

California State Archives
State Government Oral History Program

Oral History Interview

with

JAMES A. HAYES

County Supervisor, Los Angeles County, 1972-1979
California State Assemblyman, 1967-1972
Vice Mayor, City of Long Beach, 1963-1966

April 30, May 12, and June 30, 1990
Rolling Hills, California

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

RESTRICTIONS ON THIS INTERVIEW

None.

LITERARY RIGHTS AND QUOTATION

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

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

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

or

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

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

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

James A. Hayes, Oral History Interview, Conducted 1990 by Carlos Vásquez, UCLA Oral History Program, for the California State Archives State Government Oral History Program.



March Fong Eu
Secretary of State

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

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

PREFACE

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

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

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

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

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

Oral History Program
History Department
California State University, Fullerton

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

Oral History Program
Claremont Graduate School

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

Oral History Program
University of California, Los Angeles

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

John F. Burns
State Archivist

July 27, 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTERVIEW HISTORY i

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY ii

SESSION 1, April 30, 1990

[Tape 1, Side A] 1

Family history--Growing up on a ranch in Central California--Love for debate and interest in acting--Decision to become a lawyer--Student body president at Reedley Community College--Repudiating the family business for a legal career--Working in radio while attending law school and raising a family--Developing an interview program for radio--Naval career and love of foreign languages--What he learned in the military--Internment of Japanese-Americans--Working in radio after World War II--Meeting his future employer in law.

[Tape 1, Side B] 33

Moving to Los Angeles--Practicing law in Long Beach--How being a Republican has changed--Why he never became a Democrat--He never supported Richard Nixon--Hayes's support for Joseph C. Shell--The mistake Republicans made in the 1958 gubernatorial race--More on why he is a Republican--Politics takes special fortitude--Running and losing against George C. Deukmejian for the assembly--"Winning is everything"--Convinced to run for Long Beach City Council--Elected to the city council and becoming vice mayor--Legislating tidelands-revenue spending.

SESSION 2, May 12, 1990

[Tape 2, Side A] 56

More on tidelands-oil revenues and Hayes's tenure on the Long Beach City Council-- Contemporary power brokers in Long Beach--Why he decided to run for the assembly again-- Deukmejian, the anti-crime assemblyman--Entered assembly in the first class after Baker v. Carr --Orientation for new assemblymen--Impressions of Speaker of the Assembly Jesse M. Unruh's leadership--Role of partisanship in the assembly--Robert T. Monagan unable to generate enthusiasm as Speaker of the Assembly--When Republican legislators could not support a Republican governor--Governor Ronald W. Reagan not detached and removed from decision-making-- Senator George Deukmejian and the Reagan administration--A comparison of Governors Reagan and Edmund G. Brown, Sr.--Relationship between the assembly and the state senate--Political influence when seen as a "one-termer"--How measures in committees can be accommodated "behind the scenes"--Comments about fellow members of the Committee on the Judiciary-- Advantage of going out "with a bang."

[Tape 2, Side B] 85

Lack of creativity among some colleagues--No one listened to speeches on the assembly floor-- Press coverage of the legislature--Legislature's relationship with the "Third House"--Roots of corruption in dealing with lobbyists--How some legislators were overcome with their own importance--No ethical decline among legislators--Cycles of reform in California politics--Assessment of the Fair Political Practices Commission--Door-to-door campaigning obsolete--The costs of electronic media-- Limiting the number of terms an incumbent can serve--Some legislators elected too young--"In-breeding" among legislative staff and incumbents--Little incentive to be a creative legislator--Initiative process addresses legislative inaction--Regulating the insurance industry--Importance of appearance and style in modern California politics--Many Republicans are moderate despite the GOP's conservative image.

[Tape 3, Side A] 116

More on moderate Republicans--Hayes's
legislation reforming divorce laws--Debate over
and passage of Family Law Act.

SESSION 3, June 30, 1990

[Tape 4, Side A] 126

More on moderate Republicans in California--
Difference between conservative and moderate
Republicans--Place of compassion in government--
Root of hardmindedness in Republican
conservatism--Involvement with juvenile-related
offenders as Los Angeles County supervisor--
Belief in rehabilitation--How criminal justice
bureaucracies take on self-perpetuating lives of
their own--Erosion of civil liberties in the
concern over crime and drugs--Mainstream
Republicans too quiet--How the Republican
"Eleventh Commandment" is still applicable in
state elections--Consumers Legal Remedies Act of
1970--How Hayes guided the act through the
legislative process--Pure Air Act of 1968--Most
fulfilling aspect of being an assemblyman.

[Tape 4, Side B] 154

Why he decided to run for the Los Angeles County
Board of Supervisors--The frustration of serving
in the assembly--Approached by Long Beach power
brokers to run for the board of supervisors--
Power to get things done on the board--Fourth
Supervisorial District--Good ol' boy character
of the board--Why Governor Edmund G. Brown,
Jr.'s appointment of Yvonne Braithwaite Burke
was unwise--Difference between county and state
government--Hayes's political agenda after
election to the board of supervisors--Coastal
Zone Initiative of 1972--Serving on the
California Coastal Zone Conservation Commission
--Initiative's meat-ax approach which caused
hardships--Why the commission outlived its
usefulness--Hayes's impressions of the other
members of the board of supervisors--
Controversial tenure of Baxter Ward on the
board--Different ways each member of the board
handled his power--Current Latino redistricting

controversy on the board--Expanding the size of
the board.

[Tape 5, Side A] 179

The Voting Rights Act and the appropriate size
of the board--Most satisfying aspect of serving
on the board--Why he resigned from the board--
His private law practice.

INTERVIEW HISTORY

Interviewer/Editor:

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

Interview Time and Place:

April 30, 1990
Hayes's office in Rolling Hills, California
Session of one hour

May 12, 1990
Hayes's office in Rolling Hills, California
Session of one and one-half hours

June 30, 1990
Hayes's office in Rolling Hills, California
Session of one and one-half hours

Editing

Lisa White checked the verbatim manuscript of the interview against the original tape recordings, and with editor David Gist edited for punctuation, paragraphing, and spellings, and verified proper names. Insertions by the editors are bracketed. The interviewer prepared the introductory materials.

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

Papers

There exist no private papers which the interviewer was able to consult for this interview.

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

James A. Hayes was born on September 5, 1921, in Fowler, California. After attending public schools in Del Rey and Selma, California, Hayes entered Reedley Community College, where he earned an A.A. degree in 1940. He took extension courses at the University of California, Berkeley, and graduated from Hastings College of the Law with a J.D. degree in 1949. He served with the Third Fleet of the United States Navy from 1945 to 1946.

Before entering public life, Hayes worked as a news broadcaster with the radio station KLX in Oakland, California, from 1942 to 1943, and with Columbia Broadcasting System from 1943 to 1945.

A lifelong Republican, Hayes served on the Long Beach City Council from 1963 to 1966. In 1966 he was elected to the California State Assembly in the Thirty-ninth Assembly District. He served on the Committees on Transportation and Commerce, Judiciary Retirement System, Health and Welfare, Revenue and Taxation, Environmental Quality, Ways and Means, Rules, and Governmental Organization, and he chaired the Committee on the Judiciary. During his tenure in the assembly, Hayes authored landmark legislation reforming California's divorce laws. He also sponsored laws creating a consumer protection agency and a coastal management body to protect California's coastal areas.

In 1972 Hayes was elected to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and became chairman in 1975. From 1972 to 1979 he served as a member of the California Coastal Zone Conservation Commission, and from 1972 to 1976 he was president of the Southern California Association of Governments. While on the board of supervisors, Hayes was particularly active on coastal protection issues as well as educational and youth services programs aimed at school dropouts.

After resigning from the board of supervisors in 1980, Hayes was a senior partner in the law firm of Hayes and Hoegh. He is presently an attorney in private practice and a governmental consultant in Rolling Hills, California. He is married to Sonja Pederson Hayes.

[Session 1, April 30, 1990]

[Begin Tape 1, Side A]

VASQUEZ: Mr. Hayes, to begin this oral history, tell me something about your family background and about your own personal upbringing.

HAYES: Well, I was born in the Central Valley of California in a little town called Fowler. Actually I was born on a ranch--our family ranch there--at five o'clock in the morning on December 5. A very cold morning.

VASQUEZ: What year was this?

HAYES: Nineteen twenty-one. And I lived in and around that area for the next eighteen years of my life, at which time I then left to go to northern California. Do you want me to stay on the ranch?

VASQUEZ: Well, tell me something about your family: where they're from, and who they were, and what they did. And what was life like there in Fowler?

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: And how you began to get interested in

politics. Those kinds of things.

HAYES: Well, my father [Floyd C. Hayes] and his family. . . . My father and mother [Mildred Upchurch Hayes] were both born in California. And they were from parents who had migrated here from the East. My grandfather [Arthur L. Hayes] and grandmother [Eunice Sargent Hayes] came from Nebraska and Ohio, respectively. That's on my father's side. On my mother's side, my grandfather [Elmer J. Upchurch] and grandmother [Catherine Elliott Upchurch] came from Illinois. They were both ranchers in California, raising grapes and peaches. And my grandfather Hayes had cattle and horses.

VASQUEZ: Was this also in Fowler? Around that area?

HAYES: In the area. Actually, my grandfather, which is Upchurch--my mother's maiden name--was in Fowler. The other ranch was also. . . . They're Fowler post office addresses. But they're both rural, out in the country.

The families didn't know each other until my father married my mother. So it wasn't anything that went back any great distance. But I spent most of my growing-up years in and around my

grandfather Hayes's ranch. My father had a ranch, and my uncle had a ranch. So they were all together in the same general area.

VASQUEZ: When did your family first begin to come to California?

HAYES: Just before the turn of the century. About 1885, 1890, somewhere in there.

VASQUEZ: Were these sizable ranches that they had?

HAYES: Not really that big. In Central California they don't have very big [ranches] there. The acreages are relatively small, because they're so productive.

VASQUEZ: Give me an estimate.

HAYES: Well, the three ranches that my uncle, my father, and my grandfather had were somewhere in the neighborhood of two hundred acres. My grandfather on the other side of the family . . .
[Interruption]

VASQUEZ: Continue please.

HAYES: You asked me about the size?

VASQUEZ: The size and the life on the farm in Central California.

HAYES: My grandfather Upchurch's farm was smaller. I think it was somewhere around thirty or forty

acres only. His was all grapes and some peaches. But as I say, I spent most of my time on the other ranch, where my father and my grandfather and my uncle were all sort of in business together.

VASQUEZ: Uh-huh. Were these contiguous ranches?

HAYES: Yes. Although they later expanded on that and leased other ranches. My uncle got the first-- one of the first--tractors. Caterpillar [Tractor Company] tractors. And he would hire out his tractor to do work at other ranches. And as a young man--you know, fifteen, sixteen years old-- I used to do a lot of that work on other farmers' ranches. My uncle was very good at welding. He built a special trailer to haul the tractor and the equipment. And I used to load it up and drive here, there, and everywhere.

VASQUEZ: So in addition to your life on the farm . . .

HAYES: After I became sixteen.

VASQUEZ: After you became sixteen. Why was sixteen then the important year?

HAYES: That's when I got my driver's license.

[Laughter] I could operate it on the roads.

VASQUEZ: Who was most influential in your growing-up years

in terms of a social or political consciousness or set of ideas?

HAYES: Well, my political consciousness arose after I was in high school.

VASQUEZ: At Fowler? Did you go to high school . . . ?

HAYES: No. I went to Selma High School. Oddly enough, although our post office address was Fowler, it was closer to go to Selma High School. And I went by bus. I went down to the corner of Adams and North McCall avenues every morning about seven o'clock and caught the bus to go to Selma High School. And while I was there--I don't remember just how it started--I decided to sign up for a course in debate. But I had other courses that I was taking, and they conflicted with the hour this debate coach or teacher [Harold Sanders] could do it. So he suggested that I come in and work with him after school hours. Which I did. And from that, I developed a great interest in debating. And he put me on the debating team, even though I wasn't in the class. I started to win a lot of tournaments and everything, so I became a star debater in the school.

VASQUEZ: Is that right?

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: What is it that you liked about debate?

HAYES: Well, I liked being able to think on my feet. I liked the extemporaneousness. The give-and-take of it. I was very small physically. I loved athletics. And, of course, we had touch football that we played in P.E. But I was entirely too small to go out for anything. I only. . . . I was barely five feet tall when I graduated from high school, and weighed only about 120 pounds. So I was a candidate for jockey rather than anything else. [Laughter] But anyway, I decided, you know, to do that. So what I did. . . I started to act, and I acted in school plays. And they used to tell me I had a very good voice. So I was able to get good parts in school plays.

VASQUEZ: What was your favorite part?

HAYES: Pardon?

VASQUEZ: What was your favorite part?

HAYES: I'm trying to think what. . . . I also did this as I went on into college. I did the Hoosier schoolmaster in one school play. I was the

Hoosier schoolmaster, but I think that was in college rather than high school. In the high school play that I was in, I was the villain. But I came across. . . . The audience liked me.
[Laughter]

VASQUEZ: So even though you were physically small, you projected your voice very well. Is that right?

HAYES: Oh, my voice.

VASQUEZ: Have you ever had voice training?

HAYES: Yes. I had since. I didn't have it then. Oh, yes. I've had voice training.

VASQUEZ: What age was this?

HAYES: Well, not until after. . . . While I was in college I took voice lessons.

VASQUEZ: Your ideas? You were . . .

HAYES: But that debate coach is the one.

VASQUEZ: What was his name?

HAYES: Harold Sanders. He told me. He said, "You know, I think you ought to really consider being a lawyer." Up to that time I had just figured, you know, that since the family was all in ranching that that was probably my destiny. But he got me to thinking about something else, something different. So then I started to figure, you

know, what I could do. There were no lawyers in my family. At least nobody close that I could find. No uncles or anything like that.

VASQUEZ: It [was] all pretty much ranching and farming?

HAYES: Yes. Of course, all of them are deceased now.

VASQUEZ: Right, of course.

HAYES: So I just one day came home, and my grandfather. . . . I was fifteen. I remember this very much. My grandfather says, "Well, Jim, are you about ready to consider taking over the ranch?" And I told him, "No. You know, I really think I'm going to be a lawyer."

VASQUEZ: How did he react?

HAYES: He reared back and he said, "We hire lawyers!" [Laughter] He never forgave me for that.

VASQUEZ: Is that right?

HAYES: Never did. He died shortly after that. But he was very upset. I was the oldest grandchild and natural heir apparent to everything. And here I repudiated what he put together.

VASQUEZ: Have you ever had second thoughts about that?

HAYES: No, not really. I remember, you know, ever since I was a little boy getting up early in the morning with my dad. Especially during pruning

season [for] the grapes, when that frost was so cold. I would just freeze my buns off out there pulling brush away from the vines and cleaning up under the trees. He liked to do the easy part, like pruning. [Laughter] And I did all the part of cleaning up the brush from the trees. The fog up there is so terrible in the San Joaquin Valley. The tule fog that comes in.

VASQUEZ: Tule fog.

HAYES: You don't see the sun for three or four months often in the winter season. And when you finally break out of it and go either to San Francisco or to Los Angeles--as I did a little bit later on--you begin to think, "Hey, there's someplace else in California that's better than where we are." So I more or less resolved in my own mind that if I was going to do something, it was going to be in a better part of California than there in the Central Valley. I could have stayed and made a lot of money.

VASQUEZ: Right.

HAYES: But I have no regrets.

VASQUEZ: So were you a good student?

HAYES: Oh, yes. I excelled in school.

VASQUEZ: What subjects?

HAYES: Well, I excelled. I got straight A's in school.

VASQUEZ: What was your favorite subject?

HAYES: High school? Are you talking about high school?

VASQUEZ: High school.

HAYES: Well, I took three foreign languages all at the same time: Latin, German, and Spanish. And I got A's in Latin and German and A+ in Spanish. I had. . . . I was seriously thinking, as that was going along and up until I made my resolution about going into law, of being a foreign language teacher. Because foreign languages do come very readily to me. English is a very good subject for me. I did very well. Had a little more difficulty with math. But I still managed to keep my grades together and got on the California Scholarship Federation. I became a life member at the time of graduation.

VASQUEZ: Did you go straight to college from high school?

HAYES: I went to. . . . Yes. To junior college.

VASQUEZ: Where was this?

HAYES: Reedley [Junior] College. Reedley, California.

VASQUEZ: How did you do there?

HAYES: Very well. I became student body president. In

high school, I wasn't interested until my last year in student politics. And then because of my debate activities and the publicity I got in the newspaper, I ran for the position of treasurer.

VASQUEZ: Yes.

HAYES: And won. And that's how I ended my high school career. But I never ran for the big office. Student body president. But then when I went to Reedley College, I immediately became involved politically. And I was first forensics chairman. And then became student body president.

VASQUEZ: Why? Why did you want to run for student body president?

HAYES: Why did I want to? I liked doing things. I liked participating with other students. I liked working on whatever student problems there were. I liked the give and take of sessions on it. And I liked making people like me. I was the unanimous choice by the student council to be the nominee for student body president. I wanted everybody to vote for me. I knew the fellow who most likely would be nominated to run against me. He was the basketball star. Very handsome,

tall guy. A fellow named [Robert] Bob Nichols. I went to him and I asked him to be my campaign chairman.

VASQUEZ: [Laughter]

HAYES: As it turned out, he was nominated. And then he withdrew. So I was elected by acclamation to the student body.

VASQUEZ: Was that an important moment for you?

HAYES: It was very important. And, you know, it was a little bit of political intrigue that paid off.
[Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Cut him off at the pass, huh?

HAYES: Yes. But it made me realize that if you go for something like that--if it means that much to you--it's more important to win than to say you just ran.

VASQUEZ: Is that the way you've [conducted] your politics?

HAYES: Yes. That's the way it was.

VASQUEZ: So the thing is to run to win, not to run to place.

HAYES: That's right. That's right.

VASQUEZ: What did you learn out of that experience of being student body president?

HAYES: Well, I had a good period. I don't know exactly

what I learned except you get a lot of recognition on the campus. It's like. . . . I had been getting. . . . I'd won several debating and extemporaneous speaking awards and acted in a lot of school plays, so I was very well known. And you get a lot of recognition on the campus. Then when you're the student leader, you get more. And I found it every bit as fulfilling as if I were a football or a basketball star. It's a lot of the same thing, you know. You do those things to excel in what you like to do.

VASQUEZ: I'm interested why you went to a junior college rather than to a four-year college right out of high school.

HAYES: Couldn't afford it.

VASQUEZ: Really?

HAYES: Well, not really "afford." I don't mean "afford" in money. I was very instrumental in doing things around the ranch. [I'm] not just talking about chores and things like that. But in connection with the ranch, there were a lot of things I became very adept at doing.

