with his father, Carlos A. Moorhead, while in high school--More on obtaining support to run for the assembly in 1966--Demographics of the Forty-third Assembly District in 1966--What it means to be a "constructive conservative"--Issues raised during the 1966 campaign--Obtaining endorsements--Campaign fund-raising--Dealing with difficult issues during a campaign--Moorhead's opinion on abortion--More on campaigning for Congress in 1972--Moorhead limits his law practice after winning election to the assembly.

[Tape 2, Side B] 77

Jesse M. Unruh--The orientation provided to freshmen legislators--Develops friendships with fellow legislators--The effects of the 1965 reapportionment--More on Unruh--Working out a budget bill with an assembly Democratic majority during Ronald W. Reagan's governorship--Robert T. Monagan as assembly speaker--Partisanship in the assembly--Republican legislators' relationship with Governor Ronald Reagan--More on Monagan as assembly speaker--Moorhead's admiration for Reagan.

SESSION 3, September 4, 1997

[Tape 3, Side A] 101

Student political activism in the late 1960s--The Select Committee on Campus Disturbances--The Natural Resources, Planning, and Public Works Committee's efforts to improve conditions at Lake Tahoe--Challenges in working with both management and labor on workmen's compensation and disability insurance legislation--Need for

changes in the federal justice system--Attempt to eliminate a loophole in drunk driving law--The challenges of moving bills through committee--Keeping in touch with constituents--Establishment of a full-time legislature in 1966--More on keeping in touch with constituents--Role of lobbyists during the late sixties and early seventies--Seeking reelection to the assembly.

[Tape 3, Side B] 127

More on seeking reelection to the assembly--The Republican party during the late 1960s--Efforts to elect Republican candidates to the state assembly--Reasons Reagan defeated Governor Edmund G. "Pat" Brown Sr. in the 1966 gubernatorial election--Why Reagan's lead diminished in the 1970 governor's race--The Republican majority in the assembly in 1969-70--Reasons why Republicans lost an assembly majority--The advantages of taking moderate positions and being able to form alliances across party lines--Fulfilling and unfulfilling aspects of state legislative service--More on the need for changes in the federal justice system.

SESSION 4, December 4, 1997

[Tape 4, Side A] 146

Decision to run for the House of Representatives in 1972--The impact of the 1970-72 reapportionment on the Twentieth Congressional District--Campaigning before the primary election--Winning the Republican primary--Running against Democrat opponent John Binkley--Demographics of the Twentieth Congressional District--Impact of school busing on the district--Moorhead's first impressions of Washington, D.C.--Assignment to the House Judiciary Committee--Orientation as a new House member--Differences between serving in the California state legislature and serving in Congress--Developing relationships with

colleagues--Reasons why the Judiciary Committee voted in favor of impeaching Nixon.

[Tape 4, Side B] 173

Reasons Moorhead voted against impeachment--
Reasons Nixon resigned--The impeachment hearings' impact on individual Judiciary Committee members' political futures--Inequities in the impeachment process--Members of the Judiciary Committee--Peter W. Rodino Jr.--Running for reelection in 1974--The impact of the 1974 reapportionment on the Twenty-second Congressional District.

SESSION 5, December 11, 1997

[Tape 5, Side A] 196

The evolution of the Lockheed Air Terminal into the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport--Federal support for the airport--Dispute over airport expansion and noise--Moorhead's involvement with airport issues--Saving the Vista del Arroyo Hotel in Pasadena--Preserving Pasadena's Colorado Street Bridge--Supports ROTC programs in high schools--Naming a nuclear submarine the USS Pasadena--Difficulties in developing Los Angeles's rapid transit system--Federal support of the space exploration program.

[Tape 5, Side B] 223

Decline of federal funding for the space program--Importance of ensuring continuous funding for key federal programs--Moorhead supports building senior citizen facilities in his district--Bills Moorhead has sponsored dealing with energy and public utilities--The 1994 Northridge and 1989 Loma Prieta earthquakes--The supercollider program--1980 campaign against Democratic opponent Pierce O'Donnell--Impact of the 1981 reapportionment on Moorhead's reelection.

SESSION 6, December 18, 1997

[Tape 6, Side A] 251

Serves as Republican dean of the California congressional delegation--Issues discussed at bipartisan meetings of the delegation--Reasons for creating the California Institute for Federal Policy Research--Moorhead's role in creating the institute--The process of appointing members to the institute--The institute provides information on the supercollider for the California delegation--The newly established metro system in L.A.--Effectiveness of individual members of the California congressional delegation--The Republican delegation's response to reapportionment--Impact of the reapportionment of 1990 on Moorhead's reelection in 1992 and 1994--The California Republican delegation supports legislation preventing the closure of nuclear plants--Reasons Moorhead supports nuclear power facilities.

[Tape 6, Side B] 277

More on the effectiveness of individual members of the California congressional delegation--The Federal Court Study Commission--The question of whether to divide the ninth judicial circuit--Moorhead's 1994 campaign--Opposes the tax increase during the Ronald W. Reagan administration--Reasons Moorhead was not named chair of the Judiciary Committee or the Energy and Commerce Committee after Republicans gained control of the House of Representatives--The role Newton L. Gingrich played as Speaker of the House--Role of partisanship in the California state legislature and in Congress--Moorhead's assessment of House majority leaders--Moorhead's positions on abortion and capital punishment--Contentious issues Moorhead dealt with while in the House of Representatives.

[Tape 7, Side A] 303

More on contentious issues Moorhead dealt with while in office--More on the need to reform the federal justice system--Reasons for retiring from public office--Impact of term limitations--Positive aspects of serving in Congress--Moorhead's accomplishments during his congressional tenure--Disappointments during his tenure--His congressional staff--Activities since leaving Congress--The importance of public service.

INTERVIEW HISTORY

Interviewer:

Susan Douglass Yates
Editor, UCLA Oral History Program
B.A., University of California, Santa Cruz
[History]
M.A., California State University, Sacramento
[History]

Interview Time and Place:

July 22, 1997
Moorhead's office in Glendale, California
Session of one and one-half hours

July 29, 1997
Moorhead's office in Glendale, California
Session of one and one-half hours

September 4, 1997
Moorhead's office in Glendale, California
Session of one and one-quarter hours

December 4, 1997
Moorhead's office in Glendale, California
Session of one and one-quarter hours

December 11, 1997
Moorhead's office in Glendale, California
Session of one and one-half hours

December 18, 1997
Moorhead's home in Glendale, California
Session of two and one-quarter hours

Editing

Jennifer E. Levine, editorial assistant, UCLA Oral History Program, checked the verbatim manuscript of the interview against the original tape recordings, edited for punctuation, paragraphing, and spellings, and with the interviewer verified proper names. Insertions by the editor are bracketed. Susan Douglass Yates, editor, prepared the table of contents, biographical summary, and interview history.

Moorhead reviewed the edited transcript and returned it with only minor corrections.

Papers

Moorhead's papers are deposited at the Department of Special Collections, UCLA, and are catalogued as the Carlos J. Moorhead Collection #494, 1973-1996.

Tapes and Interview Records

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

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY

Carlos J. Moorhead was born in Long Beach, California, on May 5, 1922. When he was eleven years old, his family moved to Glendale, California, where he attended public schools. He graduated from Hoover High School in 1940.

Moorhead attended the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), where he majored in political science and earned his bachelor of arts degree in 1943. After completing his army service in 1945, he attended law school at the University of Southern California.

Upon receiving his law degree in 1949, Moorhead established a law practice in Glendale. While in practice, he became involved in numerous community and political organizations, including the Glendale Young Republicans. He also served as director of the legal aid and lawyer's reference service in Glendale.

From 1966 to 1972 Moorhead represented the Forty-third District in the California State Assembly. During his assembly tenure, he was vice chair of the Natural Resources, Planning, and Public Works Committee and assembly member of the California Law Revision Commission.

In 1972, Moorhead was elected to the United States House of Representatives in the Twentieth District. There he served on the Judiciary Committee during President Richard M. Nixon's impeachment hearings. Over the course of his tenure, he became ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee and the Energy Conservation and Power Subcommittee, served as vice chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and chair of the Intellectual Property and Judicial Administration Subcommittee. Moorhead was also Republican dean of the California congressional delegation and was appointed by Chief Justice William Rehnquist to serve on the Federal Court Study Commission. Moorhead was a founding member of the California Institute for Federal Policy, a think tank created to help California's congressional members. He retired from Congress in 1996.

In addition to his political career, Moorhead has been active in his community as chairman of the Red Cross financial campaign, as a foundation member for the Glendale Community College and Glendale Adventist Hospital, and as a member of the Salvation Army advisory board. At the time of this interview he and his wife Valery, whom he married in 1969, retained their Glendale residence.

[Session 1, July 22, 1997]

[Begin Tape 1, Side A]

YATES: I thought we could begin our interview session by asking you about where and when you were born.

MOORHEAD: I was born in Long Beach, California, on May 5, 1922.

YATES: Right. And you were just telling me . . .

MOORHEAD: My birth certificate says the sixth.

YATES: Right, but you were actually born on May 5.

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: Did your family live in Long Beach?

MOORHEAD: My mother and father lived in Long Beach, yes. [I'm] the first child.

YATES: And you have siblings?

MOORHEAD: I have a sister [Joanne Moorhead Gunn] five and a half years younger than I am.

YATES: OK. Where was your family originally from?

MOORHEAD: Well, they basically grew up in Redlands, California.

YATES: Both your parents?

MOORHEAD: Both of my parents. My mother was the daughter of a Dutch farmer who raised oranges in Redlands. My father was the son of a small-time contractor and carpenter who also had an orange grove for a while up in Redlands.

[My parents] both lived there until World War I. They were both young when they got married. My mother was twenty-one, my dad was twenty, but there's only six months' difference in their age. And they moved to Long Beach when my dad went to work in the war in the shipyards.

YATES: Oh, I see. How did they meet originally?

MOORHEAD: They met in high school.

YATES: OK, in Redlands. So he got a job in the shipyards in Long Beach in World War I.

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: So they would have gone out there 1917 or '18, I guess it would be. I can't remember the exact year of the. . . .

MOORHEAD: Just about that time.

YATES: OK. Your family moved to Glendale, though, later.

MOORHEAD: They moved to Glendale in 1933. We were down at the beach for the earthquake on March 10, 1933. And we were in Glendale just in time for the big

flood at the end of 1933 and the first of '34. That was before they had the check dams up in the hills here, and almost every bridge, with one or two exceptions, across the Verdugo Wash were washed out.

YATES: Wow.

MOORHEAD: Really a serious flood.

YATES: Why did they move to Glendale?

MOORHEAD: The main reason was that we were living in a suburb of Long Beach then, Wilmington. And Wilmington was a part of the Los Angeles [Unified] School District, and the Los Angeles city schools were a disgrace down there at the beach. And Wilmington schools, both San Pedro and Banning high [schools] were not accredited high schools. They knew I was getting close to that point, and they didn't want to live in a place where I would have to go to a poor school. So I went five and a half years to grammar school down there, which was fine. But the principal of the high school at the time, I understood, couldn't even walk up to the second floor of the building. This was just one of those things, and so they decided to move to Glendale.

YATES: I saw that you would have been eleven when you moved to Glendale.

MOORHEAD: Yes, I would have been.

YATES: You know, before we go on, I wanted to ask you, your family on both sides came from Redlands: How did they end up in Redlands originally? Do you know?

MOORHEAD: Well, I know how my mother's folks [Henry and Johanna Gravers] did. My grandfather was born in Holland. When he was seventeen years old, he and a blind mother and a younger sister came to the United States. They went to Clymer, New York, which was a Dutch community. But the health of my grandfather was not good in the cold, cold climate back there, and so eventually they moved to Redlands, where they also had a large Dutch community.

YATES: Oh, I didn't realize that.

MOORHEAD: When I was younger, there were a lot of Dutch churches up there.

I don't know for sure why my dad's folks [Elizabeth and John Riddle Moorhead] moved there. They were from Zanesville, Ohio. All I know is that they moved there about the same time that my mother's parents moved there, but a

little after the turn of the century.

YATES: Yes, that's a long, long history in California. Well, just for the record, what are the full names of your parents?

MOORHEAD: The maiden name of my mother?

YATES: Yes.

MOORHEAD: Florence Joanna Gravers. And my dad's name was Carlos Arthur Moorhead.

YATES: Now, once the family moved to Glendale, what was your dad doing? Was he still at the shipyards?

MOORHEAD: No, no, a lot of years went on in between.

YATES: Right.

MOORHEAD: And Glendale was right in the middle of the Depression. My dad built homes when he could get a contract to build one, but there wasn't much going on. He tried a number of things. He never had trouble getting a license for real estate or for building contractors or whatever. He didn't even have to take the course. He was really able to jump in, read the book, and take the exam. But during those years, everybody was having a struggle. And finally with the start of World War II, Dad went back to the shipyards, and I did too; I worked in the shipyards for the summer.

YATES: Oh, you did?

MOORHEAD: California shipyards. It helped me at UCLA, with the cost of living. But as soon as I was called into the service, they moved back to Long Beach.

YATES: Oh, I see.

MOORHEAD: They lived there until the end of the war. And then guess where they moved to for their final years? Redlands.

YATES: Redlands. I was going to guess that.

[Laughter]

MOORHEAD: My sister still lives up there.

YATES: In Redlands?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: You said that your sister is younger than you are, so she would have gone to high school then in Long Beach.

MOORHEAD: She went to [Woodrow] Wilson High School. I went to Hoover [High School] in Glendale. [I went to] Mark Keppel grammar school, Toll Junior High School, and Hoover High School.

YATES: Off tape we were talking about the interview, and you mentioned your mom having the opportunity to go to college. Both your parents completed high school, but in terms of any

education past that, did they. . . .

MOORHEAD: They went to business college. In fact, they were together, I understand, in class in the business college. It may be where they decided to get married, I don't know.

YATES: Was that out in Redlands?

MOORHEAD: That was up there in that area.

YATES: But tell me again about how your mom had the opportunity to go to college. Where was this?

MOORHEAD: She was granted a full scholarship to USC [University of Southern California]. Her father was very conservative. You know how Dutch people are. They don't want their kids to be subjected to any problems or anything, and they thought of Los Angeles as being a city of problems. But, you know, the funny thing is that he let my aunt [Alida Gravers Parker] come down, and she graduated from the predecessor of UCLA, which was Los Angeles [State] Normal School. She became a school principal.

YATES: She was her younger sister?

MOORHEAD: Older.

YATES: That is interesting.

MOORHEAD: I don't know the reason, but. . . .

YATES: In terms of your growing up, did your mom work

outside the home?

MOORHEAD: No.

YATES: But she did go to a business school of some form.

MOORHEAD: Yes. In those days, women didn't do a whole lot of that. My mother was always active in the PTA [Parent-Teacher Association] and things of that kind, but she never had a job.

YATES: OK. What was your home life like? Especially when you were, maybe, in elementary school.

MOORHEAD: Well, we were a very close family, actually. My parents did things with us. Socially, they didn't have. . . . They had good friends. They would have four different couples, I guess, that would meet regularly and they played bridge or whatever. But they were pretty conservative in the way they lived, actually. We always had a nice home. We didn't have much money, but we always had a nice place to live. My mother thought that was very important for kids growing up.

YATES: To have a nice home?

MOORHEAD: Yes. My sister, when her time came, was sent to the University of Redlands, with a little bit more money coming into the family about that

time at the end of the war, and Redlands was a good school. She went there for three years, and then she finished up and got her degree from USC. We had a close family, actually.

YATES: Did any particular religion play a strong role in your family?

MOORHEAD: It did pretty much in my life. I've belonged to Glendale Presbyterian Church for sixty-four years, I guess, so I am a longtime member. I was active in Christian Endeavor for a while. A group that I went around with went to a little Baptist church [Lake Street Baptist] in Glendale at night, so I'd go over there. And I was one time the president of the Lake Street BYPU [Baptist Young People's Union [Laughter]]--I didn't belong to that church however. My parents and my sister all belonged to the same church I did, but Dad didn't like to go. He'd go to church once in a while, but he didn't like to go to meetings very much.

YATES: So it sounds like your mom, you, and your sister might go to church on a regular basis?

MOORHEAD: Yes. My dad would come sometimes, but he wasn't big on any kind of a club meeting or anything like that.

YATES: Well, I am still thinking about elementary age. What did you do for fun? How did you spend your free time?

MOORHEAD: Well, in those days, Christian Endeavor had a lot of social events. We'd go on picnics and trips to the mountains and all kinds of things. And when I was young, our family always had a couple of weeks in the mountains someplace in the summertime. We played cards, played a lot of bridge, and other things like [going to] the beach occasionally. The group I hung out with had a lot of beach parties. It was just like regular kids, I guess you could say.

YATES: Where would you go in the mountains for trips?

MOORHEAD: Crestline. The San Gabriel River was a free-flowing river in those days. We had friends that had a home up on the river that got washed out later on, but that was one of the places. And we went to Running Springs and various places in the San Bernardino Mountains.

YATES: Right. There are actually quite a few nice places up there.

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: Once you got into high school, I was wondering what subjects did you like in particular?

MOORHEAD: Social studies, history, economics, things of that sort, and, believe it or not, math. I've always enjoyed mathematics. We had a radio arts class, and we did a program on KIEV [radio station]. I took public speaking, and things like that. I liked school. I wasn't a brilliant student, but I enjoyed it.

YATES: Were there any teachers in particular that influenced you at that point?

MOORHEAD: In high school?

YATES: Yes.

MOORHEAD: Yes, there were. There were a couple of social studies teachers. Mr. Howlett was one of them, Walter Barager. One of my English teachers that I well remember in high school went by the name of Auxure. He later became a real estate broker here in Glendale.

We had an outstanding vice principal at Hoover High School when I started there. His name was [Normal C.] Norm Hayhurst. He later became the principal. I think he was a friend of everybody's, and later on he became the superintendent of the schools here in Glendale. And then he became the president of Fidelity Federal Savings and Loan, which is a major

federal savings and loan. So he had an illustrious career. Nothing happened in Glendale that he and a couple of others didn't like in those days, because they were considered the real leaders of the community. So when I first ran for political office, it was pretty nice to have friends of that kind.

YATES: Right, that helped.

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: These teachers whose names you remember, how do you think they influenced you?

MOORHEAD: I think the way they influence you is to truly excite you about the courses that they teach. I had a lady that taught English literature, and I can still remember those poems.

YATES: That's impressive. Do you remember her name?

MOORHEAD: She was the head of the English department, if I'm not mistaken, at Hoover.

YATES: So that was English Lit.

MOORHEAD: Yes. I will probably remember her name, but right this second, I don't. She was an older lady, but she was really a neat gal. I remember Coleridge and Bobby Burns and Keats and Shelley and all of those great poets.

YATES: They helped you to really love the subject, it

sounds like. And it was English and history--

MOORHEAD: I still drive my wife [Valery Tyler Moorhead] bats. I remember too many of them. The ode "To a Louse" is one of my favorites. Do you remember that?

YATES: No. I couldn't memorize it.

MOORHEAD: O Jeany dinna toss your head,
 An' sprèd your beauties a' abroad!
 Ye little ken what cursed speed
 The blastie's makin:
 O wad some Power the giftie gie us
 To see oursels as ithers see us!
 It wad frae mony a blunder free us,
 An' foolish notion:

She was in church, and there was a flea on her back. She thought everyone was looking at her; they were, but not for the reason she thought.

YATES: [Laughter] Were you interested in any sports or other extracurricular activities when you were in high school? It sounds like you were involved in the church quite a bit.

MOORHEAD: Yes, I was. I was interested in sports, but not as a player. The only thing I ever won was a handball tournament, but I didn't go out for any of the teams. I was rather quiet in high school, as a matter of fact. I started coming out of that a little bit at UCLA, but that was one of the troubles I had when I got into the officer candidate school. By the time I got

back from my military service, I was ready to go. I just got much more active when I got into law school.

YATES: When you were older?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: Well, let me ask you a little bit in terms of politics at that time. You mentioned that your parents were fairly conservative, and I was wondering how interested you were in politics in particular at the time.

MOORHEAD: Very much so. All of my life.

YATES: Really? Why do you think that is?

MOORHEAD: Well, I think some things just excite you. To me, it's the basis for our freedom and our liberty, and virtually much that we have comes from sound political government. At least that's the way it looks to me. I just always have been very excited about it.

YATES: Did your family talk about politics?

MOORHEAD: Sure.

YATES: I'm thinking especially because it's the Depression, of course. I don't know if you think that had any influence in particular and if that was a constant subject.

MOORHEAD: My mother's father was always a registered

prohibitionist until Franklin [D.] Roosevelt came along and wanted a repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. Then he became a Republican.

My dad's father was a character. His main love was the Masonic lodge. He was a commander of the commandery and high priest of the chapter and everything else. But he didn't like Roosevelt and called him "that damned SOB."

YATES: Now, who would say that?

MOORHEAD: My grandfather. [Laughter]

YATES: That was your grandfather on your dad's side.

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: Yes, your paternal grandfather.

MOORHEAD: They were all Republicans, as you can imagine.

When Upton Sinclair ran for governor against [Frank F.] Merriam, Merriam was actually one of the ushers of the [First] Presbyterian Church in Long Beach. My mother was going to vote for Sinclair, and that was the only one big argument I ever remember my folks having. She didn't.

YATES: But she said she was going to.

MOORHEAD: My dad was really upset about that, but she didn't. Sinclair espoused socialistic ideas, no question about that.

YATES: Well, California has had an interesting history

of. . . . Candidates didn't fit into specific categories necessarily of the straight Republican what with cross-filing and everything.

MOORHEAD: So many of the Republican leaders have been Democrats: [Ronald W.] Ron Reagan was a labor leader. Our present congressman, whom I endorsed before he announced that he was going to run--[James E.] Jim Rogan--was a Democrat.

YATES: I didn't know that.

MOORHEAD: But the party just left his philosophy, and so he changed parties. That's the same thing that happened to many others.

YATES: Would you talk about this at the dinner table, or were these things that you observed in terms of your parents talking about politics?

MOORHEAD: Oh, we talked about politics. Our folks didn't have a lot of money, but they were interested in things going on in the world, very much so. My mother only gave me one piece of advice, though, about what I should do when I grew up.

YATES: What was that?

MOORHEAD: Never sell liquor. That was the only advice she gave me.

YATES: Why did she say that specifically?

MOORHEAD: Oh, probably her family traditions. They wouldn't be opposed to having--if they had a group over--one drink or something. My dad made wine once in a while.

YATES: He made wine you said?

MOORHEAD: Yes, but rarely. He did it once or twice.

YATES: So they weren't teetotalers?

MOORHEAD: They weren't teetotalers, but they weren't supportive of the liquor industry either. My dad smoked, and I think that's worse than liquor. He died from it.

YATES: Did he have lung cancer?

MOORHEAD: No, he died of heart problems.

YATES: Well, once you were coming towards the end of finishing high school, what were your plans?

MOORHEAD: Law school. I decided that I wanted to be a lawyer when I was in the eighth grade.

YATES: Why is that, do you think?

MOORHEAD: We had a class in occupations, and they asked us to choose what we thought we would like to be and to visit people in that profession or that line of work and write our term paper on it. I picked the law, and I stuck to it.

YATES: It still appealed to you?

MOORHEAD: Yes. So, when I graduated from UCLA, I had been

called into the service two weeks earlier. They had taken everybody in the ROTC [Reserve Officers Training Corps] at the same time, so they worked it out for everyone to graduate.

YATES: I was going to ask you about that, because you finished high school in 1940, I had down. So you entered college in the fall of '40?

MOORHEAD: I entered college in January of 1940.

YATES: Oh, I see, so early then?

MOORHEAD: Yes, I was in a mid-term class. And I graduated in just a normal period of time, in June '43.

YATES: Well, back to college. You wanted to be a lawyer, and that meant you had to go to college. How did you decide where you were going to go?

MOORHEAD: Well, it wasn't hard. I guess I didn't want to go to a--I shouldn't say this--junior college. I'm on one of the foundations for Glendale Community College now.

YATES: Why did you not want to go to a junior college?

MOORHEAD: Well, I just thought that a four-year college was preferable, and UCLA was a good school. It was one I could afford to go to. We drove back and forth every day. I didn't live at the campus, we didn't have enough money for that.

YATES: I was going to ask you if you lived at home.

MOORHEAD: Yes. We drove to school--myself and three other Glendale students. Our car was full every day. [Edward L.] Ed Hubbard became an atomic scientist. He was the head of one of the first major projects up at Cal [University of California, Berkeley].

YATES: You rode with him, is that what you said?

MOORHEAD: We all rode together. We took turns driving and so forth. My other friends became--two of them--CPAs [certified public accountants]. They all had good careers.

YATES: Are these people you went to high school with?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: And they all went to UCLA. So that's how you knew each other.

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: What was UCLA like when you started there?

MOORHEAD: It was a wartime school. Not so much the first year. But for me, I was in the ROTC advance corps. Everything was in preparation of the war, really, at that time. The navy had a large naval program there. The people in school--the men--didn't know what was going to happen to them or when they were going to be taken. A lot of the women were working in those days. I

think we had about seven or eight thousand kids on that campus. Very much, much smaller, you'd never know it.

YATES: Compared to now?

MOORHEAD: There were the two gyms. Now I understand that they did away with the women's gym there. I don't know why they did that. What do the women do for sports?

YATES: You know, I'm not sure, because I haven't used those facilities. I think there is something, but you're talking about the original building?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: The building is there, but it's not used for that, so it must be part of the newer complex of facilities.

MOORHEAD: Anyway, there was Royce Hall and the library across from it. Then there was the physics building and the chemistry building. And back of Kerckhoff Hall, there was the education building. . . .

YATES: Moore Hall is the education building right next to Kerckhoff.

MOORHEAD: And then there was the administration building that was across Janss bridge, they called it.

YATES: Why did they call it that?

MOORHEAD: Janss is the developer that developed the whole area and gave the land for the school. Those steps are called Janss steps that lead up from the gyms to Royce Hall.

YATES: Those are quite a set of stairs, huh?
[Laughter]

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: You mentioned that you joined ROTC. When did you do that?

MOORHEAD: You had to take it the first two years.

YATES: You did? OK. So as soon as you started college you were in ROTC.

MOORHEAD: Yes, that was mandatory. It probably isn't anymore. And then the last two years, there were a lot of people that tried to get in, but were not able to. In wartime, of course, people liked to get in if they could. I think there were forty of us that got into advance corps then in our class, and then there were other classes still.

YATES: How much time did ROTC take, generally, in terms of your overall taking classes and such?

MOORHEAD: Not a lot. I think it was one and a half units. Maybe it was two units. I don't know. But just a couple of hours a week, if I remember

correctly.

YATES: Since it sounds like early on you wanted to be a lawyer, did that mean you pretty much focused on certain subject areas once you got to UCLA?

MOORHEAD: I took those courses that I thought would be helpful. It's interesting probably, in one of the classes I had from Dean [E.] McHenry on political parties and pressure groups, I wrote my thesis at the end of the year on the congressional race in the Fourteenth Congressional District, which eventually became the district that I represented--not the same number. I interviewed all the candidates and the people of all of the political parties, and there were several of them in the race. The owner of the Altadena newspaper was one of the people running in a third party role. I forget what year that was. In 1942, I think.

YATES: Right, OK.

MOORHEAD: This district, the last time it went Democrat was with John Steven McGroarty, who was the poet laureate of California, lived in Tujunga, and served from 1935, '36, '37, and '38, and he was defeated in 1938.

YATES: You said "defeated in 1938," and he was the last

Democrat?

MOORHEAD: Yes. By Carl [J.] Hinshaw.

YATES: Oh, yes, I recognize that name.

MOORHEAD: Carl was the congressman for eighteen years, lacking about five months. He died after he had won the primary for his tenth term and before the general. So H. Allen Smith was chosen by the [Los Angeles County Republican] Central Committee to be the Republican candidate that year, and he served for sixteen years until 1972.

YATES: Oh, right, OK. What did you learn about the district, in general, in doing this paper?

MOORHEAD: Well, the district has changed a lot through the years.

YATES: Sure. But I was wondering, at that time, what did you learn about it?

MOORHEAD: Well, it was very conservative. Actually, this area was the very roots of, you might say, a conservative approach to politics in California. A lot of the leaders that went down to Orange County later on had moved down there from this basic area. It wasn't that the people here changed their minds or became more liberal. It was so many of our more affluent people, our

more conservative people, moved out to other areas. They were replaced by people that were not citizens and who couldn't vote. And people that couldn't afford to move to better places stayed here, and they were more apt to be Democrats than they were Republicans. So the district is now somewhat competitive.

YATES: So since that time . . .

MOORHEAD: That has somewhat changed. Glendale is now 25 percent Armenian and 25 percent Chicano, and we've got a share of Orientals of various kinds, and a scattering of blacks. Pasadena has a fairly large black population and a fairly large Armenian population, too. The Orientals are big in Arcadia, San Marino, and parts of Pasadena. They're rich, too. Their people quite often have come from Hong Kong or Taiwan and don't know what's going to happen over there, and they've come and built homes here. They still have interests over there, a lot of them.

YATES: Well, let me ask you a little bit more about what you were taking at UCLA and, I guess, specifically about Dean McHenry, because you mentioned him off tape. How much did he influence you on just your outlook on politics,

or your studying it, I should say?

MOORHEAD: I think more of an interest in politics. You know, I think there's one thing that's underemphasized in politics: if you want to be in political life, you've got to have a desire to serve. It's not what you can get out of it. Jesus washed the feet of his disciples. And I think if you want to be a leader in politics, you have to be willing to do what you can to serve other people. If you aren't willing, I don't even think you belong in the field at all. I know there are some of the others that get into it, but they don't do well, really, and they don't last very long.

YATES: That message was emphasized to you, in a way, in some of these classes?

MOORHEAD: Well, he emphasized the desire to make things better for others, sure. I think that's a very, very important thing. I don't care which party you're in or anything else. I think that has to be a desire, or you're going to be unhappy. Incumbents have a great advantage of being able to solve problems for people, individual problems. I got a letter from a guy one time. I ran the legal aid and lawyer reference service

of the Glendale Bar Association as a volunteer for sixteen years, so I had a lot of people from both political parties that were friends when I got into politics. I got this letter from a guy a few years ago that said, "Well, Mr. Moorhead, I hope you can vote for a particular bill that I am interested in. I really don't believe in your political philosophy, but you saved my. . . ." "And I'll support you regardless of what you want to run for." I think when people vote, they vote for people they like and they want to vote for people that will go out of their way to help them. The philosophy thing is important, but it isn't the only thing.

YATES: Were there other teachers at UCLA that left an impression on you? It sounds like Dean McHenry left an impression on you.

MOORHEAD: Well, he did. And there were a couple of my high school teachers that did, too. Walter Barager was one of them. I had social studies [with him]. I think the teachers that you remember are those that are so involved in their subject that they give an enthusiasm to the students that are in their class. The teacher that can't do that is probably not going to do a

very great job of teaching.

YATES: You mentioned ROTC and going into the army. And we were talking about the years that you started at UCLA in 1940. Up until the point when the U.S. entered the war, I was wondering, how closely did you follow events yourself? It sounds like you were interested in politics.

MOORHEAD: Well, I was. I think that for every young man that even had a casual interest in politics during those years, Winston Churchill had to be a hero. If there was anyone that could excite people and get them moving, Winston Churchill was the one. For one thing, he had been a maverick in politics in Great Britain. His own party wasn't too thrilled with it. He had strongly thought that England had made a tremendous mistake in not being prepared to defend themselves in case of a war. And, of course, Neville Chamberlain's ill-fated trip in which he made a deal with the Nazis could never work out. Those people didn't stick to anything.

[End Tape 1, Side A]

[Begin Tape 1, Side B]

YATES: OK, you were talking about Churchill.

MOORHEAD: Some of the speeches that he gave were, I think, some of the finest that we've ever heard. Whether you're English or American or what, they had to be the kind of call to action that you rarely got. I don't think England would have survived with just an ordinary man in that position as prime minister. Well, without Hitler's tremendous mistake, either, of getting into the war on two fronts, because if England had to defend itself against the full force of the Nazis, I don't know how well they would have done.

YATES: What did you think of Roosevelt at that point?

MOORHEAD: Well, I think different of him now than I did then. I was a staunch Republican. I thought he was bringing a lot of socialist ideas into the country and so forth. I firmly believe that he knew that the Japanese were going to attack Pearl Harbor, because the message had been sent to the White House. But I think that he felt that our preservation of the free world depended upon our getting in and helping. I think he felt that he couldn't bring the American people along unless there was something that was extraordinary that happened. I'm not defending

him, but I can well see if that were true, and I don't know that it was, that he felt it was his responsibility to bring us into participation there and that shock would unite our people. They certainly never united in Vietnam and not too well in Korea, but they were in World War II.

YATES: You entered the army in 1942. Were you drafted?

MOORHEAD: No.

YATES: Oh, OK, you enlisted?

MOORHEAD: I enlisted.

YATES: How did you come to that decision at that point?

MOORHEAD: Well, I was in the ROTC, and they asked the members of the ROTC to enlist. I could have dropped out of ROTC and not enlisted, but I felt that was the time to do it. I didn't want to be drafted. No conservative wants to be told what they have to do, they'd rather do it.

YATES: [Laughter] I see. How much of your education had you completed up until that time?

MOORHEAD: I completed college.

YATES: I saw that you received your degree in '43, so I was wondering how that works.

MOORHEAD: Well, see, I was in the reserves from June 13, '42 until May 20, '43.

YATES: I see, OK. You were able to continue

MOORHEAD: Yes. That was true of the entire ROTC advance corps.

YATES: What did that mean, exactly, in terms of your time? You were able to finish college. You were in the reserves, and that means that you could be called in at any moment

MOORHEAD: You could be called at any moment.

YATES: But you were able to get through and finish school.

MOORHEAD: I didn't get my final exams in, but that didn't become necessary.

YATES: Once you finished school, you're no longer in the reserves, so it's early 1943 then, is that correct?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: Would you still go to basic training? Or because you had been in ROTC. . . .

MOORHEAD: No, I went directly to officer candidate school, but I didn't get through the first time around.

YATES: And tell me again, why was that? We were talking [about that] before we started taping.

MOORHEAD: Well, on a tactical problem, I had screwed up. I hadn't gotten around to the area where the machine guns were supposed to be placed, but

that could have happened to anyone. That had happened to some of the best students in the class, because they didn't get around either.

YATES: What happened after that?

MOORHEAD: I went back again a year or so later, and I got through without any problem.

YATES: In between what did you do?