VASQUEZ: Administrative things?

HAYES: Administrative things. And when the crop season

came around, I knew all of that like the back of my hand. I can see now in retrospect why my grandfather was so upset over it all, because I had been very well trained on the job.

VASQUEZ: It sounds like you were being groomed from the very beginning.

HAYES: Oh, there's no question. But things like the location and the weather and all those things militated against it for me. So I broke out of the cocoon.

VASQUEZ: So what did you do after Reedley College? What year is this now? What year did you get out?

HAYES: Nineteen forty, I graduated from Reedley College. Nineteen thirty-eight from high school. Nineteen forty from Reedley. There's a little bit of an interruption in my actual schooling at that point. I took some extension courses at Cal [University of California] Berkeley. But I moved to San Francisco and had a brief stint of a job that I applied for and got-- totally on my own--at Fort Mason in San Francisco. And then . . .

VASQUEZ: What kind of a job?

HAYES: Then I got married. Just a clerical job.

VASQUEZ: Why did you leave the farm to go to a clerical job? Before you were thinking of law school?

HAYES: Well, I was thinking very much of law school.

VASQUEZ: Were you thinking about it?

HAYES: Oh, yes. I had been talking to a man who was our attorney. His name was Samuel Hollins. And he had told me, you know, if I was going to go to law school not to go to a night school or to anywhere other than a first-class, accredited college. So I asked him, you know, which are the ones he would suggest. And he ticked off all of them, you know. One of them he mentioned was Hastings [College of the Law]. And, you know, I really didn't know. But while I was in San Francisco, I went over and talked to the dean of the law school. And he suggested that I make an application. At that time you didn't need four years of college to go to law school if you were academically qualified. And I had superb grades.

VASQUEZ: Even while you were student body president and all these other things?

HAYES: Oh, yes. And so he suggested I take a little academic test. Which I did. I came out very, very high. And so they suggested I go to the law

school. So I went to Hastings. But in the meantime, in order to go. . . . In this period of time also I had gotten married.

VASQUEZ: Yeah. You were going to mention that. What was your [first] wife's name?

HAYES: Janne [Mentzel]. And, of course, you see, I had to have a regular job now to support my wife. Then fairly soon thereafter, along came the first child [Joan Hayes] a year later. But I had thought to myself [while] going to law school, "I would like to figure out what I could do that would not wear me out working, so that I would be able to exert most of my effort on studying law." So I found out that a radio station in Oakland, owned by the Oakland Tribune, was having an audition for radio broadcasters. In the meantime, you see, I'd had my voice studies and lessons and everything. So I went down to the Tribune Tower in Oakland and met with the manager [Adriel Freed] of the station and told him that I would like to apply for the announcing job that was open.

VASQUEZ: What were the call letters? Do you remember?

HAYES: KLX [Radio]. And we then talked for a little

while. And by that time. . . . Let's see. I'd gotten out of class. . . . By that time it was the end of his work day, about five thirty or six in the evening. And he said, "I have to go, but why don't you just ride on the streetcar with me, and I can talk to you some more." So I rode all the way with him to Piedmont where he lived. And while on the way, he was giving me some tips on how I could get myself trained for this particular spot. To do the best job. Among other things, he told me to pick up magazines like Woman's Home Companion and Lady's Home Journal and to read aloud the stories in there either to myself or to my young wife. And thereby get myself so that I could go through words without tripping and make a good show for myself. Well, the upshot of it is, I did that. And two weeks later, I won the audition over fifty other people. And went to work the next day. Broadcasting.

VASQUEZ: On radio?

HAYES: On radio.

VASQUEZ: What kinds of programs did you do?

HAYES: Well, it was just ordinary announcing: station

breaks and little commercials. Like one commercial advertising a diamond jewelry store: "For diamonds that delight, it's De Lane's . . .

VASQUEZ: [Laughter]

HAYES: . . . 1212 Washington Street in Oakland." And that went on and on. But I had good hours on this, you see. I could pick my hours and go to school. So that worked out fine.

VASQUEZ: And you didn't have to exert yourself physically all that much, huh?

HAYES: Well, no. Not really that bad at all. And then I was there. . . . After I was there about a month, the fellow in charge of news left. So the manager asked me if I would like to take a run at doing the news. They had news every hour on the hour. Five minutes of news. And then in the evening from 6:00 to 6:15, the evening news. And he asked me if I'd like that spot. I jumped at it and took it.

VASQUEZ: It would be called an anchor today, wouldn't it? [Laughter]

HAYES: Yes. So I became a newsman. But then what I started to do is, rather than just tearing the copy off the machines--the Teletype machines

where they would come in. . . . Are you aware of how it comes in?

VASQUEZ: Right.

HAYES: By AP [Associated Press], UPI [United Press International], and we used to have INS [International News Service]. And then some of the local news.

VASQUEZ: It's electronic now.

HAYES: Yes, it's more expanded now. But I would, you know, sit down and take a fling at writing my own news. And so I became very suited to it. Then while I was doing that, I decided that it would be a great idea to have a roundtable-type thing developed. Now what I had in mind. . . . See, I'm still studying law, right? What I had in mind was, this would give me an opportunity to have on the show all sorts of lawyers from in and around the San Francisco-Oakland Bay areas. And, you know, give me a chance to get acquainted with them.

VASQUEZ: Make friends and influence people, as it were.

HAYES: It's what it was, yeah. Well, anyway, I sold the idea. I sold the idea to the Oakland Tribune, who then sponsored it. The newspaper sponsored

my forum. And it was very well received.

VASQUEZ: What year was this?

HAYES: It was called the "Tribune Forum."

VASQUEZ: What year was this? "Tribune Forum," huh?

HAYES: Yeah. I've got a whole series of clippings. I saw--just while we moved--some of this stuff. Let's see. That would have been about 1941 and '42.

VASQUEZ: So you were on . . .

HAYES: Because then I went in service.

VASQUEZ: You were on the air or had access to the air when the war came?

HAYES: Oh, yes.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that.

HAYES: Yes. Well, I did that. And you know. . . . Then by reason of that, I had credentials to interview people if I wanted to. And I had. . . . Among other things, I conducted the first hour-long interview of Madame Chiang Kai-shek when she came to this country. And it went all over the other networks, and everything picked it up.

VASQUEZ: Now were you an affiliate? This radio station, was it an affiliate?

HAYES: No.

VASQUEZ: An independent station?

HAYES: Independently owned, yes. But I had made quite a mark. So from that, CBS [Columbia Broadcasting System] then finally tapped me.

VASQUEZ: And you went to work for them as what?

HAYES: I went to work as a newsman in San Francisco.

VASQUEZ: Out of what station?

HAYES: It was called KQW-CBS. It is now called KCBS in San Francisco. But when I went there, it was KQW-CBS.

VASQUEZ: How long were you there before you went into the service?

HAYES: Well, I was with CBS for two years, and then went in the service. And then came back to CBS. Then I took a leave [of absence] from CBS to work on [my] law [degree]. And I worked in a law firm in Oakland.

VASQUEZ: Before we get into that, tell me about the service. Your experiences in the service.

HAYES: I was in the navy.

VASQUEZ: In the Pacific, I understand.

HAYES: In the Pacific. I was attached to what we call "the flag." I was on the staff of Admiral [William F.] Halsey, the commander in chief of

the Third Fleet. And I spent my closing naval years there.

VASQUEZ: So you were in the service, what? Between 1943 and '45?

HAYES: Yes, a couple. . . . Only a couple of years till the war ended. I want to tell you one rather interesting thing about it. I had a rather bleak feeling about the war. I didn't think it was going to end as suddenly as it did. And I made applications to go to foreign language school at the University of Oklahoma while I was still in the navy. And I was accepted. And the orders had just gone out at the time of. . . . Well, just before the close of the war. You know, things all happened so fast there toward the end. And I was able only through the intervention of the admiral to get those orders rescinded so that I could get back out of the navy. Otherwise, I'd probably still be in the navy.

VASQUEZ: Oh, is that right?

HAYES: Oh, maybe not still be there. But I would have gone on in the navy. I would have gone to study Russian, Chinese, and Japanese at the University of Oklahoma. So you see where my career could

have been pointed at that time.

VASQUEZ: Did you at any time . . . ?

HAYES: I'm sorry this is so fragmented. But it just keeps coming at me.

VASQUEZ: That's all right. That's the way it comes. That is the way it comes.

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: We'll put it together. Did you use any of your training in the service? Were you ever tapped to do any announcing?

HAYES: Yes. When I was in the navy, they would have. . . . For example, when I was in my early navy . . .

VASQUEZ: Years?

HAYES: Preparation period. I broadcast the news every day on the station.

VASQUEZ: Where was this?

HAYES: In San Diego.

VASQUEZ: Were you something of a celebrity for that?

HAYES: I never used my name, but the brass knew who I was.

VASQUEZ: What were you attached to? When you got out of basic? What kind of unit?

HAYES: Third Fleet. I was attached to . . .

VASQUEZ: Halsey's staff?

HAYES: I was sent to Hawaii and joined. . . . Pearl Harbor they called it, rather than Hawaii. I went there and went on his staff.

VASQUEZ: As?

HAYES: As a yeoman.

VASQUEZ: [Laughter]

HAYES: Yeoman.

VASQUEZ: It's the nature of the job, isn't it?

HAYES: Yes. When I was in the navy, they trained me to take shorthand. So I learned shorthand very quickly in the navy and was able to get in on a lot of top matters.

VASQUEZ: Because of it?

HAYES: Oh, yes.

VASQUEZ: Anything you remember that sticks in your mind?

HAYES: Well, I had access to a lot of very critical documents and records.

VASQUEZ: Did you enjoy that?

HAYES: Yes. It was very good. I enjoyed the service in the navy. You know, especially aboard ship. I had very good quarters and good food. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: But you were not subjected to military confrontations?

HAYES: No. I never carried a gun. I never shot a

person. I never had to fire a gun. My duties at battle stations were a pad and pencil standing next to the admiral. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Not bad. Not a bad duty. So you got out of the service . . .

HAYES: I willed it that way really, you know. I knew the war was there, but I just did not want to kill anybody. And so I would just say sort of my little prayer that I don't want to be involved in anything. I naturally didn't want anybody to hit me either. And although we were in some rather troublesome areas, nothing ever happened to me.

VASQUEZ: What did you learn about yourself? Or about being an American, from being in the service?

HAYES: Well, everybody was very proud of everything at that time. You know, nobody was grouching about being in the military, although we were all concerned about how long it was going to last. Which of course entered into my decision to sign up, or make application, for that foreign language school. Because it seemed to be an avenue out. What I found about the service in general is that. . . . Excuse me just a minute. I forgot what was I saying.

- VASQUEZ: No one was grouching about being in the service. Everyone was pretty much united about things.
- HAYES: Pretty much. Yes. We were concerned about how long it was going to take. And you know a lot of us. . . . I was anxious to either be a lawyer or do something. And then, of course, this signing up for foreign language school was pretty much opting for a naval career.
- VASQUEZ: Was the navy at that time segregated?
- HAYES: You know, I didn't really notice it. But yes, I think it was. But nobody would. . . . Well, let me see. Blacks were usually mess attendants and things like that. I did note that, but. . . . Although, there were some black officers.
- VASQUEZ: Were you aware of a disparity of opportunity, if you can call it that?
- HAYES: No. I didn't notice anything.
- VASQUEZ: Tell me about another part of the war that sometimes we don't talk about enough. It has to do with--and coming from California [especially]--the internment of 120,000 Japanese-Americans.
- HAYES: Well, I felt terrible about that because that involved a lot of my friends that I had gone to school with. And some of the ranchers next to

ours were involved in that. My father and my uncle picked up the gauntlet and handled and took care of those ranches for our friends. The Japanese that were interned.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that.

HAYES: They handled. . . . They took care of the crops.

VASQUEZ: They didn't buy the ranches out?

HAYES: Oh, no.

VASQUEZ: They didn't?

HAYES: No. And they were all there for them when the Japanese came back.

VASQUEZ: Is that right?

HAYES: Oh, yes. We were all friends. We all grew up together. We never thought. . . . We were shocked when they were herded away.

VASQUEZ: Did anyone in your family or any of your acquaintances try to do anything to stop that? Was there a perception to want to do that? Or the need to do that at the time?

HAYES: I don't know that anybody did. They came out as orders from the military, you know. And everybody was in a state of shock by the whole war itself. And I can't recall. I was still pretty young.

- VASQUEZ: Did it ever occur to you that there was a different approach to dealing with the Japanese-Americans [than there was], say, to dealing with the Italian- or the German-Americans?
- HAYES: Well, not in my recollection. See, I suppose. . . . From what I've read since, you know, the Italians and Germans at other times, I think, had problems. You know, in other sections of the country, like the Irish Catholics in Massachusetts. I know you're talking about military. . . . But no, I don't think there was ever any suggestion that Germans be rounded up or Italians be rounded up and put in relocation centers, as they called it.
- VASQUEZ: Right. It's that that I'm addressing. Did the dichotomy or the inconsistency of the treatment ever occur to you?
- HAYES: It occurred to me because I felt it was terrible that the Japanese-Americans were taken away.
- VASQUEZ: Now you came out of the service, and you do what then?
- HAYES: Well, when I came out of the service . . .
- VASQUEZ: You went back to CBS?
- HAYES: Yes, I went back and was restored at CBS. But I

decided by that time, you know, that I'd better really hit hard on getting my law ready. So I took a leave from CBS and went to work as a law clerk--like a paralegal today--in a law firm [Brown, Smith, and Ferguson] in Oakland. Which was near my home.

VASQUEZ: You lived in Oakland now?

HAYES: I bought a little home in Oakland with my. . . . A little GI home for about nine or ten thousand dollars. Let's see.

VASQUEZ: You bought a home on the GI Bill?

HAYES: Yes, bought a home. And so I went to work for this law firm doing, as I say, paralegal-type things.

VASQUEZ: And on to Hastings?

HAYES: Oh, yes. I was in Hastings all the time. Every day. Going to class. There were three of us--three fellows--that were commuting from this area in Oakland over across the bridge to Hastings. And we would routinely change cars. One would drive one week. One the next and . . .

VASQUEZ: Were those good years for you?

HAYES: Those were tough years.

VASQUEZ: Why?

HAYES: Well, because I went to. . . I completed Hastings under the GI Bill. And you know there's a very limited amount of income that you could make, not very much money. But in order to get it done, I realized I had to do this. If I had gotten involved with CBS, they were going to send me to somewhere else. Either Los Angeles or New York. And I felt that my law career would be down the drain.

VASQUEZ: Do you ever have second thoughts about that?

HAYES: Well, yes. I have.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that.

HAYES: It would have been an easy thing to. . . I had, as my counterparts at CBS, Douglas Edwards and Walter Cronkite. And I could have stayed and gone very high at CBS at the time. But I don't have any regrets. I had second thoughts that probably I could have made it a lot easier for myself. Because it was quite a while, even after I became a lawyer, before I was making the money I could have made at CBS. But it's part of the decision you make. And my ambition of becoming a lawyer superseded everything else.

VASQUEZ: Did you meet anyone at Hastings--a professor or

perhaps a colleague--that had an impact on you as an attorney? And maybe as a political actor?

HAYES: Not really. At law school, no. I had more of an impact put upon me by a couple of high school teachers than anybody in that arena. I respected my college professors, but they never really confided in you. They never stepped down off the podium and talked with you.

VASQUEZ: Did you ever try to affect any of them or reach them?

HAYES: No. Because I'm basically a shy person. And this. . . . Even though I can get on the stage and do those kinds of things, I don't feel like seeking people out and. . . . I have no problem now--and haven't had for years--but that's come because of my political involvement. It has made it very easy for me. But during those times, I didn't seek people out to ask their opinions.

VASQUEZ: When you were in law school, or in those years, were you very much involved in political affairs?

HAYES: No, not really that much. At that time, I was too busy doing what I was doing.

VASQUEZ: When did you begin to get involved in politics?

HAYES: Not until after I became a lawyer.

VASQUEZ: And where was that?

HAYES: Down here in southern California.

VASQUEZ: How did you get down? Get me from the little house in Oakland and going to law school, to southern California.

HAYES: [Laughter] I fully intended to do my law practicing in San Francisco, or Oakland, or both. But my last year in law school, I got a call from a lawyer who was practicing in Long Beach. [He] had a big, major case. And he said he had been referred to me by a mutual friend of his and mine, and he wanted to talk to me about working for him. He had to be on the hearing of a case in San Francisco, so I arranged to meet him. After one of my broadcasts, I came down and met him at the Clift Hotel. And he ended up giving me an extensive legal interview. I mean, he put me through the paces with law questions that I had never even considered or thought out ahead of time. But at the end of the conversation he said, "Oh, I've got several things I'd like to have you do for me in connection with this case." And he gave me a whole sheaf of things that he wanted done. So I

did them over the course of the next two weeks-- which he gave me as a deadline--and sent them to him. And thereafter, he said, "When you get out of law school, you've got a place to go if you'd like to come down."

VASQUEZ: What was his name?

HAYES: Charles K. Chapman.

VASQUEZ: Was he a member of the firm?

HAYES: No. He had his own firm. In Long Beach.

VASQUEZ: Who was the mutual friend?

HAYES: Well, that was another fellow named Gail Eagleton.

[End Tape 1, Side A]

[Begin Tape 1, Side B]

HAYES: When I finished at Hastings, I let him know I was finished. And so he said, "Well, come on down." So I packed my wife up and my little daughter.

VASQUEZ: Reya?

HAYES: No, no. That's my youngest daughter. No, this is . . .

VASQUEZ: What was her name?

HAYES: I've got four children from that marriage.

VASQUEZ: Tell me their names.

HAYES: Joan; Judith; [James] Jim, Jr.; and Jeffrey.

VASQUEZ: How many did you have that time?

HAYES: Only one.

VASQUEZ: Only Joan?

HAYES: No, wait. Judith also. I'm sorry, we had two. Yeah. Judith was also born. So we rented a house that we found in Bellflower. And I proceeded to drive every day into Long Beach to work for this lawyer. That was before Lakewood was built. Just before Lakewood was built. So there was no traffic problem from Bellflower to Long Beach. So . . .

VASQUEZ: What year would this be now?

HAYES: This was in the fifties. Early fifties? Yes, early fifties. I can't remember the specific dates. No. All right?

VASQUEZ: That's fine. I'm just trying to get a time frame of what year.

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: Because it would have been the early mid-fifties.

HAYES: Yes, fifties.

VASQUEZ: When Lakewood wasn't built.