MOORHEAD: I was a corporal in an infantry replacement training center.

YATES: Where was that?

MOORHEAD: Camp Wheeler [Macon, Georgia] and Camp Howze [Gainesville] Texas.

YATES: OK. So you went back, and you completed officer candidate school. And then what happened?

MOORHEAD: Then they sent me to Camp Roberts, California.

YATES: I know where that is.

MOORHEAD: I got an interesting platoon there to lead. There had been a kid in the unit that had refused to carry a gun or his rifle on his shoulder. They had done everything they could to get him to do it, but they were not successful. They punished the platoon that he was in, made them get up at three o'clock in the morning to scrub the floors: everything to make the others put pressure on him to do it, but it

MOORHEAD: didn't do any good. So they called him into the company headquarters and gave him a direct order to put the rifle on his shoulder, and he wouldn't do it. They explained to him how serious it was for him not to. He wouldn't do it anyway, so they court-martialed him and sentenced him to be shot. It went through the military court of appeals. It had to go through the commanders and so forth. Eventually it was reduced to life imprisonment, and then it was cut down to twenty years, so he served twenty years for it. They shipped out the commander, and they shipped out the platoon leader, and that was the platoon that I got as my first platoon.

When I was there a number of months, they put me on orders to go overseas. I was going to go over for the invasion of Japan. I got a POE [point of embarkation] and got on an APA [attack transport vessel], the Fayette, and was out on the high seas when the peace treaty was signed. So I went on to the Philippine Islands, served a year in the Philippines, and came home. I got out late August, and I had applied to two law schools--UCLA didn't have one in those days.

YATES: Right. Where had you applied?

MOORHEAD: Stanford [University] and 'SC [University of Southern California]. I got a letter from 'SC just saying they couldn't take me, and I got one from Stanford saying that I was accepted, but I'd have to wait until the next year because that class was all filled and it was starting.

YATES: This would have been to start in 1945.

MOORHEAD: In '46.

YATES: OK. Because you were in the Philippines, you said, in '45, so not till '46.

MOORHEAD: Yes, I got out in the last part of August '46. And just a few days before classes started, I got a letter from 'SC to come on over.

YATES: They had room?

MOORHEAD: They had room. You know what happens? In a lot of schools, you know, a lot more apply than are going to end up going to their school, because they may get accepted by three or four different schools. And 'SC at the last minute had some vacancies, and so I went.

YATES: Now, you mentioned to me off tape that Dean McHenry helped you in regards to

MOORHEAD: Yes, he wrote letters of recommendation to the schools for me.

YATES: I see, for your application.

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: How were you going to pay for USC?

MOORHEAD: The GI Bill of Rights.

YATES: So that covered the whole thing?

MOORHEAD: Yes. In those days you got seventy-five dollars a month if you were single, and I think ninety dollars or a little more if you were married--I forget what it was. Plus they paid for your tuition and so forth.

YATES: Right. So you were able to really apply to places that you wanted to go?

MOORHEAD: Yes. Well, nowadays it's the same way. We've got two grandsons [Ryan and Casey Bradford] that are going to college. Their father [Steven Bradford] was a sixties dropout, so he just doesn't have much money. But his two kids are bright as can be. One of them is going to UCLA this fall, and one of them is going to the University of [the] Pacific.

YATES: University of [the] Pacific?

MOORHEAD: My wife and I went to their indoctrination. Their dad couldn't go, so Val and I went up with the family conferences that they had there earlier this year about a month or two ago. It

was fun being with them up there. They're great kids. We've taken them on a two-week vacation every year for a long time.

YATES: Oh, that's nice.

MOORHEAD: We've gotten closer, actually, than most grandparents get a chance to be with their kids.

YATES: You applied to law school in California. Did you want to stay in California?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: How did you like law school?

MOORHEAD: I loved it.

YATES: You loved it? I don't think everybody can say that. [Laughter]

MOORHEAD: I enjoyed law school more than any educational experience I've ever had.

YATES: Why? Why did you love it?

MOORHEAD: Well, everybody was going in the same direction. We were all working at the same kind of thing. And it was an area that I hoped to spend the rest of my life working in. The courses were all exceedingly interesting. We had some great teachers, you know, right after the war. Gordon [E.] Dean, who had been one of the prosecutors at Nuremberg, was my criminal law instructor. I won't say I loved every class, because there

were some as dull as a hoe, but I liked law school.

And, you know, I think all the people had a pretty close relationship. You made friends in law school. We'll always be friends. You're not with them all the time, but I enjoy our reunions. [There were] very interesting characters: a lot of people that have become key figures in the courts and in politics. [Patrick J.] Pat Hillings was a congressman out of our class. A lot of interesting careers came out of that.

YATES: What subjects, in particular, interested you?

MOORHEAD: In law?

YATES: Yes. Was there something that really grabbed you?

MOORHEAD: Oh, I really enjoyed it all, to be honest with you. I wasn't big on trusts.

YATES: Trusts, you said?

MOORHEAD: Yes, I didn't love that so much.

YATES: I guess I'm asking because I'm wondering what you thought you were going to focus on once you left law school.

MOORHEAD: Well, to begin with, when I got out of law school, I had \$400. I didn't have anyone that

could give me any money to help me. I didn't have any contacts. My folks had been out of Glendale for a long time and really didn't have business people that they knew that well here anyway. And I hadn't been here for about seven years. The young people that I knew were dispersed all over everywhere.

I rented an upstairs office in a converted apartment for \$45 a month and went to auctions and bought enough carpet to cover the floor, a couple of desks, and a few chairs, a couple of bookcases. I took in \$1,800 the first eighteen months that I was up there.

YATES: So you went into practice by yourself then?

MOORHEAD: Yes, so I didn't do well to start out with. I was offered a job as a legislative assistant up in Sacramento.

YATES: Oh, really? With who?

MOORHEAD: With the state.

YATES: Oh, just in general. OK, I see. But you didn't take it?

MOORHEAD: Didn't take it.

YATES: How come?

MOORHEAD: Well, I had already rented this office, and I was determined to make it work. It was slow. I

think I opened my office in June '49. And I think by 1957 about \$8,000 a year was the highest I had gotten. But in the next four or five years I got to \$40-\$45. . . . So, you know, it was a small practice, but then it really, really started doing well.

YATES: But that's after '57, you said.

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: From '49 to '57 it was reasonably slow then.

MOORHEAD: You know, in those days money was worth a lot more than it is now. I was up in the forties [\$40,000s] during the early sixties. Then in 1966, I ran for the legislature, and my law practice went way, way down. But you know the funny thing is, I dropped everything but probates, and I was doing--during the six years I was in the legislature--pretty well, almost as well as I'd done when having all the junk that I'd been having.

YATES: Particularly in those early years when you started your law practice, how were you getting clients?

MOORHEAD: I joined everything I could join.

YATES: Locally in Glendale?

MOORHEAD: Yes. I joined the [Glendale] Young Republicans

and later the [California] Republican Assembly. I was in the [Benevolent and Protective Order of] Elks Club. I joined the Masonic lodges. All kinds of social things. A dance club. You know, just the more people you meet, you build a network and you build your practice. I got along during those early years with no money, but [Whispers] I learned to play poker.

YATES: You learned to play poker. Is that what you said?

MOORHEAD: Yes. [Whispers] And when you need the money, you don't lose. Poker is not a gambling game, it's a game of skill, so I got so I could win. And I went to night school at 'SC and kept up with my GI Bill of Rights for those couple of really bad years. It was about \$75. I was [still] in the reserves, so I worked one weekend a month and two weeks a year. So all that helped.

YATES: You were taking classes at 'SC to further your expertise in a particular area?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: OK. What kind of cases would you handle? What became your specialty or specialties?

MOORHEAD: When you're in a small town, you take anything

that comes in the door.

YATES: So you handled any type of actions?

MOORHEAD: It was an awful lot of domestic work that comes in: probate and some criminal.

YATES: I was going to say, did you handle any trials?

MOORHEAD: Sure, sure. I didn't have very many people going out to jail. I had one lady that stole about \$500,000 and had to spend two years in jail, but it was good for her.

YATES: To be in jail?

MOORHEAD: Yes. She was someone I knew real well. But you know, the women's jails are a lot different than others. They have curtains on their windows. She was working at a desk doing clerical work. She could have walked out with me when I went to visit her. She would have been in deep trouble if she had, but there was no tight security. But she realized by the time she was through that what she had done--I won't tell you the story of why she did it--was wrong. I don't think she. . . .

There was a lot of politics involved with her going to jail at all, because she'd been the treasurer of a well-known organization. The man at the head of it was extremely well placed in

many, many ways. The [Los Angeles County] Probation Department recommended probation. She got a month of evaluation, and they recommended probation. But she couldn't beat the close ties this guy had with the judges and everybody. But I think it was good for her, really. She never got into trouble again in her life.

She had a husband that was an invalid, and she had a boyfriend. She spent most of the money on the boyfriend and paying doctor bills for the husband. That's how she got into it to begin with, not for herself--other than she, evidently, wanted the boyfriend.

YATES: When you were at USC, where did you live?

MOORHEAD: I lived the first year over on Hobart [Boulevard], and then I lived for two or three years with a chiropractor and his wife. They're Mexican. Wonderful people. A lifetime friend kind of thing.

YATES: You had enough money to be able to live sort of on your own and then go to school, basically.

MOORHEAD: Oh, yes. And these people were wonderful people. He wasn't satisfied with staying as a chiropractor. He became an osteopath, and then he became an M.D. So he kind of struggled

along. He was getting started, too. They were a very interesting family. The wife's mother lived with them. Her family, at one time, had been a very influential family in Mexico. They built [Inaudible] railroads and so forth. The revolution took that away from them down there. I didn't really find out what happened to the father, but she had raised these three daughters by herself, and they all did very well. She didn't speak English well, but I loved to sit and hear her tell these stories about Mexico and early life over there and so forth.

People put Mexicans in one particular basket, and they don't know much about them, really. They're very proud people, and they're very staunch. Most Latinos have very staunch beliefs in doing the right thing. At least that has been my experience. You run into one of them once in a while that gets into a lot of trouble, but that's true of every group.

YATES: When you were with your practice did you stay living with these people?

MOORHEAD: No, I rented a room in Glendale for the first few years. I had an apartment for a while. I liked it better just being close by, and it

worked out better. In fact, one of the fellows that rode back and forth with us to UCLA, his parents lived right up the street here, and so I lived with them for a while.

YATES: So it sounds like for quite a while it was a struggle in terms of getting clients. I mean, you were building your base, but it took a while.

MOORHEAD: It was a struggle for a while, but I never felt poor. Today a lot of people would say they were, but I never felt that way.

YATES: You felt like you were doing all right?

MOORHEAD: Yes. I never had to do without anything I really needed. And I was so active in the community by that time that having a lot of money for vacations and for other things just wasn't necessary. I didn't get married until I was thirty-seven.

YATES: Oh, I see. What year would that be then?

MOORHEAD: In 1959.

YATES: OK. So you'd made it past the initial kind of struggle through building a practice, because you said around '57 things took off more. Why do you think that is?

MOORHEAD: I think things build up, you know. Like

anything else, if you stick to something long enough, it'll go. It just took that amount of time for it to take off. I would have probably made more money if I had stayed out of politics and stayed right where I was, because I moved my office in 1957 to a more favorable location--I should have done it sooner--to right on this corner where we see twenty-three stories, on 500 North Brand [Boulevard].

YATES: Oh, I saw that building just north of where we are.

MOORHEAD: There was a two-story building there, and I was in that two-story building for a lot of years. I had two great associates. One of them [Robert Ingram] was one of the top people in the Republican party in the community and the other one was the Republican state assemblyman.

YATES: Oh, who was that?

MOORHEAD: Howard [J.] Thelin.

YATES: OK.

MOORHEAD: Howard and I had gone to law school together, and we had gone to UCLA together.

YATES: Oh, I see. Now, you said "associates." Does that mean you were in practice together?

MOORHEAD: By an associate, I mean we shared the same

offices.

YATES: Got you, OK.

MOORHEAD: If we needed the other guy to do something for us, they'd do it. If Howard had cases while he was in Sacramento, I'd go to court and handle it for him. I didn't give him a bill for it, I'd just do it.

YATES: Right. You helped each other out, basically.

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: But you had your own practice?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: I was thinking that this might be a good time to stop, unless you want to start in with your decision to run for office and do that now. How do you feel?

MOORHEAD: Well, I can do that.

YATES: OK, why don't we start with that, and then maybe that would be a good breaking point and you could come back to it. It does sound like your practice was going well, you'd gotten married, and so I was wondering, why did you decide to run for the assembly?

MOORHEAD: I had always had politics in my bones. It wasn't so much a question of why didn't I, it was a question more of. . . . This is a

community where people work together, ordinarily. But not this last time. They killed each other in the local election for the legislative jobs. But most of the time the community picked their candidate and worked together, and you didn't go against the people that were there. We've all served for a long period of time. I decided I wanted to run when Howard decided that he was going to run for the state senate.

YATES: OK, so that seat was . . .

MOORHEAD: That was the first time Los Angeles County got more than one state senator. We went up to ten, I believe it was, out of the forty.

YATES: Right, so there were more opportunities for new candidates.

MOORHEAD: So there were more opportunities. Howard decided to run, but he got beat by John [L.] Harmer. And when he decided to run for that, I ran for the assembly seat. It was only the natural thing for me to do. I had another wife at that time, and she had been the president of one of the Republican clubs here.

YATES: So you were both active then?

MOORHEAD: We were both active. And she wanted me to run.

The marriage didn't last beyond the primary, but at that point she was supportive. She ran off with my campaign manager. So that kind of fit into that. It was someone I had known since I was in high school, but they did me a big favor. She did, because Val has been a wonderful, wonderful gal.

YATES: When did you meet her?

MOORHEAD: Marian [Hall Moorhead] and I virtually split up at the time of the primary in 1966, but we stayed together until the election was over in November. I sued her for divorce in January, as she requested me to do. So it wasn't final until January 1968.

I met Val in January 1969, on a blind date with Howard and his wife [Vivian Thelin] and Val's brother [Thomas Tyler] and a gal [Sidney Billing] that I had known up here in Glendale. So we all three went out on a blind date together. I took her out the next weekend and met her family and all. She had three kids. And I took her out the next weekend. We went to a dance, and I asked her to marry me. She said, "Yes" two weeks after we met. We were engaged for six months before we got married.

YATES: Did you have children?

MOORHEAD: I had adopted my first wife's two kids. I went and visited one of them yesterday.

YATES: And Val, your second wife, had three?

MOORHEAD: They're all my kids. I'm very, very close to all of them. I'm probably as close to the first two as their mother is, maybe more so.

YATES: Let me ask you, when you decided to run. . . . This was the '66 election, right?

MOORHEAD: We had a committee of a hundred that were here, and there were about eight candidates that met that committee. I would not have run if I hadn't been selected, but I was selected. You had to eventually get two-thirds of the votes.

YATES: When you say the committee, you're talking about the. . . .

MOORHEAD: The leaders in the community. There are a hundred people on the committee, and they chose me to be the candidate. For the primary I had two that ran against me, so there were three of us in the race. I ended up with seventeen thousand votes and each one of them got seven thousand so it wasn't bad for a first race. I was able to raise \$7,000 for that campaign.

YATES: Now, was that a lot for then?

MOORHEAD: No.

YATES: To give me some perspective.

MOORHEAD: No, it wasn't a lot. I never spent a lot, really. I spent \$7,000 in the general. I didn't raise too much money during those years.

YATES: Well, they've shown that sometimes people who spend a lot more don't necessarily win.

MOORHEAD: When the seat came up for Congress, we had a lot of important people that lived in this district that were interested. [Robert H.] Bob Finch was here. Of course, John Harmer lived in the district. I think he'd been lieutenant governor at that time. No, he was still a senator. And [H.L.] Bill Richardson was a state senator in this district. We had a lot of key people here. They all were kind of interested. I didn't think I had a chance. So we moved to Sacramento for that year. We had the kids up there on the first of February. And on the fifth of February, I decided to run for Congress. I got the support of one of the senators, and Bob Finch dropped out, and I thought I had a chance. But [William F.] Bill McColl was still in. Bill was an All-American at Stanford. He played for the Chicago Bears, an orthopedic physician and

surgeon, well known. And he'd come within 127 votes of beating John [H.] Rousselot in what was half of the district before reapportionment, so I didn't really realize what I was getting into. He raised \$120,000 for the primary, and two others put in over \$100,000. I raised \$40,000.

YATES: Wow, sounds like a lot. [Laughter]

MOORHEAD: It was not much compared to the others. But I'd been the assemblyman for six years in this half of the district.

YATES: So people knew you?

MOORHEAD: And so I had that solid. There were ten candidates for that primary. One of them had been a savings and loan commissioner: a very capable guy, Eric Stattin. Two of them were orthopedic physicians and surgeons: Dr. [J. Dewitt] Fox in addition to Bill McColl. It was a tough race, but I got 53 percent of the votes.

YATES: I want to come back to that some more--to talk about the congressional race. Why don't we stop at this point and pick up with your actual campaign in 1966 and get into that. And then we'll continue on and discuss your years in the assembly. How does that sound?

MOORHEAD: OK.

YATES: Great.

[End Tape 1, Side B]

[Session 2, July 29, 1997]

[Begin Tape 2, Side A]

YATES: Good morning, Mr. Moorhead.

MOORHEAD: Good morning.

YATES: It's been a week, and when we met last time you were discussing your decision to run for the assembly. But before we begin talking about that, I wanted to ask you a question regarding something you mentioned last time. You said that you worked in the shipyards one summer while you were a student at UCLA. Where did you work?

MOORHEAD: At the California shipyards [California Shipbuilding Corporation]. It was making Liberty ships, of which they made hundreds. A lot of them went down during World War II, too, carrying transport across the seas to our allies and to our own troops.

YATES: Which summer would this have been that you did this?

MOORHEAD: This would have been the summer of 1941, before

we were in the war.

YATES: What did you do exactly?

MOORHEAD: I had to join the union. The union put you to work. I was a shipwright's helper.

YATES: What is that?

MOORHEAD: Well, the shipwright is the carpenter in building the ship. The job of the shipwright is to see to it that the keel blocks are laid so that the keel that's laid on it is in the proper place, that the sides of the ship, the bulkheads, are all in their proper place. And, of course, they use wood blocking and so forth in order to support the positions that those parts of the ship are going to take.

I worked most of the summer with a group of engineers whose job it was to see that these things--not to lift them into place--were in the right place by using the surveyor's instruments. To see to it that the ship was being correctly built in place. And, of course, I was the non-professional in the group there, so I held the pole and all the other things that you do in that kind of job. It was much more interesting than carrying keel blocks up and down the ways.

YATES: I was going to ask you how you liked being a

shipwright's helper.

MOORHEAD: I think it's like any other kind of a helper: you'd rather be doing the thing yourself, but you have to get prepared to do that.

YATES: Right. The training.

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: Were there other jobs that you worked at while you were in college, before you went off into the army?

MOORHEAD: I worked one Christmas delivering mail packages, but I went straight through when I was in college. The first semester was in early 1940, and that summer I went east on my first visit to the East Coast. I was in school the next two semesters, then I worked that summer. And after that, there was no break.

YATES: So you didn't work during the school year then?

MOORHEAD: No. There wasn't really much of an opportunity, because I had to drive back and forth to UCLA from Glendale every day with a group of people, and our car was full every day. There just wasn't an opportunity to keep that kind of a schedule and have a job too.

YATES: Why did you go back East that first summer?

MOORHEAD: My grandmother was going back and wanted some

company, for one thing. All of my Dutch relatives live in western New York.

YATES: Right, you mentioned Clymer, New York.

MOORHEAD: Clymer, New York.

YATES: They were still there then?

MOORHEAD: Yeah. They're still there. Hundreds of them. There's hundreds of them.

YATES: [Laughter] How about when you were younger, in terms of working? Did you work when you were in high school?

MOORHEAD: Well, my dad was a builder, and I spent a lot of my free hours working on the jobs that he was on. [There are] lots of things that a young man can do, and so I worked with him many Saturdays and summers. There was one particular house I remember building one summer in which my grandfather [John R. Moorhead], who was then eighty years old, and my dad and I did all the carpenter work and a lot of other things that were involved with the house, with some contractors for the plastering and plumbing and so forth. We worked all summer on that. So I got my work in, but it was mostly family.

YATES: It sounds like good skills to have.

MOORHEAD: Yes.

- YATES: I just wanted to make sure I asked you about that, because I had remembered you'd mentioned the shipyards, and I wanted to also ask about any other types of jobs you have had over time.
- MOORHEAD: Well, my dad was the night superintendent of shipwrights for all the shipwrights on fourteen ways. Each way had a ship built on it. While I was there, only the first ship was being built. As it expanded, my father had a very important job.
- YATES: Well, let's return to discussing when you ran for public office. For the record, it was 1966 when you ran for the office of the assembly of the Forty-third District.
- MOORHEAD: That's right.
- YATES: Last time you were explaining how you gained support to become a candidate for office. You mentioned a committee of a hundred . . .
- MOORHEAD: To begin with, I'd been the president of the Young Republicans. I had also been the president of the Republican Assembly, which was the major male/female Republican club in the city of Glendale.
- YATES: Was that a county committee or a city committee, when you say the . . .

MOORHEAD: The Republican Assembly is a statewide organization that's involved in many communities, and here it was the Forty-third District Republican Assembly.

I was also on the state board of the CRA [California Republican Assembly] for a period later on, but all before I became a state legislator. And I was an alternate on the county central committee at the time. I had been active enough in the party so that I was reasonably well known.

They formed a committee to try to find good candidates that would run for office. It didn't knock anybody out from running, but it was trying to select people that would run that could be elected. There were three of us that ran when I did, and I got a majority of the votes out of those three.

YATES: This is for the primary?

MOORHEAD: For the primary.

YATES: OK. I just was trying to understand the process then.

MOORHEAD: There was nothing official about the committee of a hundred, but it created a group of people who would back your campaign. As I say, it

didn't eliminate others from running, nor did it eliminate other groups that could endorse the candidates that they wanted to. I did get most of the Republican party groups' clubs that make recommendations. Republican women's clubs do not recommend or endorse candidates.

YATES: Why not?

MOORHEAD: It's just their rules. They do it another way. The CRA does, the Young Republicans do. And at that time there were a lot of United Republicans of California, which still exists, but just barely.

YATES: Well, they were considered the more conservative of the . . . They formed their own group, the United [Republicans of California], and this was out of the [Barry M.] Goldwater period, right, is my understanding?

MOORHEAD: Yes, it was.

YATES: So in '64 there was a group that existed here in Glendale, then. Is that what you're saying?

MOORHEAD: Oh yes, there were several groups at the time. There were a lot of them, and then they gradually died out. And some of them--they weren't all the same, but they all belonged to the same organization--were slightly different

variations on the theme.

YATES: You described the district earlier--I'm thinking when you were at UCLA, and you did that paper--but how would you describe the district when you ran for office?

MOORHEAD: Well, the assembly seat was different than the congressional seat.

YATES: Oh, I'm sorry, right. So describe the district for me as the assembly district. Thanks for clarifying that.

MOORHEAD: Well, it had virtually all of Glendale. It had the hill country of Burbank, primarily above Glen Oaks. It may have gone down to San Fernando, but it was the area closest to the Verdugo Mountains. And it had the Los Feliz area of Los Angeles.

YATES: How about the demographic configuration?

MOORHEAD: In those days, it was probably 90 to 95 percent Caucasian. I haven't played with those figures that much. A strong Jewish population in Los Feliz and pretty strong synagogues in both Glendale and Burbank. There were a few Latinos: I don't know what percent, but it was not that large at that time. Now it's constantly growing, so today in that same area it would be

over 25 percent. The Armenians had not come in many great numbers at that time, and most of the black population was in Pasadena at that point, and, of course, it still is.

YATES: For the Forty-third District then, at that time it was mostly Caucasian?

MOORHEAD: Yes, it was. A pretty conservative area.

YATES: That was my next question. How did it work out, Republican versus Democratic, in terms of percentages?

MOORHEAD: My guess is that--I don't remember exactly--the Republicans were, at least in voting, always well over half. Most of the Democrats. . . . The leaders of the Democrats mostly supported me before I got through.

YATES: They supported you?

MOORHEAD: Because the town has always worked together, pretty much. Now, we've had a lot of Democratic mayors in Glendale. Every one of them has supported me. You know, you work together to see that everything works right.

YATES: How would you describe the district in terms of, how do I put it, the economics or how people were doing? Was it middle-class? That kind of thing.

MOORHEAD: By 1966, people were doing pretty well. There were ups and downs, of course, but it wasn't like the Depression days. The town had not gone up in the air above the six-story level. We only had four or five six-story buildings, but surely no twenty-three-story buildings at that time. It was a very quiet community, and one that we didn't have a lot of crime. We didn't have neighborhoods where people thought, "They're not quite so good." Most of the quiet little neighborhoods that today might have a little more crime than other areas were still pretty fine little communities. Not that they aren't now, but when you jam people together into apartment houses, it creates problems.

YATES: At that point the district didn't have those kinds of apartments?

MOORHEAD: They had apartments, but not many. We had a few that were built after World War II that didn't have enough parking, that were too cheaply built, perhaps, but not many like that. I can remember a lot of my clients were from South Glendale or from the Garden area, the other side of the little airport we had in Glendale. But a safe, safe town. You wouldn't be worried about

your kids anyplace here. In fact, it still is a pretty safe town. Every once in a while, someone will commit some crime. A guy a year or two ago killed a whole family of six or seven, but that's an aberration. That is not something you'd normally be frightened of in your community.

YATES: Tell me about Howard Thelin, who was the assemblyman for the district.

MOORHEAD: Howard was about the same political philosophy as mine.

YATES: How would you describe that?

MOORHEAD: I consider myself a constructive conservative.

YATES: What does that mean?

MOORHEAD: That means I wanted to improve the community, to do the things that would provide jobs and successful business and provide a good education for the kids. We've had a great school system here through the years. And just to try to upgrade the community we all live in. They didn't want a lot of high taxes for no good reason. I probably fit that profile pretty well.

YATES: Well, I'm interested. . . . You say "constructive conservative," so what comes to

mind is, what's a regular conservative? What's the difference, I guess?

MOORHEAD: I think there are people that are so conservative that they're against everything, the fact that people are so liberal that they'll spend money if they don't need to. I think that it's important that we build--that didn't have anything to do with that election--our opportunities in foreign trade, that we be able to sell our products abroad, that we protect our intellectual property rights of our people. You encourage innovation. You try to have industry in your area that will provide quality jobs for the people here. Keep the streets safe. Support law enforcement. That's what I call constructive conservatism.

YATES: I believe you just said that you and Howard Thelin politically have the same philosophical approach, is that correct?

MOORHEAD: Pretty much. Well, remember what I said about the state legislature. It has a handful of very, very important bills each year. Quite often they are committee bills. If you happened to be on the Finance Committee--which is Ways and Means in the assembly and, I believe,

Finance in the state senate--or on some key committee, you may have a very important bill come out of that committee during the year. But it's more working together on those things. Every member has. . . . One member had a habit of putting in several hundred bills each year. None of them amounted to anything. He didn't get many of them through, either. It's a joint effort for the most part. Everyone has their own bills that they promote and they discuss back home, and not that they aren't important, but they don't change the world.

YATES: Well, let me ask you this. I'm thinking now in terms of when you were running for office in 1966, before you even got to the legislature. When you ran for office, what were the issues that you focused on?

MOORHEAD: Well, this is thirty-one years ago.

YATES: It's OK, take your time.

MOORHEAD: I focused on strong law enforcement. I focused on keeping taxes under control and support for the type of industry that would improve the quality of life for the people that lived here. Basically, those are the key issues today. You've got, of course, the environment. One of

the things we worked on in the committee at that time was the deterioration of the water quality in Lake Tahoe. I know that's been in the news this last week. I think we put in some bills and got them adopted out of our subcommittee that really helped there for a while. But you had all these new hotels and casinos on the south shore of the lake, and that's with all the . . . I don't think very much of the sewage or anything else leaves that area very far. And if you use cesspools, it gets back down into the lake, one way or the other. And it's become more of a problem recently. It's something that you have to constantly fight.

Air quality was a big issue in those days because, if you remember--you're probably too young to remember--you could look out at the sky, and it was brown when I'd fly in from Sacramento. The air was just absolutely brown.

YATES: I remember.

MOORHEAD: I think it's much, much better today than it was then.

YATES: Tell me about the campaign itself.

MOORHEAD: To be honest with you, campaigning for the assembly in those days was not the most

difficult thing in the world if you were in a basically Republican district or a Democratic district. And most of the districts of the state were in areas where they really were not contested that hard in a general election. When I've been campaigning for Congress, I'd have as many as six or seven speeches a day.

YATES: Wow.

MOORHEAD: If you had that many in a week, it would be a huge week when running for the assembly.

YATES: Well, how did you campaign? What did you do?

MOORHEAD: To begin with, I went to all the Republican clubs. That was a given. I went to a number of the churches and introduced myself to the pastors and to people who would vote in the community. I visited the Jewish community center over in Los Feliz, spoke to them. I accepted any invitation to speak to groups that wanted to hear the candidates. The reason why it was important to go to all the Republican groups was because many of them were endorsing and you didn't want to lose the endorsements. I went to the newspapers in the district and talked to the publishers. I tried to get into as many service clubs as I could. But the

numbers were much smaller then, and the dollars. I spent \$7,000 on my primary and about the same on my general. Today they spend a million dollars at some of the assembly races in California.

- YATES: Right.
- MOORHEAD: We didn't have that kind of a race.
- YATES: When you met with these various groups, what kind of forum would you meet with them in?
- MOORHEAD: Well, they were somewhat different. Some of them would have candidates come in one after another and some of them you might be on a panel, although I don't remember that particularly for that time. Some of them would take someone one week and maybe get somebody else the next week or even the next month. I was a total greenhorn as far as that kind of thing was concerned in those days. And I would have needed, in a real tough race, more experience than I had.
- YATES: What did you learn from that particular campaign that you carried with you?
- MOORHEAD: I know one thing, but I don't know that I learned it in that campaign. It's very important that people like you. You don't want

to do the things that would deliberately make them dislike you. That has to do not with what you say but the way you say it, many times. I've got a strong feeling that negative politics is a loser. In recent years it's become almost dominant, but I still think in the long run it's a loser. I don't think people like it. If you have got more than one in a race and more than two in a race, it hurts both the attacker and the guy that's attacked. It helps the guy that's stayed clear.

But, you know, you go back to 1966, all these areas were much smaller at that time. You could walk down the street of Glendale and know every third person you'd see walking down Brand Boulevard. It's not so much that way anymore. If someone gave their word, you could put it in the bank. I know that with lawyers you didn't have to have everything signed. As far as agreements between lawyers, they'd live up to their word. I hate to say that they don't all do it now, but they don't. It was a little bit different life at that time.

YATES: You mentioned how much money you raised for the primary and for the general election. How did

you go about raising funds?

MOORHEAD: Oh, we would have little parties and things like that. But in that primary, it was mostly old friends that gave me money. You don't. . . . The first time you run, unless you've really been involved in that kind of thing for a long time raising money. . . . It's not easy to do. [It was] much more difficult to raise money at that time.

YATES: How did you like that aspect of campaigning?

MOORHEAD: I've never enjoyed raising money. I've never enjoyed it. I liked the parties, but I didn't particularly like calling people and asking them for money. I do it sometimes now for the community, for the [American] Red Cross, the Salvation Army, or even for Glendale College Foundation or something like that, but it isn't the area that I enjoyed the most in politics. I think it's very important that the candidate keep his total independence. That he take money from people for what he is, not for what he promises to do. I never made a lot of promises at campaign times. I don't really believe in that.

YATES: OK. Unless you have anything else to add about

that particular campaign, I thought I'd move on.

MOORHEAD: Naturally, the first time you get into something like that it's fun, it's a new experience. You meet a lot of good people, a lot of people you haven't known before. I had some very wonderful people that started out with me to begin with and have helped me many times through the years. I had a wonderful lady that was my chairman over in the Los Feliz area, a wonderful Jewish lady [Frances Freedman]. She helped me get into their community center, and I got a lot of support there. I just remember a lot of those people. It was a lot of fun. That was that first race. I could tell you about some of the others. My next race I worked . . .

YATES: This is 1968?

MOORHEAD: One thing that I didn't mention that I did 1966 and later on, I did a lot of work in the shopping centers.

YATES: What would you do?

MOORHEAD: Well, I would be there with maybe a loud speaker and handouts and I would give them to people coming in and out of the stores on Saturday morning. And I did a certain amount of precinct walking.

YATES: So you didn't do precinct walking particularly in 1966 or did you?

MOORHEAD: I honestly don't remember that. I won't tell you no, but I've done a lot of it through the years. You meet a lot of people that way, and people remember you years later. With some of them it didn't make a bit of difference that you showed up.

YATES: When you were at places like the shopping mall or where you were available for people to ask you questions, how did you deal with real hard questions?

MOORHEAD: I would just try to. . . . The best thing that you can do anytime was to just give them a straightforward answer. They don't have to agree with you all the time. If they think you're trying to weasel out of answering the question, you're in more trouble. Just tell them what you think about it.

YATES: Can you give me an example?

MOORHEAD: Well, of course, I can't remember so much dealing back with a campaign that's now thirty-one years ago. I can remember I used to have forums as congressman. I'd have them in different parts of my district. One of the most

MOORHEAD: emotional issues through the years has been the issue of abortion. I didn't talk about that issue unless they asked me about it. It's not my favorite issue. But when people would ask me about it, I would give them a straightforward answer. I think the politicians that got into trouble with it were those that waffled back and forth from one side to the other and tried to fit their answer to the crowd. But I got asked one day if I would vote for abortion rights if I knew that the majority of people in my district wanted me to do that. My answer basically was that I think it's immoral, and I would have to be sure they wanted an immoral congressman before I would even consider that. They didn't bother me with that question for a long, long time after that.

I know that people have gotten into trouble on that issue. There's about the same number that had their votes depend upon that issue on both sides. If you alienate both sides, you're going to lose a lot of people. Members of Congress and members of the legislature can't do very much about that issue. That didn't become

an issue until the Therapeutic Abortion Act¹ came up, and that was . . .

YATES: You're talking about in California?

MOORHEAD: In California. That was the first bill I voted against, and I've consistently voted against that. I was one of the few that did that on that one. But we can't do anything about it, the [United States] Supreme Court has spoken about it. So it's more one of those issues that. . . . I know the right-to-life people would like a constitutional amendment, but it's just not available. And other people want this execution after birth kind of procedure, which is, to me, just like killing anybody. They're already out of the birth canal, all but the last two inches.

YATES: Are you talking about the late-term abortion?

MOORHEAD: Yes. They wait until they're really out of the birth canal, and then they kill the kid. I don't know how anybody can justify that.

YATES: So that would be the kind of issue where you'd try to be straightforward when somebody asked

1. S.B. 462, 1967 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 327.

you a hard question.

MOORHEAD: Oh yes. That's right. You just don't try to weasel out on answers. You have to give a straightforward answer on anything. The average person in public could see it immediately if you're not giving them a straightforward answer.

YATES: OK. Well, let me ask you about when you won the election in 1966. I'm wondering now, when did you actually move to Sacramento after you won the election?

MOORHEAD: Well, to be honest with you, I never really moved to Sacramento until, well. . . . I moved to Sacramento five days before I announced that I was going to run for Congress.

YATES: Oh, I see what you're saying. [Laughter]

MOORHEAD: No. No. We were in session from Monday morning, about ten o'clock, until Thursday at noon. I would go up, and I'd rent a hotel room. I had an apartment for a short period of time, but I found it worked better if I just rented a hotel room. They were relatively cheap in those days, and I lived there. Val and I were married after I was elected to the second of the three terms.

YATES: Right.

- MOORHEAD: After about eight months, we bought a townhouse there, which I used during that same period. When the kids were out of school down here in the summer, we all moved up there and spent the summer until we adjourned.
- YATES: So your kids stayed in school down here then, and you were up there during the week.
- MOORHEAD: Until 1972 when I ran for Congress. I really had decided not to run, because there were just too many big names in the thing, like Bob Finch and two state senators and Bill McColl, who eventually was my chief opponent. It just didn't look like it was doable. So first of February, we moved into our place. We took the kids out of school and put them in a school up there. Five days later some things changed, and I came down here and announced that I was running for Congress and sent the family back.
- YATES: OK. Well, why don't we come back to that, because I do want to talk more about that particular race. But I misspoke when I asked, "When did you move to Sacramento?" But you did go up there, you said . . .
- MOORHEAD: In January, to be sworn in there.
- YATES: Right. What were your plans for your practice

at that point?

MOORHEAD: In my law practice I dropped everything except probates.

YATES: And you had planned that at that point?

MOORHEAD: Yes. I think I got one divorce for a tenant after that. And I had one drunk driving case after that. It turned out not to be a good idea for me to handle that kind of case. I had to get the guy to sign himself into Camarillo [State Hospital], because I would have had a guilty conscience if I didn't try to get him off of liquor, which was causing a big problem for him. He got a small fine and that was all. I thought I might have had too much--by being there representing him--of an effect on the judge, and I just didn't think I should do it.

YATES: You mean because you were in the assembly?

MOORHEAD: Yes, so I just dropped it. Because the judge was in the other political party.

YATES: Oh, I see. OK.

MOORHEAD: Not that she didn't do what I was advocating, but you have to advocate the best thing you can get for your client, even though you think that you're going to have to do something about their problem. So we did something about his problem

after the case was out of court.

YATES: I see.

MOORHEAD: I guess he was cured, because I never heard of any problems again.

YATES: But he went to Camarillo. We're almost at the end of the tape, so let me stop here.

[End Tape 2, Side A]

[Begin Tape 2, Side B]

YATES: We just stopped for a minute to talk while we were turning the tape over. OK, back to when you first arrived in Sacramento. I wanted you to tell me what your impressions were of the legislature when you arrived.

MOORHEAD: Well, it was a new world for me. I think as most new legislators are, I was extremely impressed by the whole thing. At that time, Jesse [M.] Unruh was the speaker. Surprisingly enough, during that stage of our history, the speaker's job had been one of those things. . . . Unruh was a little bit different than some of the others. So many of the speakers have been chosen more by who their allies and friends were, regardless of party, than they were about the party candidate. Unruh had really been the party candidate of the

Democrats, but he appointed a number of Republicans to key positions. So it wasn't all like it is in the Congress where the winning party controls everything. That wasn't true in the legislature. Unruh appointed me as vice chairman of the environmental committee [Natural Resources, Planning, and Public Works Committee] during my first term.

YATES: Why do you think he did that?

MOORHEAD: I suppose he had a good relationship with people from this district before, and I had fairly good credentials at that time of things that I had worked on and done. I suppose that had some effect. It later became more partisan. It's been much more partisan the last few years, as I've followed it in the newspapers, than it was before. But you have had a little bit of that, if you've read it in the papers, where it didn't make people happy with the Republicans that did it. But Democrats had put Republicans in as speaker that were not popular in their own party.

But I made a lot of friends. A lot of people who were in our class in the assembly that came in when I did had been very prominent

in the party through the years in politics . . .

[Interruption]

YATES: We just had a phone interruption. You were saying that when you came in there were a lot of freshman legislators at that point. Tell me, what kind of orientation did you get when you arrived?

MOORHEAD: It was excellent, really. They took us on a trip up and down the state of California. We visited the communities and the major industries in each area and went up and down the water system of the state. I learned an awful lot about California in a short period of time.

YATES: Who went, exactly, on the trip?

MOORHEAD: Most of the new members did.

YATES: Who was actually orienting you to all this, giving you the information?

MOORHEAD: Usually they were the leaders in the communities that we would go into. It was really a pretty thorough job. The leaders of the California Water Plan quite often might be state employees explaining projects that were in various places in the state. I thought they did an excellent job at that time.

YATES: During that trip, who did you start to get to

know?

MOORHEAD: Well, there's so many of them that I got to know pretty near all of them. See, there were only eighty of us in the state assembly, and in our class I guess there were probably twenty-five or thirty.

YATES: New assemblymen?

MOORHEAD: Yes. I tell you, you got to know them all pretty well. [Peter B.] Pete Wilson and I shared offices that first term.

YATES: Oh, you did?

MOORHEAD: Yes. Yvonne Brathwaite [Burke], who's now on the [Los Angeles County] Board of Supervisors, was in that particular class. [Peter F.] Pete Schabarum was in that class and was on the board of supervisors for a long time. He's in a little bit of trouble now, I understand.

YATES: Yes, I saw that in the paper.

MOORHEAD: But any number of people that you would know and recognize almost immediately. . . . I don't know whether these old pictures that I have. . . . They're not good enough pictures to keep, but they may. . . .

YATES: Do you have some pictures of the assembly when you met?

MOORHEAD: That's the sixty-seventh session. That picture evidently fell on evil times, but you'll recognize a lot of those people.

YATES: Right. We're looking at a picture of the 1967 members of the California legislature, just for the record.

MOORHEAD: That was one of the ships that I helped. . . .

YATES: Now we're looking at a picture of one of the Liberty ships, right?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: Tell me, who did you start to gravitate towards in that early period?

MOORHEAD: Well, probably the more conservative members up there. [Robert H.] Bob Burke was one of them, Floyd [L.] Wakefield, Frank Lanterman was, of course, one of the older members, but my next-door neighbor here. [Newton R.] Newt Russell is a dear friend to this day, and he'd been there for a term before I got there. Many, many of them that I can still remember. March Fong [Eu] was my seatmate. Her son [Matthew Fong] is now in a prominent state office and going to run, I guess, for the [United States] Senate. He's a bright young man, a very bright young man.

YATES: So you got to know March Fong because she was

your seatmate?

MOORHEAD: Oh, sure.

YATES: Different party, but . . .

MOORHEAD: Yes. I could name any number of them, because everyone knew each other. We went to different events there almost every night. [It was a] much more collegial organization than the Congress can be, because they have such large districts and their reps [representatives] are so remote from each other that they just don't have time for that collegiality that there is in the state legislature. So I had close friends in the governor [Ronald Reagan]'s office.

YATES: Who was that?

MOORHEAD: George [R.] Steffes, who's now one of the top lobbyists there, was the legislative director for the governor. He's from Glendale.

YATES: I see. So you already knew him beforehand?

MOORHEAD: Yes. We and a couple of other Glendalians that worked up there would go up to Lake Tahoe or somewhere else from time to time. We'd have dinner and spend an hour or so and come back. I can probably, if I had to, name almost every member that was up there at that time.

YATES: Let's come back to Jesse Unruh, because you just

mentioned him and started to talk a little bit about the fact that you felt like, at that point at least, there wasn't as much partisanship . . .

MOORHEAD: He made a big mistake a year or so earlier, when he got the "Big Daddy" name, in locking up all the Republicans to be the one to vote for a particular bill.

YATES: Right. What was your impression, though, when you first got to know him?

MOORHEAD: You know, I didn't agree with his politics, but I think he built up the quality of the state legislature.

YATES: How did he do that?

MOORHEAD: In insisting upon more professionalism in it. The state senate had been just a little clump up until that time. [There were] only forty there and all the cow counties had senators. L.A. County had one, and we were 40 percent of the state. It was more of a good old boys club. It became more professional as you divided the state up more evenly, so that you had one-fortieth of the state in each district instead of . . .

YATES: You're talking about the results of re-

apportionment?

MOORHEAD: Yes. But that made a difference in the people and the issues they were working for. When you had the small counties having all the people, they were more interested in the agrarian issues and things of that kind than they were about the problems of the big cities, because the cities didn't have adequate representation.

YATES: How did being from a different party impact your relationship with Unruh, do you think?

MOORHEAD: For the most part, we knew each other, but there wasn't that close relationship. He had his job to do, which was basically separate from what a normal member would be doing: he had the job of running the organization. So I didn't know him as well as I knew [Robert T.] Bob Monagan, who was the speaker later on. Or others even in the Democratic party like Leo [T.] McCarthy, who sat just in front of me. He was the speaker of the assembly the last term I was there. But someone that you knew on a different level than you would know the speaker because you'd serve with him.

YATES: Versus coming in and he's the speaker. So you hadn't developed that kind of relationship? —

MOORHEAD: No.

YATES: OK. What were the times when you were on opposite sides of an issue with Unruh? That may sound kind of like a funny question to ask, but I'm trying to think if you could give me an example.

MOORHEAD: You know, one thing that I don't remember that well. . . . In Congress, the speaker doesn't vote. I don't remember whether the speaker normally voted or whether--I know he has a vote on key issues--he made it a practice to vote. I don't recall. I don't believe that, except on the major, major things that would come up, a speaker would go out and lobby people for a vote.

There was one bill that I do remember. When Reagan became governor of California, he inherited a terrible economic situation with the state budget, because [Edmund G. "Pat"] Brown Sr. had spent money that he didn't have to spend, and then used mirrors and other things to make it look like we had a constitutionally mandated balanced budget, but we really didn't. When Reagan got there, he found out that he had to either make major cuts real fast or find new

MOORHEAD: money.

And one of the biggest. . . . Education, of course, later became an even bigger problem than it was then, because in the early days the cities had their own school boards. They had their own real estate taxes and so forth. Later on the state had to come up with more money because of Proposition 13.¹ But there wasn't as much leeway there as you would like, because there were certain mandated programs, certain things that had to be financed.

Reagan found himself with a Democratic assembly. He had to come up with legislation that would be acceptable and a budget that would be acceptable. And I think it was in that first race or the second where the governor came up with a budget that was acceptable--not liked, but acceptable by the Democrats. But Unruh told him, "You have to have a two-thirds vote for this budget. We will give you the votes that it takes to reach two-thirds with every single Republican voting yes. If any Republican votes

1. Proposition 13 (June 1978), tax limitation.

no, you're not going to get a bill. But we'll give you enough votes to make that two-thirds." So there had to be some working together to ever get two-thirds.

But John [V.] Briggs decided he wasn't going to vote for it. The votes came up on the board, and they had to reach the two-thirds mark. When they came up, they were one short, so they just let it sit up there on the board for about fifteen minutes. All of a sudden there was a call: "The governor would like to see Mr. Briggs." He laughed and he joked as he walked out of the room with, "They'll never get me, they'll never get me!" He came back as white as his shirt. He changed his vote. I don't know what was said, but he changed his vote. He had to get the budget out, and so I guess he used some tough language to get it. You know, the governor was very popular, and if you lose him, a member could be in trouble.

But both sides had to make it work. The party in power in the legislature never looks good if they can't get a budget. And, of course, the governor would be in deep trouble if he didn't get a budget. That's probably the key

bill that comes in each year, because that's where you set out the priorities that you're going to have for the whole period. The bills don't die between one year and the next, but they do die at the end of the term. They did not die. . . . Well, they died in Congress, too, at the end of the term. But there was a difference.

YATES: Are you talking about between Congress and the state legislature?

MOORHEAD: I guess they must have died at the end of the year in the assembly, too. I'm sure they did.

I do know that there were members like [Charles W.] Meyers from San Francisco. He always had the most bills of anyone in the assembly, and he never would try very hard on them. The Democrats didn't like him very well, and to the Republicans, he was in the other party. He'd come up with those bills at the last minute, thinking he could get them through when no one was listening. He never got very many of them through, just an awful lot of them that he'd talk about at home.

YATES: Well, let me ask you, you were talking about the Democratic majority. Of course, the Republicans

did achieve a majority in, I believe, '69 and '70, and then Bob Monagan was speaker. What was your impression of Bob Monagan?

MOORHEAD: Bob Monagan is a wonderful man. He was a wonderful friend. He's a highly qualified political leader. I was in a different part of the Republican party than he was. He was one of the young turks. In their wing of the party you had [William T.] Bill Bagley and you had John [G.] Veneman and Houston [I.] Flournoy and quite another group. I think Bob made his biggest mistake when he appointed Moretti--[Robert] Bob Moretti--as chairman of the committee that raised the most campaign money [the Committee on Governmental Organization]. It was Bob Moretti who became the speaker the next year. Bob Moretti was the one who became the speaker after. Monagan lost his majority.

YATES: He was after Bob Monagan, and I was asking you about Bob Monagan.

MOORHEAD: Yeah, but Bob Moretti was made, by Bob Monagan, the chairman of the committee that handled liquor and gambling in California. That's what made it [easy to] raise the most money. He got the money that was necessary to beat Bob Monagan

in the next election.

But the fact that Bob was appointing Democrats to key spots indicates that we were running not as much of a partisan organization as it might have been in recent years. Even if you go back, it was Republicans that elected Willie [L.] Brown [Jr.] speaker. He was going to give them a lot of positions and so forth and never did. He did right at the first, and then took them away almost immediately afterwards. But it's been, traditionally, more nonpartisan than the Congress has been.

YATES: So whether it was Jesse Unruh or Bob Monagan or Bob Moretti, that's your impression in terms of the role partisanship played?

MOORHEAD: I'm not telling you that the party organization didn't go in a certain direction each time and on certain bills, but there were more independent individuals in both parties that could go either way. Like, for instance, H. Allen Smith--who was my predecessor in the Congress, but preceded Howard Thelin in the assembly--had forty-one votes promised to become speaker of the assembly. And two of them evidently switched when the vote was actually

taken, and he didn't have them. We had people in both parties voting back and forth at that time, so you just never knew quite where you were.

YATES: Let me now turn to focusing a little bit on the Republican caucus in the assembly. I want to get your view on the relationship that the leadership of the Republican caucus had with Governor Reagan the whole time you were there.

MOORHEAD: They didn't agree with him on everything, but they worked together pretty well. Reagan was very popular throughout his terms, both in the governor's chair and in the presidency. He knew how to work with people. He had not been a Republican all of his life, as you probably know. He'd been the head of a labor union. And he had strong contacts many places. So I would say that, for the most part, he could get pretty good cooperation from the legislature during the six years that I was there.

YATES: Give me an example of an issue or a piece of legislation when the Republicans couldn't support Governor Reagan.

MOORHEAD: I don't remember in the assembly. I can remember an issue in the Congress where most of

the Republicans supported him, but I didn't.
That's later on.

YATES: OK, we can come back to that. I'm thinking more as a group. Was there a time where there was a real obvious division between the Republican caucus or the Republican group and Governor Reagan?

MOORHEAD: It comes more in shades than it does in absolutes. And most of these things are worked out. You know, you don't let them get to a point where you have a public debate on an issue. If the governor's backing something, people would talk to the leadership, and perhaps the leadership would get to the governor's office. For the most part, it wasn't just the governor, he had his staff. [There were] people working in every area and in the various departments. So they'd come to an accommodation, an agreement, that would get overall support. Maybe the governor's position could be improved on. Maybe the leadership of the party's position could be improved upon. You always get better action out of several heads than you do with just one making a final decision.

YATES: Well, let me ask you then, were there any particular difficulties that you observed regarding working with the governor's staff? I mean, I know he had legislative assistants who worked with the assembly and the governor as the go-between.

MOORHEAD: Well, of course, I was going in as a freshman. I wasn't running the place. There's probably things that I never saw.

YATES: But you were there for a while. You were there until '72.

MOORHEAD: I think that the big argument that normally came up was money, and how much to spend and where you were going to put it. And, of course, there were the problems with trying to strengthen law enforcement, because you were beginning to go into an era where there was more crime than there had been in the prewar years. It was a very big issue for the public. There's always been a fight between the Democrats and the Republicans over whether we're going to help the farmers, especially with water. The Republicans usually supported the farmers in that area. A lot of the members of the legislature in both parties were farmers, and they usually worked

out their problems in the end.

During my time in the legislature, probably the hottest issue came out of the Vietnam War, and that was the unrest that we had with the students in the colleges: the University of California, San Francisco State [University], Stanford. Most of the schools up north had big problems, but those in the south didn't have as many. The south is much more conservative than the north, even within the parties. You find, in those days, people from the poorest areas of southern California would be considerably more conservative than those more liberal people in the north. More moderate Republicans usually came from northern California and the more conservative were those in southern California. It's a difference.

YATES: In terms of working out differences between the Republicans in the assembly and the governor's office, then, it sounds like you're saying you don't remember any real strong instances where there were problems or problems with the staff in trying to work things out.

MOORHEAD: I know the difference in points of view on many issues. But within the Republican party in

those days, the moderate wing controlled the legislature. They were much more dominant than the more conservative. They were the ones, because they did control, that were working out these issues with the governor's office more often.

It's interesting that when I ran for Congress, I got more help really in the legislature from. . . . Bill Bagley made my first contribution. He was a very moderate Republican. Flournoy helped and many of the others did. So while we had differences on a few issues, they were not such that it made any real difference in the long run about our friendships and ability to work together.

YATES: OK.

MOORHEAD: I do think that Bob would have been better off if he had gotten more of the conservatives in chairmanship positions.

YATES: You're talking about Bob Monagan?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: So his biggest mistake was not getting those people into key positions?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: OK.

MOORHEAD: And in putting too many of the ambitious Democrats into some of those spots, because they beat him in the end.

YATES: I do want to come back to some of these issues about the campus disturbances, because I know you served on a committee that focused on that. But before getting to that, I want to kind of continue this theme of talking about the relationship with the executive branch by asking you what your impressions of Ronald Reagan were when he became governor, because he came in the same time that you did.

MOORHEAD: Of course, I'm a Reagan supporter all the way through. I think everybody loved him. Even those that disagreed with him loved him. He was . . .

[Interruption]

YATES: We were talking about your impressions of Governor Reagan.

MOORHEAD: He was a very accomplished person because he'd been head of a labor union and had an executive position there. He had to lead people, and it's not always easy to lead people in a labor union. He had been active in management, at least as far as the public relations of General Electric

[Company] and the Borax Company. He really knew how to make a speech. And he'd been talking about politics for several years before he became governor. He knew how to talk to people in such a way that would bring them over to his position.

YATES: How do you think he did that?

MOORHEAD: He had a tremendous short-term memory. I guess you get that when you're in acting. But you could brief him, and he would remember everything. Fantastic. I guess he never heard a joke in his life he didn't remember.

He just had a tremendous way of grasping the facts of a situation and analyzing it and he'd make a decision and forget it. There it goes. It's done. He didn't drag things out. The presidents who'd gotten into deep trouble were those who couldn't make up their mind or would delay making decisions too long. Reagan certainly wasn't like that. He knew how to be a take-charge guy. I know a lot of people, because of his easygoing appearance, thought he wasn't quite like that. But the way he handled that Briggs problem shows that if there was a problem there, he'd get it taken care of and get

it done right now.

I think everyone was impressed with him, really. He wasn't a Ph.D. in political science, but he could have sure taught many people that were a lot about government. I was impressed with him, and I think most of the others were too. I know that he would not put himself out on a limb to an unprovable position. Even though he was relatively conservative, he would make a lot of conservatives mad at him because he would not commit to go over the edge. He wanted the end results, and he wanted to be able to get what he went after. And I think you could say that with all the elections he was up against, he almost beat [Gerald R.] Ford [Jr.] for the nomination, if Ford wasn't the sitting president.

YATES: Right.

MOORHEAD: He's very, very good at what he did.

YATES: How did your impression of Governor Reagan change over the time you were in the legislature?

MOORHEAD: I actually got to know more about him when he was president than I did in the legislature. I think he's the finest president we've had in the

last fifty years, surely.

YATES: It sounds like your comments that you've just made about your impressions of him then held pretty much during the time you were in the legislature. Is that correct?

MOORHEAD: They did. I've served in Congress under six presidents, only one in the legislature. But I'm not going to say that. . . . He may not have had an I.Q. that is as high as [James E.] Carter's, but Carter was a fatal president, because he couldn't delegate authority and the decisions didn't get made. So being the egghead way up here doesn't always do you any good. I don't think he knew as much about government or was as good at it as [Richard M.] Nixon, but Nixon made his mistakes. And when you put everything together, I don't think anyone comes close to Reagan in the last fifty years.

YATES: You're talking about as president, right? I mean, that's what you're really focusing on. I do want to know how you would evaluate his administration as governor.

MOORHEAD: We had balanced budgets. We didn't have to struggle with them. But both Browns [Pat Brown and Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown Jr.] way overspent

and probably violated the constitution in the way they had to finagle the records to make it look like it was a balanced budget.

He knew how to win friends. They had some beautiful parties at their home. He was just as friendly to a Democrat as to a Republican. He got people wanting to help him regardless of the party. I won't say that at election time there wasn't a lot of partisanship that came in, because there was. But he really knew how to work with people. I could tell you some stories about the Congress, which I will later. People loved to be around him.

YATES: OK. Well, I'm thinking maybe this is a good point to stop with the executive branch. How does that sound?

MOORHEAD: Sounds good.

YATES: OK.

[End Tape 2, Side B]

[Session 3, September 4, 1997]

[Begin Tape 3, Side A]

YATES: It's been a few weeks, so we were just chatting about the last session and what we've been talking about. When we finished up last time, you were discussing Governor Reagan's role as governor and assessing his terms in office. I thought maybe today we could start with discussing your committee assignments when you were in the assembly. I was wondering, out of the committees you served on, which do you feel were the most productive?

MOORHEAD: Well, there were an awful lot of new laws. It was a time when there was a great deal of unrest in our society. Crime was increasing, and there were a large number of criminal law bills that went through the state assembly and were passed into law, including bills that prohibited unlawful assembly or gangs or other people who were getting together to plan illegal activities and things like that.

YATES: Are you referring to campus disturbances, in particular?

MOORHEAD: Only if they went beyond the law, the things that were being planned. I actually sat in the rooms where some of their planning took place. They didn't know me there, but . . .

YATES: Where was that?

MOORHEAD: At the University of California. They were talking about bombing ships and other things.

YATES: You overheard these discussions?

MOORHEAD: Oh, sure. We started out, at one of them, up in the projection room, and they discovered we were up there. So I just took off my tie and my jacket, and I went down and joined them. Nothing happened except we could hear what they were urging the group to do. Of course, it never happened, but. . . .

YATES: How did you happen to be there at the same time?

MOORHEAD: We knew the rally was going to take place, so we went down there. I spent a great deal of time on some of the campuses. I remember visiting Cal[ifornia] State [University] San Francisco, and [S.I.] Hayakawa was the leader of the university there. The riots were taking place while we were there on the campus. We didn't

get that much trouble down in southern California. There were a few things that took place, but most of the problems were up north. And I see today there was an article in the newspaper about the Haight-Ashbury district, and, of course, the young hippies went in. They were naive children, pretty much, and preying on them were these tough drug people. They turned the Haight-Ashbury into one of the meanest areas in the country. People were afraid to come out on the street after dark. But that gradually toned down. The kids left, the hippies. And it was left with the pretty hard people, but their pawns were gone, so they gradually slipped out. I understand it's gotten pretty tough again.

YATES: In the Haight-Ashbury?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: I know you served on the Select Committee on Campus Disturbances, so how does that relate to what you're just describing?

MOORHEAD: Well, what our committee did, we tried to look into what was happening in some depth and tried to find what the causes were and whose responsibility it was. In the end, it was basically the decision of the committee, which I

agreed with, that a few very radical teachers were more responsible for what was happening than the young people. They would get stirred up by these radical teachers. And in our report, it clearly stated that we didn't think the blame could be put on the students. Where it belonged were the people that were leading the students in that direction. Teachers can have a dramatic effect on young people. I can remember my favorite teacher at UCLA happened to be a very, very liberal Democrat.

YATES: Are you talking about Dean McHenry?

MOORHEAD: Yes. He tried to teach rather than to lead. I guess he was the favorite teacher I ever had. They can inspire you for good and for bad. Teachers have a great responsibility. Of course, most of them stay in the middle and don't do much of anything, but there are a lot of very good professors. That's why I'm not condemning the faculty at the University of California or elsewhere. I'm just saying that there were some among them that urged the students to do illegal acts.

YATES: How did you come to be assigned to that committee?

- MOORHEAD: To begin with, I was on the Criminal Justice Committee. I also served on the Judiciary Committee while I was in the assembly. You know, you don't get the same committees every year, but I was on the Criminal Justice Committee the whole time I was in the assembly.
- YATES: So did this committee then come out of that committee?
- MOORHEAD: A large share of the members of that study committee came out of that committee; not all of them, however.
- YATES: OK. So it was perhaps natural that you might be selected to be on the select committee.
- MOORHEAD: Yes. We got the highest rating of the national legislators association for accomplishments that year for the work of that committee.
- YATES: Oh, did you? So that was a one-year committee?
- MOORHEAD: I honestly don't remember the exact duration.
- YATES: I was just looking through my notes to check when that was. Actually, I think it was '69, it looks like. Did that select committee exist then?
- MOORHEAD: That's pretty accurate.
- YATES: I started asking you about which committees you felt were the most productive, and you were

talking about a large number of crime bills . . .

MOORHEAD: You know, one of the things that--I've forgotten the exact title of it--I started out on as vice chairman of what was the environmental committee [Natural Resources, Planning, and Public Works Committee]. I think we did a lot of good work along that line. We had strong, effective legislation adopted. One of the things we tried to clean up was Lake Tahoe. They've overbuilt south Lake Tahoe, and it's going to deteriorate the quality of water there just as sure as anything. You can't stop it. They never should have permitted that much building that close to the lake. In an area like that, I doubt if they have much of a sewage system. And most of the stuff you put in the ground ends up in the lake one way or the other. But I think the committee's work helped point out the problem and maybe was responsible for some of the controls. It was an improvement for some time. But it still continued to grow around there, and it's not the pristine area that it once was. Incline [Village, Nevada] and a lot of stuff at the north part of the lake. . . . And you still have all of those gambling establishments at the

south end.

YATES: Right. You're talking about on the Nevada side?

MOORHEAD: Yes. Well, there's some in California. The gambling places are right on the border. They are both north and south. There are hundreds of motels that are supporters of the casinos where people stay. There's not that much housing other than the hotel rooms themselves on the Nevada side.

YATES: So Lake Tahoe, at that point, was one of the things that committee focused on as an issue.

MOORHEAD: That's right.

YATES: How did you come to be the vice chair of that particular committee?

MOORHEAD: Jesse Unruh appointed me my first term.

YATES: Did he talk to you about it?

MOORHEAD: No. He knew my predecessor fairly well, and they may have talked together about that. I don't know.

YATES: Right, OK. I was just wondering if you had any discussion about that particular . . .

MOORHEAD: In those days, a Democratic speaker would make a number of Republicans chairmen of committees. When Bob Monagan was the speaker, he made a number of Democrats chairmen of committees.

- YATES: I remember you mentioning that, in some ways, didn't work to his favor.
- MOORHEAD: He gave one of them the wrong committee. That happens.
- YATES: Any other committees that you felt were real productive and why?
- MOORHEAD: Well, the Judiciary Committee. . . . By "real productive," none of these things changed the face of the world. The big bills deal with the budget and the big money things that come out. There are important pieces of legislation, all right. I was the chair of the subcommittee my last year that dealt with workmen's compensation and disability insurance. On that subcommittee, you have to get both management and labor to agree to everything that you do.
- YATES: And how difficult was that?
- MOORHEAD: It's easy to get the [International Brotherhood of] Teamsters [Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America], but not easy to get the AF of L [American Federation of Labor]. Teamsters have now gone back into the AF of L, so I guess today they'd probably be much in the same position. But in those days, they were an independent union. It was easy to work with

them. They wanted to see a plus for them, but management also, of course, has an interest to have employees that are realistically compensated and protected against unemployment and things of that kind. We were able to get some things done. One of my favorite bills was strongly promoted by the Teamsters and strongly promoted by management, but opposed by the AF of L.

YATES: Which bill was this?

MOORHEAD: It was the one that made you eligible for much larger benefits if you were unemployed than had been available before, but which required you to have employment in two quarters rather than in just one. In other words, it was a trade-off. It was aimed at people that go out and work for a month or so in the summertime, and then they stay on unemployment for most of the rest of the year, and they're not looking for work. We didn't feel it was just to let them go on welfare most of the year just because they worked in the summer. And the next summer they'd look for another job, and that would make them eligible to go forward. The AF of L wanted to protect them.

YATES: How did you deal with the AF of L on that?

MOORHEAD: We just didn't get a bill.

YATES: That bill didn't make it?

MOORHEAD: I don't know why they took the position they did, but it may have been [César] Chávez's operation they were trying to protect. But from common sense, if you really want to help the working man of the state, you don't want to make the bulk of the money that goes out under unemployment insurance--the thing that controls the amount that can be paid to people that legitimately find themselves unemployed--to be paid out to people that are just temporary workers in the summer as a matter of habit. A lot of the wives' husbands may have been working to get a job at the cannery during the canning season for a month or two, and then they'd collect unemployment insurance the rest of the year. Some the men did that too, worked harvesting crops for a month or two. All we would require was that they had earnings in two different quarters: January, February, March; April, May, June; July, August, September. Just so that you had some earnings in two quarters.

YATES: In order to be able to get unemployment

insurance if you weren't working the rest of the time?

MOORHEAD: Yes. That wouldn't have been too difficult a thing to do, I would think, but it would keep it from being a scam. If you're satisfied with doing it the other way, you'd be satisfied with never finding a job. You'd kind of like being at home most of the time, and that's the way you'd work it.

YATES: But it sounds like, if I understand this, you did have the support of management and of the Teamsters, right, but not of the AF of L? So in the long run, though, they had enough influence, is that what you're saying, that that bill was defeated?

MOORHEAD: The AF of L can defeat any bill in that area and so can management. It has to be worked out together. But that was the point that you couldn't compromise very well. Where do you go? No place to go. But I guess I worked there. I got the Teamsters' support most of my political career, even though I was conservative, because they knew I could work with them and try to find solutions to problems that labor had, although not for the extremely aggressive directions some

unions liked to go sometimes.

YATES: Were there any other particular bills that went to that committee that stand out to you?

MOORHEAD: Not really because that's a quarter of a century ago.

YATES: OK. [Laughter] I thought I'd try. Which do you feel out of the committees you served on were the least productive?

MOORHEAD: In the legislature?

YATES: Yes.

MOORHEAD: Basically, it's hard to rate them at this time, because I only served on about four committees. One was that environmental committee. And one was the Judiciary Committee, which had the attorneys general association [National Association of Attorneys General] and the state bar association [State Bar of California] and other leaders in the judicial field who would come to me for suggestions on legislation. We were fairly successful in getting bills adopted. I think I got about 70 percent of the bills that I had adopted during the time that I was in the legislature.

YATES: Seventy percent, you said?

MOORHEAD: Yes. That doesn't mean they're earthshaking. I

don't think many of those bills really are earthshaking, to tell you the truth.

YATES: I saw you also served on the Law Revision Commission. Can you tell me about that?

MOORHEAD: Well, it was a commission that studied the overall needs for change. The laws that we had, some of them were obsolete laws that were on the books, some were areas where the law was handicapping progress. We would make recommendations for changes.

YATES: And now, if I understand that, you served on that as a representative of the assembly with [Alfred H.] Song from the senate. So it's the two of you, basically?

MOORHEAD: There were a lot of other excellent lawyers that were on it. It's a continuing process. The Law Revision Commission is still in existence.

YATES: Right.

MOORHEAD: I served on it for two years. Maybe it was a little longer than that. It might have been four. But it's a worthwhile committee that works on those issues. Right now there are changes in federal law that are really needed, but politically, it's almost impossible to get them adopted. I was on the Judiciary Committee

of the [United States] House [of Representatives], and I voted for the mandatory sentences. But to totally tie the hands of the judges, you bring about some very unfortunate circumstances. You add to the burden of the courts, because you keep people who have committed rather minor offenses from pleading guilty and getting the thing over with, because of the drastic consequences that can come to them. There should be some kind of a loophole on the "Three Strikes and You're Out" law.¹ You see, there are laws that are *malum prohibitum* and laws that are *malum in se*. Sometimes people violate a *malum prohibitum* law, perhaps even unintentionally. And if that's the third strike, they get life imprisonment for it.

YATES: Right.

MOORHEAD: It's pretty bad.

YATES: It doesn't really make sense.

MOORHEAD: Or if it happens to be. . . . I'm totally against cigarettes and marijuana, but to find someone with a marijuana cigarette, that

1. Proposition 184 (November 1994).

shouldn't be the third strike, I don't think.

YATES: Right.

MOORHEAD: Many times, also, in the mandatory sentencing, the judges cry out for some kind of a way out from some of these things, because they have to sentence people to extraordinarily long terms in prison. It could cost hundreds of thousands of dollars and destroy the life of a person that's involved, when sometimes the actual facts may show that he's guilty but do not call for that kind of a sentence. I know there are crazy judges that'll let everyone off just about, and there are hanging judges. There are all kinds of judges. But I think there has to be some way down the line where you can get some reason in the end results. I'm discussing federal law again, but that's so much more important in the long run, because it sets the example for the states. I think our federal justice system needs a lot of work.

YATES: Why don't we come back to that, if that's all right, because you were just mentioning to me off tape some of the work that you did related to the federal courts. How is that if we come back?

MOORHEAD: Sure. I have a bad habit of . . .