HAYES: Yes. Well, Lakewood wasn't built until about that time. The reason I remember is that very

shortly thereafter all that monumental building went on there. And it became a mess while the building was going on.

VASQUEZ: Right. My uncle bought a house there soon after it was finished. He's lived there ever since.

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: That's the time frame I use.

HAYES: Sure.

VASQUEZ: Mid-fifties. Now, what kind of law did you practice?

HAYES: Well, I worked exclusively on what cases he had. He had a major case involving a savings and loan association. So I became very expert in savings and loan law, as much you can become expert. I worked for him in handling a great amount of research and then made some perfunctory court appearances. I remember one of the first things I did was make a deposit in the federal court, where the case was, of a \$7 million check shortly after coming in that. . . . Something that is indelibly imprinted in my mind, when I took that check up to the court to deposit it in the registry of the court. But I then. . . . I stayed there. I worked with that gentleman

until the late fifties when I went out on my own.

VASQUEZ: And then you went into private practice, did you?

HAYES: Yes, I went into private practice.

VASQUEZ: What kind of law did you pursue then?

HAYES: Well, I did, you know, pretty much everything. But it was civil. You know, civil and probate. Things like that.

VASQUEZ: How did you get involved . . . ?

HAYES: And everything that came in the door.

VASQUEZ: [Laughter] How did you get involved in city government?

HAYES: Well, let me back up just a little. During that period of time, as I became involved--while I was still with this other lawyer--I started getting active in Republican politics by going to different functions and by talking with different people.

VASQUEZ: Were you always a Republican?

HAYES: I was always a Republican. I came from a Republican family, but I. . . . You know, it was very easy for me to. . . . I don't agree with all the Republican principles, and I never went along with them all while I was in politics. But I'm more . . .

VASQUEZ: Being a Republican has changed, hasn't it?

HAYES: It has.

VASQUEZ: Tell me how you perceive that change.

HAYES: Well, I think I'm a very moderate Republican. I'm interested in making changes in the system where I find big errors to exist. That's why I made the Family Law Act¹ [because of] the changes. Why I changed the air pollution things. And a lot of the other changes that I made. I had found most Republicans too willing to stay with the status quo. And, therefore, for the things that I did, I always enjoyed a great amount of Democratic support.

VASQUEZ: Why were you never Democrat?

HAYES: I couldn't really cotton to the Democrats wanting government to be the answer for everything. I felt that they just went too far. So what I did, I moderated what the Republicans did and incorporated a lot of the good Democratic approaches. And, you know, still. . . . I felt I was closer to being a Republican than I was a Democrat.

1. S.B. 252, 1969 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1608.

VASQUEZ: So you were a [Dwight D.] Eisenhower man?

HAYES: Very much. Very much.

VASQUEZ: Were you a [Richard M.] Nixon man?

HAYES: No.

VASQUEZ: Why?

HAYES: Well, I could never stand him in the first place because I felt he was. . . . Although he did a lot of good things, I think he almost destroyed the party.

VASQUEZ: Here in California? Or nationwide?

HAYES: Well, wherever, you know. I think he did a lot of good . . .

VASQUEZ: Like?

HAYES: And I liked to read what he's done. I bought all his books. I've read all of his books. But I find he has such a flawed character that it's hard for me to like him. I've met him.

VASQUEZ: What do you think the flaw is? Have you identified that flaw?

HAYES: Well, he's . . .

VASQUEZ: He's a man that likes to run to win, not to place.

HAYES: Well, that's different though.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about it.

HAYES: He . . . He . . . Oh, I've got to think on that a little. This one I haven't thought through.

VASQUEZ: Let's come back to that one.

HAYE: I really don't want to critique him that much. But I just know that he could have done so much more because he has the ability. He is a brilliant man. But I just think that his way of doing things, and his necessity for intrigue about things that were so small. . . . I don't know what happened in the Watergate thing, but he had just won an overwhelming reelection victory. He could have won it without even campaigning. And yet he participated in all that silly cover-up. To me, it was very reprehensible. I just think . . .

VASQUEZ: This politics . . .

HAYES: Wait a minute. It grated against me as a lawyer. I didn't think that he acted in conformity with our legal system in the things that he did.

VASQUEZ: Let's get back to where you were just beginning to be involved in Republican politics.

HAYES: You can strike all this critique out. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: No, well. . . . You'll get a chance to review

that. But I think it's fascinating.

Getting back to the years when you're just getting into Republican politics here in California. And Nixon was a player in state politics, an important player. You just didn't identify with him. Was it his political ideas or his political style?

HAYES: Well, I didn't particularly identify with his style. This is when I started to get really involved. There was a fellow running for political office named Joe. He ran against him for governor.

VASQUEZ: [Joseph C.] Joe Shell?

HAYES: Joe Shell.

VASQUEZ: The oil man?

HAYES: Yes. And I supported Joe Shell. I liked Joe Shell.

VASQUEZ: And he was from your area. Wasn't he?

HAYES: No. He's from Bakersfield.

VASQUEZ: That's right.

HAYES: I didn't particularly like the way that Nixon came into the campaign. And, of course, he came in and knocked Shell out politically. But I felt that since Shell represented a good approach,

that he should have been allowed to be the one to run for that particular post that time. I don't know whether he could have won in the general election or not.

VASQUEZ: Was Joe Shell involved in the tidelands oil drilling at that time?

HAYES: No.

VASQUEZ: In the Long Beach area?

HAYES: No. No. He just. . . . He had a bunch of independent oil companies in the Bakersfield area.

VASQUEZ: Nothing in Long Beach?

HAYES: No.

VASQUEZ: How did you . . . ?

HAYES: As far as I know he didn't.

VASQUEZ: How did you connect with him?

HAYES: Well, just because he was running for office.

And I heard him come to Long Beach to speak, and I went up and introduced myself to him.

VASQUEZ: He was relatively a conservative. In some areas.

HAYES: Probably. I never thought of it that way at the time. I just, you know, liked the approaches. I liked his campaign approach. I didn't really dislike Nixon. But I would have preferred Shell

at the time. I think Shell, you know. . . .
Nixon later ran against [Edmund G. Brown, Sr.]
Pat Brown and lost. I think Shell could probably
have taken Pat Brown, but it doesn't make any
difference.

VASQUEZ: Who were some of the other Republicans of the
time that you admired? Or that you
[knew] . . . ?

HAYES: William [F.] Knowland, who was a U.S. senator.
And you see, he was the owner of the Oakland
Tribune and the Tribune station. And that's why
I, you know, really started getting. . . . When I
really started getting active. When I supported
him for governor when he wanted to be running for
governor. That's the time that [Governor]
Goodwin [J.] Knight was eased out.

VASQUEZ: And he switched offices?

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: Do you feel that was a mistake?

HAYES: That was a terrible mistake. A terrible mistake.

VASQUEZ: Did you think so at the time?

HAYES: I did. I felt that, you know, whenever the
general population perceived that the Republicans
were divided over who should be running for a

political office, the people would come up and say, "Well, possibly none of them. None of the Republican candidates should be running." So they would defeat them. And that's what happened with Knight and Nixon and Knowland. It's a result of that terrible and brutal internecine warfare.

VASQUEZ: There was another issue that was very prominent in that campaign that had to do with the right-to-work initiative.¹ Do you think that hurt Republicans?

HAYES: Yes. Yes, it did.

VASQUEZ: Where did you stand on that one?

HAYES: I was against it. I'm not anti-union at all. I belong to the American Federation of Radio and Television Artists.

VASQUEZ: Is that right?

HAYES: [Laughter] I think there's . . .

VASQUEZ: I'm trying to get to why you're a Republican.
[Laughter]

HAYES: You want my inner thinkings about that. Why I'm a Republican? You know I think the Republican

1. Proposition 18 (November 1958).

party--as I modify it with my thinking--provides the greatest opportunity for people. Whether minorities or whether majority people are involved. Because they believe in providing opportunities, whether it's work or education or the other. Maybe not enough. . . . But that's the reason that stronger officeholders [have] got to get in. I think the whole problem with our political system is the strongest moral and hardworking people [don't] get into public office that should be there.

VASQUEZ: What vitiates that?

HAYES: Well, because there are things connected with politics that don't appeal to the person who may have those virtues. There were a lot of things I found disagreeable.

VASQUEZ: Such as?

HAYES: Well, the having to make deals. Having to work for less money than you can do on the outside. Having to, you know, deal with certain people that you may not feel very comfortable dealing with. A lot of people are, you know, internally quite biased. And so when they get in a working arena where they've got to work with people they

may not actually like, they say, "It's not for me." I can't tell you the number of lawyers and businessmen that I've talked to who have indicated--who I think would make good political candidates--who back off with that kind of an answer. Which I think is a reflection of what is really inside that person that you may not see otherwise.

VASQUEZ: You seem to feel that it takes a special kind of fortitude to be in politics?

HAYES: It takes a strength. And it does take a willingness to recognize the internal views of the other person. I became extremely tolerant, by reason of being in politics. I changed my outlook toward my fellowman. For example, I served on the [Health and] Welfare Committee. I had thought before . . .

VASQUEZ: This was in the legislature or at the [Los Angeles County Board of] Supervisors . . . ?

HAYES: No. In Sacramento. And I had thought before that time that if you gave a person a chance--gave him a job, gave him an education--you know, they could make their own way. But I found after hearing lots of evidence on it before that

Welfare Committee that not everybody can do that. And that was a big eye-opener for me.

VASQUEZ: In that it may not necessarily be their fault?

HAYES: Absolutely.

VASQUEZ: That was a revelation?

HAYES: Very revelatory.

VASQUEZ: Any other examples? Things like that?

HAYES: Well . . .

VASQUEZ: They'll come up with other things . . .

HAYES: Other things similar to that. But that's one. That's a classic that stands out in my mind.

VASQUEZ: Let's get back to your initial foray into politics. You lived in the Long Beach area. Or, you worked and operated in the Long Beach area, although you were living in Bellflower still.

HAYES: Well, ultimately, I moved to Long Beach.

VASQUEZ: You ultimately moved to Long Beach. Get me from your early involvement to being vice mayor of the city of Long Beach.

HAYES: Well, following that election year that I mentioned when things were really going on . . .

VASQUEZ: This is '65 and '66.

HAYES: Right. Then it came up to '65 and '66. The fellow who represented Long Beach in the

legislature was an assemblyman named [William S.] Bill Grant. And when he ran for reelection After he was elected in 1964, he announced that he wasn't going to run again. And that was when George [C.] Deukmejian started making appearances and speaking at various service clubs and political clubs around town. And he indicated . . .

VASQUEZ: Did you know him at the time?

HAYES: No. [He was] indicating that he wanted to run for the job. He was just new in town. Not too many years. I don't think he was but two or three years in California at that time. And so some of the Republicans in Long Beach, particularly Gladys O'Donnell, the leader of the Republican Women--she is president of the Long Beach Republican Women--talked to me. She had become well acquainted with me during these other campaigns I mentioned. She suggested that I should run for the assembly seat.

VASQUEZ: You were a mayor now?

HAYES: No.

VASQUEZ: You weren't mayor from '63 to '66?

HAYES: No.

VASQUEZ: All right.

HAYES: No, wait a minute.

VASQUEZ: You were Long Beach mayor from '63 . . .

HAYES: We're in the wrong years, Carlos.

VASQUEZ: I'd asked you to get me from just beginning in politics to becoming vice mayor, then mayor, and then going onto the assembly. That string of events.

HAYES: Well, first I had to run for the legislature. I ran there first.

VASQUEZ: Ah.

HAYES: I ran for the legislature. This was in 1962 that we're talking about. And George Deukmejian had been, you know, running fairly hard. But was not really having that much enthusiastic support, particularly from the Republican Women.

VASQUEZ: Why, did they not find him an exciting candidate?

HAYES: I don't know.

VASQUEZ: You don't know?

HAYES: I don't know. Finally, in February of that year--which I think was 1962--I declared my candidacy, and started feverishly working and talking. Putting on quite strong campaign efforts. But, of course, the primary was in

June. So I'd only made my decision a couple of weeks before I announced. So I was in a mad race for the wire for something that George Deukmejian had been running for for two years. And actually had the blessing of this Bill Grant, because he had already gotten it before I even came in the race. But in any event, I ran a very credible campaign. Didn't lose by very much. You've probably got the votes somewhere. And just shocked the pants off Deukmejian.

VASQUEZ: How did you feel about that loss?

HAYES: Well, I didn't like it. I never liked it . . .

VASQUEZ: How did you feel about the race, let's put it that way?

HAYES: How did I feel about the race? I felt that if it had been two weeks longer, I would have won.

VASQUEZ: Really?

HAYES: Yeah.

VASQUEZ: Did you . . . ?

HAYES: Things were picking up steam.

VASQUEZ: Did you get hooked on it as a result?

HAYES: Well, what happened from that is . . . I was, you know, pretty shattered as a result of it. Because you don't do anything to come in

second. Second is nothing. As [Speaker of the Assembly] Jesse [M.] Unruh used to say, "Losing is nothing. Winning is everything, but losing is nothing." But while I was still licking my wounds, I was visited by a series of people who were extremely dissatisfied with the present city councilman from the very district where I lived.

VASQUEZ: Who was that?

HAYES: His name was Andrew Baird. So they said, "We'll handle all the campaign for you. And you already have heavy name identification." You see, I think it was only a matter of six or seven months from one election to the other. So they said, "You can probably get in without any kind of a problem."

VASQUEZ: Who were some of those folks?

HAYES: So I said okay.

VASQUEZ: Who were some of those folks?

HAYES: Well, they were the power brokers in Long Beach: Henry Clock; [Henry] Hank Ridder, the owner of the [Long Beach Independent] Press-Telegram; Sam Cameron, who worked also at the Press-Telegram; George Johnson, who's a lawyer. His father [Ward Johnson] was a congressman from

the area at one time. I haven't mentioned them all. But that's all that spring to mind.

VASQUEZ: What was attractive to you about being a city councilman?

HAYES: I wasn't attracted to it at all.

VASQUEZ: What did you think you'd get out of it? What did you think you could do?

HAYES: Well, there was a big problem with what to do with the Long Beach tidelands money. And I saw in it an opportunity to meet a challenge. So I decided, "What the heck? Let's see where it goes. I'll go. I'll only run for one term and see what happens."

VASQUEZ: What were the opposing sides of what to do with that money?

HAYES: Well, the state of California wanted it all. And various other sections of the state felt that Long Beach was greedy. But I felt that I could do some things to preserve a considerable portion of it for Long Beach. And I had some ideas of what we could do that could fend off the opposition. In other words, prudently use some of the money so that all of the state could come down and benefit from things that we'd put

together. I, ultimately, was able to put those forward.

VASQUEZ: The people that backed you at that time, did they have interests in how that tidelands oil money was spent?

[Interruption]

All right. I was asking you whether any of the people that were involved in convincing you to run for office and helping your campaign had a particular interest in how that tidelands money was going to be apportioned. And what was going to be built either in or outside of Long Beach with that.

HAYES: Well, yes. They all had an interest. The people in Long Beach were very interested. These were all businessmen and women in Long Beach who were very interested in seeing that the tidelands revenues were pretty well spent in and around Long Beach. For public purposes, of course, but in the Long Beach area. So they definitely had a political ax to grind in that respect.

VASQUEZ: And you had strong feelings?

HAYES: Well, I had strong feelings about that, too.

I . . .

VASQUEZ: You were living in Long Beach by now?

HAYES: Yes. And I had my law practice there, too.

VASQUEZ: What kind of practice?

HAYES: Just a general civil practice.

VASQUEZ: So you became a congressman.

HAYES: No. An assembly . . .

VASQUEZ: A councilman, I'm sorry.

HAYES: Councilman.

VASQUEZ: And you became vice mayor.

HAYES: Yes. Because I was elected by 4 to 1 over my opponent. And I came into that office with a high degree.

VASQUEZ: Who was your opponent?

HAYES: That was Andrew Baird.

VASQUEZ: We got that.

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: Okay. And then you became vice mayor?

HAYES: I immediately became vice mayor.

VASQUEZ: How did you move up to be mayor?

HAYES: Well, I was acting mayor because the mayor happened to be quite ill most of the time. And so by reason of being vice mayor, I was participating as mayor.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about your mayoral experience. Your

tenure there as mayor. What was the biggest issue? Did you affect. . . . Were you able to affect tidelands?

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: How?

HAYES: Well, we were able to get at that time a suitable division of the proceeds approved by the legislator and the then governor. And so Long Beach was really quite happy with that. And I worked. . . . By reason of being a lawyer, I worked with the city attorney in drafting the language of that legislation and the contract that we made with the state pursuant to it. One of the other things that I am proud about being instrumental in doing was working toward and getting the Disneyland architects to develop the sites for the tidelands-oil islands that are in the Long Beach Harbor. I felt that there shouldn't be indiscriminate drilling, unless they could be highly disguised. And so we were able to get approval of those designs with the waterfalls flowing. So that they look like little resorts from the coastline.

VASQUEZ: Why don't we come back to this? We'll pick it up

here the next time that we meet.

HAYES: Oh, fine.

[End Tape 1, Side B]

[Session 2, May 12, 1990]

[Begin Tape 2, Side A]

VASQUEZ: When we last talked, we were talking about your tenure as the acting mayor of the city of Long Beach. Tell me again your recollection of the importance of the tidelands oil, and the revenues thereof, for the city of Long Beach at the time that you were there.

HAYES: Well, since the tidelands oil came from in and around Long Beach, the intent of the tidelands legislation was to allow Long Beach to have a considerable portion of that revenue in order to develop things in and around the harbor areas for the benefit of everybody who came to visit Long Beach. There were harbor facilities. There were marina facilities and things of that kind. And the tidelands revenue was a requisite [in] allowing that to be done [without having] to assess the taxpayers of Long Beach for that particular expenditure.

- VASQUEZ: How did access to that revenue skew the power relationships of certain individuals or interests in Long Beach?
- HAYES: I'm not sure what you mean.
- VASQUEZ: Well, did it provide pockets of influence that otherwise might not have been there? And how did that affect city government?
- HAYES: I don't think it did. Everybody--that is, everybody in Long Beach--in any position of authority was pretty much supportive of the things that the tidelands revenue would be able to develop for Long Beach. There wasn't a power struggle as to where certain funds were to go. It was pretty much a uniform decision.
- VASQUEZ: Were there any outside forces? People outside Long Beach that tried to make their influence felt on how those revenues would be used?
- HAYES: Not to my knowledge.
- VASQUEZ: Tell me the role of the Press-Telegram in Long Beach politics.
- HAYES: It was a very vital role.
- VASQUEZ: In what way?
- HAYES: The publisher of the Press-Telegram was one of the movers and shakers in Long Beach. His name

was Hank Ridder, and he participated very actively in meetings and let his views be known.