YATES: [Laughter] That's OK. I want you to be able to talk about it, but maybe we can try to finish up the state assembly, and then we can focus on some of those topics.

MOORHEAD: OK.

YATES: Let me ask you about getting legislation successfully through the legislature. You just mentioned that you had about a 70 percent success rate, and even though the bills weren't maybe earthshaking . . .

MOORHEAD: We'll little note or long remember most of the bills that we passed in the state legislature.

YATES: I was wondering if you can give me an example of a piece of legislation that was particularly difficult to get passed?

MOORHEAD: [Laughter] I'll tell you one that I had a little trouble with. You know, there was a loophole in this drunk driving situation, so that if you pled *nolo contendere*, for some strange reason, it didn't count as a drunk driving conviction as far as your driver's license was concerned. Now, we had a member of the state legislature that was notorious for drunk driving, but he never lost his license

because he'd plead *nolo contendere*. They'd know who he was and let him off, and he really didn't have much of a penalty. I'm not going to mention any names, but that's where it was. And so I put in a piece of legislation to change that.¹ I got it through the committee process all right and got it to the floor of the assembly. It was one of those times when a lot of bills were getting through pretty fast, and it passed. He didn't catch on to it until about two seconds after it passed.

YATES: So the vote had happened, and then he realized what the bill was.

MOORHEAD: When you pass a bill, it doesn't matter how many people are there. If forty-two people are there, you still need forty-one votes. It doesn't matter at all. He asked for reconsideration about two seconds after the vote. What happened was that he needed forty-one votes on the floor to get reconsideration. It's easier to defeat something than come up with forty-one votes to change it, and he never

1. A.B. 496, 1972 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1207.

could get the forty-one votes. I presume after I was gone, he was able to get the bills back to correct it. The man's dead now.

I just don't think it's proper to be able to find a loophole for misbehavior that endangers. . . . Look at these crazy nuts right now that are going the wrong way on the freeways. They're doing all kinds of things, and people die. My wife's brother died because of a drunk driver. Many, many families have had that situation come up. You really shouldn't have a license. And if you drive without a license, you really ought to spend some time in jail to teach you that you have to have one before you drive.

YATES: Were there any other bills that you really had difficulty with? It sounds like you didn't have as much difficulty getting this one through. I was wondering if there was any particular bill that stands out to you that was a challenge to get through?

MOORHEAD: I had bills that were defeated in committee. In the senate there was a member, Clark [L.] Bradley, a Republican, that never liked anything. And so if you got out to the

Judiciary Committee over there and there was just a bare quorum, you were in bad shape, [although] I'm sure he must have voted for something at sometime or other.

YATES: But you knew if it went to that committee then it would be difficult?

MOORHEAD: But what we'd do. . . . I had a lot of friends on the committee, including the chairman. And if he saw that was the situation, he would just step down and step out of the room, the chairman would. There would not be a majority. . . . It would be considered later in the day, when they decided which bills they wanted to pass or not, and all the members were present, and they would put it through. That's the way you'd get around it. But if he was able to kill it, it never came up again. So that was just a situation that existed, and you had to be able to beat it some way or the other. Lots of bills you had trouble with, but I really don't remember too many of them.

YATES: OK. Well, let me ask you, then, on another subject. When you joined the assembly, the legislature just had begun to meet full-time. It was a full-time legislature.

MOORHEAD: It really wasn't full-time, although they called it full-time. You'd go in on Monday morning, and you'd work until about eleven o'clock on Thursday. We were in session usually until early July or sometimes late July, and we'd be through for the year, although there were committee hearings in various parts of the state.

YATES: Right. But compared to how often the legislature met before that, I'm just wondering about how that would impact your keeping in touch with your constituents, for example.

MOORHEAD: There were no problems with that, because you'd get the plane on Thursday noon and be in the district for Thursday afternoon, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday.

YATES: So you don't feel like that impacted your . . .

MOORHEAD: Ability to be in touch? Not at all.

YATES: Even though you'd have to be in Sacramento more than the previous assembly had been?

MOORHEAD: Well, to begin with, before they didn't get paid anything, maybe \$500 a month, and it went up to \$16,000 a year that year. The big change that was made was that you had unequal representation in the senate, as there is in the United States

Senate now, actually. There were forty members of the senate. There are fifty-eight counties. So most of the larger counties had one state senator. L.A. County had 35 percent of the population of the state and one state senator. Jack [B.] Tenney was the senator for a long time. [Mildred] Millie Younger ran against him once, I remember that, and did pretty well, but not well enough to win. But in 1966 for that election, we had equal representation in the senate.

YATES: Right.

MOORHEAD: And it was a revolution. L.A. County got something like ten or eleven state senators instead of the one. A lot of the cow counties had their representation dramatically reduced. So the interests that were in control shifted too. Agricultural interests were not as heavily represented and the cattle areas and so forth. And not that they shouldn't be represented, they should, but they shouldn't have had way over half of all the members, because the state population wasn't that way.

YATES: I know you came in in '66 when this went into effect--the full-time legislature--but I was

still wondering what you thought of that system, that process?

MOORHEAD: I do think that the changes that were made in the senate had a dramatic result on what might happen in the state. Although the people that had been there. . . . Like Senator [Hugh M.] Burns from Fresno was still a dominating character in the senate for a long period of time. He was in it for about forty years, I believe. I don't know exactly, but he was there forever. He liked to tell the story about the first term he was there. He decided to do nothing and just listen and learn, and everyone told him what a great job he was doing. And then the next term he decided to make himself get out and do things, and his popularity went down as he was accomplishing things.

It made a dramatic effect, but most members of the legislature had outside work. They couldn't live very well on legislative pay. My law practice was dramatically reduced, but I was able to handle probates and do things like that. But I did not have time for trial work.

YATES: I was just asking about the impact of the full-time legislature on keeping in touch with your

constituents. How did you keep in touch with your constituents?

MOORHEAD: Well, I went to every meeting I possibly could in the district. I don't think that in those days political activism was as strong as it is today. I remember the first time I went to the legislature, you'd get two or four speeches a week maybe, but that was all the opportunity there was, really. You could walk precincts and you could go out on the street to meet people, but you didn't have to make that many speeches. When I was in Congress, whether we were in sessions or not, I'd come to California on the weekend, and I might have six or seven major talks. And if I was here for a week, I'd always have twenty-five or so.

YATES: Twenty-five, you said? That's a lot.

MOORHEAD: It was just a different ball game. The legislature has heated up since that time. When I ran for the legislature, I spent a few thousand dollars on a race. Fourteen [thousand], I think, was the most I ever spent on a race. And now they're spending a million dollars to run in some of the races. It's a whole different world. I think the most I ever

spent was maybe \$350,000 on a congressional race. I think a lot of that's wasted. But [Michael] Huffington spent \$5 million to win a primary. A lot of them are spending in the millions.

YATES: Right. So when you were in the legislature, if I'm hearing you correctly, the constituent demand wasn't as strong in terms of dealing with issues or going out and speaking to groups as it later became.

MOORHEAD: No, but I did a reasonable amount of it during that time. I was here on the weekend for any events that were scheduled, and I'd go to them.

YATES: OK. You kept your home, as I remember, down here.

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: So this was really your base?

MOORHEAD: Yes. The first few years I was in the legislature, I didn't have a home up there. After Val and I were married, the last couple of years, we had a little condominium or town house at Campus Commons, but our home was still here.

YATES: Another subject we haven't discussed was the relationship of the legislature with lobbyists. I wanted to get your observations during the

time you were there, which was '67 to '71, basically.

MOORHEAD: Lobbyists were very active in those days. I think in some ways they had more influence than they do today, primarily because most of the people that go into the legislature are quite young, and they aren't always that experienced in these things. It wasn't easy for them. If there were groups that were friendly to them or had basic goals such as theirs, they would follow that pattern. They'd be very available to what they were considering. I don't know whether it really affected the outcomes that much, because you had people on all sides of every issue. And, I guess, they always will activate their friends.

YATES: How about in terms of influencing campaign contributions?

MOORHEAD: I think right now as far as campaign contributions are concerned, that business groups give as much or more money to the Democrats as they do to Republicans. They're trying to buy access to them.

YATES: Well, wait a minute. I'm thinking, though, about when you were in the assembly.

MOORHEAD: It was probably true then, too. They weren't getting much of an audience with certain people, and they were trying to get some support, so that they would get some benefits or at least get an audience so that they could tell them their problems. I think today that, at least in Congress and probably in the legislature too, except for a very few members, most of the members will take their money and vote the other way if they believe they are wrong.

YATES: That's now?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: But then?

MOORHEAD: Well, I think for the younger people that were there that didn't have much knowledge in the fields themselves . . .

YATES: That it did have an influence?

MOORHEAD: . . . it had an influence. Bound to. I don't think it's necessarily the money that has the influence, it's just someone coming in and talking to them and telling them their problems.

YATES: So it's pressure that way.

MOORHEAD: Yes. I think you have to be pretty green for money itself to have an effect on what you do.

YATES: OK. Well, I want to ask you about California

Republican politics in general, but first let me ask you about your 1968 and '70 campaigns. How did those campaigns compare with running for office in 1966?

MOORHEAD: I kept working at it. The first time I ran, I had an area of Hollywood that I totally bombed out in. And I'm one of those people that if I'm challenged, I have to do something about it. But there was a portion of Hollywood between Gower [Street] and Normandie [Avenue] and between Santa Monica Boulevard and Hollywood Boulevard where there were forty precincts, a heavy population. And the first time I ran there, I didn't win anything.

[End Tape 3, Side A]

[Begin Tape 3, Side B]

YATES: You were talking about this area that you didn't do well in in '66.

MOORHEAD: Yes, I lost all the precincts there. And I got out and did everything under the sun over the next period of time: going to shopping centers with a loudspeaker on my station wagon, going up and down the streets, walking to almost every home. I did everything you could do, and I only lost three precincts the next time.

YATES: So that would have been the '68 election?

MOORHEAD: Yes. But I never spent much money. I never had much of a drive for money. And frankly, the people around here never felt I had a race.

YATES: So you don't feel like the challenges, in terms of an opponent, were severe?

MOORHEAD: In my career, I had a few tough races. You know, the first time you run for anything, it's a challenge. The first time I ran for Congress, I had the toughest race.

YATES: Right. I want to come back to that race. So the campaigns that you had while you were in the assembly, that's the main thing that was a challenge?

MOORHEAD: Well, I would have had to lose them. Winning was not difficult. The main thing you had to do was to get the nomination of your party the first time. I had two opponents. One, a very nice young man, and another, a very pompous guy who finished third out of three.

YATES: This is for the Republican nomination?

MOORHEAD: Yes. They each had in the seven thousand range and I had seventeen thousand, so I got more than half of the votes. After that was over, it was easy during those races. I still didn't like to

lose any areas. I worked very hard at it.

YATES: Now, let me ask you more generally about California Republican politics. Summarize for me what was happening with the Republican party in California during the 1960s and into the 1970s.

MOORHEAD: Through most of those years, we were very successful in retaining the governor's job. Of course, Ronald Reagan was a very, very special man. Everyone loved him. Even his opponents liked him. Very personable. A lot of people thought he was not capable of being strong, but I've seen examples of where he could be. He would go the easy way if it would work, but he could go the hard way if he had to. He could be very forceful. I probably told you before about John Briggs not wanting to vote for that bill . . .

YATES: Right, and that he went and spoke to Governor Reagan and came back and changed his vote.

MOORHEAD: Pale as a ghost.

YATES: I'm wondering how were things changing in terms of maybe the club movement? That might be one way to approach this question.

MOORHEAD: The club movement?

YATES: I'm just thinking more down to the grassroots level. What was happening with the Republican party movement in general?

MOORHEAD: In this area, the Republican party was very, very strong in those days. Very well organized. Top people in leadership. Most strong women were. . . . Well, there were some strong men there, too, but our central committee, I think, really played a role in campaigns. It hasn't that much in recent years. I think there's been a change between the time that the parties controlled the elections and put out the literature and so forth, and nowadays the members themselves really control their own destinies. We used to get a lot of financial help from the party. By a lot I mean it depends on what area you were in, but there was a lot of help. There's not that much anymore. The party looks to the members who are raising the money to help them.

YATES: So basically, during the time you were in the assembly and past that into the seventies, are you saying that was still fairly strong?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: You just mentioned the success of having a

Republican in the governor's office. But I'm thinking now about, for example, the assembly in general and how the Republicans had the majority for those couple of years, but not just prior to that and after that. What are your observations about what was going on with the Republican support system in terms of getting candidates elected?

MOORHEAD: I think they worked harder and more effectively in those days to get candidates than they always have in recent years. But on the congressional side, I think they still work pretty diligently in trying to find adequate candidates. Although here in our district, we did very, very poorly this last time other than for the congressional seat.

YATES: If I heard you correctly, you just said they did work effectively during this period that you were in the assembly?

MOORHEAD: Yes. For instance, I think of [Clare L.] Berryhill's race up there that he had in the area south of Stockton. Berryhill was a farmer in that area, and he was having just nick and tuck races. They would get people from all over the state to go out and campaign on election day

for him. They did that in a number of areas. I went up there and walked precincts for him. I didn't know him. I think there was more of that work in those days than there is today.

YATES: But, obviously, the success in terms of having a majority in the assembly did not happen. I mean it didn't maintain its level.

MOORHEAD: It didn't maintain largely because of money.

YATES: You think money was a big part of it?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: Why do you say that?

MOORHEAD: There are certain groups that will put a lot of money into legislative races in California: the schoolteachers, the labor unions, the trial lawyers, the racetracks, the liquor industry. And frankly, they want to be on the winning side. They were contributing large sums of money to the Democratic party. Business tries to influence both sides. They want their nose under the tent, at least, so that they can get heard. But even though the Democrats don't vote with business, they contribute much more money to the Democrats than they do to the Republicans, because they don't want to get left out. They want to at least be able to voice

their concerns.

When the PACs came in, it hurt the effect of the labor unions, because that's where the money came from. There was no other really organized availability of funds.

YATES: The political action committee is, I think, what that stands for.

MOORHEAD: They kept the labor unions from controlling the legislative process both nationally and locally.

YATES: So that dispersed their effect, is what you're saying?

MOORHEAD: Yes, because there were other interests that could come up with contributions. And they would do anything they could to do away with the PACs, because they would get their influence back.

YATES: Well, let me come back to Governor Reagan for a moment. In 1966 when he was elected. . . . Let me back up a second. That was the first year you were elected, and that was also a gubernatorial election. Why do you think Ronald Reagan was able to defeat Pat Brown?

MOORHEAD: The finances of the state were on the rocks, for one thing. We have a constitution that requires that the budget be balanced in California. And

he was using all kinds of manipulative figures to make it look like it was, but they didn't have the money to pay the bills. Pat Brown Sr. was a nice guy. I enjoyed being around him. But he didn't do that great a job of running the state, because he had too many friends. He did a better job than his son did, but there were just a lot of things that. . . . We were spending beyond our means.

YATES: But I'm wondering, leading up to that election, how aware would the public be of that?

MOORHEAD: Well, I think they were wanting a change. I think they felt the need for a change. And, of course, Reagan was a dynamic speaker. I guess we haven't had any as good, that I know of. And he had connections in every direction you'd look. He'd been the voice of the desert in his Death Valley Days.

YATES: So there was a public appeal, then, to his persona.

MOORHEAD: People knew him from . . .

[Interruption]

. . . You know, he'd been a labor union leader, General Electric spokesman. Everyone knew him. Everyone knew him, and they liked him. He's

warm and personable. You have to look to find even a Democrat that didn't like him personally. And he had given enough speeches on the government or what he felt should be done with it that it had a major effect. When he got there, a large share of the Democrats would vote with him, because they knew the effect he had on the electorate. The same thing was true when he was president.

YATES: In 1970 he ran against Jesse Unruh for the governor's office, and, of course, Reagan defeated Unruh, but it was by a much closer margin than in 1966. Why do you think Reagan's lead diminished?

MOORHEAD: Well, I would say probably that this is a state that, though the registered voters are strongly in favor of the Democrats, the voting public was pretty evenly divided. We've won most of the presidential races here in California. We've won surely our share of the governor's races over the last fifty years here. We do lousy in the rest of the state. If people don't know the candidates, they vote Democrat. We've done better right now than we've done before. Matt Fong and [Daniel E.] Dan Lungren and Pete

Wilson, and there is one other. We've got four elected state offices. I don't think we've ever had four of them before that I can remember in my time in politics.

Jesse Unruh was a well-known person. You either loved him or you hated him. You've probably gathered from what I said that I neither loved him nor hated him. I thought he was a very capable political leader. He's certainly been able to win a lot of races as treasurer and otherwise since that time. But I think after you've been governor for four years, you make some enemies. People don't agree with everything. The aroma is off. And being able to hang on is quite a feat.

YATES: Well, I think we touched on this a little bit, but I want to ask you again about the Republican's gain of seats in the legislature in the late sixties. Why do you think the Republican party was able to obtain a majority at that point in the legislature?

[Interruption]

MOORHEAD: I think the Republicans worked harder, and a lot of the Democrats were getting old. They had been in so long that some of them were losing

steam. You can only go all out so many times. And areas change. We went through a period when we were having reapportionments all the time, two of them in every decade instead of the required one. We had one big change there for the '66 election. Sometimes it takes a little time to take advantage of that. We started winning elections that we probably shouldn't have won. Like we won that [Bill] Brophy seat down there in [David A.] Roberti's old district, but we'd have been better off if we had lost it, because our candidate was no good.

YATES: You mentioned Bob Monagan as leader of the assembly and who he named to committees.

MOORHEAD: Bob Monagan was a wonderful gentleman. He was a highly motivated legislator. He was not a strong political leader. Now, there's a difference. He was a good, professional speaker, but he wasn't that good at going out and electing Republicans.

YATES: My next question was, then, since the majority did not last very long, why did they lose the majority?

MOORHEAD: The majority was tenuous in the first place. They had a one-vote majority there for a brief

period of time. They didn't have a solid majority. One of the things that we had is a strong controlling group in the Republican party in the legislature that were not partisan. Bob Monagan, Houston Flournoy, Bill Bagley, and a substantial group that were there that really controlled the legislative process. But they didn't necessarily appeal to the more conservative Republican base in California, and I think that's probably the reason they couldn't hold on to it. They didn't inspire the conservatives to go out there and work for them. But, as a legislator or as a gentleman, you'll never find much of a nicer man or finer man. All of these people were. . . . I wasn't in that group. I'm much more conservative than they were, but they're all my friends.

YATES: Right. You mentioned, I think, the differences.

MOORHEAD: They've all been my friends through the years. They were very effective when the Democrats controlled, because they were able to get chairmanships and everything from the Democrats, too. So they were a strong moderate voice. [Thomas H.] Kuchel was one of the same type. I'm inclined to think as I grow older, even

though I'm more conservative than that group, that probably you're able to get more progress if you can appeal to both sides of the aisle.

YATES: To be more moderate, then?

MOORHEAD: Yes. On some things. Or at least appear more moderate. But the sides have become more frozen than they were in those days.

YATES: You mean by having extremes in either party?

MOORHEAD: Yes. I think you've had a lot of extremes both ways. And I don't think that that's where the progress comes from.

YATES: OK.

MOORHEAD: Is that the wrong thing for a conservative to say?

YATES: No. You should say whatever feels right.

MOORHEAD: I know that our very, very conservative leadership thought I was too friendly to the Democrats, but a lot of the things I was able to do I did with their help, you know. I think the goals of a leader should be first to your country and the people you represent and next to your party. You have to be supportive of your party, because if you don't work together, you don't get anything done. But someday or other you have to work for your party's interest, but

at the same time be able to expand it so that you can go beyond it, or really you just don't accomplish very much.

YATES: At this point, why don't we wrap up the period you were in the state assembly. Let me ask you now to summarize your experiences as an assemblyman. Tell me, what did you find fulfilling in being an assemblyman?

MOORHEAD: Well, it was the first political office I ever held. I found it very exciting to be in a position where I could consider the necessary laws for the land and be able to vote on hundreds of issues over the years, except there may be only a dozen bills that really have long-range meaning. There were so many things that affect the lives of a smaller group of people or that have minor effects on a lot of people, but do have an effect in total. It's like a river: a few drops don't do anything, but when you get the river together, it does a lot. The end result is very important in our lives and what happens to us. I think we're learning to work more with ombudsman-type things. That was the field that I was very interested in, because I had been running the legal aid and lawyer

reference service here for sixteen years. I guess I get more pleasure out of being able to help [individual] people than I do something which I do for all humanity, because you can't do that much for all humanity, but you can help the individual that needs help.

YATES: But you did get some of that from being in the assembly, is what you're saying?

MOORHEAD: I got a lot of it. It can make a big difference in people's lives. There is a great deal of joy that you get when you can really make things better for your constituents or for some of the laws you pass that directly help your area, but they help everybody, too.

YATES: What was the less fulfilling aspect of being in the state legislature?

MOORHEAD: As I said, maybe they didn't have that much of it when I was there, but the negative battles that you get into where you. . . . A lot of the opponents that you get, even though they aren't effective or they can't do much, will accuse you of everything under the sun. I had one guy accusing me of both being a womanizer and being a homosexual. Both of which were false, totally. But they'll do anything to try to win

a race.

YATES: You're talking about in a campaign, particularly?

MOORHEAD: Yes. I've had three or four really bad apples through the years that ran against me. They never did anything, but they wanted to win so bad that they'd say anything or do anything to try to do it.

YATES: Anything else that was, perhaps, unpleasant about being in the assembly?

MOORHEAD: It was harder on our wives. When I was married, I would be gone four days of the week. And when I got back home, I had a law practice to take care of, and I had to go out to do the political meetings and everything. It was very difficult for Val. She didn't get to see me much. So when the chance came to run for Congress, she jumped at that like it was the greatest thing to happen, because in Congress I'd come home a couple of weekends a month. And most of the time I would be with her in Washington. I'd get home at seven o'clock at night, and we'd have the evening together. We had the weekends when I did not go to California.

YATES: So your schedule in Congress was better than

being in the state legislature?

MOORHEAD: Yes. Better for both of us, because we had much more time together. You have the cocktail parties and so forth that you have to go to in the evening. I had a rule: you never drink at a cocktail party, never. You might have a glass of wine someplace else, but not there, because you go to four or five of those things, and you're not fit for yourself or anybody else. Maybe once or twice a week we'd have a dinner to go to, but I wouldn't go to one if my wife wasn't invited.

YATES: Tell me, what were you unable to accomplish that you would have liked to accomplish when you were in the state legislature?

MOORHEAD: Well, you get into the area of crime, which was what I was working at. Our society was a bigger state. We had more people living right next to each other. We weren't able to do as much with that as we would have liked to have done. I've developed the feeling, too, that the court system is in bad need of repair. But you are fighting the [California] Trial Lawyers Association. That was one of the fights we had in Congress, and on the Federal Courts Study

[Commission]. Everyone agreed, with the exception of the representative of the American Bar Association, that we need to do something about it, but you just can't get the support. They practically own the Democratic party. I don't think you have to have the best vision in the world to see that, because it's there.

YATES: Did you also have similar feelings when you were in the state assembly that it was difficult to deal with the criminal justice system? Is that what you're saying?

MOORHEAD: It was difficult to make dramatic changes.

YATES: OK.

MOORHEAD: I think some of the things aren't working, and they could be made to work.

YATES: Anything else that you were unable to accomplish when you were there?

MOORHEAD: Well, those things that I was working on were, of course, more important than the others. The state legislature, in those days, was a very enjoyable experience. I shouldn't say this, but they didn't overwork you, because they spread out the time that you were involved in it, so there was no "Hurry up and do it now" that was involved except the last days of a session. And

maybe that's better in the long run anyway.
There are so many laws to begin with. I think
one of the biggest mistakes is that so many of
them come up the last day . . .

YATES: Oh, that the bills come up on the last day?

MOORHEAD: Yes, and I don't think they get scrutinized very
well. But most of the serious work comes up in
Congress.

YATES: OK. Well, why don't we wrap up today by
finishing with the state legislature. How does
that sound?

MOORHEAD: OK.

YATES: Great.

[End Tape 3, Side B]

[Session 4, December 4, 1997]

[Begin Tape 4, Side A]

YATES: I thought today we could turn to when you ran for Congress, which was 1972. When did you decide to run for election?

MOORHEAD: The vacancy had been created or was being created when H. Allen Smith announced early in 1972 that he was not going to run for reelection. A number of potential candidates announced their interest, including the two state senators from this area and Bob Finch, who had been the former head of HEW [United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare], and some other very well-known businessmen. There were a couple of other assemblymen that were interested in it. I decided after a while that I wasn't going to be the candidate, and so my wife and I moved to Sacramento for the session that was underway on the first of February with the kids. We put the kids in school up there.

YATES: So this is the first of February in 1972?

MOORHEAD: That's right.

YATES: OK.

MOORHEAD: On the night of the fourth or fifth, I was at home, and I got a call from one of the senators who said that if I wanted to run I would have the basic support of his group.

YATES: Who was this?

MOORHEAD: It was Bill Richardson.

YATES: OK.

MOORHEAD: I asked my wife if. . . . Well, I told him I had to ask her, and I needed a little time. He said he had to know that night. So I asked her, and she said, "Go for it." The next day I went down to the district, down to Glendale and Pasadena, and made my announcement to the two newspapers, the big ones: the [Glendale] News-Press and the [Pasadena] Star-News. And the campaign was on. I didn't really realize how strong Bill McColl's support might be in Pasadena, but having come within 127 votes in that part of the district from winning the time before, he had the eastern part of the district pretty much under control.

YATES: For a second, why don't you explain what you

mean when you say the previous district, because off tape we were talking for a minute about reapportionment and the impact on the district you were running for in '72.

MOORHEAD: Glenard [P.] Lipscomb represented a large part of Pasadena and the surrounding areas, and he had passed away a couple of years before. And so there was a contest between three prominent Republicans: two former congressmen, Pat Hillings and John Rousselot, and an orthopedic physician and surgeon who had been an all-American football player at Stanford and . . .

YATES: This is Bill McColl?

MOORHEAD: Bill McColl. All of Pasadena was put in the new district along with large portions of Los Angeles: Highland Park, Eagle Rock, Atwater Park [now Atwater Village], Glassell Park, Silver Lake, east Hollywood, and a good portion of Hollywood, along with the Los Feliz hills.

YATES: These were all new areas brought in?

MOORHEAD: They were all new areas that came into the district. When the race began, Bill McColl really had strong support in the eastern part of the district. I had none, because they didn't know me; I'd never run there. I had strong

support in the Glendale-Burbank areas and in Los Feliz. So it was basically nip and tuck, as far as the race was concerned, for many months. We had some other good candidates in there, too, like Eric Stattin, who had been a savings and loan commissioner from La Cañada. There was another orthopedic physician and surgeon that was prominent in the Adventist community that was in the race, along with a number of others. There were ten of us all together.

YATES: Is that a particularly large number for a primary?

MOORHEAD: That's a pretty large number. We had, if I remember correctly, about thirty-three or thirty-four so-called debates. But with that many candidates, you get about five minutes a piece. You can imagine that would take an hour, and then we had question and answer periods after that. So it was a very, very difficult race to run.

I wasn't able to raise the kind of money some of the other candidates had. I think I raised about \$40,000 and put a little bit in myself. We were in debt when the primary was over. I didn't realize it, but my campaign

manager wanted to win, and that was probably the best organized campaign that I have ever seen. It just happened at that time that a lot of top-notch campaign people didn't have anything else to do during that primary period, and they all jumped in the race. So we had some beautiful support.

YATES: You just mentioned debates. What were the hot issues that you were discussing at those debates?

MOORHEAD: School busing was the big issue during that particular period of time. Crime was a big issue. The economy, of course, is always a major issue in a campaign. There were a number of things. What I did when I prepared my potential speech was I prepared about ten different topics, and I would vary them from one group to another. I'd try to cover about three or four topics at any one speech that I was giving so that they didn't hear the same thing over and over again. I think that's one place where Bill made a tremendous error, because he had the same canned speech that he gave every single time. The other nine of us could have given the speech for him. Unfortunately, when

you're in a campaign like that there are a lot of duplications, a lot of people come to more than one of them. When they hear the same thing more than once, they begin to think you don't have anything else to offer.

YATES: How did you distinguish yourself from other Republican candidates in this primary on a subject like busing, for example?

MOORHEAD: I was against school busing, and it basically turned out to be a failure.

YATES: School busing was?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: OK. How did you distinguish yourself from the rest of the pool of candidates?

MOORHEAD: Well, I didn't campaign against any of the others, except where Bill McColl would take a stand that was contrary to mine, because he was the opponent. Bill did not live in the district, and his business was not in the district. He was an orthopedic physician. His office was in West Covina, and his home was in Covina. He did rent an apartment in Glendale for the campaign, but that was a major issue. It always is. The other issue was that he had issued a number of positions on school busing,

all of them different. And in our final brochure we quoted his press releases. It said, "Elect somebody that knows where they stand on the issue."

YATES: OK, let me understand just so I'm clear, even though you had these debates and all the Republican candidates might be at this, then . . .

MOORHEAD: They didn't all stay for the question and answer period, though. Bill didn't stay very often for the questions and answers.

YATES: That was what I was trying to imagine: If all of you were there and you were being asked questions about busing, for example, how would you separate yourself from the other candidates on the topic?

MOORHEAD: I normally don't do negative campaigning. I do think if there's an issue, you're allowed to distinguish yourself from your opponents on the issue. Like I think living in a district and not living in a district is a legitimate issue. But I didn't attack anybody. Some of them attacked me.

YATES: How did you deal with that?

MOORHEAD: I just ignored it. I just totally ignored it. The one that did that primarily--Bill did it a

little bit--was a lawyer up there in La Crescenta. I won't give you the name. He accused me of everything you could ever be accused of. Then he said after the election, "I hope you don't have any hard feelings. It was just that the only way I could win was to get you into a personal debate with me"--and I wouldn't do it. He got fourteen hundred votes, which wasn't a major thing. But you don't particularly appreciate being attacked constantly on personal things that aren't true.

YATES: Besides the debates, what other campaign activities were you involved in to get out and get people to vote for you?

MOORHEAD: We were both featured by KNX [radio station]. They went to an event for Bill, they went to an event for myself, and I guess they did for Eric Stattin, because that was the one endorsement that Stattin got that I know of. He got their endorsement. He was a good man, he really was a very fine person. We were friends afterwards for a long time, and he'd call me and so forth. He finished third in the race. Most of them were decent people.

The man that finished fourth was Dr. Fox.

He ran against me twice, but he had contributed to my general elections both times. He was an older man and wanted to top off his career with a term in Congress, I guess. But most of them were not really serious contenders, although one or two of them had a lot of money and they put it in. Dr. Fox put \$100,000 in . . .

YATES: Wow, that sounds like a lot even for then.

MOORHEAD: . . . the "Three Cheers for Dr. Fox" campaign, and that's what it was. He got suckered into putting his money into a bad campaign manager's program.

YATES: Why do you think you were able to win the primary?

MOORHEAD: I had six years' experience in the state legislature, I was very well-known in the area on the west side, and I was helped immensely by the team in Pasadena that had helped John Rousselot two years before. Evidently, there had been some antagonisms in that campaign. They helped me in the end, even though I didn't get involved in the personal type of debate. I know Bill had a negative sign out in front of his headquarters in Glendale about my not being aggressive enough or whatever it was, but we

tried to stay away from that. I know his team was afraid I'd bring up the issue of malpractice suits, and evidently someone had in the campaign before. I would never have done it, but they wanted me to promise not to, and that was something else. I'd rather keep them on the edge of their toes, thinking it might happen. But I just never did that with any candidate I ran against. I didn't believe in it.

YATES: You avoided negative campaigning?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: Of course, that has been a hot topic in recent years in particular.

MOORHEAD: I think it's self-defeating. We had a race here for the assembly, and one of the candidates, who I really favored, got into a negative approach. It killed him. I guess if it's one-on-one, it might come out dead even. But if there's a group in there, people will vote for one of the other candidates than the one attacked or the one that attacks. That was pretty bad.

YATES: Let me ask you now about the general election.

MOORHEAD: I would tell you just one thing more about the primary. The polls showed us dead even up to the last three or four weeks. Three days before

the election, the manager for Bill came up to me and he said, "Well, you beat us, but I still think we had the best candidate." This is several days before the election. It turned out to be a 53-20 [percent] result, with the third-place man getting 10, and the fourth place 5, and the rest were down.

The general election was pretty much a typical two-party election.

YATES: I'm just checking who that was against. The Democratic opponent was John Binkley.

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: OK, just to clear it up.

MOORHEAD: That ran pretty much along regular lines down to the last week.

YATES: What do you mean by regular lines?

MOORHEAD: Well, the Republicans had dominated, basically, in this area, and the Democrats were at about 40 percent most of the time. Usually about a 40-60 situation here. I went basically to the Republican events, and he went to the Democratic events. He spent a lot of time at Occidental College, and he wiped me out there. That was during the battles on the campuses, as you know. They were just coming to an end, but that

MOORHEAD: feeling was still there. He got over four hundred votes in that precinct there, and I got a handful. I still won the overall Los Angeles area in spite of that.

But what happened in the last week in the primary was that a member of the Pasadena City Council was a lawyer, and he had gotten a contribution from a man that was probably the most distinguished man in the theatrical world in Pasadena. When he died, there were two full pages in the Star-News about his life.

Unfortunately, he owned a square block in Pasadena from Fair Oaks [Avenue] west and back for a block, and in that block was the Oaks Theatre, which was a pornographic theater. And this lawyer had gotten a \$500 contribution from him for my campaign. I didn't know anything about any of it. I wouldn't have known the man if I had fallen over him.

So during the last week a big brochure came out from Binkley saying that he was my principal financial supporter, which wasn't true, and he described a relationship that wasn't there. I didn't know the guy. I didn't even know he had given me \$500. [Binkley] had ads in every

newspaper with the marquee of that theater shown in the ad, as well as in his brochure. I won't use the words that were in the marquee, but they were tomcat and something else shows that they had there. Well, the people who called me by the dozens said, "Is it true?" "Is what true?" I got \$500 from him, and I didn't even know the man. None of the rest of it was true. But it was two or three days before the election, and I couldn't do anything about it. He held me to 57.5 percent.

YATES: It was a tight race, right?

MOORHEAD: Well, it wasn't tight. He'd gotten around 30 something percent.

YATES: I think I might have the percentages. Maybe I don't. You had 122,309 [votes] and he had 90,842.

MOORHEAD: He was closer than he should have been.

YATES: Right. You attribute it to this last-minute attack?