VASQUEZ: Who were some of the other power brokers at the time in Long Beach?

HAYES: Well, they were--let's see--Sam Cameron, who worked for Hank Ridder; Henry Clock; George Hart. There were others, but they're just not springing to mind right now.

VASQUEZ: Who did you find most helpful as mayor among these individuals? And who was, perhaps, less than helpful?

HAYES: They were all pretty much helpful. There wasn't. . . . As I say, there wasn't a power struggle within the group to dominate in any way. They were pretty cohesive and supportive. And pretty unified in their support for particular projects. They were very interested in preserving the downtown complex, to prevent all business from fleeing to the suburbs as it had done in Los Angeles and other cities. They were very active to see that that did not happen. They weren't against the suburbs, but they wanted to see the downtown area vitalized and preserved

as much as possible. That was the reason for the heavy activity in the Port of Long Beach, to make it a very viable port. And the reason for the ultimate development of Shoreline Drive, and now what has now become Shoreline Village in Long Beach. Which is a very economically viable project.

VASQUEZ: What was the relationship that you had with your assemblyman and your senator and your congressman as mayor?

HAYES: Well, a friendly working relationship.

VASQUEZ: Who were those? Who were the respective . . . ?

HAYES: Well, the congressman at the time was Craig Hosmer. The assemblyman was Bill Grant. There was only one state senator for all of Los Angeles County at that time, and his name was Richard Richards. I don't recall any dealings with him during my tenure in the city.

VASQUEZ: Did you ever have occasion to go to Sacramento to lobby or to try to influence legislation or decisions that affected your city?

HAYES: I think I went a time or two. But not very often.

VASQUEZ: What was your most memorable experience--positive

or negative--while being on the city council and as acting mayor of Long Beach?

HAYES: Well, I think the most exciting time was the fact that we developed the oil islands, which were just off the coast of Long Beach, and developed them in a very aesthetically beautiful way. This was really my insistence at the time. I didn't want to have people drive down Shoreline Drive and see a bunch of oil derricks going up and down. Oil wells. And so my colleagues shared that with me. So we were able to get architects who developed the project in a very aesthetically beautiful way.

VASQUEZ: Tell me why you decided, or how it came about that you decided, to run for the state assembly?

HAYES: Well, before I had run for the city council I had already run for the state assembly and lost that election by a relatively small amount of votes. When George Deukmejian elected to run for the state senate-- By that time, you see, the senatorial districts had been expanded in Los Angeles County. He opted to run for that new state senate seat, which meant that the assembly seat opened up. So I ran for it.

VASQUEZ: Why?

HAYES: Well, I was interested in it in the first place when I ran before, and I decided that this was a chance to make it.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about the Thirty-ninth Assembly District.

HAYES: You mean what the make-up of it is?

VASQUEZ: Right. As you remember it. Its geographic configuration. Its demographic configuration. What was attractive about it to you?

HAYES: Well, it was in the eastern section of Long Beach and also included the little city of Signal Hill. And I think the number of registered voters was about equal between Democrats and Republicans. But it had traditionally been a Republican seat. And so I felt that if I could get the Republican nomination, I could pretty well win the election.

VASQUEZ: Right. The Republican registration at the time was around 51,000. Democratic, around 53,000.

HAYES: Right.

VASQUEZ: But when it came down to elections, all Republicans could field around 50,000 votes. The Democrats, at best, could do 30,000.

HAYES: That's about how the way it always worked out.

VASQUEZ: Is that right? Tell me what you remember of George Deukmejian as an assemblyman for that region.

HAYES: Well, he was primarily an anti-crime legislator. So I remember he introduced bills along that line when he got into the legislature. I'm not too sure that he got any of them passed. [Those] of any major nature, anyway. But he was a hard worker. And I think he was an effective legislator.

VASQUEZ: When you ran, did you pick up on his law-and-order tradition?

HAYES: No.

VASQUEZ: What were your issues? Do you remember?

HAYES: Well, I was more interested in social issues and in trying to improve the environment and in working on things related more to improving justice from a civil standpoint.

VASQUEZ: What does that mean?

HAYES: Well, improving the laws relating to non-criminal matters. I was serving on the Judiciary Committee which dealt with civil law, not criminal law. And so I. . . . So I geared my attention toward those kind of things. I don't

remember now all the bills. But maybe you have them.

VASQUEZ: Oh, yeah. We've got all that. Tell me about your impressions on your first getting to Sacramento as a freshman assemblyman. What kind of orientation you got, if you got any. And what kind of people, what group you gravitated towards.

HAYES: Well, speaking first of orientation, I thought it was a wonderful touch that they provided some of us new legislators. . . . And there were quite a few of us, as I remember. I think there were about thirty new assemblymen that year.

VASQUEZ: You were in the class after the Baker decision¹ was expanded in the senatorial, and also . . .

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: . . . brought in a whole bunch of new assemblymen.

HAYES: Correct. I think largely because of the urging of Jesse Unruh, several of the lobbyists made it possible for us to have an on-site view of several sections of the state. We went on a bus

1. Baker v. Carr, 369 U.S. 186 (1962).

tour, literally, from south to north. And I think we stayed overnight at Santa Maria. And then we'd gone somewhere else. We toured [the state] and saw all of the. . . Well, we saw the water projects underway, and, generally, got a good visual inspection of things that had been done in California. Which helped me very much.

VASQUEZ: Was it the first time that you'd seen some of these things?

HAYES: Oh, yes. Yes, it was.

VASQUEZ: Was that the same case with some of your colleagues?

HAYES: Oh, yes. One of those colleagues, interestingly, was [Senator] David [A.] Roberti. He was very, very quiet. I don't recall that he said one word during the whole trip. He was a very, very quiet young man. I don't recall all of the others. I believe [Assemblyman] Paul [V.] Priolo was on the trip.

VASQUEZ: In my interview with him, he talks about this same bus ride.

HAYES: Does he?

VASQUEZ: It seemed to have been very impressive to him as well. What was your impression of the assembly

leadership under Jesse Unruh?

HAYES: I thought Jesse Unruh was a very effective leader.

VASQUEZ: In what way?

HAYES: No nonsense about legislation. And he believed in the committee structure. That is, when bills were referred to committees, he expected the committees to deal with them. There was never-- to my knowledge, in any committees I served on-- any effort on his part to control bills. And in that respect, I found it very enlightening. I had known Jesse before. He is one of the ones I had dealt with as a city official. And he was always very interested in tidelands legislation. So I knew him before I went to Sacramento.

VASQUEZ: Did your being of different parties have any limiting effect on that relationship?

HAYES: Not at all.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that.

HAYES: Well, I had a talk with him before I went up there, and he asked me what committees I wanted to serve on. And I had indicated I'd like to serve on the Judiciary and the Transportation

[and Commerce] committees.

VASQUEZ: Both of which you got on.

HAYES: Both of which I got on.

VASQUEZ: In fact, you were vice chairman of
Transportation.

HAYES: He made me vice chairman of Transportation, not
at my request, but he did it. And that gave me a
great deal of incoming effectiveness. And I
liked that post very much.

VASQUEZ: Was this a common treatment of Republicans by
Jesse Unruh at that time? Or were you a certain
kind of Republican that he felt he could work
with?

HAYES: Oh, I'm sure the latter. He felt he could work
with me. But there was never any precondition
made by him as to what I should do or what I
should work on. I mean, it was. . . . Jesse was
never heavy-handed in his approach to anything.
I don't recall he ever asked me to give him a
vote on any particular legislation during the
whole time he was speaker. Or even after he was
not the speaker.

VASQUEZ: Were you among the group of Republicans that he
could count as loyal opposition? But someone

that he could count on in important legislation?

HAYES: I don't think so. I think he would, you know, pretty well know how many of us would vote on bills. But if he felt he could count on us, he never expressed it that way to me.

VASQUEZ: Was there any time that you and he were on opposite sides of issues?

HAYES: Oh, on the budget. And I'm sure there were others. But they don't stand out.

VASQUEZ: Let me get to a more general question then. Tell me what your impression was, at the time, of the role that partisanship played. And did that change over the period that you were there in the legislature?

HAYES: Partisanship played a big part in the budget. But on other key things. . . . Yes, there were other things. Particularly as it related to programs by Governor [Ronald W.] Reagan. They became many times partisan issues. I just can't recall them right now, which ones they were. But they would evolve that way. I think there was a change that happened about my mid-tenure there. About . . .

VASQUEZ: 'Seventy, it would be.

HAYES: Yes, at the time that the Republicans were in the majority.

VASQUEZ: Under Speaker [of the Assembly Robert T.] Monagan
. . .

HAYES: Right.

VASQUEZ: . . . for a short time.

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that.

HAYES: For one term.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that.

HAYES: Well, I think Monagan blew it.

VASQUEZ: How? How so?

HAYES: Well, I don't think he was able to generate enthusiasm and support for Republican candidates in the various districts where he went to speak, or to encourage people to go for the Republican candidates. We had the majority at the time. A slim majority. And some of us really urged him to use many of the other members of the legislature to help out. And it wasn't done. He wasn't enthusiastic for that. And as a result, we lost the majority.

VASQUEZ: Tell me of the relationship that the leadership of the Republican caucus in the legislature--and

specifically the assembly--had with the governor, Governor Reagan.

HAYES: Well, I wasn't in that caucus position. You mean, the caucus chairman? Or the . . . ?

VASQUEZ: The membership. The Republican membership.

HAYES: I think the membership itself was. . . . You know, we did everything possible to try to support things that the governor felt was important. And, in that respect, we had a pretty good relationship with him. There were times when we disagreed. And some of us would go down and talk with the governor. I was one of those from time to time. He was very open and willing and sometimes changed his position. If we felt we couldn't support him, he was pretty stubborn and would want our support. But when it became evident that many of us couldn't support it, he would back off.

VASQUEZ: Give me an instance of an issue or, perhaps, even a piece of legislation where Republicans couldn't support their own governor.

HAYES: Well, he. . . . I can remember the issue of withholding for state income tax. The governor was extremely adamant for a long time over that

issue. And many of us thought that would have solved our fiscal crisis to have the withholding in place. And we urged that he make a change. For a long time he wouldn't. But then he did. He did give in and allowed the change to be made to withholding. And that was a big move.

VASQUEZ: At least one prominent member of the Republican caucus membership, but in this case caucus, has complained that it was very difficult to have a relationship with the state house. That there was very little consultation on the part of the governor and the governor's staff with Republicans in the state legislature. And, thereby, many times it cut the effectiveness that Republican programs might have had. What's your observation on that?

HAYES: I don't agree with that. It wasn't that way as far as I was concerned. I know there were complaints about it in the caucus by some of the members. But I just don't think some of them went about it right. And . . .

VASQUEZ: Give me an example if you can think of one.

HAYES: Well, they tended to antagonize people. [John] Jack Lindsey was the governor's legislative

representative. And he was very able and was constantly there. He was on the job. And if the Republicans weren't in the position to support the governor on an issue, you talked to Jack Lindsey about it. If he wasn't able to get the support, he would then arrange for us to go down and talk to the governor. And the governor was remarkably well informed on most of these things. Contrary to what some people say was "detached," I didn't find him detached at all.

VASQUEZ: That was going to be my next question.

HAYES: Not at all.

VASQUEZ: What was the role of people like William Clark or [Edwin] Ed Meese [III] in that administration in the day-to-day, hands-on managing of government?

HAYES: Well, I never found that the governor was detached from any of the issues. He may have been briefed by his people. And, indeed, I think he was. He believed in what they called the "mini memo" system.

VASQUEZ: Which was?

HAYES: Well, you put the issue up at the top of a page. And on the left side, you number and put the pros. And opposite that number, you put the

cons. On each issue. That's how he liked to have things synthesized for his consideration.

VASQUEZ: At the risk of sounding unfair, was this something that could fit on a 3 X 5 card?

HAYES: Oh, no.

VASQUEZ: [Laughter]

HAYES: No. These were sheets of paper.

VASQUEZ: You know what I'm referring to . . .

HAYES: Well, those were . . .

VASQUEZ: . . . the popular notion that everything that he did was off of 3 X 5 cards.

HAYES: Well, he had a speech that didn't vary very much, and that was mostly on the 3 X 5 card. But even though he gave the speech over and over, I found it inspiring to hear him. [Laughter] He had a remarkable delivery.

VASQUEZ: But you felt that he had a grasp, pretty much, of the subtleties of issues that were before the legislature?

HAYES: I felt he did. And I felt the greatest accolade he received was the one from Jesse Unruh, who said, "I've never misjudged anybody so much in my life as I did Ronald Reagan." And so, you know, I . . . And I have to say, I went to Sacramento

thinking Ronald Reagan was going to fall on his face.

VASQUEZ: Did you?

HAYES: Because he was inexperienced. He knew nothing about state politics. Or any politics, really. But he was a remarkable success story, I believe. And he became, as he went along, much more effective. I think one of the mistakes he made was not calling on some of the members of the legislature besides George Deukmejian to formulate his legislative program. That antagonized a lot of the old-timers up there who would have liked to have helped him. And George was relatively a newcomer up there. He was a brand new state senator. But here he was formulating the governor's legislative program.

VASQUEZ: Why do you think it was he and not someone else of, perhaps, greater stature or longer tenure that was called upon?

HAYES: Well, I'm sure he solicited that position.

VASQUEZ: You mean, he was an ideological choice?

HAYES: He might have been. I don't know.

VASQUEZ: Evaluate then the Reagan administration--the two administrations, say--and compare them with Pat

Brown or anyone else you'd like to.

HAYES: Well, I wasn't there during Pat Brown's. I went up there with Reagan.

VASQUEZ: No. But you were active in politics in the state of California.

HAYES: Yes. I was familiar with what Pat Brown did. I thought Pat Brown was a good governor. And he did a lot of valuable things for the state. The water program. Getting water to southern California, I think, was a critical and vital decision that we're still benefiting from today. We still need more. He was an entirely different governor from Reagan. He was a hands-on governor in every instance. I found him to be. Reagan dealt with issues that needed to be dealt with. But he didn't deal with details.

VASQUEZ: Contrast for me their social programs and your adherence to either one of the two. How do you characterize yourself?

HAYES: Well, I feel that I'm more moderate than Reagan on social programs. He went up with. . . . He became governor with the preconceived idea that welfare was bad and that it should be eliminated. And he pretty much carried through

that theme. Although I'll have to say that had he not made reforms in the Medi-Cal program--he did it and has never really taken credit for it--the state today would be totally bankrupt. But he urged and got people to go forward, and we did make Medi-Cal reforms. And that, I think, was a great asset. As I say, he has never taken credit for that. I don't know why.

VASQUEZ: What role do you think [Assemblyman] John [G.] Veneman had in any of that?

HAYES: John Veneman was very influential in that area. He had forged out that position. I think he was chairman of the Revenue and Taxation Committee at the time. And he is the one who alerted the governor and others to the fact that the state was going to have severe fiscal problems unless Medi-Cal was reformed. And so . . .

VASQUEZ: There was a case in which he made the argument that the state Medi-Cal fund was in danger of bankruptcy. Then after hearings and after several months went by, it turned out there was an accounting error. And this was after many people had been dropped from the rolls to receive benefits. Do you remember that incident?

HAYES: Not off-hand, no.

VASQUEZ: Okay. Tell me about the relationship between the assembly and the senate when you were there. Especially your first term.

HAYES: Well, I had trouble with a senator named [Senator Randolph] Randy Collier.

VASQUEZ: Why?

HAYES: [Laughter] Well, I had. . . . I was vice chairman of the Transportation Committee. He was chairman of the Senate Transportation Committee. And I was . . .

VASQUEZ: He was called "Mr. Freeway," wasn't he?

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: "Mr. Highway"?

HAYES: [Laughter] He was. . . . He had carried a bill which allowed farmers to be exempt from the gas tax for the transporting of their implements or equipments from one spot to another. And I had introduced a bill allowing the public transportation companies--and the private transportation companies--who had to use the freeways partially in taking care of their transportation services to be exempted from the highway tax.

Randy Collier got his bill through his

senate committee. Of course, he owned the committee. Or, rather, he controlled the committee. And it came over to the assembly. In the meantime, my bill on exempting transportation companies went over to the senate. And while I was walking up to present my bill, he said, "Mr. Hayes, we've already considered your bill. And the bill is dead." You know, I was a lawyer with considerable trial experience. But not ego. And I said, "How could it be dead without a hearing?" And he said, "Because that's what the committee has decided." Well, the thing is, I had had as co-authors of the bill the majority of the members of the Senate Transportation Committee, all of whom sat silently while Randy Collier made his comments.

So I picked up my marbles, went back to the assembly, and called a special meeting of the committee since it was near the end of the legislative session. And we amended my bill into Randy Collier's bill. And it was passed unanimously by the committee and adopted by a vote of about 71 to nothing on the floor of the assembly. This meant it had to go back to the

senate for action. That action was either concurrence in the amendments, rejection of the amendments--which meant it would go to a conference committee to decide how to work out the problems--or killing the bill. And of those options. . . . Do you know this story?

VASQUEZ: I want you to tell me.

HAYES: Okay. Randy Collier got up on the floor of the senate and killed the bill. And afterwards, I went over and talked to him. And he said. . . . I said, "You know, I think we both had good bills. And I hate to see that you did this, this way." He says, "Well, I knew I was dealing with a one-termer. So I don't care what you've got to say."

VASQUEZ: [Laughter] Just like that?

HAYES: Just like that. So that's the way that session ended. The bill. . . . Both bills were killed. The next year when I came back up to Sacramento, Randy Collier had a call in for me when I got to Sacramento. I went over and had a very friendly talk with him. He said, "Jim, there's no reason for us to be fighting on anything. I've seen you're a pretty tough cookie. I think we'd do

better if we work together. So what do you say we work together?" He put out his hand and we shook. And he was one of my best friends for the rest of the terms. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: That is a good story.

HAYES: It's true. It was written up in Cry California.¹

VASQUEZ: Right.

HAYES: Virtually that way.

VASQUEZ: Right. Right.

HAYES: But I had other good relations. My very first bill was a bill that provided that when a person was relieved of the civil service position to which he had been appointed as a result of governor's appointment selection. . . . When that person was changed and then went back to his previous position, he would not have to go back to the same department. There could be a lateral transfer elsewhere. That meant that it wasn't necessary that they be there looking over the shoulder of the new appointee. That went before the Senate Governmental Operations Committee.

1. Simmons, Bob. "The Freeway Establishment." Cry California 3, No. 2 (Spring 1968): pp. 31-38.

The notorious bill-killing committee that always met the night before the "hearing"--hearing in quotation marks--and made all the decisions as to what they were going to do. I had no idea what they were going to do with this. But Senator [Joseph M.] Joe Kennick was on the committee. And he was sort of my mentor in those things as they went to the senate. And he said, "Just let me handle it. Don't make any waves. Just come to the meeting and be very accommodating. Don't be challenging." So the committee was then chaired by Senator [Eugene J.] McAteer. And when the bill was called, he very politely asked me if I had a few comments I'd like to make. And I said, "Yes. And if you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them." And he says, "Well, just what does your bill do?" And I explained what it did. He then made the comment. . . . He said, "Well, we on the committee have studied that. And we think you've got a good bill. Is there any objection?" So he said, "Okay, Mr. Hayes. The bill is out, 'do pass.' Congratulations. I understand this is your first bill." [Laughter] So it was a thrilling moment.

- VASQUEZ: Or that things had been taken care of behind the scenes?
- HAYES: Well, I don't know. I suppose. There was really no political problem with the bill.
- VASQUEZ: What prompted you to introduce a piece of legislation like this?
- HAYES: Well, I thought of it on my own. Because one of the . . . I can't remember [his name]. I think it was the resources department head under Pat Brown. [He] was a civil service member and he had been appointed to that position. I knew Reagan was naming a new man, and I knew that the Brown appointee was going to be the next one in the department. And I just figured, you know, that this was going to be a difficult time for the new appointee. So I came up with the idea. I mentioned it to the governor's man, Jack Lindsey, and I got the governor's support on it. Just quietly. And that's where it went. That's the bill out in the front. It shows the first bill signed by Reagan in the . . . The first bill of mine signed by Reagan in the 1967 session.
- VASQUEZ: What do think was the most important piece of

legislation that you passed in that first session?

HAYES: Well, that was one. The one that I just mentioned. I honestly can't remember the others. Everything blends together. I don't remember what happened in one year.

VASQUEZ: In which session? Let me ask you to comment on fellow members of the Judiciary Committee, of which you became chairman of in 1969. Your second session. Is that right?

HAYES: Right.

VASQUEZ: [Assemblyman] Jack [R.] Fenton. Tell me about Jack Fenton. What do you remember about him on that committee?

HAYES: Well, Jack was a very active member. He later became chairman the following year, following me. He was very supportive of my legislation. The Judiciary Committee was not really a partisan-type committee. The members dealt with the merits of a bill. And I like that. As I recall, Jack was always supportive of the positions that I took and of the measures I introduced.

VASQUEZ: What about [Assemblyman] Walter [J.] Karabian?

- HAYES: Oh, very supportive. Walter Karabian was totally supportive.
- VASQUEZ: Assemblyman [W. Craig] Biddle?
- HAYES: Craig Biddle was very supportive as well. I can't really think of. . . . Well, you can tick off the other members.
- VASQUEZ: How was [Assemblyman Walter W.] Powers, [Assemblyman Patrick D.] McGee, and [Assemblyman Harvey] Johnson?
- HAYES: Walter Powers did not attend meetings very well. Pat McGee was supportive. I don't really think Pat had his heart that much on committee work. But he was, you know, a hail-fellow-well-met. Pat liked to have a good time with legislators and others. Who was the other one?
- VASQUEZ: Harvey Johnson.
- HAYES: Harvey Johnson was very hard working. He was very diligent and attentive. Very supportive.
- VASQUEZ: Your first term, or perhaps the whole time that you were there, did you live in Sacramento? Or did you commute?
- HAYES: No. I lived at the El Rancho [Motel]. In a little room.

VASQUEZ: Did you go up there by yourself? Did you take your wife?

HAYES: I wasn't married at the time.

VASQUEZ: You weren't married at the time. What was your impression of who was most effective? Those people that had their families up there? Or people that went up on their own? Who could do the legislative job better as you remember?

HAYES: Well, I certainly don't think there was any distinction as to whether the family was there or not. I think there were just some that were more interested in working on bills, and others in doing things for themselves. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: I asked you that because . . .

HAYES: I can't really separate the two to give you an intelligent answer to that question.

VASQUEZ: It was a period, some have said, where it was the fellows that were out with the boys at night that could, many times, get things done. And that they bonded relationships that carried over to the legislative agenda. Perhaps more than those people who were more aloof or more removed from that sort of thing.

HAYES: I think that's probably true. That's probably

true. And that's why I worked harder. Because I didn't do that. Oh, I would go out for an occasional dinner or something like that, but. . . . And I'm not trying to pontificate or anything, but I didn't really enjoy that type of life. And I really loved the give-and-take and the working on and the persuading of people to my cause. Whatever it was. So I used to get down to my legislative office, you know, as early as seven o'clock in the morning. And [I'd] formulate things and figure what I was going to do to get my forty-one votes in the assembly or my twenty-one in the senate. And I would literally go talk to everybody on a particular bill. If I didn't meet them in their office, I would talk to them on the floor. Either of the assembly or the senate. And I think that's why I was able to get things through. People respected my work.

[End Tape 2, Side A]

[Begin Tape 2, Side B]

VASQUEZ: Give me your impression of. . . . What were your impressions when you got up there of the quality of the people that were serving with you as legislators, as thinkers, as speakers. Any way

that you. . . . Were you surprised? Were you satisfied? Were you disappointed?

HAYES: Well, let me see. I was somewhat surprised that there was not very much creativity in thinking by the fellows that came up there--and the women--who were legislators. Some of them were pretty content just to follow whatever. They didn't come up with any innovative ideas or thoughts. And I felt that was kind of a waste. But as time went on I began to, you know, understand that that's the way people are. And that I had no right to try to foist what I thought the people should be doing onto them. I changed my judgments.

VASQUEZ: Did you?

HAYES: That's right. So I figured, you know, it was If I wanted to come up with a new or a different idea, it was up to me to try to persuade the others to go along with it. Not worry about what they were doing. And so that's the way I did it. And I became very happy in that conclusion. I did that early on, by the way. It only took me about three or four months to realize that was the case.

But there were always some who liked to get up on the floor and talk and pontificate on almost anything, you know. But I found that talking on the floor of the assembly is like talking to yourself.

VASQUEZ: Why is that?

HAYES: Nobody is listening.

VASQUEZ: [Laughter]

HAYES: Not even the press. The press may be listening for some catchy phrase or something that can result in some quotable quote. But I didn't feel that that was very beneficial.

VASQUEZ: Do you think there's more or less attention given by the press on what goes on in Sacramento today?

HAYES: Well, not being there, I'm not sure. And, of course, the L.A. Times doesn't really carry the legislature that much. So I'm a little out of touch on what they do now. But--of course--when I was there, television stations and everything else were there. Channel 2, Channel 4 had stringers up there. And San Francisco and Sacramento stations all had television. And the then Examiner, [Los Angeles] Herald Examiner, had reporters. And the L.A. Times, I think, had

three or four reporters in addition to the Associated Press, the United Press. Very, very skilled reporters. Many of whom are in very important positions today. I met them when they were reporters in Sacramento.

VASQUEZ: Who do you remember as the more prominent or more respected reporters at the time?

HAYES: Well, on television--because of southern California--I liked Warren Olney, who was there for Channel 2 at the time. The newspaper reporters was [Robert] Bob Schmidt of the Long Beach Press-Telegram. And, of course, I was very interested in him because he was representing the hometown newspaper. He was very careful to follow what I was doing, and he did a very accurate job of reporting. George Skelton represented the, I think, United Press at the time. I see now he's reporting for the L.A. Times. Jerry Gilliam was another L.A. . . . He was an L.A. Times reporter. There was another L.A. Times man by the name of. . . . He's now retired. . . . And I can't think of his last name. [Robert S. Fairbanks] An older gentleman who retired. He was very serious and hard

working. And there were women reporters, too. Tracy Wood, who is now a reporter for the L.A. Times, worked for the Associated Press.

VASQUEZ: Do you feel overall that the press was fair on their coverage of what went on in the legislature at the time?

HAYES: By fair, do you mean if it was complete?

VASQUEZ: Was it complete? Was it accurate? Was it biased?

HAYES: Well, I think the press was accurate most of the time. I think much of the reporting was not that complete. And that's why I rather liked the Sacramento Bee reporters. Because they covered the legislature like a blanket. And they covered. . . . They covered every significant bill as it moved through legislative committees all along the way. And those reporters were very good reporters.

VASQUEZ: But did that help you outside of Sacramento?

HAYES: Not at all. Not at all. But I'm just saying, you know, while you're sitting there waiting for bills to be heard, you can read the Sacramento Bee and pretty well know what's happening all through the legislature.

VASQUEZ: Did that, in fact, become a means of communication?

HAYES: Oh, yes. Oh, very much so.

VASQUEZ: Across the aisle? Across the chambers?

HAYES: Oh, yeah.

VASQUEZ: All right.

HAYES: Oh, yes.

VASQUEZ: Do you remember James [R.] Wrightson?

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about his writing.

HAYES: Oh, he was a very lucid, clear-headed writer as I remember. I can't remember specifically about what he wrote on. But . . .

VASQUEZ: Did you ever plant stories? Or try to plant stories?

HAYES: No.

VASQUEZ: Or try to tip people off to stories that should be covered for the purpose of helping your legislative agenda?

HAYES: Well, I issued news releases.

VASQUEZ: But beyond that?

HAYES: No. I never. . . . You know, did I try to urge a reporter to do a story? No. Never did that.

VASQUEZ: Was it a common practice?

HAYES: I had been in the news business before.

VASQUEZ: That's right.

HAYES: So I knew [they] would react probably adversely. You know, I'm not. . . . I wasn't trying to make my own record.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about the relationship of the legislature at the time that you were there with the "Third House," the lobbyists. Characterize it in general first.

HAYES: Well, I think it was a very cordial relationship at the time. I don't think it was an adversarial one at all. And I think my recollection of feeling toward it--and I assume that's what you're interested in, too--was a cordial one. I never found the lobbyists that were working up there were doing anything other than informing us of various positions. It wasn't a, you know, "If you pass this bill, you're going to ruin our client's business" or anything. It didn't do that. They would clearly indicate what the effect of the bill would be and what aspects of it were good or what aspects were bad. And I, frankly, felt it was a very enlightening experience. I never . . .

VASQUEZ: So it was information that you wanted and needed?

HAYES: Yes, I never had to make commitments to them as a result of that.

VASQUEZ: Lobbyists have come to be seen in the state as the purveyors of money and special interests.

HAYES: That's because . . .

VASQUEZ: And consequently a corruptive influence on the state legislature. What's your assessment of that?

HAYES: Well, I think what has happened is the legislators themselves have solicited that type of thing. I think they are to blame. I don't think that lobbyists, per se, like to dole out money. But I think when they get requests to buy tables at \$5,000 a table, and they might be representing companies that are coming before a particular committee, they feel impelled to have to make the donation or else. I think it's very bad. I think it would have been much better if there could have been more detachment [between] the legislators and the lobbyists who were pushing for a particular legislation. It just doesn't. . . . It just smells bad. And, of course, that's the problem that some of the

legislators have run into up there.

VASQUEZ: Does that speak to a declining morality or to a more corrupt kind of a person that has become the legislature? Or does it speak to the cost of running for and keeping an office?

HAYES: Well, the latter is what is used as the excuse for it. The fact that campaigns are expensive, and that in order to deal with the constituency, you have to do this and that. But, really, all legislators are interested in is getting reelected. You know. I was, too. So that's no evil in and of itself. But I think when it becomes evil is when you solicit the very group that you're supposed to be impartial towards in weighing their bills. And you find that you've got to be partial toward them, because they contributed to your campaign. And I think it's just like night follows day. One begets the other.

VASQUEZ: But isn't that the same whether it's a lobbyist or whether it's a private individual? People are going to expect something in return for their money.

HAYES: I don't think there's any difference really.

But, of course, if it's a private individual, what do they expect to gain from it? You see. That's, I think, the distinction.

VASQUEZ: You've let . . .

HAYES: If it's good government you get as a result of contribution, then I don't think there's a similar taint to the giving of the money. But if you're putting through a bill that benefits a certain group and that group has made a major contribution to your campaign, I think that's when the appearance of impropriety becomes overwhelming.

VASQUEZ: Some people have argued that the professionalization of the legislature, in addition to the large staffs and the amount of information that these staffs can provide a legislator. . . . But a legislator depending for a living only on his legislative salary and/or contributions and/or honoraria, that that has produced poorer quality of government than the old citizen legislature model. The amateur legislator. What's your assessment of that?

HAYES: Well, of course, this was the Jesse Unruh modification that we see up there now. And I

think the initial concept was very good. I think probably they've gone beyond even what Jesse Unruh had in mind. I don't think he intended that there would be such heavy staffing of committees. Nor did he believe that legislators had to devote full time to serving in the legislature. I didn't. I was able to continue to keep my law practice. I wasn't able to do much with it, but at least I was able. . . . I had my law partnership going. And that provided me. . . . It supplemented my income so that I could do it.

Yes, I think the fact that many of the legislators devote a lot of time and don't have any other source of income leads to a bad influence and a dependence on something else to get their money. Whatever they need to live. The thing about it that becomes bad is you get wined and dined and you get treated very royally. And the temptation is, "If I'm so royal, why don't I get some of the royalties of it?" It happens to a lot of legislators. They just get overcome with the fact that they're in a position of importance and they should be getting

more money for it. And in some ways, well, that's a human frailty. But I don't think it's an excuse for something that leads to corruption --or near corruption. And, yet, that's what has happened.

VASQUEZ: Let me ask you this. It's sort of the individual-or-the-system type question. Do you feel that the quality of our legislators has deteriorated over the years?

HAYES: I . . .

VASQUEZ: Since you were there?

HAYES: I don't think so. They're, you know. . . . Every human being is different from another. But I think, by and large, that they're probably just about the same. I read the ratings that came out the other day in the California Journal. Which I read all the time. And I see, you know, there are a lot of hardworking legislators up there. A handful. Which is about the way it was when I was there. So I think it probably. . . . There's a constancy to it. The curve remains the same.
[Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Why then are there what seems to be cycles of concern about corruption in our legislature? And

the stagnation of dealing with difficult issues? And the need for reforms and ethics bills and all of that, if there's a constancy, do you suppose?

HAYES: Well, those types of things go on regardless of who's there. What they're trying to do is to deal externally with things that probably should be dealt with internally.

VASQUEZ: Explain that to me.

HAYES: You're trying to externalize and put the Band-Aid on the problem of correcting the temptation to corruption and all those things by having an ethics bill. Or to have a conflict of interest disclosure. And all of those things. Those are trying to deal with human behavior externally. People have got to consider more deeply the election of people who, internally, believe that way. Not to have to be forced to believe that way by reason of the adoption of those items of legislation dealing with it. And so you say, "Why does that continue?" I say it continues as long as people are elected to office without having internal control over their taste, habits, desires, and ambitions. And I don't know whether

that can ever be controlled.

VASQUEZ: I was going to ask you that. How much control is enough control?

HAYES: Well, I don't know. I don't know. But that's why you say, "The cycle continues."

VASQUEZ: In looking at the history of California politics over, say, a fifty- or sixty-year period, you see these cycles come and go. Calls are made for a reform of this or that. The need for a Fair Political Practices Commission. The need for an ethics bill. Then there seems to be a period in which you don't get as much of that, and then again there's a rise of attention to this. And I'm wondering where you think that comes from. Is this media hype? Is it cycles of bad guys? Is it the need every once in a while to purge politicians? I'm sure you must have thought [about] this.

HAYES: Probably all of the above.

VASQUEZ: All of the above, huh?

HAYES: I have no magic answer to that question. But I think that, just like anything else, if you have a constancy of the attention on a particular issue, everybody gets tired of it. You get

anesthesized. Even the reporters get tired of writing about it. So that's why you don't hear about them. And there are only a very small handful of reporters that really make the big news. Whether it's in Sacramento or Washington. There are just certain key reporters that make the news. And if they choose not to write about something, or to talk about it, there's a . . . It's not an issue anymore. So the cycles come, I think, as interest flags on a particular issue. Then it rises again when something happens, like the FBI [Federal Bureau of Investigation] sting. And the legislators then jump into action and say, "We must do something so we can restore public confidence in us." And so they come up with an ethics bill or whatever. But it won't, in my judgment, change human behavior.

VASQUEZ: Let's be more specific. The Fair Political Practices Act¹ and the ensuing commission. Do you think that has made politics any more honest? Any cleaner in California? Any more

1. Proposition 9 (June 1974).

dependable?

HAYES: I suppose it's done that a little bit because of the strictures of it. Campaign reporting and all that sort of thing.

VASQUEZ: Some analysts have said it has been a boon for lawyers and that the professionals, especially big-time lobbyists, have made out like bandits. Whereas the smaller interest groups haven't been able to keep up.

HAYES: Well, they've allowed the Political Action Committee things to explode all over the place. And, you know, that's just a subterfuge for everything. So. . . . But it has had probably a slight salutary effect because people don't want to violate the law. They don't want to be charged with crimes or have to pay penalties or things like that. So I think there have been some. But, you know, even so, a lot of the major legislators have been stung by fines and penalties.

VASQUEZ: Republicans, traditionally, have argued against limits on campaign spending. Arguing that because traditionally they have had a lower registration, they would be at a disadvantage if

there were too many strictures on the amounts of money that they can raise. And that money sometimes makes up the difference for the lack of numbers and, say, registration or organization. What's your reading of that? What's your position?

HAYES: I think that's probably true. Again, the problem--particularly in California--in running for political office is getting your name identification to a sufficient number of people so that they'll think of you. And then continue to educate them to your positions, so that maybe they'll vote for you. That takes money. You can't. . . . The day of going door-to-door is a thing of the past. In the first place, people don't want to be bothered at the door anymore. It's too dangerous! You never know who's going to threaten your life or anything. So people don't want to be interrupted in their activities in the privacy of their home. So you have to get there some way. So how do you get there? Either through the mailbox or through some television commercial. And those. . . . Or radio commercial. Those are terribly expensive. So as Jesse Unruh

said, "Money is the mother's milk of politics."
And without it, you don't get nurtured.

VASQUEZ: So it's going to be an ongoing, necessary evil?

HAYES: I think so. I don't see any public financing of political campaigns in the future. I don't think either party wants it, really. So . . .

VASQUEZ: How about spending limits?

HAYES: Well, the spending limit then benefits the incumbent. And I think if you want to have an eternal incumbency for the life of the legislator, spending limits is the way to keep that person in office. And I don't think that's a good idea. There probably could be a happy medium of limiting terms of office. I'm not saying how many terms a person should serve. But there probably should be some limitation.

VASQUEZ: There's been a proposal before.

HAYES: And certainly an age limitation.

VASQUEZ: Really? Tell me about that.