MOORHEAD: Oh, I know that's what it was. About a week after the election, they arrested him for his relationship with three little black boys that worked in his campaign.

YATES: They arrested John Binkley?

MOORHEAD: Yes. I never followed the results. I know that he left town and was never heard of again.

YATES: Let me ask you, before we leave this election, to return again to the district and the impact of reapportionment on it. You talked about the various areas that were added on to this district.

MOORHEAD: Two years later, we were reapportioned again. They took out Eagle Rock and a lot of the other areas that had been in the district for the first race. Most of the Los Angeles area was taken out.

YATES: Well, just to come back to that '72 race, you talked about the geographic changes. How did that impact the race in term of the demographics? Who lived in those areas? Do you know what I'm saying? You described the district that was Smith's district prior to your running for election as traditionally Republican and conservative. How did this . . .

MOORHEAD: Both sides were traditionally Republican, really.

YATES: OK. I was wondering if those new areas impacted the ratio of Republicans and Democrats, and if that impacted the race?

MOORHEAD: I don't think it had. . . . The Los Angeles area had a Democratic registration. Altadena had a strong Democratic registration, which was in the district. But for the most part, it was a Republican district. I know that basically it's almost the same now as it was after the first reapportionment there . . .

YATES: Really.

MOORHEAD: . . . except that San Marino was not in it before or South Pasadena. It's a whole lot the same district that it was before, except it's changed dramatically through the years.

YATES: You mean who lives in those areas has changed?

MOORHEAD: School busing changed Pasadena. The public school turned. . . . The white kids left the school system, for the most part, and it segregated the educational program in Pasadena to a great extent.

YATES: Explain to me what you mean by "they left."

MOORHEAD: They either moved out of the city with their children or sent their kids to private schools.

YATES: Specifically because of the busing?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: They didn't want to see any integration?

MOORHEAD: There was more integration before school busing

MOORHEAD: than there was afterwards. Muir [High School] was more black than Pasadena High School, which was predominantly white. The black population isn't that great to dominate a school. But it's changed; the school system now has some whites in it. Largely, they have a lot of the Armenians that have come in and a lot of Latinos that have come in. But the traditional people in Pasadena had joined some rather large private schools that they have over there, and I think that's--I'm not against private schools--too bad that it divided the town that way. Why should a black kid be bused from northwest Pasadena to east Pasadena to go to another school that's predominantly minority when he gets there? It doesn't make much sense. I think that Pasadena schools were hurt by that particular program. There are those that would disagree with me, I'm sure.

That battle brought in just scores of political activists that were working for school busing. That changed the nature of the town. The school board itself, during those first years, was very predominantly conservative. And they did something that I don't think someone in

public office should do. They were good people, but they would argue with the folks that would come in to speak on issues to the school board. You shouldn't argue with people that come in, you should listen to them. You vote your own conscience, but you listen. They debated so much that they finally lost the support of the newspaper over there.

YATES: You're still talking about the early seventies?

MOORHEAD: Yes, and that changed the conservative state through most of the seventies. But they gradually weakened and they lost out, I think, getting into these debates on these issues. You listen, and once in while you get a good idea from the other side. You don't have to debate them on it.

YATES: Well, we can come back to the '74 election, but, in the meantime, I wanted talk to you about going to Washington, D.C. You won the election, you went to Washington, D.C., and you began your first term in the House of Representatives. What were your initial impressions?

MOORHEAD: Like most new congressmen, I was excited about it. It was a new world, really. It's so much larger than the state [legislature], where we

had 80 in the assembly and 40 in the senate, and here we had 435 people in the House and 100 in the Senate. The issues were so dramatically increased in size from the issues that we'd have in the [state] legislature. So it was a very exciting time. I actually didn't get the committees that I asked for.

YATES: That was one of my questions: How did you receive your committee assignments?

MOORHEAD: Well, there's a Committee on Committees, or there was at that time, that determined what committees everyone was going to go on. We had a representative from California that worked with the Republican side, and they determined who the Republican members were going to be, and there was a committee that did that for the Democrats. I asked to be on Energy and Commerce [Committee], Foreign Affairs [Committee], or Banking [Committee].

YATES: Banking?

MOORHEAD: They asked me if there was one committee I didn't want to be on, and I said Judiciary. The reason for that being that I had been on two judicial committees in the state legislature, and I had been a lawyer. I felt I needed to go

out into something else.

YATES: Why did you want Energy and Commerce and Banking, in particular?

MOORHEAD: I felt that's where the most action was on the economy. Controls on industry and things like that. Well, what happened was I got one committee, and I was really busy. We were tied up with impeachment. Just to give you a few examples.

YATES: You got Judiciary, which is the one you didn't want, right?

MOORHEAD: That's right. [Spiro T.] Agnew resigned, and we had the selection of a vice president and the approval by Congress. That was done in our committee. We had the impeachment proceedings that never went beyond the committee; the president was not impeached, but he resigned. And we had the selection of another vice president. [Nelson A.] Rockefeller was never very popular on the West Coast, as you know. I voted to approve him, and I got some flak from that. The reason I voted to approve him was, how can you expect the majority of Democrats to approve a Republican that we're nominating, that the president nominated, if we won't approve him

on the Republican side because we think he's philosophically different than we would be? It didn't make any sense. So most of us voted to approve him, and he was approved.

YATES: Let me ask you, because I wanted to get into your activities on the Judiciary Committee a little bit more. . . . Back to your arriving in Washington, I was wondering, how did you become oriented in your new role as a representative?

MOORHEAD: To begin with, the Republican Conference does an awful lot of work in that direction. In our own California delegation, the other members are there as a support. We have a congressional delegation that meets regularly. [Robert C.] Bob Wilson was the chairman of the California delegation for those years.

YATES: That's for the overall delegation?

MOORHEAD: Yes. For the Republican delegation.

YATES: Oh, OK, for the Republican delegation.

MOORHEAD: They helped the new members as much as they could. You'd get a certain amount of indoctrination in your committee. We got rushed into things pretty fast that year. I was on one subcommittee, and it had a man that should have retired ten years before as the chairman. He

was a Democrat.

YATES: That was Claims and Government Relations [Committee], I have written down.

MOORHEAD: Yes. And claims were about all we did[--claims that government had a moral obligation to pay but were not protected by law. The other area covered by the subcommittee was administrative law. These were the laws regulating the rules made by government agencies to carry out their responsibility under basic law.]*

YATES: Where was your office?

MOORHEAD: My office was a very dark and dingy office in the Longworth [House Office] Building. The wood is dark, dark colored--all of it--about the color of the door here, and I like a cheerful, white office. I was there for six years in that office. If that office had been painted and fixed up it wouldn't have been too bad. It was relatively small. And then I had another annex down the hall where some of my staff could work. Longworth was at one time called the new House office building, because Cannon [Office

* Mr. Moorhead added the preceding bracketed material during his review of the draft transcript.

Building] was first, but it was outdated by the time I got there. Although John Anderson kept his office there all the years he was there, but it was one downstairs--a big, big office. There were few of those in there, and he enjoyed it.

YATES: You mentioned size, obviously, as one of the big differences between Congress and your experience in the California State Legislature. What else struck you, in particular, that was different about the way things operated from your experience in the state legislature?

MOORHEAD: In the state legislature everybody knew everybody else. You were thrown into working with everyone else a whole lot more than you are in Congress. You went to parties quite often during the evenings where you got a chance to get well acquainted with everybody and their issues.

YATES: And it didn't matter what party you were from. You were all thrown in together.

MOORHEAD: Yes, you were. So it was a whole lot closer relationship. Now, we had a close relationship with Californians, all right, back in Washington. But after they started clamping down on entertainment in the evening--as you

know they've done that in recent years--the members didn't get a chance to get as well acquainted with each other and didn't work as well together as they had before. A lot of people didn't realize that those social events are great opportunities to iron out problems, too, and to get acquainted, to find out what makes other people tick and where they're coming from.

YATES: How did you end up developing relationships, then, with your fellow representatives?

MOORHEAD: Well, I was the chairman of the Republican delegation for fourteen years.

YATES: I think the first year was '83. Does that sound right?

MOORHEAD: Something like that.

YATES: OK.

MOORHEAD: So I had a chance to work very closely with Don Edwards, who was the Democratic dean or chairman. On California issues we'd try to come together so that we would be working together. We didn't always get the credit for the things we were able to accomplish, because the papers like to say we were fighting each other, but we weren't on the California issues that much.

- YATES: How about in those early years, then? How did you find you were developing relationships with others?
- MOORHEAD: Well, you got to know the people on your committee. In my second term, I was put on Commerce, too. So I had the two. Actually, I was on Veterans Affairs [Committee] early on, but I never got to go to one of their meetings even, because they did all their work early in the year. And we were in those impeachment hearings and the hearings on vice presidents and . . .
- YATES: How much of your time was that taking, then?
- MOORHEAD: Oh, it took long into the evening, day after day. That was a very, very busy period of time.
- YATES: Why don't we talk a little more about that, because you're a new representative, you get put on a committee that you specifically requested not to be on, and then on top of it you have Watergate and the impeachment proceedings. Maybe you could just . . .
- MOORHEAD: I incidentally learned to love that committee. I really . . .
- YATES: I don't mean to imply that you didn't.
- MOORHEAD: . . . enjoyed the committee overall, because

there were some very, very fine people that landed on that committee. There were some fine people on the Commerce Committee, too.

YATES: Well, I realize it's a lot to cover, but maybe you could give me your assessment of what happened on that committee that led to the vote in favor of impeachment?

MOORHEAD: Well, I think the big thing that happened was that the volume of mail coming in across the country demanding impeachment was the thing that stirred the Congress into action.

YATES: Really?

MOORHEAD: I think it was more political than anything else during that time.

YATES: When you say it was more political, you mean how the committee reacted?

MOORHEAD: Yes. What happened was when Nixon was nominated and elected for his second term, the first thing he announced he was going to do was to reform welfare. There was a welfare lobby that was then formed with all the left-wing groups along with labor, the ACLU [American Civil Liberties Union], many of the church organizations, and others that you would expect to be in that kind of a struggle. And as the newspaper people for

the Washington Post, who were most active in this thing, started getting headlines and more people writing in, the welfare lobby became the impeachment lobby.

YATES: I still don't quite understand what's the transition there exactly. You said the welfare lobby became the impeachment lobby?

MOORHEAD: They figured impeachment was the way they could stop the welfare reform, and so the groups that were in the welfare lobby became the groups that were in the impeachment lobby. You could almost predict which ones they would be. Two of them were extremely active. The ACLU took out ads in all the major newspapers in the country--full-page ads--demanding impeachment and listing every sin that they could imagine that the president had committed, and they included coupons to send in demanding impeachment from members of Congress. Well, I've got droves of those letters right now, just droves of them, thousands of them that came in. Now, in my district, there were more of them to save the president than there were against him. But across the country--this had never been a big labor district for one thing--the AF of L-CIO

[American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations], in every one of their newspapers across the country, had these full-page demonstrations and their headlines on the papers were all the same thing. And they had the coupons to send in to demand impeachment. I got thousands of them.

YATES: But you still had evidence to deal with that you're hearing in the committee, and regardless of the pull of people writing in, you're still dealing with the information at hand, right?

MOORHEAD: If you read the grounds they had for impeachment, most of the grounds had nothing to do with illegal behavior. There were some of them that did, a couple of them, but many of them were against basic things that they felt the president hadn't done that he should have or others-- They were not legal grounds for anything.

But really, impeachment doesn't require a law be violated. The first impeachment that took place. . . . The only president [Andrew Johnson] that's ever been impeached was impeached on grounds that should never have been brought up. He was impeached because he wanted

to follow Lincoln's program of dealing with the South. The senators from the North wanted to punish the South for their behavior. But, you remember, Johnson wasn't a Republican, he was a Democrat, and it was a union party that won that second election where [Johnson] became the vice president. So after Lincoln was shot, you had a member of the Democratic party as president and a Republican Congress, and they didn't like his program in dealing with the South. That's not grounds for impeachment, or it shouldn't be, but it's a political action, and a political body has the power to do it, whether it's crime or even misdeeds. But you have to sell the public, too, if you do it.

YATES: Right.

[End Tape 4, Side A]

[Begin Tape 4, Side B]

MOORHEAD: I had a book of evidence, and I don't know where it went. If I had it, you would see that some of the grounds were ridiculous and everyone laughed at it. You know, it was a big joke. That doesn't mean that there weren't grounds that could be used, because there were. But you don't have to impeach a president just because

he's done something that we think is wrong.

That's a political decision.

YATES: So what you're saying, though, is that in your mind there wasn't evidence of criminal activity, and, therefore, that he shouldn't be impeached?

MOORHEAD: You better remember the bad tape came out after the vote was taken.

YATES: Right. I want to deal with what you, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, were dealing with, the information that you had at that point.

MOORHEAD: I wish I had that book of evidence. I had saved it, but it just disappeared. Someone could have walked off with it or whatever, but it didn't make it out here to California.

YATES: Well, you may have, in just what you've talked about, explained your reasoning, but tell me why did you vote against impeachment?

MOORHEAD: It was clear that President Nixon did not know about the break-in at Watergate until after it was already done. Where he got into trouble was that he defended his administration, he defended his staff, just like [Janet] Reno's defending [William J.] Clinton. She's got a right to do so. Not good judgment, really, but there's a

MOORHEAD: right to do so. He defended his staff. If he had done the smart thing, he'd have fired the two top people, and it would have been all over, but he kept them. Poor old [John N.] Mitchell did know about the break-in in advance and opposed it at every level until the last meeting, in which he shut his mouth, and he went to jail, but he was bitterly opposed to it.

What they were trying to do, really. . . . The Democrats were organizing hecklers wherever Nixon was going to go during the campaign. They didn't go to every one, but they went to a number of them. They were trying to find out which one of these speeches they were going to try to heckle. And that's what the goal was, not to steal something, but to find out where the hecklers were going to go. That was pretty clear from the evidence that was offered.

Nixon lost a lot of his support. I never heard him use a bad word anytime, and I was with him on a number of occasions. Obviously from the tapes, he did use those words. I think it has to be pretty clear that for a Republican to win, they have to have a substantial support from the religious community in any election.

He lost a lot of that by bad language.

YATES: From the tapes, you mean, becoming public?

MOORHEAD: Yes, that's right. The bad language really turned a lot of people off.

YATES: So you're talking now about overall popular support for him during this time?

MOORHEAD: Yes. I think it became clear that the popular support was not there. A lot of the Republicans on the committee--there were seventeen Republicans, twenty-one Democrats--voted for one of the articles. They didn't vote for all of them. They didn't vote for those that I said were frivolous, but they did vote for several of them. And they paid a heavy price for doing so. They didn't win their election. Like, for instance, [Harold V.] Froelich, who represented the area up north of Milwaukee in Wisconsin, voted for impeachment. Father [Robert J.] Cornell, a Roman Catholic priest, beat him in the general election. And his argument basically was this--Cornell told me what his argument was, so I'm not trying to get it third hand. He told the people, he said, "I am a Democrat, I would have voted for impeachment. But Froelich was disloyal to his party, was

disloyal to his president, and he'll be disloyal to you."

YATES: Interesting. Let me come back to when you were talking about why you voted against impeachment.

MOORHEAD: I didn't think it was good for the country. You had a man that had been elected by one of the largest majorities ever just a few months before. I thought that the opposition was heavily orchestrated by the far left that had opposed him at every turn. I felt that every president that I know of has defended his administration. Clinton defends his, Roosevelt defended his.

There are impeachment articles brought against almost every president, as there have been against Clinton, as there were against Roosevelt, and many of the others. And many of them have broken the law. But they are the one that's elected president, and, to some extent, as long as they don't go overboard, there are questions of judgment. Roosevelt's question of judgment was whether he should have been better prepared because the White House had been informed that the Japanese were approaching with a military force. But he felt we had to get

into World War II or else England would go down, and we'd be in danger later on. If he did know it, should he be impeached if he allowed that to go on? It's something that's a question of judgment. A lot of people were opposed to using the atomic bomb. It saved my life. I'm glad that [Harry S] Truman ended the war that way. [Lyndon B.] Johnson made everybody angry at him for going forward so long with a war that no one was trying to win. Thousands of American lives were being lost, and we weren't even trying to win the war. Is that an impeachable offense? Probably. But would it be good for the country to handle it that way?

YATES: But in this particular case, if I am hearing you right, if President Nixon defended his staff and knew that they had committed a criminal act . . .

MOORHEAD: I don't know what he knew. I don't know what he knew other than what was in the paper. I know that it wasn't the staff itself that did this, but that [G.] Gordon Liddy was the bad apple. He wasn't even a major player. I don't have a way to tell. I think Nixon was paranoiac, to some extent, about dangers that he was in in that campaign where there was no danger at all.

He would have had a difficult time losing the election, and he was too concerned about winning the election. And obviously second-guessing that he should have gotten rid of the people that had consented to the break-in. If he felt that they were vital for carrying out the government, well, that was obviously a politically wrong thing to do. But whether it was in the best interest of the country to impeach him is something else.

YATES: Well, let me ask you this. In hindsight and with other information that's come out since that time when you were on the Judiciary Committee, how do you view what happened and the decision that was made in that committee?

MOORHEAD: I'm glad I voted the way I did.

YATES: You still wouldn't change your vote?

MOORHEAD: I didn't say that. I said, "I'm glad I voted the way I did."

YATES: OK.

MOORHEAD: I think at the time I made the right decision. I think that the defense. . . . I don't want to get into this point with you, because it's something that I'm very concerned about. I think the impeachment process is totally unfair

to the president. Theoretically, it takes the place of a grand jury hearing, but there's always a trial that follows the grand jury indictment.

In this instance, the president had been so harassed by all that was going on around him that he wasn't capable of running the government at the time. Remember when Alexander [M.] Haig [Jr.] was asked who was running the government. He said, "I am!" How could he say that? Because if there had been a trial, it would have taken probably at least a couple of years, or taken most of the term, if it had gone forward. There would have been no one at the helm. The government would not have been well operated at all. Nixon had to resign, not because he was afraid of the trial, because I'm not sure they'd have gotten two-thirds of the Senate to kick him out. That would have been a very difficult thing.

YATES: Why did he resign, then?

MOORHEAD: He just wasn't able to run the government. Nixon was a brilliant political leader. Everyone will tell you, even the Democrats, that he was probably the finest foreign affairs man

that we've had in many, many decades. When he came later to speak to the members of the House and the senators would come over, there were usually a couple of hundred, at least, that would come and listen. He'd talk for forty-five minutes on every major trouble spot in the world with not a note in the world. And many of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee said everything was there. They had all the information, and he was way ahead of them. He was not just some bumpkin that came along. I think that he'd probably be considered the greatest president of this last half century if he hadn't gotten into the trouble he got into. Maybe Johnson would have been if he hadn't gotten into the trouble he had gotten into. I don't know. Now Reagan stands alone.

YATES: Well, Nixon is an interesting person because he's so complex, and was able, I think, in a way, to resurrect--resurrect is perhaps the wrong word--but once again be recognized for many of his acts as president. Then, of course, there's this other side to him. We now know that he knew more, too. I mean now with the [National] Archives and the information coming

out. So it's a complex issue.

MOORHEAD: But you don't know that he knew about the break-in, because I don't think he did. That evidence wasn't there.

YATES: You mean before it happened.

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: So in your mind, that's still the distinguishing point?

MOORHEAD: If you look at the major issues, the major issues that we have dealt with: World War II, the war in Vietnam, the Central America situation, with all the other key international problems, the situation in Iran, all those things. . . . I don't think you'd want to know what the presidents have had to do. I think most of them, to make it happen, to make it come out right for our country, have done things just as off the books as the president on a tinnhorn burglary--it was a break-in, but wasn't a burglary. It was something that normally would be probably handled as a misdemeanor.

YATES: Well, of course, it snowballed from there.

MOORHEAD: It snowballed. If there had been a way to take the top guys out and have the government process whatever it was going to be, they wouldn't be

any more than misdemeanors.

YATES: Let me ask you one more question about that particular time on the Judiciary Committee. Give me your assessment, if you will, of your fellow participants on the Judiciary Committee.

MOORHEAD: Well, Froelich, who I mentioned, was concerned about reelection. He was in a close district, so he decided to vote for one of [the articles of impeachment]. [Lawrence J.] Hogan was running for governor of Maryland in a state that was predominately Democratic. He hoped by voting for impeachment it would give him a chance to win the governorship. What happened, however, he took out a half hour on television all over the state three days before the vote in committee, announcing that he was going to vote for it, telling his reasons and so forth. He was in a primary with an unknown woman, and she beat him about four to one. That's what happened to him. Those that thought they could get something out of that didn't get much. [William S.] Bill Cohen voted for it, and it didn't hurt him up in Maine. I'm trying to think of who the others were. I think that [Robert] McClory and [Thomas F.] Railsback may

have both voted for it. Both men I respect.

Railsback had Paula Parkinson trouble and was defeated out of Congress. Do you know who she was?

YATES: No.

MOORHEAD: Well, I don't know how involved they were with anyone, but there was a female lobbyist that was in the house that some of these people were assigned to down in Florida when they went to a golf tournament down there. They were accused of being too friendly with her.

YATES: She was a lobbyist?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: That may have hurt him?

MOORHEAD: That probably cost him an election. It cost [John] Evans from Delaware his seat, too. One of the other people that was down there in that same house was [J. Danforth] Dan Quayle. He was so tied up in golf, he didn't go near that place more than a few hours at night to sleep fast and get out of there. So he totally escaped any problems that might have come from that.

YATES: How about any other members on that committee?

MOORHEAD: The Judiciary Committee?

YATES: In terms of what happened on the committee

itself.

MOORHEAD: I'm trying to . . .

YATES: I have a list.

[Interruption]

MOORHEAD: I think that because of the vital character of it, the president should have the right to offer to be a witness himself if he wants to be. He should have a right to have counsel of his own choosing, participate in the hearings all the way through. He should have the right to cross-examine through counsel.

There was a Republican attorney [Albert E. Jenner Jr.] that was hired to represent the Republicans on the committee that committed himself and promised to do the best he could to represent the president's case in the end. There was only one argument made for impeachment, and that was by the Republican counsel. He changed sides and became a Democrat in the middle of it. Now, if you did that in court you'd be disbarred. You see what I mean? Some of those things probably upset me more than the evidence.

YATES: The procedural aspects?

MOORHEAD: The procedural aspects more than anything else.

I was just a freshman. I didn't have the access to the type of counsel available all the time that most of the older members did. I wrote my own speeches. Very few of them did. I think that [Charles E.] Chuck Wiggins did a marvelous job for the minority. He's been an outstanding circuit court judge for many years now, too. But if you go back and read his arguments, you can see that there were plenty of grounds to vote the other way--[that is, vote] "no." [Hamilton] Ham Fish [Jr.] voted for the impeachment.

YATES: Here's the list I was . . .

MOORHEAD: Ham was a good friend.

YATES: You said he voted for impeachment?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

[Interruption]

YATES: You're looking at the list [of Judiciary Committee members and their votes on Article I].

MOORHEAD: What had happened to them . . .

YATES: Or your assessment of what happened on the committee.

MOORHEAD: [J. Edward] Hutchinson was the senior Republican on the committee. He was, at that particular point, not an adequate leader. He'd been in

office too long, and he was not able to take charge. McClory voted no. [Henry P.] Smith [III] voted no. [Charles W.] Sandman [Jr.] lost the next election, because he. . . . You know, there's a lot of ways you can say no, but he was too abrasive, probably, in his comments. Railsback voted yes, and he didn't last either, but I think for other reasons. Wiggins, of course, voted no. [David W.] Dennis was very, very abrasive, too--he was from Indiana--and I think that probably hurt him some. He lost the next election.

YATES: You're talking about the media exposure and everything that happened as a result, that this became such big publicity? I mean, people saw members of Congress in ways that they hadn't seen them before, right?

MOORHEAD: Yes. Hogan I told you about. [M. Caldwell] Butler was a fine lawyer. He served ten years, and it cost him all the money he had. He had over \$100,000 that he had in savings. He went and served his ten years, and the \$100,000 was gone, and he had to go back home. He became the senior partner in the largest firm in his part of the state of Virginia, so he was not hurting

later on. But Cohen voted yes. [C.] Trent Lott, now the head of the Senate, voted no. Trent's a very fine man, a very, very outstanding person. [His] integrity is beyond question. And here Froelich is, he voted yes and he lost out. [Delbert L.] Del Latta was put on the committee really to fill up the spot--he was not normally on the Judiciary Committee--and he voted no. And [Joseph J.] Maraziti--I won't make any comments about him--voted no. He voted no. They knew him as the "Streaker."

YATES: The "Streaker"?

MOORHEAD: We were sworn to not talk about the testimony that had been given during the proceedings, and he would streak to the TV cameras after we were released. He never told them anything, but they called him the "Streaker," because he tried to get his name in the press. He didn't last either. But that's basically what it was.

[Peter W.] Rodino [Jr.] was a man that I have great respect for. He was the chairman of the committee. He was a very fine man. He calls some of us from time to time still. He's retired. He didn't feel comfortable in this, but he was asked by the speaker to do it.

YATES: How do you think he handled the proceedings?

MOORHEAD: I think he handled it as fair as you could. The thing that should be changed in the procedure is the rights of the defendant should be expanded, so he should have had the right to defend himself in what might be the only forum that there would be. I think there should be counsel that owes their allegiance to the president that's there. It would work out all right if someone like the man that had been named on the Republican side had worked with him, but he was a very liberal Republican. He was hired by Railsback and the others from Chicago. I thought what he did was extremely unethical, especially in view of the assurances that he had given that he would represent the president's point of view in the arguments on closure. He did just exactly the opposite. We had to hire somebody at the last minute, and we got him. I can walk down the street here and find twenty-five lawyers in twenty-five minutes ten times as good as he was. I just do not respect the guy. He got arrested later on in life for the problems that he was in. He just was not adequate for anything. I wouldn't want him on a

default.

YATES: Well, of course, your reelection came up in 1974. How do you think your participation on the Judiciary Committee and your vote impacted your reelection?

MOORHEAD: It hurt me, because normally. . . . I won by sixteen thousand votes that year, which was the lowest margin that I ever had.

YATES: I have that you won with 56 percent of the vote and your Democratic opponent received 44 percent of the vote.

MOORHEAD: There were no minor candidates that year. I think 44 percent is the highest the Democrats . . .

YATES: This is Richard Hallin.

MOORHEAD: He was a good candidate, too.

YATES: Tell me about why you think what I just asked you about, your participation on the Judiciary Committee and your vote, hurt you in the reelection.

MOORHEAD: I think it hurt every member on the committee, Democrat and Republican alike, because all of us get votes across party lines. There are a certain number of people that can go and vote straight Democrat and some that vote straight

MOORHEAD: Republican. I've gotten tremendous support from the Democrats in my community through the years. We've had a number of Democratic mayors in Glendale. Virtually all of them had financially supported my campaigns. It's just one of those things. And what you do when you get into something like this, you harden all the lines, and you lose some of your own people that may feel the other way.

That was a tough campaign. Richard Hallin was a dean at Occidental College. Highly intelligent man. I understand he later became the president of a college down in the South. He was the kind of a person you would not be ashamed to have represent you. So he was difficult to defeat.

The first Democrat [opponent] I had running for assembly was Richard [A.] Ibanez. He was a very capable judge later on in his life, so you don't judge by that. If I make a comment about some of them that haven't fit into that category, you know, it's not just because they're Democrats that I feel that way about them. The guy that ran the last three times in this district, I wouldn't vote for him for

anything, because he was very rich and never did anything in his life that amounted to anything other than getting married and having a child or so.

YATES: What was your strategy, then, for that particular campaign?

MOORHEAD: My strategy is always to go out and meet as many people as I possibly can and tell them just exactly how I feel about each issue that comes up. I try not to hide anything from them. If there's an issue that I think is extremely controversial, I may not bring it up, but I'd give them a straight answer if they asked me. I think people vote for someone that they like, and they vote against someone they don't like. More than just politics. That's what I did; I covered as much ground as I could and made as many talks as I could.

YATES: Did you go have debates like in your '72 campaign?

MOORHEAD: To be honest with you, I don't remember. I've had debates in most of my campaigns, but I doubt if there were any . . .

YATES: Nothing stands out to you in that campaign?

MOORHEAD: Nothing stands out.

YATES: I assume that people asked you about your vote on the Judiciary Committee. How did you handle that?

MOORHEAD: I just would tell them that I didn't think that it was in the best interest of the country that the president be impeached. If they wanted to discuss the issues, you can discuss the issues.

I think Ford was a wonderful replacement for that time, because he was virtually noncontroversial. A very gentle, very kind man that knows his way around the political quarters. Most of the Democrats liked him. Nixon they didn't always like. They always personally liked Reagan. Sometime before we're through with this, maybe I can get you to come up to the house. I've got a neat picture up there with Reagan at his best and with a mixed crowd, half Democrat and half Republican. It's really a neat picture.

YATES: Well, we're almost out of time. Is there anything else you want to add about that particular election? You also mentioned to me about reapportionment. How did that . . .

MOORHEAD: Yes, we were reapportioned for that second race . . .

YATES: . . . change the district?

MOORHEAD: It took a lot of the Los Angeles parts out of the district.

YATES: OK. And this is the Twenty-second Congressional District.

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: So the ones that were added in '72 were now not part of it in '74. Is that what you're saying?

MOORHEAD: A lot of it was not. I think, if I remember correctly, we lost Los Feliz for that second race. I think we lost Atwater Park, Highland Park . . .

YATES: Anything else you want to add?

MOORHEAD: . . . Eagle Rock. I don't know where Hallin lived. He worked at Occidental College down in Eagle Rock. I don't remember exactly how that was split up. Then in the reapportionment in 1981 . . . We reapportioned twice in the eighties, actually. When we reapportioned the first time, I was given Gorman, Neenach, and everything out at the far edge of the county and clear up to the Kern County line.

And then they changed that two years later and I got Palmdale and Agua Dulce, which I hadn't had, but I lost all that way out country.

But I got half or maybe two-thirds of what's now Santa Clarita. During that period of time I had Temple City, Monrovia, Arcadia, San Marino, South Pasadena, all solid Republican areas. I lost Altadena--Altadena west of Lake Avenue--and most of the upper regions of Pasadena. In other words, I lost the solid Democrat areas in both Altadena and Pasadena. That gave me a district that was not very difficult. The first race I had in that new district I didn't even get a Democrat running against me.

YATES: Oh, you didn't? What election are you talking about?

MOORHEAD: It was 1984, I believe.

YATES: Do you want to wrap it up for today?

MOORHEAD: OK.

[End Tape 4, Side B]

[Session 5, December 11, 1997]

[Begin Tape 5, Side A]

YATES: Let's see. When we met last time, we ended up by talking about your 1974 reelection campaign. Today I thought we would begin by talking about your activities related to California in your district. So first, let me ask you about your involvement in the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport. How and why did you become involved?

MOORHEAD: Well, the Lockheed Air Terminal became the key airport for southern California after Grand View had to be shut down. It wasn't an adequate place for jets. Grand View was in Glendale, and it was the key airport for southern California for many, many years. It was fine to watch Amelia Earhart and Jackie Cochran and Lindbergh and others come in there. The early Western Airlines was the first airline, and it was great for that purpose. But with World War II the jets became prominent, and the Burbank Airport was more suitable to take care of that kind of

thing. It later then became the Lockheed Airport. By the time that Lockheed began to slow down on their activities here, they wanted to sell their airport. It was not profitable for them at the time.

YATES: Now, my understanding is that it was in 1977 that they were trying to sell the airport.

MOORHEAD: Yes, some place along that time.

YATES: OK.

MOORHEAD: The city of Los Angeles had developed Mines Field by that time. And in the early years that they had Mines Field, it wasn't capable of operating when there was fog, and there was a lot of fog down there. It became LAX [Los Angeles International Airport]. When they had expanded it, they'd done everything but take care of the fog problem. They still had to come back to Burbank to land their planes many times during the winter, where there was little or no fog and no interference. Later on Lockheed became more of a regional airport. When Lockheed moved to Georgia, its key leadership was gone, and Lockheed began to feel that they would like to get rid of the airport. I guess they moved to Georgia thinking they would get

more business in the state where the head of the Armed Services Committee in the Senate lived.

YATES: Oh, really.

MOORHEAD: It moved to Georgia, so the place was on the market. Our cities tried to get Los Angeles to go in with them in order to build it. L.A. operates several airports: the one in Ontario and the one down at LAX, and they have an interest in the one out in Antelope Valley. But they didn't want to play.

YATES: Why is that?

MOORHEAD: Who knows? I don't know. They didn't. When Glendale, Burbank, and Pasadena got together and decided to try to acquire the airport, we needed money from the federal government, so I worked to get the funds for them. I had the support of Glenn [M.] Anderson, who was the chairman of the [Public Works and] Transportation Committee. Glenn was a Democrat who was a wonderful man. He did a great job for all of California, I think it's safe to say. Through all of our efforts, we were able to get the funds that were necessary. It was rather expensive, so we were lucky to get what we needed.

YATES: When you say "federal funds" to purchase the

airport, how much is federal funds and how much is from this area? I don't understand how these things work.

MOORHEAD: Virtually, the bulk of the cost came from federal funds. It serves a very needed purpose for all of our area here. If LAX would get all the air traffic dumped on [them], then they'd be in bad shape. But we have a couple of million passengers that come in and out of Burbank a year. It's been gradually going up from a million. I don't know exactly what it is right now. But as the airport got busy and stayed busy--the jets were more noisy than the others--the people in the [San Fernando] Valley started complaining about the noise.

YATES: Right. I saw some articles about that.

MOORHEAD: Howard [L.] Berman took up the gauntlet, demanding that more of the flights go over Glendale and Burbank and not over the Valley. But there are two runways. The runway that brings them into Glendale and around this way goes straight into the mountain. It's also too close to the main buildings of the airport, so it isn't very safe. There are times they can do it, there's smaller planes that they can do it

with, and they do it when they can, but this has been an issue for a long time. And, so far, I've been able to. . . . Did I say "so far"? My time is over, but I'd been able to win when the issues came up in Congress.

YATES: So that's still an issue, the noise and how the planes are taking off?

MOORHEAD: Sure, but not out of Burbank. Only the quietest planes operate out of Burbank. In other words, an airline that wants to use it has to put up the most modern technology and the quietest planes they have. So even though the volume is up, the noise is down. But that doesn't keep it from being a political issue, and it's become one for certain elements in the city of Burbank. Burbank has more jobs than it has people. There are more people that work in Burbank than live in Burbank. And if they would lose that airport for any reason, they could lose the motion picture industry and all of the plants that are around the airport and many out in the San Fernando Valley. So those people are working against their interests.

YATES: I see.

MOORHEAD: But they don't seem to get the point. The big

issue right now that has come up is whether the Burbank Airport can be modernized and expanded. They've cleaned up the skunk works, so they're working at it. That was more on Hollywood Way, and it was across from the runway from where the terminal is at the present time. They want to move it all over there, tear down the buildings that are now the terminal and make it safer for the runways, so that they're not so close to where planes are parked and where the buildings are located or where there could be an accident later on. The Federal Aviation [Administration] people are all on the side of modernizing the airport and expanding it. Now, Burbank doesn't want as many of the terminal outlets as the [Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena] Airport Authority needs.

YATES: You mean like a concourse?

MOORHEAD: Yes, they don't want as many places where planes can take off from.

YATES: Oh, I see. So they want a limited number of gates?

MOORHEAD: They don't want as many gates as Glendale and Pasadena want and some of the people in Burbank want. And they want a limitation on the hours

MOORHEAD: that the airport can operate. Well, a lot of the people that come in for the motion picture industry come in late at night or they leave late at night. They're coming from New York or wherever. It would certainly make the airport less beneficial for them if you too greatly restricted the hours. Now, I think they can be restricted. They are restricted now for normal commercial flights. They are at most airports, which is OK.

I think when they build this airport, they should build the most modern facilities they possibly can. And there's no question that Burbank right now is not up to the modern status that LAX would be. But LAX is getting too busy. Anyone that uses it knows that there are times when it takes you a long time to get your car parked, and you have to park them miles away. There's all kinds of problems there at the present time.

Well, these have become political issues, and they've got three people, and sometimes four, on the city council that want to drag their feet on this thing. A lot of people in Burbank don't agree with them. The council they

had before agreed about the need for building the best airport they can right now. But this group doesn't want to, and they resent the fact that. . . . They think they should control everything from Burbank. They're in an airport authority now; they joined with Glendale and Pasadena. So there's constantly a fight by the airport authority with the city of Burbank, but that's kind of a continuing issue in the background for some time. Now, when I was in office, I would give my views in my newsletters many times, and I never lost votes for it. I think the people in Burbank are not as unhappy with that situation as some of the members of the council that can get political votes right now from the issue.

YATES: Somebody must be supporting them, though, right?

MOORHEAD: Yes, but this present council has only been in it a relatively short time. The two key leaders of the council from before are now no longer on the council. Now you have a very fine man that has probably been the key leader there, but he wants everyone happy with them. He's a good friend of mine, so I'm not saying anything against him, but I think he could be a little

stronger leader in this direction. All politicians are concerned that they always be on the side that's going to get the most votes. They appeared, to outsiders, fairly wild, although I think one of them is toning down. Maybe the other will. When you first get into office, it's a little bit different than it is after you see the practical side later on.

YATES: You said that there were certain elements against expansion or modernizing the airport. Who are you talking about specifically? The people you just mentioned on the council?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: Are you thinking of other people? Who are they?

MOORHEAD: There are groups in the community that are against it. I don't think they would tell you if you asked them. They'd say, "Oh, we want to expand it. We want to do this work on the airport, but we don't want to expand the number of people that use it or the number of flights that come out of it." Whenever you build a more modern airport, you're going to have that happen, so that's really why their feet have been dragging, I think. I think if it came right down to whether we closed the airport,

they'd all say, "No." But this has been an ongoing political issue for a long time.

YATES: You mentioned, in reference to the issue about noise and where the planes were taking off, Howard Berman, but you also mentioned that you were able to "win." I don't know if that's the right word.

MOORHEAD: Well, at least the flight controllers, according to law, make the determination about which runway they're going to use. We didn't want anything in the law that said that you had to have half of the flights one way or half the other, because it would be dangerous to do that. That's the reason I've been able to convince the committees through the years that we didn't want anything in the law of that kind.

Howard's a very practical guy, and he's not that difficult to work with, so I'm not saying anything against him. But he's got groups of people out there, especially in the far valley, that aren't bothered that much at all, but they don't want any planes going over. And they put pressure on him. So to satisfy them, he keeps working on these issues. I don't know whether he believes in them that much or not. I have no

way of knowing that.

YATES: You said you think, generally, people would support the airport in that, of course, they wouldn't want the airport to shut down. At the same time, you talk about modernizing it, etc., and the potential for more people to come.

MOORHEAD: That's going to be done.

YATES: How do you address the concerns of those people who legitimately feel that there's an impact on them from that?

MOORHEAD: Well, we tell them this: there's less noise at that airport than there was before we started our campaign to use only the quietest planes in existence. We're doing everything possible to keep the flights during normal hours of the day, so people wouldn't be in bed and lose sleep. I can hear the planes sometimes from where I used to live in Glendale. Obviously, they make some noise. But the usefulness of that airport to Burbank is extreme almost, because if it were gone you'd find half the people unemployed.

Burbank has been really able to modernize beautifully in recent years. If you go along Ventura Boulevard, you'll see the high-rises that [Walt] Disney [Corporation] and Time Warner

have built along there. They've built a new huge shopping center in downtown Burbank. San Fernando Road, which is their main street, is really coming along beautifully recently. I've represented Burbank for thirty years, so I. . . .

YATES: Tell me on a sort of practical level, how would you, as the representative of the area, work with these groups to come to an agreement or for you to be their supporter at the congressional level?

MOORHEAD: I've never had a group that I know of opposed to me on this issue. Burbank is changing. Just like everywhere else, it's becoming more minority. And it isn't that the minorities are opposed to you, but many of them can't vote; they're not citizens yet. And the people that were voting, the people that might vote Republican, many of them moved out. So it changes the balance. They moved out, because they get to my age, and they go to Newport Beach or to Palm Springs or Santa Barbara, where there are more activities that are oriented to people who don't want to spend a lot of money, but they want to enjoy a retirement life. And this is a

busy area, and things are very expensive here in this area. So quite often, they move to places where they can get more for their money.

YATES: What I'm hearing you say, then, is while you were in office you didn't have real difficulties in working on this issue, but now the area is changing, and perhaps those dynamics will change.

MOORHEAD: I had trouble with Howard's programs that he came up with. The Burbank Airport is right on the city limits of Burbank and Los Angeles. I think even a part of that one runway is in Los Angeles. For that reason, the people in L.A. are as concerned about any noise, more so probably [since] the planes take off over Los Angeles and part of San Fernando Valley. That's more of an issue there than it is in our district.

YATES: For constituents in this district?

MOORHEAD: That's right. Los Angeles is constantly trying to tell us how to run the airport. When they had a chance to be the ones that were running it, they didn't want to be a player, but they wanted to be a straw boss. That doesn't work out very well. So that's been an interesting

issue.

One other struggle we had in Pasadena was that we have the old Vista del Arroyo Hotel. That closed down during World War II, and they used it as a hospital for wounded service people. And when the war ended, they didn't need the hospital any longer there, so the Department of Defense occupied a large part of the building and other government offices were there, including mine.

YATES: Right. That was where you had your first office when you became a representative?

MOORHEAD: Yes. Then after I'd been there less than a year, they decided to close the building and put it up for sale. The trouble with putting that up for sale is it took so much money being spent on it.

YATES: Just to put it up for sale?

MOORHEAD: No, for anyone to buy it and to use it effectively. Ambassador College was interested somewhat, but when they found out what the costs would be, they weren't any longer. So the building just sat there for years. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals--Judge [Richard H.] Chambers, in particular--thought that that

building could be converted into the southern California headquarters for the Ninth Circuit. We worked with that for a long time, getting the money for it after the circuit decided they'd like it. It was not in [Edward R.] Ed Roybal's district, but he represented half of Pasadena, so we worked together to try to get the financing where it was necessary. And finally we got it, and it's a beautiful, beautiful building now. It's beautiful.

YATES: Right, I've been there. It is a beautiful building.

MOORHEAD: It's one of the most beautiful courthouses you can find.

We had another local issue, and that was the Colorado Street Bridge right across from the courthouse. There were parts of that bridge that were falling off and dropping on the streets below. It was not particularly safe anymore. It used to be called the suicide bridge, because so many people would jump off of that thing. We were able to, in the preservation of historical properties, get behind the project and to obtain the funds that were necessary to restore it.

YATES: Now, my understanding is that the restoration of the Colorado Street Bridge really was at the local level. How were you approached about federal funding to help with that?

MOORHEAD: We got federal money for it.

YATES: Who approached you about that?

MOORHEAD: Well, the city did, and were able to get that.

One of the other issues that's been present. . . . I'm a strong believer in the ROTC. I've gotten a number of ROTC programs put into high schools in the district, and I've gotten some nice letters from people thanking me for our efforts in this direction. Of course, ROTC is something that, for some people, is not politically correct. For others, it's a necessity, because--no question--it builds purpose, duty, character, and all the things that General [Douglas] MacArthur talked about: "Duty, honor, and country." You know that famous speech?

YATES: Yes.

MOORHEAD: I was in the ROTC at UCLA for four years--all my time there--so I believe in that program. And for a lot of kids that aren't really anxious for sports, they can get a lot of training there

that they would perhaps not get in any other way. I don't know how strong the ROTC is now at UCLA, but we've gotten it into a number of programs here. I think it's slowing down in some places, because when you're at peace time, it's not the same thing as it is when the country's in danger. I know a lot of people have appreciated our efforts in getting the schools approved for ROTC. One of the ways you do it is that the community is supportive. From Pasadena we've gotten a lot of support for it in the past. Now that community has changed somewhat. I don't know whether it would be supportive today. Because of their Navy League [of the United States] and other things, I took up the desire that they had to have a nuclear submarine named after the city of Pasadena.

YATES: Oh really?

MOORHEAD: We've been fortunate here that we had two CNOs [chiefs of naval operations] in a row from this district. That's the highest officer in the navy. One of them was Admiral [Thomas B.] Hayward from Glendale and the other one was Admiral [James D.] Watkins, who later became the secretary of energy, from Pasadena. And through

working with the military, I was able to get them to name the nuclear sub the USS Pasadena. There had been other older boats way in the past that carried the name of Pasadena, and so now they have another one. The liberals in Pasadena were outraged to have a nuclear submarine named after Pasadena, but most of the people there were thrilled. A bunch of Pasadenans and myself went back to see the ceremonies for it when it was dedicated in Connecticut. But when we came for our ceremony here, they wouldn't allow us to use the city hall steps, because the mayor didn't like the idea--and a couple of other councilmen. We had to do it at the [Pasadena] Historical Society. So there's kind of a battle that goes beyond just simple politics that goes on in many cities.

YATES: Well, let me ask you this. We were talking about the Burbank Airport--I'm thinking in the area of mass transit--but I know another issue you were involved in was regarding the light rail. I don't know if that's the right term, but there's metro rail, light rail. Tell me how and why you became involved in that.

MOORHEAD: I think it goes back to the history of southern

California. We had a great rail system here at one time.

YATES: Right, the Red Car.

MOORHEAD: Well, it was more than just the Pacific Electric [Railway Company]. There was another rail line in Los Angeles that went all over the city. The Red Cars went from here to Newport Beach to San Bernardino. They served most of the greater Los Angeles area. And gradually the use of those lines began to slow down with our love affair for the car. But most people were beginning to find out that our highways were overcrowded, and we don't have enough roads for the people that are here that are using them. Some other form of transportation had to be found at least for the people who couldn't afford cars. We were wanting to get them off of the roads so that we wouldn't have the smog that we have. So that ties in with a lot of other issues. I know that they were able to make a deal with Southern Pacific Railroad [Company] to buy their line on out to Santa Clarita and on over to Palmdale.

YATES: When you say "they," is this the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission [LACTC]?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: Is that the organization that would handle that?

MOORHEAD: Basically.

YATES: OK.

MOORHEAD: They wanted to get the Santa Fe [Railroad Company] line that went out to San Bernardino, and Santa Fe wasn't very anxious to do it.

YATES: Why do you think that is?

MOORHEAD: Well, that was on their main line to Chicago. They've changed it somewhat. Now they go through a slightly different route. I don't know, I won't take full credit for it, but I called them into my office, and I told them that they were going to have it taken from them-- death and taxes--if they didn't agree to something, and you didn't know what they'd get out of it, they'd better make a deal. They left my office and made a deal, and they told me they did it because of my intervention. Whether that's true or not, I've never said anything public about it.

YATES: Why do you think you were able to convince them?

MOORHEAD: Because I was a friend. I had always supported the transportation systems that they had, and they knew that. I supported them on many issues, but that was just one I couldn't. I

thought it was in the best interests of all of us here that we have a way to travel around southern California that the public could afford, and it would slow down some of the traffic on the roads. I don't know whether it's done as much as we would like. I was a cochairman of the task force on this metro rail line in Los Angeles that they're putting in, but they've screwed that up kind of. I hope it works out all right.

YATES: Have there been a lot of problems?

MOORHEAD: I don't think the professional job on that was as good as it should have been.

YATES: I saw a document when I was doing research in your papers¹ that outlined the Mass Transportation Corridor Act of 1991. I was wondering, how does that fit into this discussion about improving the transportation?

MOORHEAD: There's money in those programs that have helped Los Angeles more than probably any other area. This local line out at Wilshire Boulevard has cost a fortune to build. It's unfortunate that

1. Carlos J. Moorhead Papers, Department of Special Collections, University Research Library, UCLA.

I don't think the engineering on it has been what it should have been, but that doesn't mean that it wasn't the kind of a project you should be supportive of.

YATES: I just pulled a document out, and I noticed on the top of it there's this note that says--I guess this [document] came from the LACTC-- "Summary of proposed legislation. Railroads could go nuts." What does that mean?

MOORHEAD: I don't know. You've got me there.

YATES: Want to take a second to look at it?

MOORHEAD: Where did you see "Railroads go nuts?"

YATES: At the top there. I don't know whose handwriting that is.

MOORHEAD: Oh, "Summary of proposed legislation. Railroads could go nuts." Well, I think what they mean by that. . . . That sounds like David wrote something like that.

YATES: This is one of your staff persons?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: It's David Joergenson? Is that who that is?

MOORHEAD: Oh, this is what we're talking about: the Southern Pacific right-of-way and the Santa Fe among others.

YATES: OK, so that's part of this.

MOORHEAD: They were able to make deals with both Southern Pacific and with Santa Fe. They were taking a long time in the process. They have to do it by court action or by action of the ICC [Interstate Commerce Commission], I guess.

YATES: So that's what that act was about?

MOORHEAD: But those things take a long time to do, because they aren't going to make a major change without lots of hearings, lots of discussion. This was one of the areas that I was concerned with primarily as chairman of our Republican delegation for the state and also in an area that's deeply involved, because many of those lines come into Pasadena or Glendale and go out to Santa Clarita. That was my district at the time.

YATES: OK. Another area I know that you were interested in was that of technology--I use that like high technology. And in your district, of course, you had Caltech [California Institute of Technology] and JPL [Jet Propulsion Laboratory]. I know from my research and your papers that you were a supporter of JPL. I was wondering if you could talk about in what ways you showed your support for that organization?

MOORHEAD: Well, there are two ways. Caltech has been involved heavily in the space program, as you know, and they've been very heavily involved in other defense issues, too, and also in earthquake detection and many things of that kind. All this is important to their Jet Propulsion Laboratory. The Jet Propulsion Laboratory is probably the number one laboratory in the United States in the space program. Not very much question. . . . There's been a battle going on in the Congress as there have been accidents in the space programs. When a school teacher [Christa McAuliffe] was killed in one of those explosions, it lost support for the space program. Every time something goes wrong, support goes down. And then there's a big victory, and things improve and the support goes on. It depends somewhat on how much you want the United States to lead in this particular area, how much knowledge and expansion of ideas are worth. Many of the drugs that have been developed because of the space program have saved lives of American people. It isn't just space, there are many things that come out of the program that are helpful for our everyday

lives.

The battles go on on the floor over whether they're going to give money to the program or what program they're going to support that's coming up next. A lot of people believe that in any kind of research, you should only use practical research and not the development of ideas which could be developed into practical purposes later on. There's always that battle going on in every field. I fought for the programs that the Jet Propulsion Laboratory would handle and for others, because I believe in the space program. I've also tried to get other programs for the laboratory as the space program has been cut down in size.

YATES: That ties into my next question, I think, which is, what role do you think the federal government should play in supporting space exploration and military programs, especially now that the cold war is over?

MOORHEAD: As far as the federal government, there's no one else that can do it. Either the federal government supports it or it doesn't happen. I believe that it's important to the United States. I think our landing on the moon gave

the American people a greater feeling than the people at [the University of] Notre Dame have with their greatest football win. You know, it's something that builds the spirits of the people, but it also lets them learn things about what kind of a universe we live in. Obviously, this El Niño thing that's come this year will tell us in a way that we're not just alone, because other things affect it from outside. The better we can understand them, the better we can predict earthquakes, the better we can . . .

YATES: Why is it that it's only the federal government that can fund or provide the support for those programs?

MOORHEAD: Who else can do it? There's no product. Most research has. . . . You can get pharmaceutical companies to support research all right, but then you find others that don't want them to get the benefit for the research. The generic drug companies want to be able to get their product as soon as it's developed, before it can be paid for. If the federal government wasn't involved in some of these things, it never could be done, because it benefits all of us. And if you make it benefit only a few, which it has to be if

they're the ones paying for it . . .

YATES: But the fact is the federal support has diminished over the years.

MOORHEAD: The amounts of money put into it have gone down.

YATES: So how does the private sector fit into the mix, in that case, if the money is diminishing?

MOORHEAD: What has happened, basically, in the space program is that they've learned. You know, at the beginning they couldn't have done this, but they have learned how to keep the cost down somewhat. And they've learned how to keep the size of the vehicles and other things down and still do the job. You saw that little vehicle that they had that was exploring out there in Mars. They've learned how to put those things into smaller units, and so it does cost less. I think they're doing a very good job with the money that they have available to them.

YATES: You're still talking about the federal dollars that they have?

MOORHEAD: Yes. Well, the space program contracts with private companies to put up their satellites. They're using these things to send communications across the globe. They're using satellites to do that, and the space program

puts them up there. And they charge for it. They're making money on it, and that pays part of their cost.

[End Tape 5, Side A]

[Begin Tape 5, Side B]

YATES: OK, we were talking about defense and space exploration. Well, let me ask you this next question. Of course, over the years the funding for the space program has declined, which we were just talking about. What do you think about that?

MOORHEAD: I think it's necessary to make sure you get the most for your money on any program that you have. Obviously, when you're running as great a deficit as we have been running, you have to make every program as financially efficient as you can. I think the people in the space program understand that sometimes things have to be delayed a little bit. But those people that want to cut have to also understand that you've developed the greatest groups of scientists that are involved in the Jet Propulsion Laboratory and the program in Houston and others. Once you break up that team, it's gone. You can't put it back together. It's just like Humpty-Dumpty:

MOORHEAD: once it's broken, it's broken. People go off into other fields.

It is important that there be continuity. If you cut it down somewhat and you still have it going forward on an even basis, you don't kill yourself. But if you have it in a choppy way--if you cut it off all together for a year or two--it's going to cost you a lot more money to try to get a team back together again than it would have cost if you had gone through in a normal, straightforward way and had some kind of program going on all of the time. I don't want to see the team broken up. Anything that happens that would take that know-how away from the program I think is a big mistake. That doesn't mean that I would be opposed to some of the cuts that have had to be made, but there has to be that continuity there or you pay a terrible price. And it's true of a lot of programs, but especially where you have such a strong team of expert scientists that have been put together. It would be true if you had a program of disease control to develop new drugs that would help us with AIDS and other illnesses. It's more important that there be an

ongoing program than one that is spotty and you don't know what you're going to get and when you're going to get it. You can't get good people to come into that kind of a program, and you can't get them to stay in it. That's why some of the extremists in the Congress that will just cut all this out for this year are doing financial harm to themselves--to the government--if they do that.

YATES: Who are the extremists, would you say?

MOORHEAD: I'm not going to name the individuals, but they're a . . .

YATES: Well, even along party lines--or how would you describe it?

MOORHEAD: It's not party line, it's not party line. There's pro-space and there's anti-space people in the Congress, the people that would chop out everything.

YATES: So it crosses party lines?

MOORHEAD: Yes. I don't think that you can say that one party's more for the . . . Obviously, the Democrats want more money put into welfare programs, social programs, but they forget there are a lot of people employed in defense and in space and in other things, too. So in a way,

they're taking care of the same things that a welfare program would, only there's a product. I just think that it's reasonable judgment that will let the programs go through on a fairly level basis and can get the top people involved and get them to feel that they have security to move forward, and they're not going to get cut off at the last minute. Well, the horrible thing is. . . . Like the fight over the B-2 bomber. If you get a plant set up to build those things, and you're going to need them for the future, and you cut out all the money so they close the program down, the ones that they build in the future are going to cost them twice as much as they should have cost. It's the continuity that you need in the program.

YATES: What if there are problems with the program or the cost outweighs the benefits?

MOORHEAD: I don't quite know what you mean. The cost . . .

YATES: I don't know enough about specific military programs or something like the building of the B-2 or whatever. I'm just thinking if you build something, but then it turns out you've spent all this money on something and it really wasn't the most effective way to use the money, or the

product wasn't the most effective. What about in that case?

MOORHEAD: That has happened on occasion, obviously, where there have been defective products that have been built. It didn't happen often, thank goodness, but it has happened. Well, if you find you've got a defective product, you either have to correct it or you have to get rid of it. You don't build it just to build it. But if you have a product that's effective, you develop it, you spend the billions of dollars getting it developed. And you have the building in place, you have all the line in place, and everything else. Once you take that line down, it costs a lot of money to ever get it back together again. That's why sometimes you see that if the money's slow and they don't need a lot right now, they keep one or two or three of them going so they don't shut it down. They cost more per unit when they make less of them. I'm not a cost-effectiveness expert, but I do know that if you're going to need something, you'd better not terminate a program and start it up again. That's true in space, it's true in the military, it's true in many things--transportation. Once

you do away with the Pacific Electric system, you take up the rail lines, you put other things in place, you've got to find something else. I think that's where we wasted more money probably in the lack of continuity than any other individual place.

YATES: You mean here in Los Angeles with the rail lines?

MOORHEAD: In L.A. and all over everywhere.

YATES: OK. While we were taking a break, you mentioned to me that there were a couple of other areas you wanted to talk about that deal with your district.

MOORHEAD: One of the areas that I feel very strongly about is that senior citizens, when they no longer have much money at the end--and a lot of people don't; they haven't saved very much money--need a place to live. And they ought to be able to live, if possible, in the communities that they had lived in before, where they can go to the same churches, the same markets, and so forth. I've worked very hard to get senior citizen facilities built for seniors in my district. We worked on the first project. It was a church [Church of the Brethren] that moved into the

Methodist church that had the first program in Burbank. Now they have a number of buildings over there, but we helped them get started and get the first ones built. A lot of seniors live in there now. In Glendale, [Southern California] Presbyterian Homes have been the leader. They have at least four major facilities, one of which they had before, [which] was a little bit expensive, because people that have funds lived in there. The others are government financed, and I helped them get there.

YATES: How did you become interested in that?

MOORHEAD: I think we've always had a lot of seniors here in this area. I don't believe in building projects like the Pepper project in Pasadena, where they build these dumps for families and they become crime centers.

YATES: I don't know what the Pepper project is.

MOORHEAD: Well, it's one up there in northwest Pasadena. There have been times when the police had been afraid to go in there at night because it was so dangerous. We were able to get them to change the program and build single-family homes in the lower part of that area. Mostly it's a black

area, Pasadena primarily.

The other project is a place for people that are new in town to land until they can find something else, but in the meanwhile they're living in a rather unfavorable place. It's better now than it was, because there had been a lot of efforts to cut some of the buildings out and to do other things that might make it a little better, but it's been pretty pathetic. But where they built these single-family homes, it's been a very successful program. The purchasers take good care of them. I've had dinner in many of the homes over there. It gives them the start that lets them be proud of themselves. They take good care of the places, and there's very little problem of any kind in the community where that happens.

YATES: You were saying you don't support something like the Pepper project, but. . . .

MOORHEAD: I don't support building cheap housing for poor people. I don't think it pays off. In the long run it's better to bring better housing into the community, and the poor people can move into the places that are given up by the people who have moved on to something else, but they have a

MOORHEAD: nicer home. They have a place that's safe. And you don't have a place that's safe if you squeeze all these people in a small area. Hunter-Liggett was the same up in San Francisco. It's dangerous and trashy. They have to tear those down after a while.

As far as the seniors are concerned, these units that they have built for them have restrictions on the rents that can be charged. They're operated by private organizations, not by the government. Presbyterian Homes has a number of them in various places. And the Methodists have a number of them. You name the denomination, they have some, but they usually do a better job than for-money operations would do that are trying to make a profit.

The last one in Glendale was the Gardens. I believe it was Soroptimists that were behind that project to begin with. It was built right up here on the Verdugo Wash. When you go up Louise [Avenue] and you come to the Wash, you look at the buildings right there and that's the Gardens. I've got a picture of it someplace. They were working on it. The city of Glendale was working on it. And Presbyterian Homes was

going to operate it, so they were working on it. We got the project approved, and then it didn't make the cut for money. They got it approved again, and everyone cheered, then they didn't get it. They got turned down. And then the last time they got it approved, they didn't get it again, the third time in a row.

The secretary of HUD [United States Department of Housing and Urban Development] at that time was Jack [F.] Kemp, who was a good friend. I called back there, and I said, "You can't do this to people three times in a row." But he wasn't in. They started giving me excuses and so forth, and I said, "Where is the secretary?" They said, "He's taking his vacation. He's up at Vail, Colorado." I called him at Vail and said, "Jack, you can't do this to us. We've been promised this project three times, now we're cut out again. It can't be that way." And he said, "Carlos, I'll be back in Washington tomorrow, I'll see what I can do." We received the money. I was able to be there when they dedicated it. They wouldn't have gotten it otherwise.

YATES: Because of that phone call?

MOORHEAD: Yes. There are a lot of things that you have to just keep on working on them. I've tried to help the Crippled Children's Society. They've built some nice buildings in Glendale and in Pasadena that we've helped them get money for. They put on a beautiful dinner for me several years ago.

YATES: You mentioned, also, a project in Burbank that you wanted to talk about. I believe the picture up above my head. . . .

MOORHEAD: Basically, there have been so many battles that have gone on in electrical issues, but one of them was in the National Energy Act [of 1978] that was passed when Carter was president. There wasn't much in that bill that I liked, not much of it.

YATES: Why is that?

MOORHEAD: It adopted premises that were not true. They told us that natural gas was running out, and we wouldn't have any in four or five more years. It will all be gone. You know, we have more of it now than they know what to do with. There were all kinds of restrictions on the development of electric power and many other things. The whole thing was screwed up. It's

all been corrected. It was corrected in the last major energy bill, with the support of both parties, incidentally.

YATES: Well, I interrupted you. What were you saying about the National Energy Act?

MOORHEAD: In that particular bill, there was a select committee that was formed on energy taken out of the other committees that had something to do with energy. There was a task force in the select committee, and they decided they weren't going to take any Republican amendments. None. John [D.] Dingell [Jr.] was the chairman of it. I had an amendment that meant a lot to California. It was one that would permit them to build generators in water conduits without going through all of the licensing process that was required for any kind of electric generators. Conduit lines bring water from one part of the state to another, and this affected many other states. California, of course, brings their water from the Parker Dam over here. They have water that we bring from northern California down here. We've got all kinds of water projects. Those come over hills and mountains, up and down, up and down. Well,

MOORHEAD: it takes a lot of power to take them up the hill, but they can develop a lot of power when the water is going down. And I had an amendment that would let them do that on a very short-cut licensing process. We limited the size of the generator, but we later got it substantially increased.

When the amendment came up in committee. . . . John Dingell was a friend, and I'd been on his committee for a long time. And when I came up, he accepted it immediately. There were about four hundred people in the room, and they were all tremendously interested in industry, because they were all involved in energy. They all are. And they all stood up and cheered when that amendment went through. So that was a big moment. I felt thrilled about it. It wasn't that that was going to change the world, but it was something that was very important to us.

There was another situation for the licensing of dams and facilities that are on public land--the relicensing. Public utilities and public entities have a positive presumption on getting their projects renewed. They just aren't out there for the world to grab. And

there was a proposal that was being made to restrict that relicensing giving, private and public, everyone a shot at it. I was able to work with the people to work out a fair arrangement there that was fair for everybody. I know that the private companies were in danger, too, on that in their losing projects that they had developed and getting the public people to come in and grab on. I was able to get them all to come into agreement, and they appreciated that.

I have virtually all publicly owned utilities in my district. It's going to change now as we have the new system that's coming in where anybody can choose the utility they wish. If you live in Glendale and you want to get Southern California Edison [Company] instead of Glendale [Department of Water, Light, and Power], you can do it now as this new program gets going.

YATES: Right. I don't know too much about it, but I've heard a little bit.

MOORHEAD: On the relicensing bill, I would say the private companies wanted the bill that we worked on more than the public, but all my public went along

with it, because they thought it would be fair to them. They were willing not to grab the private companies and their property with the presumption they had, but they didn't want to lose theirs either.

YATES: What bill was this, specifically?

MOORHEAD: It was one of the big energy bills back a number of years ago.

YATES: And you worked on that?

MOORHEAD: Yes, I worked on all of them for a lot of years.

YATES: Right, because you were on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

MOORHEAD: The other project. . . . You know, so many things have happened through the years, it's hard to pull them all out of the hat all at once.

YATES: Well, we'll be meeting again, so if you think of some other things in between now and then, we can talk about it.

Let me ask you about the Northridge earthquake and how that impacted your office and staff in Washington [D.C.].

MOORHEAD: Actually, I would say with that Northridge earthquake, it was important to all of southern California. But in reality, its impact on our

area here was slight compared to what it was in many of the other areas. I won't say there was no damage, but it was not catastrophic here, as it was out in Northridge and it was over the mountain and some buildings in the Santa Monica area over there where that freeway was destroyed. When something happens of that nature in California in recent years, we've all worked together as a team.

YATES: When you say "we," who do you mean?

MOORHEAD: I mean the members of Congress of both parties that have joined in. I know Nancy Pelosi was trying to get the funds to help with the restoration of San Francisco, where the Marina area was so badly damaged. It was built on fill.

YATES: Right. This is the Loma Prieta earthquake.

MOORHEAD: Yes, and the freeway over there on the Oakland-Alameda side was destroyed. [It was] improperly built. You know, say what you want, it was not completed correctly. But we've jumped in together, and we've tried to bring the state together.

Another issue we worked on that didn't work out was when they were trying to build that

supercollider California was vying for. Thank goodness, we didn't get it. Sometimes you lose something you're grateful you lost, eventually. The areas of California that we were trying to get it for didn't want it it turned out, and so our California people on the commission that was making the decision all rejected California. We didn't even get in the final run for it. Texas got it.

It's a shame that we tied up all that land and spent all that money down there, and then didn't go ahead with the program. I think it's a big mistake not to go ahead with something once you're going to start it, which is why I'm talking about continuity. You shouldn't start something you aren't ready to finish. And if it's a good program and you need it, you shouldn't make it periodic. You should just follow through.

YATES: Well, let me ask you now about elections--or return to elections I should say--because obviously we've been talking about a lot of issues that happened over the years. We were going to talk about the 1980 campaign, which was against Pierce O'Donnell. Is it OK if we talk

about that now?

MOORHEAD: Sure.

YATES: I believe I read in a news clipping that I saw that this was one of your toughest races. Is that correct?

MOORHEAD: It was one of the toughest races insofar as you had a qualified candidate that was running. Pierce O'Donnell in a Democratic district would, I think, have made a good congressman. The Democrats really organized. They never have been before. They thought they could run the district. As a result, they had Pierce and [Thomas P.] Tip O'Neill [Jr.] who came out here for a big rally. Tip was a great guy. He could tell you stories, was very humorous to listen to. But he also knew how to run the House of Representatives. No one who has sat there has known how to run it as well as he, but he knew how to run it. I didn't agree with him on lots of things, but you still have to recognize competence.

He'd come into a Republican district, and his line was that he didn't even know the person. He didn't know who the Republican was, hardly. He was just there--just there not doing

anything. So he came here and he told that same story. I had a newsletter that was all ready to go. I had this all ready to go. And I had three pictures that had been taken with Tip and myself on projects we'd worked on recently. I told my staff to hold the newsletter and put these three pictures in spots, with no comment, just the pictures were sent out. So it landed in the district less than a week after he made the statement The Democrats were furious, because it made a lie out of what Tip had said.

He was a typical Boston politician. He knew how to run politics, and that was the story wherever he went.

YATES: What was your strategy in this particular campaign?

MOORHEAD: You know, when I ran a campaign, I really didn't have that much new in the way of strategy. I made sure I was totally scheduled. I went to everything. I'd have six or seven events a day. We usually had one major fund-raiser. Sometimes there would be smaller events. I always went to every kind of a meeting I could get into, regardless of where they stood politically. Obviously, the Democratic [National] Committee

wasn't going to invite me to their events. I went to as many things as I could. We put out mailers--political mailers. This wasn't a political mailer I was talking about.

YATES: Right, that was your regular newsletter.

MOORHEAD: I couldn't comment on politics or anything like that, but I could put pictures in them and people knew it. We tried to have at least two major political mailers in the last week when people were making their decisions. I used radio. I didn't use TV until the last two campaigns. I think it's a waste for us. It's kind of a waste of money, because our TV stations cover such a wide area. They are too expensive. You can put your ads on cable, but each cable station is only used by a small number of people. I just work hard at it when a campaign is going on. I talked about the issues I've worked on. I'm probably not the greatest politician in the world, but I try to. . . .

YATES: I've got those file figures here.

MOORHEAD: I wanted to see if I had one on that '80 campaign. This is it right here.

YATES: For the record, you're looking at some files on the 1980 campaign.

MOORHEAD: When you're the incumbent, they'll say anything they can against you. And you can understand that because that's the way they hope to win.

[Looking at a file] This was an economic plan that Pierce O'Donnell wrote to promote the growth of capital. Of course, that's something we're all for. He was against income tax cuts, and I'm in favor of them where we can get them. He really set up a major program to [create a] business task force and all kinds of things that he. . . . He wanted to increase the support of basic research, which I, of course, agree with. That was in his program.

YATES: Right. This is from an article, "Candidate Woos Business, Releases Economic Plan" from the Glendale News-Press, let's see, September 25, 1980. How strong a campaign were the Democrats able to run in that election?