HAYES: I don't think people are effective in their eighties and so forth in public office. You then become an institution, and people will respect you for that, but I just don't think you're effectiveness is as great. And I think, you

know, a person should move aside and let others do it. You shouldn't feel that you're annointed to remain in office until you drop dead. I think you should spend your time and then move on.

VASQUEZ: There is before us, or there will be before us, a proposal to limit the number of terms that a legislator can hold office. What is your sentiment about that?

HAYES: I'm not sure what its limitation is.

VASQUEZ: Six terms.

HAYES: Well, it's a move in the right direction. Is that [State Attorney General John K.] Van de Kamp's? The one he's pushing?¹

VASQUEZ: Right. Right. There were several versions of it.² But I think Van de Kamp's is the one that probably will have more attention.

HAYES: Well, I think it would be of some merit to have a limitation. I'm not sure that's the correct number of terms. Again, you know, if a person is

1. Proposition 131 (November 1990); measure limiting number of consecutive terms a public official can serve (defeated in election).

2. Proposition 140 (November 1990); measure limiting total number of terms a public official can serve (passed in election).

already in advanced age when he gets elected the first time, it could be very ineffective if he goes through six terms in the post. [Laughter] So I think age is a factor.

VASQUEZ: There's another phenomena . . .

HAYES: I think some legislators go up there too young.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that. Give me an example.

HAYES: There were some who were too young, I think. And they, therefore, aren't able to do very much. There isn't the right amount of seasoning or understanding or just basic understanding of life when they go up there. I think it's a mistake for people to get elected in their twenties. I think there should be some seasoning of life before you go up there.

VASQUEZ: As a general rule?

HAYES: As a general . . .

VASQUEZ: Some of our more illustrious legislators went up there at twenty-seven, twenty-eight, twenty-nine.

HAYES: I know.

VASQUEZ: [Laughter] Let me ask you about another phenomena that's taking place, that draws a lot of commentary. It's something called "in-breeding." There's a growing instance of people

going up as interns to an assemblyman, for example.

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: Then becoming a staff member on that assemblyman's staff. Then becoming chief of staff. And then before you know it, that assemblyman moves on to the senate or to the Congress, and they are the incumbent or the other candidate that becomes the incumbent. Do you see anything wrong with that?

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: What?

HAYES: Well, it's the . . . You said it when you introduced this as in-breeding. I think you . . . I think the particular offices need a little spontaneity. A little variety, if you will. I don't think there should be an inside track developed as a result of being close to a particular legislator for a long period of time, and then inheriting--if you will--that post by reason of that closeness. I don't care for it, frankly.

VASQUEZ: Well, the argument in defense is that these people, by the time they do become incumbents,

have a real understanding of the process and of government and they don't have to bumble around for a term or two trying to learn the ropes. Convincing?

HAYES: No. There isn't a need to bumble around for two or three terms. The legislative process isn't that difficult to understand. The helping hand--you can get to know where the restrooms are--is very easy to develop. And all the rest of it. By that, I'm being facetious. Of course, you know the way a bill goes through is not a difficult process to understand. And you certainly understand that to get bills through, you need a majority vote on almost all of them. And on some, those that we call money bills, require two-thirds vote. Well, all you have to do is know how to count. And there isn't any magic formula to working with people. It's up to you. So I find it a very specious argument to say, "We should always elect people who know the ropes." Sometimes the ropes tie you up.

VASQUEZ: [Laughter] There's another question that comes out of this. And that is, both at the national and the state level, we're seeing what appears to

be a stagnation in the dynamics and the innovation and creativity of legislators. And there seems to be a parallel movement of an increasing number of incidents when crucial issues that need to be decided are decided on by initiative. What's your reading of that? Does that make for more democratic lawmaking? Or does it indicate that we are increasingly getting legislators who are afraid to deal with the crucial issues of the day?

HAYES: Well, you said a lot of truths in there. I think that it's unfortunate that there's not much creativity in legislators today.

VASQUEZ: Why do you think that is?

HAYES: Well, to be creative tends to create controversy. Most legislators are interested not in controversy so much as in reelection.

VASQUEZ: Survival?

HAYES: So it's a survival issue. Yes. So rather than ripple the waves or do anything, they'll keep the lake as calm as possible. You do that by not introducing legislation. And that becomes pretty much a way of life, whether it's in Washington or Sacramento or wherever. And I think that's what

has unfortunately happened. And how do you change it? There isn't much incentive for the truly creative person to leave private society and get into government. I've talked to many competent younger persons and tried to induce them to become involved politically. And they don't want it.

VASQUEZ: What are their arguments?

HAYES: Pardon?

VASQUEZ: What are their arguments?

HAYES: Well, their arguments are, you know, "Why should I do it? Why should I go there and work with people that aren't interested in really doing anything to make changes? What are the benefits that will come to me? There is certainly not enough money to do it. And if there's not satisfaction to go along with it, why should I sacrifice myself and my career and my family life to go through it?" Now, I happen to. . . .

I went to Sacramento at a time when I was single and I could work at it. And I literally enjoyed it. But many of the legislators are not in a position to do that. And I understand why they're not in a position to do that. Because of

their individual circumstance. Because of their family situations and everything. So they are able only to take the very un. . . . [Pause] Well, let me put it in another way. They take the course of least resistance. And so you don't get much creative things done. And that leads to the initiative process. I don't think the initiative process is altogether evil. It is a way to get things done. And heaven knows what we would have in California if we hadn't had, for example, Proposition 13¹ to limit, you know, property taxes. It's overused and, in many cases, abused. But it's a way to overcome legislative inertia. And so . . .

VASQUEZ: Is it a more democratic or less democratic way of doing things? The initiative process, and depending on it?

HAYES: Well, it's clearly democratic because it's a vote of the people. But whether it's a proper way to do things, I find it very questionable on that. I think that corrections and changes require the give-and-take of a legislative process. And the

1. Proposition 13 (June 1978).

things can be formed better. I have particular reference to the Coastal Zone Act,¹ which I happened to support. I supported that initiative because the legislature did nothing.

Then I became a county supervisor and served on that commission the minute it became law. I served on the [South Coast] Regional [Coastal Zone Conservation] Commission. I then was elected and served on the state [California Coastal Zone Conservation] Commission. The thing [was], the initiative was silent as to how the commissions were to function. So we had to work with the attorney general to formulate the way the commission functioned. We had to spend months putting that together. That was absent in the initiative. That shouldn't have been the case. It should have been more carefully crafted. And all those things should have been taken into account and spelled out very carefully. As it is, it was rather cumbersome in the way that it functioned for several months. I guess it's improved as time has gone on.

1. Proposition 20 (November 1972).

VASQUEZ: That's one of the criticisms of the spate of initiatives. That too often multi-subject, rather than single-subject initiatives, get passed. But then all they do is tie the issue up in the courts for another year or two.

HAYES: Exactly. Well, that's what is happening with the insurance initiative right now. Nobody knows where that thing is now. You know, I follow that as much as I can. I don't even understand what they're doing.

VASQUEZ: Some people are frustrated by the fact that one industry can basically overrule the vote of the people of California. Do you feel that frustration? Or was it just that it was a bad initiative?

HAYES: That industry can overrule . . . ?

VASQUEZ: That one industry.

HAYES: You're talking about the insurance initiative?

VASQUEZ: The 103.¹ Right.

HAYES: Well, I think in. . . . There were definite reforms necessary. I don't know whether that initiative was the answer. As I recall, there. . . .

1. Proposition 103 (November 1988).

Weren't there five initiatives?

VASQUEZ: Right.

HAYES: And this was one of the . . . This was the one that passed. As I say, I think like all initiatives there's a lot left to be desired in the composition of initiatives when you come to implementing, whatever they were supposed to do. And that's what the defect is there, as I see it. If I were a judge listening to these things, I think they would drive me up the wall trying to figure out how to make sense of what to do. And I don't know whether we can blame the industry for it. The industry is in the business of insuring against things. And they have to figure that they're insuring against the likelihood of certain things happening. And if their exposure becomes too great, they won't be in business very long. And they won't do anybody any good. Whether they should be totally controlled and regulated, like a state-run insurance fund, well, that's another issue.

VASQUEZ: How do you come down on that issue?

HAYES: I don't think there should be a state-run insurance. I don't believe the state should be

in the business of running insurance or really a lot of other businesses as well.

VASQUEZ: As someone that was successful, in addition to having good ideas and being a hardworking person, but whose appearance and whose presentation was very important, too--I think you'd agree it was important to your success--has appearance and form overcome substance in California politics? What do you think? The use of media and the use of image?

HAYES: Probably. You were referring to political campaigns now?

VASQUEZ: Political campaigns.

HAYES: Well, I think . . .

VASQUEZ: And political styles.

HAYES: I think so. I think there's altogether too much attention given to less important matters, by reason of whatever the media consultants decide to do for a particular candidate. We see it happening now in the Democratic candidates for governor. I don't see where the two differentiate on very many points. And, yet, the media's been able to work it out, so that there's something like eleven or fifteen points separating

the two right now. I don't know. I don't know how to explain it. But they're not dealing with the basic issues that need to be dealt with over what is important to California for the next ten to twenty years. They're only talking about . . .

VASQUEZ: So what does it do to political discourse?

HAYES: Well, it weakens it. It waters it down. We're not really. . . . I don't even know. . . . I doubt if they even know what they would do themselves. Because nobody is suggesting to them, you know, "Give us your battle plan for the next ten years." Assuming that you're in office that long. Or at least the next eight years. Which would be two terms. Nobody is saying that. Or asking them for things. You know, "What are your views on abortion? What are your views on . . . ?"

VASQUEZ: The death penalty?

HAYES: ". . . death penalty?" Those are those things. Little specific blips. You don't have anything to do with the long-term thing.

VASQUEZ: Are both parties equally guilty of this?

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: Did it bother you that a Republican would win the

presidency--not perhaps totally, but in large part--because of the characterization of one black man in 1988? The Willie Horton image. I think most political analysts agree that that had a great deal of impact on that campaign.

HAYES: Well, I don't. . . . It didn't have any influence on me. But I didn't care for that being characterized the way it was. But in political campaigns, they don't particularly care what issue is the one that galvanizes the public's interest.

VASQUEZ: The objective is to win?

HAYES: I'm not sure exactly what you asked me now. What did you ask me?

VASQUEZ: Well, you're a Republican.

HAYES: Whether I liked what was done?

VASQUEZ: Your party, I think has. . . . I'm not saying that it's more to blame.

HAYES: Oh. We don't endorse. . . . We don't, as a party, endorse things that a presidential candidate might do.

VASQUEZ: I'm leading up to something. And that is, you consider yourself a moderate Republican. There used to be people on the political horizon that

would identify with that. Whether it was a [Nelson] Rockefeller or a [United States Senator Thomas M.] Tom Kuchel. But it's harder to find Republicans that seem to hang out in your neck of the woods. Why? And what has that done to the political discourse, say, at the state level?

HAYES: Well, I think there has been a swing in the so-called party structure to the conservative right-wing element of the party, if you will. But there are a lot of people within the party who are moderates who just aren't speaking up as much as they could or should. I characterize the moderates as those who, you know, do have considerable compassion for their fellow men. And I think there are a lot of Republicans that . . .

[End Tape 2, Side B]

[Begin Tape 3, Side A]

VASQUEZ: Go ahead. We were talking about moderate Republicans. A seemingly invisible species in California, but you were naming some. You had started out with Senator . . .

HAYES: [United States Senator] Pete Wilson, I think. Because he's dealing and willing to deal with

some critical issues. And I think has the correct vision on a lot of things. You're asking me for others?

VASQUEZ: Uh-huh.

HAYES: [Pause] I can't think of any offhand.

VASQUEZ: Maybe we'll come back to this later in the interview.

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: But I thought maybe we can at least get into one today, one area of legislation that you did make a mark--a definite mark--in California. And, of course, I'm referring to your legislation on the dissolution of marriage. [It] reformed and, many consider, civilized the dissolution of the marriage process. Tell me how you came to that? And why you decided to get involved in that area?

HAYES: Well, I had been a lawyer and had seen the farce that was necessary in order to get even an uncontested divorce. The evidence that was necessary to be presented in court. And the corroboration by a witness who, in many cases, would have to dream up evidence of either infidelity or cruelty as the grounds [for

divorce]. There were seven grounds at the time. I knew that the senate and Senator Donald [L.] Grunsky, who was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee at the time I was chairman of the Assembly Judiciary Committee. . . . Senator Grunsky was prepared to introduce, and he did, a bill calling for social workers to deal with all matters of domestic problems. And I felt that was entirely the wrong approach. So I took . . .

VASQUEZ: Why?

HAYES: Well, because I didn't think, and still don't, that social workers have any magic formula for dealing with family problems.

VASQUEZ: They represent the state, don't they?

HAYES: Yes. And many of them, even under his bill, would not have been adequately trained to deal with individual issues or to settle family and other kinds of disputes between the parties. So I felt all it would be doing would be creating another heavy layer of bureaucracy and wouldn't civilize the relationship between the parties at all. So I worked then with my two staff persons on the committee and literally wrote the Family Law Act. And I determined after talking with

Justice Louis [H.] Burke of the California Supreme Court, who was very interested in the subject, how to characterize the ground for dissolution of the marriage. His idea was that I should call it "an irremediable breakdown of the marriage." But I didn't like calling it a breakdown. An irremediable breakdown. It sounded too negative. So after working on it for weeks and weeks, finally one night it came to me as I was in my assembly offices. Really, what we're trying to do is reconcile the differences if they can be. If not, to describe them as "irreconcilable differences." I literally came up with the words.

So that's what happened. I put it in that way. So there are two grounds only. Irreconcilable differences and incurable insanity. Those are the only two grounds for dissolution of a marriage. So I put that together. And Senator. . . . Are you going to ask me how it became law or anything like that?

VASQUEZ: Yes, I am. I'll let you lay it out as you want. I'm interested in who supported you. Who didn't? Did you have problems with other

Republicans on this? You know, what groups came forth to oppose you? That sort of thing?

HAYES: I worked on the bill very carefully. And I worked with various groups. And worked particularly with the Catholic church representatives.

VASQUEZ: Do you remember who?

HAYES: You know, I don't. But . . .

VASQUEZ: Or what offices?

HAYES: It would be all in my committee files. And they're all in Sacramento. But the archdiocese in Sacramento was very interested and very supportive. And they all realized that what I was doing was taking perjury out of the courtroom. And Father Leo McCallister was the chaplain for the assembly. And he would frequently come by and talk to me. And I would informally discuss with him different things. And, ultimately, I had the support of literally everybody in all of the groups in putting it through. I got the . . .

VASQUEZ: Go ahead.

HAYES: I got the bill through the assembly. And as I recall, the only eight votes against it were all

Republicans. And then I was able to get it through the senate. And I don't remember the vote in the senate. But I had amended my bill into Senator Grunsky's bill. And it infuriated him at first. And then when he realized that was the only way that a bill was going to get through, because I told him no way was his bill going to get through the assembly, he reluctantly supported it. But he never really had his heart in it. I don't think he cares for it today. [Laughter] But it passed. Then I had a great deal of trouble with Governor Reagan to get him to sign it.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that.

HAYES: Well, he felt that it was changing things. And changing things a little too quickly. He felt that I should have allowed more lead time to get it into operation. And that perhaps I ought to let him veto it and go over it again. I told him, no. I was absolutely convinced that it was necessary. Everybody was supporting it, and I told him. I ticked off all of the supporters. I had about a one-hour session with him. And I came away with his agreement to sign it. But it

was uphill. He felt that there would be a Las Vegas-type flooding of divorces. People would just file indiscriminate actions.

VASQUEZ: I remember the debate. It took the extremes from, "We will become the Las Vegas of the country," to "It's an imminent breakdown of family."

HAYES: None of which happened. As a matter of fact, you know, there was a slowdown of breakups after that. But, of course, my most important legislation was the year following when I got through the bill requiring counseling prior to marriage where one of the young people is under the age of eighteen, I think it is.¹ And that became applied statewide. And that led to a major reduction in dissolutions. I had already held hearings on that and found that 40 percent of the marital breakups occurred when the young person--one of them in the marriage--was under eighteen years of age at the time of the marriage. Forty percent of the marital failures were in that category. I really wanted the

1. A.B. 402, 1970 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 474.

counseling to go up to twenty-one. But I couldn't get it through. The legislative committees wouldn't go quite that far. So I figured, you know, if I was going to be up there-- and I planned to be up there for a considerable period of time--I figured in a session or two, I could get the age increased. And, thereby, bring about more heavy thinking before people got into marriage.

VASQUEZ: Since 1969 and 1970, we've gone through a considerable shift in public opinion in this country toward a more conservative--a more right-wing, if you will. . . . At least in discourse, if not reality, of return to basic values. I'll put it another way. Do you think that the climate at the time was conducive to something like this? Do you think you would have more opposition today if you were trying to pass something of this magnitude?

HAYES: Probably, yes. It probably would have been more difficult today. The people that are involved in the anti-abortion thing would probably have militated against it if it were. . . . Well, either way, it would have. . . . The pro-choice

would have been on one side, and the anti- on the other, in this particular case.

VASQUEZ: Apart from the wanting to extend the counseling, was there anything you would have done differently? Or that you would do differently about this issue, were you legislating it now?

HAYES: With the basic Family Law Act itself?

VASQUEZ: Uh-huh.

HAYES: No. I don't think so. Oh, maybe as it relates to a division of the property. I think the courts have gone overboard with this mathematical computation of dividing fifty-fifty. My idea was that there should be an equal division similar to the breakup of a partnership. And that that division should be in every possible case fifty-fifty. But the courts have gone to using computers and everything else, down to the last nickel and dime, to calculate exactly what that 50 percent was. I would probably have put in the law some provision to allow a wife who had been married for a long time to be able to get all her educational or training experience completely compensated to prepare her for the new life. And then to allow--perhaps, in the case of

the breakup of husband-wife business, where business is broken up--for some adjustment or alleviation of the problems that are caused when you try to take a meat cleaver and cut a business in two. There have been some harsh results that have come as a result of it.

VASQUEZ: But overall, you've been pretty satisfied with it?

HAYES: I'm extremely satisfied. Of course, it's been adopted in all the states now. And many of the European countries. And, you know, it took the foolishness out of the law that had been put there by King Henry VIII. That's where it all started. The placing of fault as a means of accomplishing a termination of the marriage.

[End Tape 3, Side A]

[Session 3, June 30, 1990]

[Begin Tape 4, Side A]

VASQUEZ: Mr. Hayes, when we were last talking, we were trying to get you to come up with a list of names of what you consider to be Republican moderates active in California politics. I'm wondering if you had time to think about that list and add more names to it?

HAYES: Did I start the list already?

VASQUEZ: Yes, you did.

HAYES: At what time?

VASQUEZ: Oh, in the last twenty-five years. We had named . . .

HAYES: Local and . . . ?

VASQUEZ: No. No. State. The state Republican party. Moderate leadership in the party or representatives of the Republican party that espoused or embraced moderate approaches to policy, government. Would the name of Paul Priolo be fair?

HAYES: I think Paul was more conservative than moderate. I believe [Assemblyman Robert G.] Bob Beverly, [Assemblyman] William [T.] Bagley, [Assemblyman] John [G.] Veneman, Robert H. Finch, who was then lieutenant governor. . . . I'm trying to think of some who were in both the assembly and the senate. I like to consider myself in that category [of] moderate. I don't think of any right now. The others were either conservative or very conservative.

VASQUEZ: What set you apart from conservative Republicans?

HAYES: Well, I consider a moderate Republican one who has some compassion, one who has concerns for the poor or those who are downtrodden and who actually and sincerely tries to do something about it. And I think those persons I mentioned are in that category. And many of the others who were serving were Republicans that I tried to work with to try to educate [were] in that category. It's a difficult thing to bring compassion into a person's psyche. I found that [out] during my political years that a lot of people even became more hardened. For example, Pete [Peter F.] Schabarum on the [Los Angeles]

County Board of Supervisors, when he was in the legislature and later when he became supervisor, is very hard line on the so-called compassionate people issues. I found that a very bad thing for the Republican party.

VASQUEZ: Why?

HAYES: Well. . . . There's no corner on compassion, and I think a Republican can be as compassionate as a Democrat and still fit within the framework of the party. And that's what I try to do. I try to mold that particular image for Republicans.

VASQUEZ: Where does the compassion come from?

HAYES: Well, actually . . .

VASQUEZ: From people understanding issues?

HAYES: I have to say during my early years I didn't feel that welfare programs were even necessary, because it appeared to me that we were supporting the indolent and those that weren't really interested in bettering their lives. And that the best thing to do was to cut it out and let them fend for themselves, as they had done for hundreds of years. But after I became involved politically and, particularly, as I served in the legislature, I found that as a result of

testimony given in public hearings and my readings and talking with people, that it was just too hard for some people to make it. And that we did need to help and prepare the way. And to eliminate discrimination and to eliminate the impossibility in job applications of people who could not qualify for those jobs because of the types of questions that were asked.

I held lengthy hearings during one of my committee tenures as chairman of the Public Employment Committee into the discriminatory approaches of applications for jobs and for the upward mobility once people got into those jobs. And I found that it did exist. Discrimination did exist. And we did a lot in rewriting internal rules and regulations to make changes in the way that questionnaires were prepared and the way job applications were presented to applicants. The words were changed. And it was made--I believe--easier to understand and less likely to discriminate against those who couldn't fill them out very well.

VASQUEZ: Where do you suppose this hardness that we've

seen in the last ten or fifteen years--and perhaps going back even further--has come from?

HAYES: Well, I think people get very upset about paying high taxes and feeling that it's going to support somebody that isn't interested in carrying his own weight. And it's a bias and prejudice that grows. People have that prejudice. They talk to friends and relatives. That increases the prejudice, and it goes on and on that way.

I think that what people should do is to look at the underlying cause of why people are in a certain condition and then try to work toward eliminating it. . . . I realize that's perhaps an impossible dream, but I think it is possible to find out how to help people and how to allow them to increase their effectiveness in life. Mainly it comes about by getting ourselves to understand why people are there and what they need to do to get out.

VASQUEZ: This is perhaps chronologically out of order, but I think it might be a good entry point into this discussion. You've been involved at the local level in the overhaul of the juvenile justice system and juvenile-related crime. Is this the

approach that you take to understand, let's say, gang-related activities and juvenile delinquency?

HAYES: Yes, that's exactly what I tried to do. I made special visits to a juvenile hall and interviewed the juveniles myself.

VASQUEZ: In your capacity as . . . ?

HAYES: As county supervisor.

VASQUEZ: Okay.

HAYES: And, no, I didn't do this when I was in the legislature. It was not until I became county supervisor. But I found out in those interviews with these young people that they were in a cycle that they couldn't break out of. That once they had been tainted with juvenile crime and juvenile activity and periods of time in juvenile hall, they became marked. And as a result . . .

VASQUEZ: Marked by whom?

HAYES: Marked by the authorities. By the police. By the juvenile authorities. So that whenever any crime was committed that might be in some area where they lived, all of them were swept [up]. All of those who had any kind of record--and I mean arrest record, not necessarily conviction record, but an arrest record--were scooped up.

And it increased their arrest record by reason of doing this. They would then become cynical with the system, especially if they knew they hadn't done anything or if they hadn't even been anywhere around where a particular crime had been committed. Many of them adopted the attitude that, "Well, if I'm going to be accused of this, I may as well do it." So they became more and more involved with gang activities and participated actively as a gang member from then on.

I tried to figure [out] a way to break them out of the cycle--give them opportunities for education. For example, in one situation at the ABC Unified School District, I developed a program. I happened to be chairman of the Department of Superintendent of Schools of L.A. County at the time. So I could do this without even having to go anywhere else. And this program provided for the absolute hard-core juveniles--ones who had long, long arrest and conviction records--to participate in a job education and job training program. In other words, learning what the job was and preparing

themselves to do the job at this school facility, after which there would be a job to which they could go. And during my period in office when that program functioned for about two or three years, dozens of juveniles went through this program. And while I was there, not one of them went back into crime. They got jobs, and they continued in them. I kept in touch with them until I left as county supervisor, after which they dropped the program--the board of supervisors.

VASQUEZ: It sounds from what you're saying that you believe in rehabilitation?

HAYES: No question. I think there is possibility of rehabilitation for every human being. I didn't see it as a very profitable experience for the taxpayers to be prosecuting and convicting day after day. All that we were doing then was feeding the entire criminal justice system. By that I mean juvenile officers, the court facilities, the social workers, and the camp directors as well as judges. Creating a system that fed on this juvenile crime. I felt it was money better spent for the taxpayers to eliminate

that thing and also to create some value out of the human life that was here.

VASQUEZ: I ask you that question on rehabilitation because you seem to be running in direct contravention with at least some conservative Republican views on the matter over the last ten or fifteen years here in California. Is this another thing that sets moderate Republicans apart from conservatives?

HAYES: Well, I never considered myself "counter" to Republican principles in doing that. I just felt that I was doing something that I felt the rest of my colleagues should be participating in more. And I hope that by setting some kind of example in this direction and, in effect, proving my case, that I would be able to persuade them to do likewise in whatever fields they chose to maneuver in. I hoped to trigger their thinking.

VASQUEZ: Did you?

HAYES: To give them other ideas? Well, unfortunately, not that much. I think it was more that there was too much [conservative] thinking, and it's not necessarily Republican thinking. My Democratic colleagues on the board of supervisors

weren't interested either in seeing anything done with juveniles. Their attitudes were generally, "Well, they're bad apples. So lift up the rug and sweep them under. Let the juvenile authorities take care of them and quit bothering about it. They're no good anyway." I felt that was reprehensible. But that was pretty much the attitude.

VASQUEZ: Tell me something. Is it possible that a system like the juvenile system--the juvenile judicial system--begins to take a life of its own and almost has to justify its existence and even its growth, and, perhaps, overstates the problem of juvenile delinquency sometimes?

HAYES: Well, that's a point well taken, I think.

VASQUEZ: Let me give you an example of what I'm talking about.

HAYES: Okay.

VASQUEZ: Over the years in Los Angeles County, or in the city of Los Angeles at least, there has been a median or an average reached by those people who collect parking tickets. And from that is calculated how many tickets per officer one should expect. And then taking it further,

revenues depend on that. . . . It is an integral part of the city budget. So that a crisis can even develop if not enough people are given tickets. What happens when people stop committing the infractions that cause tickets and you've got a system that calls for more officers giving more tickets? It's a recent issue in the city of Los Angeles that I'm sure you've heard about.

HAYES: Oh, yes.

VASQUEZ: Can that happen?

HAYES: Well, it did happen. And again, you know, it's something that I think is reprehensible. I don't believe a system should be created that becomes voracious in order not only to preserve its existence, but to create a pyramid of power. Let me tell you another thing that bothered me along that same line. Every year we would hear requests from the sheriff and others for more personnel, obviously to fight crime. Statistics were provided and information given as to what was needed, how many officers were needed on the street, how many patrol cars were needed. The whole justification process. And, of course, on paper it all appeared to be necessary.

But the thing that always concerned me is, as we provided this. . . . And we usually provide the sheriff's request, because how could you ignore it and then live with yourself if you knew serious and heinous crimes were committed because not enough was given to the sheriff, what he said was necessary to fight these crimes? But the thing I never saw coming out of the sheriff's office--or any police agency for that matter--was where crime had been reduced as a result of these efforts and these new expenditures of money. You don't ever see a sheriff or a police budget reduced unless it's done as a result of a meat-ax approach when you're running out of money. And then, of course, the police--everybody--screams to high heavens because safety services are being cut. I just found it very alarming that they--the police and the sheriff--were never able to produce statistics to show that by giving them another twenty or thirty officers, crime was reduced by 10 percent. It never came about. The next budget session, there was always a request for more, not less.

VASQUEZ: And that has continued, hasn't it?

- HAYES: It's progressive. And statistics, I think, are manipulated in order to justify those requests.
- VASQUEZ: Who benefits?
- HAYES: The sheriff and the police department, not the people.
- VASQUEZ: Who loses?
- HAYES: The people lose.
- VASQUEZ: What do they lose?
- HAYES: Well, in the first place, I lost respect for the law enforcement people, because they were never able to show this reduction. And the people lose money, because they have to pay for more and more all the time with not really any effective results.
- VASQUEZ: Might they lose in the area of individual rights as well as more searches, arrests, investigative powers are given to the police? Is that a concern?
- HAYES: Well, hopefully not there, because constitutional guarantees are supposed to prevent that abuse of the investigative process. But, of course, there might be more arrests or quicker response to arrests if there are more police. There is always the argument. "If we can have twenty more

police officers, we can respond to a crime in five minutes. If you don't give us any more, it may take ten, and by that time, the suspect will get away." So, you know, you say, "Well, we'd better give him twenty more officers, so we can get that response time down." I don't know how they could certify that, but that was always what the police agencies would say.

VASQUEZ: Was there any opposition to that?

HAYES: Not really that much, because who is going to speak against it? It's just like speaking against motherhood when you say, "No, you can't have twenty more officers." It just wasn't done.

VASQUEZ: Where does it stop?

HAYES: It isn't stopping. It's still going on. You never see a police or sheriff's agency coming in and saying, "I'm voluntarily reducing my force this year." Never.

VASQUEZ: There's a concern in some quarters of the country today that the drug wars and the drug problem has been, perhaps, inflated into a hysteria. And that the kinds of freedoms or the kinds of powers that have been given the authorities of the criminal justice system may be putting constitu-

tional guarantees in danger, precisely because there's a public willingness to accept cutting corners on civil rights in order to arrest drug dealers. There are bloated police agencies with budgets to buy almost any kind of technology. Or if they don't buy it, they take it in sweeps [drug arrests]. What is your reading of that concern?

HAYES: I think there's a real danger of the deterioration of legal rights [and] civil rights of people as a result of this expansion of law enforcement capabilities in order to reach the drug criminals. It will most likely extend itself over into other areas besides the drug [trade]. . . . It's impossible to restrict it only to the drug traffickers and the drug agents. So I think there's a real danger of the reduction of rights as a result of this. But I would hope that the judicial system will rectify it from time to time as cases arise. The legislatures and the Congress can only go so far. Those limits are proscribed by the Constitution. I don't really practice in the criminal law area, so I don't know exactly the

effect of some of these new provisions that are going into the law.

VASQUEZ: Well, the cumulative [effect] is the concern on the part of some. Let me give you an example.

HAYES: All right.

VASQUEZ: Recently I tried to take a train ride to San Diego with my son who is going to be married soon. On the way to the train station, Union Station--which was always a fun place to go and sort of be awed by the size of the room and the cavernous design of the waiting area--we had to go through a sobriety checkpoint, because, as you know, there are drunk drivers on the streets. Now, of course, sobriety check points the Supreme Court says are not a violation of one's right of movement or abuse of reasonable search and seizure. We got to the train station, and before we got into enjoying that big room, we had to stop at two tables and have our luggage gone through by the authorities concerned with the spread of the medfly. And after we put our things back together, we got on the train, and we had not been more than ten minutes out of the station when the immigration authorities came

down the aisle checking people, especially Hispanic-looking types, for their papers. That sounds like 1940-1945 movie about Germany, not a 1990 excursion in the United States. Is that paranoia?

HAYES: You know, I hadn't heard of this until you said that.

VASQUEZ: This is a kind of everyday occurrence.

HAYES: That shocks me to know that that's going on. I think it's becoming very, very close to Big Brother government, which I find very objectionable. I realize, you know, in this country, which is considered to be a free country, that we do have certain limitations that we have to live within to prevent injury to those with whom we come in contact, whether it be drugs or whether it be the medfly, or whatever--or the mexfly, I guess, is now going on. [Laughter] But I think, you know, there has to be a swing of the pendulum back toward a little more moderation. And I think eventually it will take place. I am, to say the least, shocked by the story you tell me. I had never heard that before.

VASQUEZ: It's just an everyday occurrence in some parts of the city, perhaps not in all parts of the city. But on any one weekend, you have to pass through these sobriety checkpoints, and everyone--not any particular individual--has to have their luggage gone through for some kind of fruit. And, of course, technically anybody has to show proof of legal immigration status. But I'm wondering if over a period of time, this incremental control and investigative process mitigates the freedom of movement guaranteed by the Constitution?

HAYES: No question. There's a danger, and it should be prevented. Perhaps I ought to run for public office again.

VASQUEZ: Perhaps you should. [Laughter] Perhaps you should.

HAYES: To stop it.

VASQUEZ: Maybe your Republican colleagues would argue that this is good. This is the way to protect America. That we are under attack constantly.

HAYES: Even some Democrats.

VASQUEZ: In fact, even Democrats who are not quite sure exactly what they are. . . . But they're clear about that. That's well defined.

HAYES: Right.

VASQUEZ: Well, I was trying to get some kind of a reaction from you on that as I try to distinguish or lay out the differences between a moderate and conservative Republican in California politics. What many of us have come to see as sort of mainstream Republicans, which are the more conservative type of Republicans.

HAYES: I don't really consider them the mainstream of the Republicans in California.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that.

HAYES: The mainstream of the Republicans are the ones you don't hear from. Those are the ones who work day-to-day, are concerned about how to make a living, how to get to and from work--[and that] their transportation problems are taken care of. The rank and file of those Republicans are conservative in so far as fiscal matters are concerned. They don't like to see heavy taxation. They don't like to see increasing problems in the community that are not being taken care of in the most efficient manner. Those are the things that the rank and file of the Republicans concern themselves with.

The so-called hard-line or conservative part of the party-- And, you know, I can tick off some, like [Congressman Robert K.] Bob Dornan and [Congressman William E.] Bill Dannemeyer, a couple of congressmen. And some in the state legislature, like [Assemblyman] Gil Ferguson and. . . . I don't think of the others right now, but those type of people are the ones that are more or less the Neanderthals of the party. I don't think that any amount of education could change their views. They happen to be in office. And having gotten in office, they are able to stay there, because Republicans don't disturb Republican incumbents once they're there. That's in lots of ways unfortunate.

VASQUEZ: Is that the "Eleventh Commandment"?¹

HAYES: Well, that's part of it. We saw a bit of it in this particular assembly district two years ago.

VASQUEZ: What's the number?

HAYES: I believe, it was the Fifty-first Assembly District now being held by [Assemblyman Gerald N.] Felando. He had a primary fight from Deane

1. "No Republican will criticize another publicly."

Dana, Jr.--son of the supervisor Deane Dana--who made a run at the Republican nomination. He was able to obtain nearly \$1 million--that's Deane Dana, Jr.--from his father in order to finance his campaign.

VASQUEZ: For an assembly seat?

HAYES: For an assembly seat.

VASQUEZ: In the primary?

HAYES: In the primary. To defeat Felando. He put on, you know, a rather biting campaign. Most of which were centered around the fact that Felando is a Republican, had cozied up a great deal to Willie [L.] Brown, Jr., who was the Democratic speaker. And that he wasn't really in line with what Republican thinking and action should be, because he was trying to protect his own perquisites in Sacramento by being friendly with the speaker, Willie Brown. The upshot of it is, the campaign by Dana to unseat him lost by a considerable margin despite that infusion of money. And despite, probably, the accuracy of some of the points that Dana was raising. Whether they're meritorious or not, they were probably accurate. But Republicans did not see a

need to unseat an incumbent Republican for that reason. So that's a cogent example that happened in the recent past.

VASQUEZ: Let's talk about at least one other area of legislation that you were involved in when you were in the assembly, and that has to do with the Consumers Legal Remedies Act¹ of 1970. Tell me the background on that.

HAYES: Well, that took place as a result of my involvement as chairman of the Assembly Judiciary Committee. And I had found that there were several bills that had been pending in Sacramento and in Congress in Washington [D.C.] on the subject that hadn't been acted on. So I decided that that would be one of the areas of concern that I wanted to take care of while I was chairman of the committee. So I found out that there was a professor at Boston College in Massachusetts--Boston College being a foremost law school in the country--who had considerable expertise in the whole subject of class suits. So I made a trip there and spent about a week

1. A.B. 292, 1970 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1550.

with him. I wish I could remember his name. But it would be on my records on that bill. We literally drafted the cogent language of that bill, which I brought back with me and introduced in Sacramento. The reason being that I wanted to see if we couldn't curb bad business practices without interfering with the rights of business people. Protecting the consumer. This was almost unheard of in Republican politics.

VASQUEZ: Exactly.

HAYES: And nobody gave me a ghost of a chance of anything passing. But I tell you what I did to get it passed. I convened meetings in Sacramento with every known opponent of the bill: the California Manufacturers Association, California Retailers Association, individual retailers who had powerful lobbyists in Sacramento, the chambers of commerce, and everybody. I think we had about twenty-five people convene for numerous meetings in Sacramento, where I went through every phase of the bill with them after assuring them that my purpose was not to interfere with or cause any problems to the good businessman or the good businessperson.

In other words, I said, "What we're trying to do here is to weed out the bad apples in the business community by eliminating those persons-- by punishing those persons for bad business practices--and allowing the pressure of the class suit, which is a strong impact." A whole group of people would be involved in getting results from that bad person or bad group of people. So the upshot of it is I ended up getting their support when I got through. I did not leave the meetings until I got the pledge and support from every single one of them.