MOORHEAD: They ran a very strong one. They spent a lot of money. They had a fund-raiser in Washington by the bagman for the Democratic party--back there from the Washington Redskins. This is the kind of thing they put out in that . . .

YATES: OK, we're looking at a mailer that they sent out.

MOORHEAD: "Economic Health Restored," "National Defense

Posture," "True Peace through Strength," these are issues that I worked on. You might get something out of a thing like that. It's really a commonsense approach to government. I don't attack my opponents.

YATES: I remember you mentioning that previously.

MOORHEAD: "Hometown Boy," if you want to look at that. All those issues are in there. This is one of the things. . . . They always demanded that I debate. In my first campaign I think there were thirty-four different debates which I went to. There are very few races that I haven't shown up at one time or another in one of these events. But I never let them pick the spot.

YATES: Why is that?

MOORHEAD: I just wanted to have control. I was in a position that had control. I always wanted to have control. This is what a letter from him said:

With the support of thousands of my fellow citizens and my wife, Connie [O'Donnell], I have conducted a strong, positive campaign for the Democratic party nomination for Congress in the district. In the tradition of the Lincoln-Douglas debates, I formally challenge you to debate the issues confronting our district and the nation, [and] demand that you defend your record in the face of runaway inflation, unaffordable and unavailable housing, spiraling crime rate, and escalating unemployment. I also

challenge you to release the details of your personal income, including your 1979 income tax returns.

YATES: This is a letter from O'Donnell to you?

MOORHEAD: Yes. We all have to report all of our financial status, our income and everything, in the reports. I don't release my income tax returns. I never did. That's not what the law requires you to do.

And none of these debates are ever Lincoln-Douglas type debates when they take place. What they do is this: Congress is in session usually late, until generally the middle of October. So you've got about two or three weeks to campaign, and you can come out weekends and campaign. Your opponent has full time to go to everything he wants to do to get his program on par. If I would let them pick the time and place, they would occupy my campaigning time. And to get out and do it by yourself is worth something, and your opponents have had that. But if you give all your time to them, you don't have time to really campaign yourself.

Campaigning is walking the precinct. It's going from meeting to meeting. It's going every place that you can get into. Seeing maybe three

different groups in the time that you would spend preparing and getting ready for a debate. I don't remember how many joint meetings, if any, we went to this particular year. I did get on the radio stations that offered us each time. I tried to do what I could in that respect. I don't think that people that have nothing but debates to go on really have much to judge a candidate by.

I was trying to see what else we had in this file. We probably got a lot of things in here, but I'm not going to have time to read it all, and I don't want to take all of our time.

YATES: Well, we're getting close to noon, so I was thinking this might be a good place to stop, if that sounds OK, unless you have something else to add about that particular election?

MOORHEAD: That was an election that I don't know what went wrong for Pierce O'Donnell, I really don't. He had the mayor of Atlanta [Andrew Young], who had been the ambassador of the United Nations, that came out to campaign for him. One of the largest black churches in Pasadena hosted him. He had the governor that came down on several occasions--it was Jerry Brown. Of course,

[Thomas] Bradley came over on several occasions.

He did miserably well, and I won by the largest margin I had ever won by. Ask me why, I don't know. He didn't do well in the black community. I've worked in the black community, as I told you. I go to black churches, take part in their events, whatever they are. I don't talk politics in churches, incidentally. In other words, I wouldn't talk against a Democrat or for a Republican. I would talk about what I feel that we, as citizens, need to do to improve the quality of our lives. In all, I got two-thirds of the vote. As long as I've been in politics, I don't honestly know what makes things turn like they do. It's just like my first race against Bill McColl. We were running dead even until the last week, and I beat him 53 [percent] to 20 [percent].

YATES: Right.

MOORHEAD: Why people turned to that extent, I don't know. And in this race, everything was in there for a strong Democratic showing.

YATES: But it didn't happen?

MOORHEAD: It didn't happen. I think some of the thing was that there had been a Democratic president and

there had been such horrible inflation and economic conditions. He tried to blame me for it, as you read in that, but that wouldn't sell. O'Donnell sure has done a great job as a lawyer since then. But that was the race where, if anything would come together, it should have been there.

YATES: That was it.

MOORHEAD: That was it. My last two races were tough. I had lost the Democratic parts of my district in the 1981 reapportionment and the modifications that were made for the next race after that. I had a solid Republican area--solid--from Arcadia and Monrovia and Temple City, clear out to Palmdale and the Kern County line. So when you get the Democratic areas back all at once in 1992, and you're busier--I was much busier in the latter years, as I had a leadership position on my committees--I didn't have the time, really, to sneak away and campaign. My opponent [Doug Kahn] was from a millionaire family and had all the money he needed to run a race from family coffers. It was much more difficult.

I especially didn't have the time that it takes to go back into minority areas, as I had

done for so many years. That I hadn't done for ten years. And to be able to go back in and reestablish yourself, you have to have time to do it. You have to show them they mean something more to you than just to come to a meeting or two. So I didn't really get those areas back that I had.

And we had so many new people coming into Burbank and Glendale. I went for years that I didn't lose a precinct in Burbank, not a precinct. But with these changes, it brought about new problems. I won by eleven points, I guess, approximately.

YATES: This is in '92?

MOORHEAD: In '92 and '94. I had a shade under 50 percent in the '92 race. There were six or seven different candidates in the race.

YATES: Right. Maybe next time we could pick up with that and talk a little bit more about those races and some of the challenges. How does that sound? We're almost at the end of the tape, so I'd hate to run out while we're talking.

MOORHEAD: The man that was running the last two races was very close to the poorest candidate that I ever ran against. With all the money in the world,

they didn't run a good campaign. They were
always negative. Negative, negative, negative.

[End Tape 5, Side B]

[Session 6, December 18, 1997]

[Begin Tape 6, Side A]

YATES: When we met last time, we ended with your talking about running for reelection in the 1990s. But before we return to that, let me ask you about some other activities you were involved in during the time you were in Congress. As you mentioned earlier, you were Republican dean of the California congressional delegation. Explain to me how the California congressional delegation works.

MOORHEAD: Unlike most states, we have not worked as a common team most of the time. Texas has been able to do that, but everyone's conservative in Texas.

YATES: So every state would have a delegation, obviously.

MOORHEAD: And their own way of doing things. Our delegation was responsible for electing a man to represent us on the Committee on Committees, which was changed somewhat by [Newton L.]

MOORHEAD: Gingrich in his first term as speaker. But during most of that time, we chose a representative on that Committee on Committees who would fight to get our Californian Republicans placed properly on the best committees we could get for them. Each of the larger states had a representative on that committee, and the smaller states were banded together to have a representative on it, so everyone was represented. We also chose anyone that needed to be selected to represent our state on any particular kind of a project or whatever it might be. We met every week and went over the problems that we might be facing as far as our state was concerned: the things that we wanted to be working on, to coordinate the work of somebody that's on the Armed Services Committee with the rest of the committees, or the Commerce Committee, or whatever committee it might be, if they were affecting national policy. And it was a pretty successful operation through the years I was there. I was the third dean to serve as chairman of the California Republican delegation while I was in Congress.

YATES: Oh, only the third?

MOORHEAD: Only the third. Bob Wilson was the dean in the early years that I was there, and then [Donald H.] Don Clausen, who represented the far, far northern district along the coast of California. He was defeated. Bob walked away when he wanted to retire, but he'd been our representative on the Armed Services Committee. Don Clausen had a tough district to win. It became more environmentally concerned. There was a question there of the timber people and of the environmentalists fighting each other.

YATES: You said that you were only the third dean . . .

MOORHEAD: During my time in Congress.

YATES: OK. So that "position" was always there?

MOORHEAD: I became the senior Republican from California after the massacre of 1982.

YATES: The massacre?

MOORHEAD: Yes. In 1981 [Phillip] Phil Burton had controlled the reapportionment of districts, and he tried to elect as many Democrats as he possibly could, so the districts were all changed. For instance, they put John Roussetot and myself in the same district for all practical purposes.

YATES: Right, I remember.

MOORHEAD: And that was a touchy thing at that point.

YATES: What did it mean to be Republican dean?

MOORHEAD: Well, it gave you a lot of responsibility. You had to be at every single meeting every week: regardless of what you had going on you had to plan to be there. I won't say I never missed one, but rarely in the time from. . . . I guess it was fourteen years that I was the dean. That job originally went to the senior member of the delegation, and I became senior after that massacre. But I insisted that they have an election, not right away but within a few years, because you have more responsibility if you're elected as the chairman of the delegation.

YATES: So when you say election, do you mean the whole delegation?

MOORHEAD: By the delegation.

YATES: Republicans and Democrats?

MOORHEAD: No, just the Republicans.

YATES: Just Republicans, OK.

MOORHEAD: The state party, for instance, makes a distinction over whether you're in an honorary position or elected. And I became the representative on the executive committee of the

state party because I had that job. I was named to the committee--from the California delegation--that escorted the president when he came to speak to America in the House of Representatives. I was on the escort committee because I was the dean of the delegation. So it gave me a lot of other responsibilities on the side.

YATES: Pardon me, because I don't know much about the California congressional delegation, but if you're the Republican dean, do you have a counterpart that's a Democratic dean?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: OK. So you worked with the Democratic dean? Or how does it work?

MOORHEAD: Yes, and we did have joint meetings on occasion. If there was a major problem that came up we had them, and later on we tried to get them more often. But it wasn't a burning desire unless there was an issue present.

YATES: Well, give me an example of an issue you worked together on.

MOORHEAD: Well, when the supercollider issue came up, we did. Thank goodness we didn't win on that.

YATES: Right. I remember you talking about that last

time.

MOORHEAD: We had joint meetings concerning our fight to preserve our shipyards and the military bases in California. And the money we were getting for highways and other social services, especially on immigration, where we had the most illegal immigrants. They were costing the state a lot of money, and we felt the federal government should be financing a large share of their care, because they were responsible for immigration. Agricultural problems such as the use of federal water for agriculture in our state. Issues that dealt with bringing water from northern California to southern California. A number of energy issues, nuclear energy being one. There were a vast number. . . . The earthquake damage situation where northern California needed earthquake money to take care of their losses in San Francisco and elsewhere. We did in Northridge in southern California. There were a lot of issues of that kind that affected our whole state.

YATES: Well, how often would you meet as a whole, as a group?

MOORHEAD: To be frank with you, probably not more than

five or six times a year.

YATES: I see. So how would you, on an issue like some of the ones you just brought up like the supercollider or immigration, decide or come to an agreement to meet and work on this together?

MOORHEAD: Don [Edwards] and I were friends. We'd get together, and we'd talk about doing it, and we'd do it. One of the big struggles to decide was when we formed the California Institute, which is still operating successfully.

YATES: Right, I wanted to ask you about that.

MOORHEAD: Yes. That was Don's dream, but he needed bipartisan support. I appointed [William D.] Bill Lowery to do a lot of the negotiations on that. But I won't say that it was popular with everybody on both sides of the aisle.

YATES: What were the arguments against it?

MOORHEAD: Primarily that it wasn't needed.

YATES: Now, the full name of it is the . . .

MOORHEAD: California Institute . . .

YATES: . . . for Federal Policy Research.

MOORHEAD: Yes. It's been quite successful in a number of areas. Primarily, one of the big things they wanted to do was to find the areas where it was needed for us to work together more closely and

recommend it, because you don't hear about everything that's going on in various areas. If you're on one committee, you don't know everything that's coming up on another one.

YATES: Why were you convinced that there should be such an institute?

MOORHEAD: I think that it was the general feeling--in industry and in education and in agriculture and other places--that the California delegation wasn't working together as closely as it should. Because the Texas delegation worked very closely together, and they were able to get a lot for their state. But when you get the most conservative members of Congress and the most liberal members of Congress all in the same delegation, it's not as easy to bring them together as it is when they're all conservative as they were in Texas, with maybe one exception out of Houston or that area. So they didn't have any problem getting together there. But especially when you had Phil Burton in the California delegation, the leader of the Democrats who, as far as politics is concerned, was out to beat the head of every Republican he could. It was awful hard to get along with him,

because you're dealing with the enemy instead of somebody that you're working with.

YATES: What did you do specifically to help get the California Institute off the ground?

MOORHEAD: Well, we had a lot of meetings to determine the selection of the board of directors. Who's going to run it? Is it going to be a Democratic show? They were the biggest group in California, although not much bigger than ours, but they were the biggest. Are they going to take advantage of it for their own purposes? It needed some solid Republican support to get it going.

YATES: When you say you met to talk about it, who are you talking about?

MOORHEAD: Well, with some of the other members of the delegation. It came up frequently in our Republican delegation. It took a sales job to convince them that we should go ahead with it.

YATES: To convince the whole delegation?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: What convinced them, do you think?

MOORHEAD: Who knows what convinces? They don't all react the same way. They're pretty independent people that you find in Congress usually. I think that

industry really wanted us to try to do something along that line, and they've been the ones that have been financing the institute.

YATES: Industry has been?

MOORHEAD: Yes. And I wouldn't say that it's been a raving success, but I think it's been a success.

People I have appointed to the board have become leaders of the board along the line. We have the leaders in the Orange County land development, the Irvine Foundation down there, that sat on the board.

YATES: Are you talking about the James Irvine Foundation?

MOORHEAD: Yes. We had people from Disney. That was the sad, sad thing. Really, he was a fine man, and he got a fatal disease and died. At the last meeting he came to, you could tell he wasn't going to make it. He had to get up and leave and go in the other room. He didn't last long after that. He was a very capable man. But we had some good people on the board. They weren't second-raters that were on that. People that were leaders in the electrical industry and people that were leaders in education. I guess I chose different people than Don would always

choose and, of course, Cranston. And Wilson put people on the board. Governor Wilson was the organizer whose support was most needed.

YATES: Maybe you could explain how people were picked to be part of the institute or how you envisioned it to work.

MOORHEAD: Well, the two senators each had an appointment, and Don and I each had two appointments--and the governor.

YATES: So the Republican dean and the Democratic dean of the delegations would pick someone.

MOORHEAD: And then the governor was involved. Wilson always supported it. You know, it was a California body. Oh, what else is we would all get together. If one of the leaders of either party was going to be back in Washington [D.C.], we would all get together at the same time. These weren't the only times we got together, because there would be gatherings that affected space. When folks in the Jet Propulsion Laboratory or NASA [National Aeronautics and Space Administration] or so forth were putting on a presentation, we'd all gather. There were a lot of those. So to say that the delegations only got together rarely would be wrong.

At one time we got together more, but we had a very unfortunate circumstance that came up. We were asked to meet and. . . . James [G.] Watts, the secretary of energy, was very unpopular with the Democrats. We were asked to come and ask him his positions on issues in his agency and help him to better understand what our goals were. Unfortunately they were organized as a committee to impeach him. They were out after him, but they hadn't told us. They had people lined up to ask him the meanest questions you ever heard of in your life.

YATES: I'm sorry, so when you say "they" you mean the Democratic portion of the California congressional delegation?

MOORHEAD: Yes. So it turned out to be--the rest of us walked out--a disaster. You couldn't get the Republicans to go to a joint meeting after that for a long time. You can understand why.

YATES: Do you roughly remember when that was?

MOORHEAD: It was 1983 or 1984. He was a very bright man, but he wasn't right at the top of the list as far as tact was concerned, and he knew how to step on toes. And it showed they were going to get him, but they were trying to use us to get

him.

YATES: I see.

MOORHEAD: No one wants to be used.

YATES: Right. Well, back to the California Institute. Perhaps you could give an example where you really saw the creation or the role of that institute working well in terms of working with the California congressional delegation and helping you to do what you felt was good for California.

MOORHEAD: Well, I'll tell you first about one that failed.

YATES: Oh, great. I was going to ask you that, too.

MOORHEAD: And that was the supercollider. We were all working on that. Well, circumstances had us all working very closely together to try to get the supercollider for California. It would mean a lot of jobs and everything else, hopefully. But what happened was that the areas that were picked in California for the supercollider, or their candidates, didn't want it. There was all kinds of opposition locally for bringing it there, because it's a vast project that took up hundreds of acres. The one in Texas is so huge where they started to build it that it would take a long time just getting around seeing it

all. I went down there to visit it after they were well along on its construction, and then the project was totally canceled. You can see what it does. It messes up property ownership that's been taken in those areas. It messes up the whole thing.

YATES: Explain to me what the California Institute was doing.

MOORHEAD: They got all kinds of information for us. They developed the facts and arguments and everything else they could to help. But our own commission members from California that were appointed. . . . When they looked into all the facts, the California commissioners didn't vote for California, because the local areas didn't want it. That was just one that didn't work. It wasn't the fault of the delegation.

I think where it did work beautifully was when it came to finding out what kind of money was needed by our state, and where it was needed, in the earthquake damage situations. There's all kinds of other instances like the water project and the energy projects of various kinds where it was successful. To go back without papers in front of me, my memory isn't

that perfect, so I can't pull things out that came up through all the years.

YATES: Well, I guess I was really interested in how having the institute helped you. If I heard you correctly, you described the one reason for setting it up was because of California's delegation not being really cohesive. So I'm wondering, how did the institute help that?

MOORHEAD: Well, they talked to members of both sides. They encouraged action in areas where they could. They were not a part of the Congress. They couldn't direct the Congress, but they were a tool for the Congress to use. And we have a lot of tools of that kind, but none of them-- other than the governor's office, which works in that same area--are prepared to directly work with the Congress to try to encourage us in certain areas and to get us the information that we might not have otherwise.

YATES: What's happened to the California Institute?

MOORHEAD: It's still there. It's still operating. I think it's doing OK. It's not changing the world, but I understand it's having a little easier time on financing than it had for a while. In the early days, it had a lot of

trouble getting the money that was really necessary to do the job. A lot of states have gone in this direction, incidentally.

YATES: I wanted to ask you how this setup compares to what other states have?

MOORHEAD: We don't have the money that some states have. Some of them have bought rather fancy buildings in Washington [D.C.]. We do have a building that's located in Washington, but it's not as elaborate as some of the states have been able to finance.

YATES: OK. Anything else you can think of to add about that and also, perhaps, about the delegation?

MOORHEAD: Well, the delegation had a lot of individuals within each party. I think it's relatively safe to say that while the delegation was divided by party, each of the party delegations were divided by personalities, also. You had a tremendous range in the Democratic delegation from one side to the other. I think you had some of the most competent members of Congress that were in our delegation. I'm talking about Rs and Ds alike. I hated to see Glenn Anderson leave, because I thought he was very effective in the transportation area. And [Norman Y.]

Norm Mineta, who took it over after that, was very capable, extremely capable, and was able to help our state a great deal, because there's always a fight for money for freeways and for highways and for airports. I won't say that it's been the greatest project in the world, but building the metro system in L.A., which is still running on one lung, took more federal dollars than any state had ever gotten. I don't think it was designed properly. It went to the wrong places, right out to Wilshire Boulevard, and that's the most expensive kind of a run you could take. It went right through that area, the La Brea Tar Pits, practically. There were tremendous gas problems.

YATES: Right, I remember.

MOORHEAD: That lost the support of a lot of the members that lived near that particular area, so I don't know whether they ever will get that thing really completed. What they should have done was to use the large sums of money they got first to build the less costly lines, and then the last thing to complete it being the one that cost the big bucks, because then they'd have a system that was workable. You aren't going to

work it with a seventeen-mile line that doesn't have a lot of backup for it. I think we're doing a little better with the use of the rail lines from Southern Pacific. Incidentally, I found an article that I hope I can still get on this subject. I know it's on my desk or in this file I've got over here. I'll try to get it for you. But that was a very important step, and it's been in use. It's doing something. A lot of people are using it. You can go from here to Antelope Valley from downtown Los Angeles if you want to and get there cheaply and reasonably without bucking all that traffic. A lot of people in Antelope Valley, Lancaster, and Palmdale work in Los Angeles, and that enables them to do it.

YATES: Let me ask you, as the Republican dean, what did you see as the strengths and weaknesses of the Republican delegation?

MOORHEAD: I would say probably the weakness is the diversity. While we had a strong conservative bent to the delegation, we had some very, very effective people that weren't supposed to be quite as conservative as others. Bill Lowery was one of them and [Charles J.] Jerry Lewis,

who's now the dean. Of course, we had a lot of people in between, too.

The Democrats had the same problems, however, with the northern California delegation being much more liberal than southern California, regardless of race or anything else. The Democratic delegation from southern California was mostly Latinos and the blacks and Jewish members, and they were pretty moderate in their approach. At least that's the way it appeared to be. And some were quite effective for that reason. I think Norm Mineta was probably the most effective person they had up north, although [Victor H.] Fazio [Jr.] and [Leon E.] Panetta were both effective. And, of course, Burton was effective in politics. He lived and breathed politics; that was his whole life.

YATES: Could you describe a particularly difficult issue that came up and how it was handled within the Republican delegation?

MOORHEAD: Well, we had almost two reapportionments every ten years. There's only supposed to be one, but something would happen and we'd end up with a couple of them most of the time. There was only one in the 1990s, but there were two in the

seventies and two in the eighties. There's nothing that can be more controversial and of more interest to members of Congress than reapportionment, because some people live and some people die by it. You can have people who have safe districts who all of a sudden have one they can't win. In fact, in the last reapportionment, I was told by the Rose Institute [of State and Local Government] that my district was not winnable after the middle of the 1990s. It's going to be. Jim Rogan can carry it as long as he wants to run, I believe.

YATES: You responded with that to my question about, within the Republican delegation, how you worked together. What were you thinking of specifically?

MOORHEAD: We were trying to protect ourselves. I know that Pete Wilson wanted to go in a particular direction that some of our delegation didn't want to go in. There was a fight that developed there.

YATES: How did you resolve that?

MOORHEAD: That was the only big argument I got in with my delegation. We had a man that had been chosen to be our representative on reapportionment. He

was extremely antagonistic to the governor, and the governor wouldn't talk to him, and the governor's office was drawing up the plans on the reapportionment. I thought it was necessary for us to meet and kind of bring ourselves together.

YATES: I'm sorry, who was this that you're talking about?

MOORHEAD: The man was John [T.] Doolittle.

YATES: You wanted to meet with him?

MOORHEAD: I wanted to meet with the governor and see if we could work out the problems. They voted that I should not go.

YATES: The Republican delegation did?

MOORHEAD: Yes. I went anyway. I think we got a better understanding, and things quieted down a lot after that. I can understand. . . . Doolittle was a very nice man, but extremely straight . . .

YATES: Down the line?

MOORHEAD: Down the line. A very nice person, but he'd said some things about the governor, and the governor just didn't want to work with him. So there were problems on both sides that way. But I think we got things back together a little better after I went up there and talked to the

governor about it. Eventually he got basically what he wanted in the reapportionment, and it enabled us to gain a lot more seats than we would have had otherwise. But what it does when you spread the Republicans out, you've got a possibility to win more seats, but you've got a possibility of losing them, too.

YATES: When you say "spread out," do you mean geographically spread them out?

MOORHEAD: No. Spread the Republicans that you have out in such a way that they have a chance to win every seat, but a chance to lose every one, too. And there were some seats that we hoped to win, but for one reason or another we didn't. We came up even. We probably should have been able to do better. I think we did better than we did when there was no interest in fairness whatsoever like in the Burton reapportionment. I've gone along with the reapportionment that was set so that it hurt my chances of election probably more than anyone, because in 1992 I went down to about 49.8 percent of the vote.

YATES: Right. This is against Doug Kahn, who was the Democratic opponent.

MOORHEAD: Yes. But that was primarily because before that

I had Arcadia, Temple City, Sierra Madre . . .

YATES: Monrovia, right?

MOORHEAD: . . . Monrovia, Santa Clarita, and half of Palmdale. Those areas were all taken away from me. They gave me back the half of Burbank that I hadn't had for ten years that was more Democratic than Berman had. They gave me back the half of Pasadena that the Democrats had had for ten years: basically, the black half of Pasadena--the black fourth of Pasadena, I should say--and the lower income areas there. And they gave me back Altadena. I had had a small part of Altadena, but not the biggest end of it. When they gave me all of those areas at a time when I had heavy committee responsibilities, I wasn't able to work it as much. So I won it by 10.5 percentage points, because there were a lot of candidates in the race. The next time around, there were less candidates, and I went up to 53 percent. If I had a chance to really work the area, I could have gotten it back, because when I had the toughest race I ever had in Pasadena, in 1980 with Pierce O'Donnell, I won by five thousand votes. Instead, I lost it substantially the last two races.

YATES: Well, let me ask you about the Republican delegation [again]. You mentioned reapportionment as one of the issues that was difficult.

MOORHEAD: That got everybody's interest, everybody's.

YATES: What other issues came up that were difficult for the Republican delegation to agree on or to work on together?

MOORHEAD: I think that there were a lot of other key issues, such as the pay raise was a big issue. There were differences on the Americans with Disabilities Act, which I voted for. There were a number of other issues that involved nuclear energy. One of the biggest battles we got into was over legislation that would shut down two of the nuclear plants in the eastern part of the United States. We eventually won that battle in Congress. The one in Long Island shut down anyway, because the local government would no longer support it. It was a big political issue. And I think it was safe to say that the people in that area were scared because of Three-Mile Island [nuclear power plant]. It didn't help a bit what went on over in Russia, either, with . . .

YATES: Chernobyl?

MOORHEAD: . . . Chernobyl. But it's also true that we get a lot of our electric power from nuclear energy. It's become too expensive now to go into any new. . . . It isn't because the government won't allow you to. It's too expensive to go into an area where the cost of shutting down. . . . You may build a \$2 billion plant and never be able to use it, and that's what happened back there. They spent all the money on it. Someone had to pay for it, and it never operated.

YATES: How do you convince people on the safety issue?

MOORHEAD: Well, no one ever lost their lives at Three-Mile Island. And other than Three-Mile Island, there's never been a real serious problem.

YATES: Well, you just mentioned Chernobyl.

MOORHEAD: Chernobyl did not have the safety factors built in that we have. You know, the Russian system was just abhorrent.

YATES: I know. I'm just throwing it out, because obviously people are concerned.

MOORHEAD: Well, they had no protection. They've got a number of dreadful problems over there that [persist] to this day. From the way they've disposed of waste, there's a lot of people

dying. Health is destroyed by what they do. One of their problems under communism, the biggest problem probably, was that they were giving the people things that everybody wanted whether they were willing to work or not. There was no responsibility, and that's one reason it's hard when they come over here. It's hard for them to get used to everything not being handed to them on a platter. I think you've got to get people used to working at least a regular job and to carry out their specific responsibilities. If you give a child everything, he'll never amount to a hill of beans.

YATES: But regarding nuclear energy, there are people who would argue that you can never guarantee safety, no matter how many precautions you take.

MOORHEAD: And you can't in a car. People die. A whole lot of them died up in northern California here . . .

YATES: Right, there was a horrible accident.

MOORHEAD: . . . in a horrible accident. There are the trains that come together and collide. Airplanes are a very safe means of transportation, but every once in a while you

get a TWA [Trans World Airlines] or another one that comes down and one hundred and fifty people get killed. Well, you don't talk about. . . . This little Burbank airport had about two million people use the airport last year. If you get a couple of hundred people, or three hundred or four hundred people, in the nation that died in a years time, in the millions and millions of miles that have been flown, it sounds like something.

[End Tape 6, Side A]

[Begin Tape 6, Side B]

YATES: You were telling me a little bit more about the delegation. Why don't you summarize for me how you feel the delegation has been represented.

MOORHEAD: I think we've had some outstanding people in Congress representing California. You have people that fit a number of different categories. You have spokesmen who support a philosophy or belief in certain areas. They are tremendously good in that area, but accomplish very little other than that; but that's their area, and it's useful. In both Republican and Democratic parties, that is true. You have other people that are the workers that are in

MOORHEAD: there plugging all the time and don't look for much publicity, but they do an extremely competent job in the areas that they work in. That's another area. And then there's some that are basically good at both. I don't think you can. . . . If you had all wonderful spokesmen that were able to preach the gospel of their position all of the time and that was what the Congress was made out of, you wouldn't get anything done, you'd just get into a lot of arguments. But you need spokesmen. I don't know whether you'd ever get the public's attention if you had just workers that are willing to work hard and get the job done. No one would think that anything was getting done because you wouldn't have anyone out there speaking for it.

I can think through the years that a lot of extremely capable people have come. Jerry [L.] Pettis was one. He's from the Redlands area. His wife took his place after he was killed in an airplane accident. Bob Wilson was extremely capable. I think that Clair [W.] Burgener was one of the most capable people that I have known since I've been in Congress. Straitlaced, but

able to get along with people beautifully. A strong conservative that the black community, including the black mayor of Washington, gave a luncheon for honoring him when he decided to retire for what he had done in the health care area for young people who were handicapped in Washington, D.C. I think that John Roussetot played the role of the Republican protector, the "objector" they would call it. But he had enough good humor that he could do that and still have people like him. Hard worker and very bright. Very conservative, but still people on both sides of the aisle liked him because he brought a little humor into what he was doing.

I can name people up and down the state. I've already named some of the Democrats that I thought were very good at that. So you have competent people from California. You've had a few, you know, that probably could have been better, but most of them were very capable folks.

YATES: Let me ask you now about the Federal Courts Study Commission which you served on in the late eighties. How did you become a member of that

commission?

MOORHEAD: I was appointed by the chief justice of the United States to that post, primarily, I suppose, because of my committee assignments that I had. I was the ranking Republican on the courts subcommittee that handled any legislation that was needed with the federal courts and any legislation that was necessary regarding intellectual property. That's what a lot of these plaques and so forth [on the walls of Moorhead's office], to deal with the intellectual property issues which I was most active in.

YATES: What was the charge of the commission?

MOORHEAD: The charge was to make the federal courts more efficient, to determine the areas where they should be doing more and the areas where they were doing more than they should right now. They determined areas of the law that really needed to be fixed. Now, one of those areas that I think everybody realizes needs to have something done in it is in our tort cases. Frankly, the politics regarding torts is such that it's impossible to get anything done. In the end, they didn't end up making

MOORHEAD: recommendations, but they made a lot of recommendations on the administration of the torts themselves and how they should be handled. I carried one of those bills in the House that corrected a lot of the things that had been suggested by the committee. Of course, [Robert W.] Bob Kastenmeier was on that commission with me. We worked together on those issues that the courts were interested in. A very interesting area that has arisen in the last few years is whether they're going to split up the ninth circuit. During the time that I was there, I kept my finger in the dike on that issue, because the judges in the ninth circuit don't want to be split up. And I think it's contrary to the goal of the federal courts and the chief justice, because both Warren [E.] Burger and [William H.] Rehnquist have wanted to work towards having as much unity in positions on major federal issues among all the circuits. If you split the ninth circuit up with the big cities in one and the outer areas, the farm areas, in another, you're working towards getting diversified positions, and that is not going to be helpful.

YATES: Who supports splitting it up?

MOORHEAD: The cow counties, the cow states: Idaho, Montana, those states that are out on the fringes like Washington and Oregon. They want California to have a circuit of their own.

YATES: When you said you kept your "finger in the dike," what did you mean by that specifically?

MOORHEAD: Well, they had to get the bill through my subcommittee before it was ever going to go any place, and I could do something while I was there, unless the speaker would take over the issue himself. He seldom did in those particular instances, although there have been instances where the speaker has taken over an issue. They did that on the energy bill that came up during the Carter administration, and they did that on Hillary [Rodham Clinton]'s health care bill, too. Neither of those efforts were crowned with any great favor. The Carter bill passed, and it's all been repealed since then in a bipartisan way because it didn't work. They didn't have the right information, and they were just going in the wrong direction. And Hillary's bill, no one liked that--very few people did, anyways, that I could find--and so

that didn't go anyplace either. You have to sell to people, too, on a big issue like that.

YATES: I said at the beginning that I was going to return to your reelection campaigns in the early 1990s. You have talked about that to a certain extent, so I don't know how much more you want to add. But I did notice, when I was looking at the primary and the general election, the large number of candidates. I think maybe you explained that in terms of reapportionment. But what else was going on, do you think?

MOORHEAD: Well, there were a lot of candidates when I first ran. There were ten . . .

YATES: Right, in your first election in '72.

MOORHEAD: . . . in the first election. I never had a serious Republican opponent after that, I don't believe. I won't say I never had anybody run. I had a lady who had been a man who ran against me.

YATES: Who's that?

MOORHEAD: Michael.

YATES: Oh, yes. Elizabeth Michael?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: I saw some articles, you know, about that election with her.

MOORHEAD: She ran as a Republican, and then she ran, I believe, as some other party.

YATES: Like an Independent, maybe? Anyway, I'm looking because I have the . . .

MOORHEAD: But she was never a serious contender. That's the kind of thing you just ignore.

YATES: I just have her down as Republican.

MOORHEAD: There's nothing you can say that won't put your foot in your mouth.

YATES: OK. I just have her down as a Republican, but that's just . . .

MOORHEAD: She ran twice. I forget whether the second time it was against me or when [James E.] Jim [Rogan] ran.

YATES: It may have been. I have her down for the '94 election. But I just looked at the '96 election, and I wrote down Rogan and Kahn again. It must have been just the general election.

MOORHEAD: The Republicans that were unhappy usually voted for the American Independent or the Libertarians.

YATES: Oh, they did?

MOORHEAD: There's such a small number of those people that are way out, and if you adopted their views that they wanted you to, you couldn't win anything.

MOORHEAD: You just don't worry about that, as the primary opponents have always been the Democrats. We wondered what would happen when [H. Ross] Perot was so strong, whether there'd be a third candidate. They were upset with me because I had voted for NAFTA [North American Free Trade Agreement]. They didn't really turn against me much, but that was their big issue, and it is with a lot of Republicans. I thought that it was a close issue with me. I've always had a hard time with that issue. But in the long run, I thought that it would be good for our economy and it was the right way to go, and so I voted for it. I didn't vote for GATT [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade], but the reason I voted against GATT was that no one really knew what was in that bill, and you hate to buy something that you don't know.

I voted against the three major tax increases that we got: one under the latter part of Reagan's presidency and one under Bush--the "Read My Lips" one--and one under Clinton. I voted against all of them. The interesting thing was that the one that came in the latter part of Reagan's administration, I was asked to

come down to the White House three times to be indoctrinated in that particular issue. At one of them, [Edwin] Ed Meese [III] and the president and [Franklyn C.] Lyn Nofziger had me on the carpet for forty-five minutes.

YATES: How did you handle it?

MOORHEAD: I just told them. I told the president that I loved him, that I cared for him a lot, and I'd vote for anything he wanted me to, but I couldn't vote for a tax increase. I didn't think the bill was good for the country. And he called me personally on the phone during the vote. I just had to say I voted the other way. I think he's the greatest president we've had in this last fifty years, but that didn't mean I could vote something I thought was bad for the country. The interesting thing was that I learned. . . . Lyn's a good friend. He started out with the Glendale News-Press. And I talked to him. He said, "Carlos, I talked to the president"--this is just in the last couple of years--"not long ago about your position. He said, 'You know, Carlos was right.'" We had a major recession that was caused by those tax increases. You can't put too big a burden on

the people and still keep the economy up. So I can say that even the greatest president in the last fifty years could be wrong on an issue.

YATES: Let me come back to the elections, specifically the '94 election. Of course, the Republicans gained control of the House with that election. And I know that you were the ranking senior member and, therefore, in line to become chair of either the Judiciary Committee or the Energy and Commerce Committee, but that didn't happen. I wanted to get your perspective as to why.

MOORHEAD: I don't know totally, because Gingrich did not talk to me until after it was over. If the Committee on Committees had been kept as it always had been, I would have won.

YATES: Well, what happened then?

MOORHEAD: Gingrich asked for a reorganization of the appointment process in which he was able to control the process almost totally. I can only guess about some of the other things. What he told me was that I wasn't mean enough and I had too many Democrat friends. I was too close to John Dingell, who had been the chairman of the committee. And that's what he told me. I suspect that he thought that in a key issue, he

couldn't control me. And he did try to control the committees, especially during that first two-year period. They gave me the subcommittee [Courts and Intellectual Property] I wanted. Without going to any committee, he said, "You got that subcommittee." That was to placate me, I guess.

YATES: How did you respond when he gave you this reason?

MOORHEAD: I said, "I don't want to be mean. I don't think you gain anything by being mean. I just don't want to be that kind of a person. I think I could do more the way I am." What he told me doesn't necessarily mean he felt that way, even. He had decided he wanted somebody else. I know what the problem was there, but I don't want to put it on tape.

YATES: OK.

MOORHEAD: He told me he talked to a lot of Republicans, and they felt that same way, that I shouldn't have the committee. But I know that from meeting people that he was meeting with, they told me they were supporting me and would try to see that I came out on top. So who do you believe?

YATES: Right.

MOORHEAD: It's one of those things. I think Gingrich just decided he wanted another person. I'm pretty much a team player. I supported his "Contract [with America]," and I had supported him. But I don't want anyone to tell me what to do. If I think something else is better. . . . I try to work with a team wherever I can. You might say I wasn't a team player when Reagan wanted me to vote for the tax increase, but I think I probably supported his legislation as much as anyone in the Congress has done. When I think somebody is not doing the right thing on a particular issue, I think that's what you're for. That's why you have a Congress. That's about all I can tell you about that.

YATES: This leads me into a more general question regarding Republican party politics. I wanted to get your overall observations on how the Republican party changed from, let's say, the time you were voted into the House of Representatives through the present time.

MOORHEAD: I think it comes down to this: We have had some wonderful outstanding leaders in the party. For the most part, at least in the Congress, they

MOORHEAD: haven't been successful taking over. You can say this about Gingrich. He devised the program, and he made it work. Whether we would have won without him, I don't know. If you think he's my hero, you're wrong. But we needed something to get the people to leave their congressional support of Democrats and come over to our side.

We've been able to do very well in the presidency through the years. During my years in Congress, the twenty-four years I was in, we had the Nixon-Ford combination in for four years; you had Reagan in for eight years; you had Bush in for four years. So you have sixteen of the twenty-four years I was in under Republican control. In other words, we had it two-thirds of the time. And if you've gone back four years before that, Nixon was in for those four years. So in a period of the last twenty-eight years, the Republicans have controlled the presidency for twenty years.

Yet this is only the second term when we've had control over the House of Representatives. We've done better in the Senate. I think that John [J.] Rhodes and [Robert H.] Bob Michael are

two of the finest human beings you'll ever find. If either one of them had been the speaker, I wouldn't have had any trouble at all. And yet I supported Gingrich when he ran, because I felt that the time had come when we had to do something a little bit differently to get our points across. I'd much rather Bob Michael was the speaker. And I think in the long run, once you get in, people like that will be able to accomplish more.

I think that the two biggest bills that I know of--the three biggest, actually--that we've gotten through Congress in recent years have had bipartisan support. The big energy bill--not the original one, but the one that came later. . . .

YATES: You mean the one under Carter, not that one?

MOORHEAD: Not that one, but the one that came later and repealed Carter's and almost everything that was in it. That bill was bipartisan. I think that we had one "no" vote on that one. The big bill in this Congress that balanced the budget, even though there were things our party didn't like, was a bill that everyone worked together on. There'd been a number of those examples.

The best is the Telecommunications Act [of 1996]. The two parties worked together. On my subcommittee, we got fourteen bills in the last Congress that were signed by the president--passed in the House. Most people in the industry consider them major pieces of legislation. We didn't get any "no" votes because we worked together. And if you say, "Well, you have to compromise too much," we didn't have to compromise too much. When you work together, you come to decisions on the issues that are workable for everybody. And I think that works better in the long run.

If the Democrats had gotten the point, before we took over, that they ran the show. . . . They didn't bring Republicans in very often, as the Carter deal demonstrated. That was a partisan one-way shot. And I don't think the Democrats really liked the bill that well, but they were locked in. They didn't want amendments.

YATES: You anticipated, in a way, a question I was going to ask you. In an earlier session, you talked about the fact that partisanship was not prevalent--I think that is the right word--when you were in the California state legislature. I

think that's how you described it.

MOORHEAD: It was on some issues, but we were all basically friends and it seldom was as heavy-handed.

YATES: Well, I wanted you to compare that experience with your experience in the House of Representatives.

MOORHEAD: You know, traditionally through the years. . . . It's become more partisan in recent years, that is true. Willie Brown brought a lot of that about.

YATES: The partisanship into how things happened?

MOORHEAD: Yes. The Republicans elected Willie Brown. Without the Republicans he wasn't electable. He promised them the chairmanship of some of the committees, and then he took them away. He was running against Howard Berman. And the Republicans, probably not with any real vindication of their position, thought that Berman would be more left-wing and would roll over them more. He's a very capable legislative leader. But what happened was that Willie got in, and he probably went further to the left than Berman would have.

You know, when my predecessor was in the state assembly the fights were such that both

parties were all split up on their votes. The Republicans didn't vote for one candidate and the Democrats for another. They were torn apart. That's happened down through history many, many times. You voted for the person that you thought would best represent your point of view. It wasn't always your party.

In Congress, parties choose who their candidates are going to be. And when the party candidate is chosen, that's the one that's going to be running. So the majority makes that decision. And then when you vote on the floor, it's very rare that there will be anyone that votes against their party candidate. That makes it much more partisan. The members of the committees are chosen by party. We're told how many we get. If we're in the majority, we get a majority of the members on each committee. If they're in the majority, they get a majority on each committee. They get to pick the chairman if they're in the majority. It goes that way.

YATES: Right, so some of it is in the nature of the structure.

MOORHEAD: But in the legislature, it's not that way. For instance, when Bob Monagan, whom I spoke about

earlier, was speaker, he appointed Bob Moretti to be chairman of the committee that had charge of alcohol and gambling in California, which is the big money spot. And Moretti built up enough money to win the next election and become the speaker himself. So those things do happen that way. But in my time, Unruh would appoint Republicans chairmen of committees and vice chairmen of committees. Bob Monagan did that. In the last few years, they haven't done that as much.

YATES: You're talking about the state legislature?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: Last time you made the comment that Tip O'Neill knew how to run the House of Representatives and that no one since then has known how to run it as well. I want to know what you meant by that.

MOORHEAD: There's been a lot more of a lack of civility, a lot more time wasted on personal battles and vendettas, a lot more name-calling. I think part of that's maybe due to the fact that campaigning has become so negative in recent years. But I think the leadership, to some extent, has to be responsible for what their party people do in campaigns.

YATES: They set an example, is that what you mean?

MOORHEAD: They set an example, that's right. I don't think Tip was a saint. I didn't agree with his politics at all. I think they were too dictatorial, perhaps, on occasion. But the House ran. It ran smoothly. I don't think under [James C.] Wright [Jr.] or [Thomas S.] Foley that it ran smoothly.

YATES: My next question was going to be, how would you assess the other leaders while you were in the House of Representatives?

MOORHEAD: Leaders of what?

YATES: I mean of the House of Representatives. The majority, I guess.

MOORHEAD: Well, I think Wright's position on the pay raise killed him. He told the Democrats they could say anything they wanted at home, and he would protect them from having to vote on it, and they would get their pay raise. And then when a little criticism came up of it, he sent out a questionnaire to all the members asking them whether they wanted to vote on it or whether they wanted the pay raise themselves. He said it was a secret expression. Well, most of them wanted the pay raise, but they didn't want to

MOORHEAD: vote on it. But he said whatever they said would be the way it was going to be. Then the press started calling every member. When the press called, many members said, "Oh, I don't want that pay raise," or, "Of course we should vote on it."

Then he calls for a vote, and he hung people out to dry. If he had been straight in the first place and said, "I'm going to recommend this pay raise, but there will be a vote on it on the floor". . . . If it had gone down, it would have gone down. If it had been successful, it would have been successful. That's the way it should have been done. But for him to take three different positions that were totally conflicting with each other. . . . A lot of these people had made statements publicly that they didn't want the pay raise when they did, and they eventually voted for it. It put them in a bad spot. And then he told Republicans, "If you vote for the pay raise, I will see to it that your opponents in the next election do not use it against you," but they did. It became a big issue.

You've got to be straightforward in a job

MOORHEAD: like that. I think at least you know where Gingrich stands. Whether you agree with him or not, you probably know where he's going to stand. That's better than the wishy-washy kind of thing. Foley never really had control, really, of the thing. His potential opponents were always breathing down his throat so hard that he never was really able to get control of the Congress.

I think that there has been too much personal animosity that's been involved in recent years, and I think the House would run a lot better and serve the public better if you had less of that. And that's basically what I meant by that statement. I'm not trying to put anyone down, but I just think if you're the speaker you have to try to be fair to both sides; you're the speaker of everybody, not just of one party. It's true you can be partisan, but you have to be fair. You have to stand for the issues you believe in, but you have to give everyone a shot. And I think Tip was probably better at that than the others. He's sure no hero of mine, but you've got to give the devil his due. He knew how to run the House.

YATES: During our times that we've talked here, you made it sound fairly easy to be in office, but there must have been a lot of difficulties in balancing demands. I was wondering how did you accomplish that?

MOORHEAD: Well, I tried to have an open office. Anybody that wanted to see me would get to see me. I tried to listen. Sometimes people would sell me on a different position than I had. Not often, but sometimes. You have to be willing to listen to them. On that Americans with Disabilities Act, I really had planned to vote against it, but I heard some of the stories of people that had been born with handicaps, and it's not their fault. It became too hard for me to vote against it. A lot of conservatives didn't like my position that I eventually took, but I had to vote the way my conscience told me I needed to go. You can't blame people for something they had no fault in having happen to them. You try to make life as pleasant for them as you can.

I suppose my biggest fights on issues were with myself when I tried to go over everything and tried to come up with the answer I could live with. There are some issues that I could

MOORHEAD: not compromise, and one is abortion. I'd rather have been defeated than to have voted for abortion, because I think it's murder. I think that it's just dead wrong. But I wouldn't accuse somebody that believed in abortion of being immoral, because they might have a different standard than I have. I understand they have a right to a position. I just think it's dead wrong, and so are the babies dead.

Sometimes you have to go with your conscience--forget politics. It is about what's right and what's wrong in your opinion. And sometimes it may work in one direction and sometimes in another. I think I gave you two examples in which it may go a little different. For some people it may go in a different direction, but I could not, in good conscience, vote for euthanasia or for the taking of life for a reason undeserved by the person that's getting that treatment. I believe in the death penalty, but I don't feel a bit good about it when somebody has to pay the price. I don't feel even a tiny bit good about it. Sometimes I'm rooting for a decision the other way someplace along the line. But I've been to the

worst prison in America, and the people there have killed many times while they were in prison. If you have no death penalty, there's nothing to stop them from killing the guards or from killing other prisoners that they can get their hands on. There's nothing that can stop them, because in the tough, tough prisons they'll do anything. Everyone's their victim. And some of these people when they'll go into a store and they'll steal the money and everything they want--the guy's done everything he's told to do--and as they leave, they shoot him and kill him. I don't think they deserve anything but to pay the same price. I won't feel good about it when they do, but I think you have to have some kind of order in your country. People can't live in fear of these vicious people that are around.

YATES: During your time in Congress, what was the most contentious issue you had to deal with in relation to your district?

MOORHEAD: I suppose NAFTA. I think that probably was the one that people were divided the most on. On the impeachment of Nixon, most of the people were against it, but that doesn't mean that you

didn't have a strong, strong minority that were for it. Nixon, I believe, was brought to the brink of impeachment by his support of welfare reform.

YATES: Right. I remember you talking about that.

MOORHEAD: Most presidents have the threat of impeachment. Impeachment articles have been filed against Clinton, as you know, and they are against most presidents one way or the other. They're just put on a shelf on the speaker's desk and left there, as they will be in this instance.

YATES: But you feel NAFTA and the impeachment proceedings were the most contentious issues that came up during your career?

MOORHEAD: Yes, I think so. The Energy Act, for people that knew what they were doing, was a major issue. But most people don't know very much about energy or the issues that make it expensive or scarce. They hear things and they jump on board. I really didn't have problems with many of my votes.

Pay raise was another hard one for me. I had planned to vote no on that, too, but I felt as long as we were giving up on honorariums, which were worth a lot more than the pay raise, then

it was a major, major pay reduction unless that pay raise went through. And it was really a cost of living increase, if you consider that for a number of years the Congress had rejected any kind of raise when they gave a raise to every other federal employee.

[End Tape 6, Side B]

[Begin Tape 7, Side A]

YATES: OK, we just took a short break. I'm sorry, but the tape was just running out, and you were talking about the pay raise vote as one other contentious issue for you.

MOORHEAD: It was very contentious. There was a strong feeling at the time that people in Congress shouldn't take an honorarium for speeches that they gave. I don't know that I share that opinion, because I think that when they give up several days of their time to travel across the country to speak for somebody at a convention, even though the trip's paid for, it's a work trip. I can remember one time I was asked to speak at an event at the Spanish Bay, a beautiful hotel. Gorgeous room. I got there at six o'clock in the evening just in time for dinner, gave my speech at seven thirty in the

MOORHEAD: morning, and left on the nine o'clock plane. I could have slept in the car, and it would have been just as nice, because I couldn't enjoy any of it. You do a lot of those things and everybody else through the years has gotten honorariums, so I don't really think that that was a cause of great problems.

There are some groups in the country that claim that they work for legislative reform or something but not if it was harmful. So when you voted for the pay raise, you voted for that at the same time. And everyone thought, "Well, gee, people want reform for one part of the bill and not for the other." It didn't matter what you did, you'd catch it from somebody. So that was a contentious issue.

There have been a lot of others. There's contentious issues on the death penalty. The big crime bills that have passed through the years have been very contentious. Some things in crime bills that I've voted for I think are causing problems. We had big problems because some judges would be extremely liberal and others would be very, very tough. So it might depend which judge you got for what kind of

MOORHEAD: penalty you would get. But when you have these mandatory sentences as we have today--which I voted for--you have a lot of people that otherwise might have selected to plead guilty, but you're forced into a trial.

With the criminal cases taking so great a percentage of the agenda today, a lot of the civil cases never get to trial that should. Courts are too overcrowded. Some of those cases have to be settled out of court. We just don't have the judges without spending billions of dollars to have every one of those cases tried. Especially since the government--if [the defendants] don't have the money--has to pay for the lawyers to defend them.

There's the problem also that I know I've talked to judges about. They have people that find themselves in a position where they're going to get a long-term imprisonment, maybe twenty-five years, that really have had just a small amount of some narcotic in their possession and may not really have a bad habit or not sell or not do anything, and yet there's no choice through the court but to give them the whole penalty. And we have to pay for that,

which costs a lot of money. I know most of the judges think they should have more discretion. Now, I don't know what you do about the judges that go far in the other direction. Perhaps if you're ever going to change that, you have to have a way that if you want to change what would ordinarily be a mandatory sentence, you have to have a three-judge panel or something that makes that determination. But I do know that a lot of judges are really pained by what they have to do. These are not just the far-left people. Some of them are very conservative judges, but they still don't think that someone should get a sentence so outrageous for what he particularly did.

YATES: Are you thinking also of the "Three Strikes and You're Out" law?

MOORHEAD: Oh, of the "Three Strikes and You're Out," the third strike should be a crime of violence or a serious criminal offense. But the first two could be felonies of any kind. In some places today there are a lot of things that you can have in there that would give the first strike or two. And then you get one and they're in forever for something that doesn't amount to

much.

YATES: When you were talking previously, that particular law came to mind.

MOORHEAD: I know that's one that the committee on court reform [Federal Court Study Commission] that I was on was very concerned with. But you get the total opposition to any change from the district attorneys associations and the others who I normally support all the way. There has to be some room for common sense. In the outrageous case that comes up where the person really doesn't belong in prison for life, there has to be some kind of a loophole someplace.

YATES: Let me ask you the big question: Why did you decide to retire from public office?

MOORHEAD: Well, to begin with, I'm seventy-five years old. And the negative campaigns that the Democrats have been running lately really make the election campaigns difficult. I know that I was just as effective at my job as I ever was. But I wasn't able to do the cross-country campaigning that you have to do at election time as effectively that I once was able to. You're working hard in Washington [D.C.] putting in long hours. You have to jump on the plane on

MOORHEAD: Friday night and come out, do your thing, and then maybe get the red-eye back Sunday night. It's hard on a kid, let alone for some of us who are getting a little older. And my wife was ready to come home.

I didn't like negative campaigning. I didn't like the verbal battles that have taken place over the last six years or so. They've been increasing. They've been there before the Republicans took over, and they were there after the Republicans took over. I just don't see that as that beneficial, and that had something to do with it. And it had something to do with that I didn't get the position that I thought I was going to get and was entitled to. But all of them put together played a role.

You know, I think that my good friend who retired at the same time I did, [Anthony C.] Tony Beilenson. . . . We see politics from a different direction. I'm quite conservative, and he's quite liberal, but that doesn't keep us from being friends. I think both of us were disturbed about the less-than-amicable conditions that had prevailed. But, you know, you're getting that on city councils. You're

getting it on boards of supervisors. You're getting it in the state legislature. You're getting it everywhere. And I guess you've had it in the past at times. But we've been very fortunate that for most of my political career we didn't have that much of it. We had some of it, but not that much of it.

YATES: So you saw a noticeable increase in that type of campaigning later on?

MOORHEAD: Yes.

YATES: Why do you think that's occurred?

MOORHEAD: Well, I think that you get the worst of it because of the character of the people that are running. I don't think that you have someone of good character that would tell things that weren't true about others. I don't believe you would. I can give you examples from both parties. Most people that are in government are decent people, but you do get them in campaigns that I think go over the line. Some good people go over the line; they want to get elected so bad that they don't control themselves.

YATES: Well, I want to ask you also about your perspective on term limits. How do you feel about term limits?

MOORHEAD: In my last campaign, I told people that I was going to support the "Contract [with America]," and term limits were in the contract, and I voted for it. Do I believe in them? No, I don't. I think when you find someone that obviously shouldn't be there, that doesn't follow the rules of good society. . . . [Daniel D.] Rostenkowski. I think he was a bright guy that was very capable. But if he did some of the things that he was supposed to have done, and I don't know that he did, but if he did, he didn't belong in Congress. Sometimes people are in so long they get to thinking they own it, and if they're in a powerful position, they have a right to tell other people what they have to do without listening to their positions.

YATES: But then people can vote them out of office.

MOORHEAD: That's right. That's right. But unfortunately they don't do it very often. I think [the reason] Rostenkowski got into trouble--my personal belief--was not because he spent money on himself, but that he got that money supposedly illicitly. I think he wanted to be the big man in town, you know, "The drinks are on the congressman," [Laughter] "Bidders on the

congressmen." I think he wanted to be the great godfather to everybody, and that's the way they work it in Chicago. So that has something to do with it. I don't think he was a bad person at heart, I just think he thought that he was such an important person that anything he did was all right. Well, a lot of them do that. I think Nixon got into some trouble that way. But I can name two or three Democrats who have done the same thing, only worse.

YATES: How do you think term limits fit into the picture in terms of . . .

MOORHEAD: Well, you have term limits on the president now. You don't have them in Congress. I think for California at the beginning of any term of the state assembly, no one has had more than four years of experience. I don't think it's enough. I just don't think they know enough about all the problems in the state to be the leader with four years of experience. And it's been my experience. . . . When the Democrats came in big numbers in the 1974 election, the Democrats that were elected were so far out, so aggressively radical in their positions, that they did a lot more harm than good. For a lot of them,

experience and time corrected that. It didn't mean they'd stay that way forever. But the younger a person, if they've accepted a philosophy or a direction without a lot of knowledge going with it, they go overboard. And they did.

YATES: I think, ideally, you'd want a mixture of people who had been there for some time and then new people for a shorter time.

MOORHEAD: If anyone wanted to ask me what I think--I don't want to put this in any report, either--but I think the Republicans have had a little bit of that the first two years. I think they're correcting a lot of it.

YATES: You mean, there were so many new members with little experience?

MOORHEAD: Yes, and very strong ideas, some of which would work and some of which wouldn't. I think it takes a little time to season.

YATES: Let me ask you now, turning to summarizing your career, what did you like about being in Congress?

MOORHEAD: The thing I liked the most was being able to help people--individuals--and sometimes large numbers of people together, but being able to

MOORHEAD: help people. Being able to work for a safer society. And what I said about criminal laws, I'm in favor of strong criminal laws. I think there are little areas that need to be fixed up and corrected, but people want a safe society to live in. Being able to work for a sound economy, because people want job opportunities, and they don't get it with high taxes and the government throwing their money away on things that could be done without. Nothing comes free. But I really liked it when people came into my office and needed help with an individual--for us to be able to help them. I really loved to be able to do that. I had one man that wrote to me and he said, "Carlos, I hope you can vote for this bill"--that he was for--"and by the way, I really don't believe in all your political philosophies, but you saved my. . . . I'll support you regardless of what you want to run for."

Service. I think in any elective office that service is the key. People want someone to represent them that they can admire, that doesn't break the rules, but believes in providing service for others. And I tried to

make that the key of my political career. I tried to help everybody that I could. I tried to make myself available to them, like these events where I invited everybody in the district to come. We got some good arguments back and forth from time to time. But just because someone argues with you doesn't mean they don't like you or won't support you. It's when you're not available to them that they get outraged, and they should.

YATES: What do you think is your most important accomplishment?

MOORHEAD: Well, I have to say that as far as legislation is concerned, my contribution in the intellectual property area is probably the most important. Intellectual property is our biggest area of growth in the economy. It's the area where we have the biggest balance of trade. It gives the most promise to our people to keep up our high standard of living. And I've made a major contribution in that area. I don't think I'm bragging to say that. Now, for most people, that's a minor field.

YATES: Were you thinking of any specific pieces of legislation?

MOORHEAD: We had major bills in trademarks, copyrights, patents. When I was ranking member, we worked to bring our country into the Bern Convention, had hearings in Geneva. And I said I worked closely with my Democratic counterpart [Patricia S.] Pat Schroeder when I was chairman. Both Bob Kastenmeier and Bill Hughes worked with me. We didn't run it as an us-against-them kind of a committee. We tried to find out what would be the best for our country and our people here and tried to do it. And I think through the years we've really made--and most people that are in the intellectual property field will tell you--a major contribution.

[There was] one bill that I worked on and developed, and I wanted it badly to pass. I had to wait for other leaders to bring it through, but they brought my bill through this year, recently.

YATES: Oh, which one is that?

MOORHEAD: It was a big, huge patent bill. It was the one that people like [Dana] Rohrabacher and a few of those people made me a villain of the ages for promoting, but it's one that will be of great improvement in the law.

YATES: What was the least fulfilling aspect of being in office?

MOORHEAD: Well, I was going to say a little more on the other thing. I was heavily involved in almost every energy bill that passed over more than a decade. You might not love every part of a bill, and you might not have been the author of the most important part, but I was one of the two key sponsors of the wholesale wheeling legislation, that amendment [to the National Energy Act of 1994]. That was something that had to have both the Republicans sponsor and the Democrats sponsor if you have any chance of getting it through. It did pass, and now they've put in retail wheeling, which I wasn't that strongly for. That's where you can pick any electric power provider you want in a specific area.

YATES: Oh, right, right. You talked about that last time.

MOORHEAD: The wholesale wheeling bill let Glendale Department of Water, [Light], and Power and Southern California Edison [Company] or anyone else buy from anyone that they wanted to pay to bring it in. It required anyone that had lines

MOORHEAD: that weren't used to let others use those lines, which had been paid for by the public in their rates anyway. The same thing would be true. . . . Glendale Department of Water and Power provides electric power for Glendale, but Southern California Edison now can come in and supply for anyone that wants to use them under the retail wheeling as that gets going. It isn't going as strong as it will later on, but they wouldn't have gotten the wholesale wheeling without my support, I'm sure.

All those things make major, major differences. It's not war and peace and it's not a major tax bill or anything of that kind, but they're vital. The areas that I've been assigned to have not been headline issues for the most part, but I think in the long run they're more important to our welfare as a nation than the others should be. I don't know anything more important than energy as far as our industrial empire is concerned. And as far as growth, I don't know of anything much more important to California than what we can do with new inventions: motion pictures, records, computer tapes, other things that you don't want

stolen and copied. So those are the areas of my greatest contributions.

I served on other committees and other subcommittees. Administrative Law, I was on that for ten years. That comes and goes, as you know. I've been on the Immigration [and Claims] Committee. I believe in building up a strong border patrol. One of my plaques over here is from the [United States] Border Patrol. And I think one of the pictures on the wall shows them giving me their top award for the year for what I'd done to encourage stronger criminal laws. I was more involved in that when I was in the state legislature, but I think those are important issues for us.

But you asked me what I enjoyed the most: I enjoyed my staff. I had wonderful people on it. Mr. [Allan] Coffee was the one who I couldn't remember his name.

YATES: Oh, Coffee? We were looking at a picture of some staff members before we started interviewing.

MOORHEAD: I just know him as well as I know anyone. He was a Republican staff man, and his wife was a Democratic staff lady. Both were great people.

So that's it. It was really a wonderful opportunity to be able to serve Burbank and Glendale and the surrounding areas. I had both of them for thirty years.

YATES: Well, what was the least fulfilling aspect of being in public office?

MOORHEAD: I think the least fulfilling is the negative campaigning. I like to work hard and fight for the issues that I believe in, but I like to do it under the rules. I don't like to break normal rules of society to get what I want, and I guess I like to be kind and polite to 99 to 100 percent of the people. There are two or three that I've run into that I didn't put in that category, but most of the people I have a great respect for. I'd rather be called too gentle a person than to be called too much on the other side. We all live in the same country or the same world. I think anything we can do to make life better for people that surround us, we're doing something that's worthwhile. That's just my particular political philosophy. I might even call it my religious philosophy because it fits into the same category.

YATES: What were you unable to accomplish that you

would have liked to have accomplished?

MOORHEAD: Well, you know, I'm not going to say that I feel exactly as Henry [J.] Hyde said, and I know he doesn't either, but he's got a funny little saying: "You know, when I came to Congress, I had a lot of ideas that I could change this world that we're in and make everything come out right. Now," he says, "I just want to get out of here with a little self-respect." [Laughter] You can't go into a group of 435 men and women with a senate of 100 and a president that has strong ideas and a huge bureaucracy and get everything you want or everything you believe in. I was sorry that during the time I was in Congress we didn't come up with a balanced budget. I felt very sad that we gave the Panama Canal away, because I don't think it will be run anywhere near as well as it would with our people running it. We didn't have to make a profit on it. I think we made a mistake when we gave it up. I'm disappointed that our crime rate has been going up instead of down. It's doing better in the last year . . .

YATES: I was going to say, I think there were just some reports saying how the crime rate is going down.

MOORHEAD: It's a little better, but over the last decade it hasn't gone down. I think perhaps the Republicans in control of Congress are giving the impression that it's not as easy for people to break the law and get by with it as they could before. But still, it's disappointing that so many people out there are willing to break the law if they can get by with it. And it's disappointing that there are so many people that are not faring better through their own effort than they are. I don't think we'll ever be able to get everybody working hard at providing for their families. It's very disappointing to me that abortions have gone up dramatically in the last twenty-five years. It shows total lack of responsibility. In a way, it's a lack of respect for their own bodies and for their own offspring, which is sad.

But personally, I was disappointed I didn't get a copyright bill through that I wanted and that patent bill I told you about. There was a copyright bill that I very much wanted that no one was against, except they wanted to bargain. They'd even say, "We'll give you that if you will give us something" that they shouldn't

MOORHEAD: have, and I couldn't do that. I won't accept something that I think is wrong in order to get something that I know is right. The copyright bill would have given our people a right to copyright for seventy years, instead of fifty years, after they're dead. The reason that's important is because most of the rest of the world has that rule, and we're the ones that are out of step. In Europe, they collect the money to pay copyright fees. I guess all the motion pictures and other things of that kind, but they don't give it to us after the time has gone by. They take our money and distribute it to the others. So that's not fair to the United States.

I think as far as the things that are going on in the world, what I feel most disappointed about is that the people in the Middle East, the terrorists that have come out of that area, have become more terrible than they were before. I mean primarily Iraq and Iran and, to some extent, Libya. Because terrorism is a terrible thing. They take people's lives that they don't even know. That's a kind of violence that's almost impossible to understand if you're not a

violent person. I guess I'm one of those people that doesn't believe in beating kids. I think that if you've got any brains, you can find a better way to punish children. With a little child [slaps hand] . . .

YATES: A slap on the hand?

MOORHEAD: Something like that is all right.

YATES: Well, let me ask you this now. You left office at the end of 1996. How have you adjusted to that?

MOORHEAD: I miss the action in Washington [D.C.]. Actually, after twenty-four years, I miss my staff more than anything. I had four of the most wonderful lawyers and two gals that worked for me on my subcommittee, and I miss them.

YATES: What are their names?

MOORHEAD: Well, Sheila [F. Klein] is the senior lady staffer that was there, and she was there the whole time. Then there was [Thomas E.] Tom Mooney [Jr.], who was the chief of staff. He's now the chief of staff of the full committee. Joe Wolf was my number two guy. He's now retired and lives in a huge, huge ranch in northern New Mexico, right next to Ted Turner's ranch. Then there was [Mitchell] Mitch

MOORHEAD: [Glazier]. His mother was the personal chief of staff for Henry [Hyde]. Then there was John [Dudas]. Those were the guys that I worked with. They're all fine people.

On my own staff, I showed you Dave Joergenson. Dave's been my friend long before I went to Congress. He's been the political editor of the News-Press here. Then, of course, I talk to Alice [K.] Andersen every few weeks. She's now probably eighty-four years old, I guess. She lives north of Baltimore in Maryland. She's got a wonderful daughter and family that come down with all the grandchildren.

In my last four years I had another gal [G. Maxine Dean] that had taken over, whose husband was a preacher. He died, and she kept carrying on. She sets up the conventions for one of the Baptist denominations.

And there's just a lot of these folks like Dave Flores, whose picture is there. Dave's an old buddy. He came around all the time. He's now a lobbyist, but he never came to me for votes. I mean, he was just an old friend. Well, you saw that big picture of my staff.

YATES: Right, we were looking at it in the hallway.

MOORHEAD: They're past and present, because we all stuck together as friends through the years.

YATES: What activities have you been involved in since you've left office?

MOORHEAD: I was the chairman of the Red Cross financial campaign this last year. And then I am on one of the foundations for the Glendale Community College. I'm on the foundation for the Glendale Adventist Hospital. And I'm on the advisory board of the Salvation Army. I've been asked to help on certain things with the New Revelation Missionary Baptist Church, which is a black Baptist church in Pasadena. They asked me to give the keynote address when the pastor reached his thirtieth anniversary of his ministry there. I've given a number of talks to intellectual property groups, including the one out in the San Fernando Valley. I've attended some of their meetings. I'll probably be more active. I still go to some of the bar association meetings in Glendale.

YATES: It sounds like you're doing a lot, then.

MOORHEAD: We've been, as you know, to Greece and to Turkey. We're planning a trip to China with a

large group of other former congressmen and senators on kind of a trade mission over there. And we're planning to go to Australia and New Zealand in the fall next year. We're going to spend a month in the desert in January down in Palm Desert. We've been down there a few times. We go to Santa Barbara to visit the grandchildren. And I've played a lot of games of hearts on our computer.

YATES: [Laughter] So you're a computer person, huh?

MOORHEAD: Well, not a computer person. I just like to play a game of hearts on there. My wife's the one that plays the computer all the time.

YATES: Those are all the questions I had. Is there anything else you think we should have talked about that you'd like to add now?

MOORHEAD: No, I think I've told you most of the things. There's probably a lot of other things.

[Interruption]

YATES: OK, we just stopped for a minute because you were showing me some articles and things. This is in response to when I asked you if there is anything we've missed.

MOORHEAD: We've missed about nine-tenths of it. You can't tell everything in a few interviews that took

place over a thirty-year political career.

YATES: I hope we've hit some of the main points.

MOORHEAD: I think we've hit a lot of the main points. I think the point that I have to make is that most of the members of Congress or the state legislature are fine people of high character who really, truly want to make life better for the people that they represent. And that's true of both political parties. We see things differently than the Democrats, because they want to do things for society, and Republicans want to make life better for each individual, which makes a difference. In the end, I think the goal is to make life better for everybody. And I have really been thrilled with the opportunity to help so many people through the years, and to have the respect of the people shown to me because of what I have done to help them. This has been a great district that we're in. Lots of times people that are in politics never go back to their hometown. When I was elected to my first political office, I lived one block down the street from where I am here.

YATES: Oh really.

MOORHEAD: We still know a large share of people in the

community, and they've just been wonderful to me--people in both political parties--since I retired. It's made it easier for me to jump back into the civic role that I played before in the community and to work with groups that try to help folks that are either sick or, for one reason or another, have lives that have been handicapped. I think that's what's important. Because to me, I've tried to make the key to my life Christ's saying, "Even as you do it unto the least of these, my brethren, you do it also unto me." And I hope I've been able to accomplish a little bit of that.

YATES: Great. OK, thank you very much for meeting.

MOORHEAD: Thank you.

YATES: It's been very enjoyable.