VASQUEZ: On the basis of their self-interests?

HAYES: Of their self-interest and the fact that I was, you know, I was putting a measure through [which] would correct a lot of these bad business practices. You want me to tell you how?

VASQUEZ: Yes, please.

HAYES: What happened, the kind of action [it took] in the legislature. Well, the measure passed the assembly overwhelmingly and then went to the senate. And I remember the first hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee. One of the senators on the committee spoke up to me and said, "Do you

have opposition to this bill?" And I said, "No. No opposition at this time." And he said, "Well, there must be something wrong with it." And I said, "Well, I don't think so. I worked with the opposition for months, and I think the opposition is satisfied that I've made a very fair bill to correct that business practices." And that was it. I got it through there.

VASQUEZ: Who was that senator, do you remember?

HAYES: I was trying to think. I had Senator George Moscone carry the bill on the floor of the senate where it passed overwhelmingly. I think the senator on the committee was a Republican, Senator [Lewis F.] Sherman, who is now deceased. But he was the one who queried me about it. Then, of course, I had the problem with the governor after I got this through. And I made a personal visit to Governor Reagan at the time to persuade him to sign. And he said, "Well, Jim, are you sure that all these people are for your bill?" [Laughter] I said, "No question. I'll even be willing to hold up until you contact them all yourself." And he said,

"No. If you say it's that way, then I'll sign it." So I persuaded a Republican governor to sign the consumers bill, which is the first--and to my understanding--the only one in the nation to this day on this special subject.

VASQUEZ: And definitely the strongest, isn't it?

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: What has been the impact of this legislation in the last twenty years?

HAYES: Well, I have followed that only a newspaper away, but I have noticed. . . . And I happen to have a whole group of books on my shelf now, because I'm developing a class suit myself based on my own legislation. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Is that right?

HAYES: There's a wealth of information on the subject now. One book up there, [by B. E.] Witkin, who is the foremost authority on California law, has a large section in his book on it,¹ and it relates to the subject of class suits. And the Consumers Legal Remedies Act is outlined fully in there, and also how it can be applicable to

1. Witkin, B. E. Summary of California Law. San Francisco: Bancroft-Whitney, 1987.

various situations.

VASQUEZ: Do you find that this has had any impact on federal legislation?

HAYES: Well, I had hoped that there was going to be federal legislation that would follow up on what I did here, because I felt that law should be a nationwide law rather than just a California law. But to my knowledge, it's still being talked about.

VASQUEZ: But for eight years, one of the opponents to it being considered at the national level was the very governor you convinced to sign it in California, who was then the president.

HAYES: He must have forgotten what he did for me.
[Laughter]

VASQUEZ: What other pieces of legislation do you think were critical in your career as a state legislator?

HAYES: Well, let's see. We've discussed the Family Law Act, haven't we? We've discussed the counseling of minors before they get married. I think the other is the Pure Air Act¹ of 1968--which I was

1. A.B. 357, 1968 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 764.

the principal author of--which brought about air pollution control measures for automobiles more stringent than anywhere else in the nation. And that law is still on the books. It's been amended, but California's requirements are considerably greater than those of any other state, much to the chagrin of the Detroit and out-of-the-country manufacturers. But it has made it possible for California's air to be a little bit better than it otherwise would be by this time. We would probably be stifling in smog by now if we had not put controls on oxides of nitrogen as well as hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide.

VASQUEZ: What was the most enjoyable aspect of being an assemblyman? Fulfilling is perhaps a better word.

HAYES: Well, the opportunity of putting through--of accomplishing--the things that you worked on and in which you believed. And I found that I was able to build on that each year that I was there. And, of course, you develop a reputation, just as you do anywhere else in life. And a person's reputation is enhanced with each

success, and it is not lost by any of the legislators there. So they become more. . . . I don't say reliant on you, but they become more willing to believe you as you get up and say, "This is a good bill. This is what it contains." And when you're a straight shooter on things.

VASQUEZ: You build up a little political capital?

HAYES: You build up tremendous capital. And so I was able, I think, with each success that went along to enhance my credibility with my colleagues, which I thought was very good. And I think I could have stayed there in a leadership capacity for many years had I chosen to do so.

[End Tape 4, Side A]

[Begin Tape 4, Side B]

VASQUEZ: Why did you choose not to stay there?

HAYES: Well, the opportunity came along for the position on the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. A position, frankly, I had never even thought of, let alone aspired to. But some of my strong supporters in Long Beach, whom I was then representing then in the legislature, then called me and said that I really ought to consider doing

it. They wanted me to come down and talk to then Supervisor Burton Chase and see if it was something that I would be interested in.

VASQUEZ: Before we get into that, what was the most frustrating or less than fulfilling aspect of being in the assembly?

HAYES: I enjoyed the legislature tremendously, and I don't really think of the less than fulfilling things, frankly. I think there were tremendous opportunities. I'm sure I didn't take advantage of them all, but I enjoyed the creativity of things. That I could put things in--like the Family Law Act and the other legislation--and persuade people to follow what I thought was a good course. There were some things that fell by the wayside, and I suppose that's because I wasn't quite persuasive enough. That's the only less than fulfilling aspect I would describe.

VASQUEZ: What kinds of things do you feel you would have liked to have completed, but weren't able to?

HAYES: Well, I would have liked to have gone back and amended the marriage counseling provision to increase the age level when mandatory counseling would have been required before young people

could get their marriage licenses. I had found that during the lengthy hearings that I held as judiciary chairman that the massive amount of marital failures were brought about by young people who were married without any counseling and who, in effect, entered into a shotgun marriage. I find that to be appalling. I would have liked to have corrected that. That's one big area. And to my knowledge, that hasn't been done yet.

And then, I think, some of the things involving the reform of the welfare system that could and should have been done that I didn't have a chance to complete.

VASQUEZ: Now tell me why you decided to become one of "Five Kings"?

HAYES: Well, I thought about it for quite a while.

VASQUEZ: Who approached you besides Supervisor Chase?

HAYES: He didn't approach me. The group of political supporters I had in the Long Beach area approached me.

VASQUEZ: And this included?

HAYES: Well, it was the ones that I mentioned last time, I think.

VASQUEZ: The Long Beach Press-Telegram?

HAYES: Daniel Ridder, Henry Clock, Sam Cameron, George Hart, George Johnson, and a few others that don't spring to mind right now. And they talked to me, but that isn't what persuaded me to run.

VASQUEZ: What persuaded you?

HAYES: I got a copy of the county charter, because I wanted to see what kind of power the supervisors had. I enjoyed my position in the legislature. I really enjoyed the legislature, and I wasn't just about to toss it aside unless this was truly something better. I read the charter, and I found that the powers of the supervisor were unlimited. And I saw there a chance, maybe, to really accomplish a lot. So that was really what induced me to run.

VASQUEZ: The power?

HAYES: Well, not necessarily the power, but the ability to effect the changes.

VASQUEZ: As a result of the power that you have?

HAYES: Exactly. Exactly. That's . . .

[Interruption]

HAYES: Where was I?

VASQUEZ: We were talking about the power to get things

done.

HAYES: Yes. And so that's really what I persuaded myself after reading that. "Hey, this is really someplace where I can really have some action."

VASQUEZ: Let's mark off the terrain, shall we? Tell me about the district. Give me a thumbnail sketch and the history of that district, your predecessor in that district, and your successor in that district.

HAYES: Well, it's a very diverse district running all the way from Malibu to the Orange County line. All the way from north of Malibu to the Ventura [County] line, clear to the Orange County line, and then inward to Compton. And different economic circumstances and social circumstances throughout. It had a population of about 1.5 million people, about 600,000 registered voters. And the composition of the district was a little more Democrat in registration than Republican. But, basically, according to the analysis of the voting material that I had available, more conservative than liberal in their voting patterns based on previous national and state and local elections. So it appeared to

be, you know, tailor-made for a Republican, particularly a moderate Republican. So I saw it as quite a challenge and decided to jump in the swim.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about the campaign.

HAYES: Well . . .

VASQUEZ: Before we do that, your predecessor was . . .

HAYES: Burton Chase.

VASQUEZ: Burton Chase. Tell me about him.

HAYES: Well, he had been in the office for several years. I believe he was appointed in that office by Governor Earl Warren. He was previously the mayor of the city of Long Beach. The members of the board I found at that time pretty much a group of good ol' boys, who pretty much met on Tuesdays to act on what was before them and left it pretty much up to their department heads how anything was going to be done and what was to be carried out. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chase suggested to me to just be smart in coming on the job and select good department heads, and take it easy and enjoy myself. I just listened to him without criticizing him, but this really turned me off.

VASQUEZ: It did?

HAYES: Absolutely. I didn't say anything to him, but the last thing I wanted to do was just be in the post just to have a job. I could return to the practice of law and have a job. So that was something I totally ignored--his advice that I didn't even put into practice from the first day that I became supervisor.

VASQUEZ: Who succeeded you?

HAYES: Yvonne [Braithwaite] Burke. Following my resignation, I had recommended to then Governor [Edmund G. "Jerry"] Brown [Jr.] that he appoint my former chief deputy Barna Szabo--who was a very talented, brilliant young man--who had done a wonderful job for me as chief deputy for several years. But the governor chose to make the political appointment of Yvonne Burke, which as it turned out was an unwise appointment considering the make-up of the district. And she ran a terribly ineffective campaign and was allowed to be beaten by an absolute political unknown in the Republican party.

VASQUEZ: Who was?

HAYES: Deane Dana, who is still there.

VASQUEZ: How does one unknown do something like that to the Republican party?

HAYES: Well, he ran an extremely effective campaign. He had as his campaign manager a fellow named Ron Smith who exploited every possibility he could and did an effective job doing it.

VASQUEZ: Some people say bordering on racism.

HAYES: Oh, yeah. I don't think there's any question. His newspaper ads fought her. He's in office. And that's all that counts. It's unfortunate that that's the way it was engineered, but this is America, and things are done that way sometimes.

VASQUEZ: The differences in power are obvious. Tell me about the difference between state government and county government that were most striking to you?

HAYES: Well, county government, particularly in Los Angeles County, which is the largest county actually in the world--of this type of government--the supervisors are not accountable except to the people. In other words, there's nobody over them to determine whether what they're doing is right or wrong, except the people at the time of the voting process or in connection with a

recall if that is ever attempted.

In the legislature, of course, before you get a bill through the legislature, you have to persuade forty other assemblymen and twenty-one senators to approve your bill. And then you have to persuade the governor to sign it. In the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisor actions, you need only persuade two other supervisors, and then it is law. So it is a relatively easy process if you know what you're doing.

So I decided to carve out certain things to do, which I followed through and did. But I saw it for what it was after I read the charter and decided it was a chance for me to do some very action-oriented things, which I was interested in doing.

VASQUEZ: So you happened to have a political agenda.

HAYES: Well, I had a political agenda, but I didn't know exactly what specific areas I would work in when I became a county supervisor. I knew that there were serious problems in transportation, in juvenile justice, and in energy. And so I was formulating ways in approaching all of those things when I became supervisor.

VASQUEZ: In fact, your participation on the [various] coastal commissions became something of a pet project, didn't it?

HAYES: Yes. I was in support of the Coastal Zone Initiative. When it came out, I was one of the first elected officials to support it. I think I was the first Republican to support it.

VASQUEZ: Proposition 21?

HAYES: Proposition 20. And the bill passed. Then I was elected county supervisor at the same election. I had been appointed earlier and served for a few months before the election. When Burton Chase was killed in an accident, I was appointed by then Governor Reagan after I had won the primary. But following that period of my appointment, I was then elected, and Proposition 20 passed at the same time. And the coastal zone comprised my entire supervisorial district. So it was logical that I be the one to serve on that local coastal commission, what they call the Regional Coastal Commission. And then when I was elected by my colleagues to serve on the coastal commission, I was then elected by that regional commission to serve as the representative on the

state commission. So I was in the formulation of the whole process from its very early stages in 1972.

VASQUEZ: Let me finish asking you about that. Were you satisfied with the kind of progress you were able to make in the, what, seven years that you were on the coastal conservation commission as a supervisor?

HAYES: Well, I have to say the approach taken by the initiative was sort of a meat-ax approach to the whole thing. And no, I am not satisfied with the way it was done. Because what we in effect did, we stopped everything--even good projects--while everything was held in focus. And that cost a lot of hardship to a lot of people. I felt very bad about that.

VASQUEZ: Give me some examples.

HAYES: Pardon?

VASQUEZ: Give me some examples of this hardship.

HAYES: Well, some of the people would be in the planning stage for their home that would be clearly acceptable under the coastal act, but because of the imposition of the act, a moratorium was placed on it, you know, statewide by the

initiative. So a lot of people were caused undue hardship--financial hardship as well as other hardship. And I felt that was rather bad. We did curb the unholy growth and development along the coast, and I think that was a good result. I think some of the things that were done by the coastal commission--some of it over my objections--were not particularly good.

VASQUEZ: Some examples?

HAYES: Well, there were some building projects in northern California, where some people were able to persuade enough of the members in the commission that they should be stopped. Because of personal prejudices against the people involved in it. I thought it was not an objective view that was taken, but rather a personal view. And I felt bad about that, too. But sometimes when you have a process like this, it's like a monolith and it takes over. And, of course, it's the democratic process that wins. The votes did it. But, I think, by and large, the commission performed its purpose. I think it has outlived its usefulness now.

VASQUEZ: Do you?

HAYES: Oh, yes. I think clearly it should be subject to local control. Once the statewide purposes are resolved and in place, there's no reason why local governments can't provide the necessary impetus for the program.

VASQUEZ: But like the discussion we had a while ago, institutions and bureaucracies at one level or another usually find a way to justify their existence.

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: To the detriment of their initial purpose?

HAYES: Yes, yes.

VASQUEZ: Comment, if you will, on your colleagues on the board while you served.

HAYES: Well . . .

VASQUEZ: Your impression of their capacities and their qualities.

HAYES: A critique? [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Whichever.

HAYES: Well, when I was first appointed on the board and then first elected, the members of the board-- other members of the board--were some longtime people there.

VASQUEZ: Kenneth Hahn.

HAYES: Kenneth Hahn, Warren Dorn, Ernest [E.] Debs, and then, of course, the newly appointed and elected other member, Pete [Peter F.] Schabarum.

VASQUEZ: Was [Edmund D.] Ed Edelman there?

HAYES: No, no. Ed Edelman succeeded Ernest Debs several years later. When you say comment on them, what do you want me to. . . . Are you interested in . . . ?

VASQUEZ: Well, Warren Dorn or Ernest or Pete Schabarum, what kind of vision did they bring to that position, or what style of leadership did they offer?

HAYES: Well, let me just talk about Kenneth Hahn, because he's still there. The longest [tenure], I think, in the history of the county. Kenneth Hahn is a superlative politician. He is more in tune with his district than any other supervisor.

VASQUEZ: How does he do that?

HAYES: He caters to the needs of the people in his district and caters to them whether they need anything or not. He is extremely visible. I would venture to say that if you submitted a questionnaire to the constituents in his district

that would be one question--"Who is Kenneth Hahn?"--90 percent of the district would be able to say. . . . If they couldn't say he was the county supervisor, they would say, "He's a big political leader." He is well known. His name is synonymous with the Second District of Los Angeles County.

Now, he also has a wide-ranging grasp in a general way in a lot of things in the county, by reason of having been there so long--very intelligent--and has that grasp and knows what he wants to do on things. He is what I would consider very liberal, and still at the same time he always supported law enforcement, requests by the sheriff for more personnel, and things of that kind.

He knew how to keep getting elected and re-elected. And he mastered it. As you can see, even though he's only a fraction of the person he was before his stroke, he is still able to get elected over and over. So I think that's a great credit to him. I think as far as creativity and the development of the potential of the county, I don't think that's in his mind at all. I think

he is interested in the here and now. He is the type of person who responds with a knee-jerk reaction to crises that come up.

VASQUEZ: Can you give me an example of that?

HAYES: Well, the roof-burning ordinance.

VASQUEZ: The wooden shingles.

HAYES: On the shingles. His immediate reaction is to ban them all over. And, you know, nobody likes to be burnt up and the like, but you also would like to hear what the reasons for it all are. Whether shingles really are the thing that cause all those fires. Of course, we've had them terribly in the last few days. So it is obvious that they're pretty bad. So, I imagine, in time that will be the case. It will be rectified. But that's probably not the best example I can give. If there were problems, say, in juvenile hall, he didn't approach them with the idea of, "How can we correct them?" He would move for an order directing the chief administrative officer to examine and report on the subject. Which I would consider referring something to a committee. Another report is another report. What I am saying is his reaction to a problem was

to create an appearance of action on his part or on the part of the board. And you know, really, how could we vote against a motion to have the chief administrative officer look into it?

VASQUEZ: That is the person who supposedly knew what was going on, right?

HAYES: That's right.

VASQUEZ: Did he follow this philosophy of getting good managers and department heads?

HAYES: Well, he always participated actively in the review of new department heads--in the interview sessions--at least when I was there. And so I think he was always very much interested, as we all were, to get the best possible people there. I definitely support the idea that the best person should be there. But I didn't feel the responsibility, as far as I was concerned, ended with the selection of good department people. I felt that I had the executive authority over all those people and I should exercise it by looking at things myself as well.

VASQUEZ: Compare Ernest Debs with Kenny Hahn.

HAYES: Well, Ernest Debs was also a Democrat, but he was considerably more conservative than Hahn.

VASQUEZ: In what areas specifically?

HAYES: In fiscal areas. And at the same time, he was more part of the old Chase philosophy of letting your department heads do things and leave them alone. Things will correct themselves through the help of the department head. Don't meddle in it too much yourself. He was able to stay in office and to get elected and reelected much the same way as Hahn, although he enjoyed the liberal Westside support to get elected and reelected, despite the fact that East Los Angeles was in his district as well. I don't think Debs paid much attention to East Los Angeles, although he had a deputy on his staff who did.

VASQUEZ: Who was that?

HAYES: I can't remember his name right now. I don't remember too much about him, frankly.

VASQUEZ: Is that right? [Laughter] How about Warren Dorn?

HAYES: Well, Warren Dorn I served with only a short time, because he was defeated by Baxter Ward in that November [1972] election. So I served with him only from the time of my appointment by Governor Reagan in August of 1972 until

November. Well, actually the first Monday in December, when he was no longer on the board. He represented the fairly conservative Fifth Supervisorial District and had been a previous mayor of Pasadena. So he enjoyed the support of the people in that area and liked to go to big-time social events, like Rose Bowl activities and things of that kind. I don't remember too much about anything that he brought before the board, frankly, during the period of time I was there.

VASQUEZ: How about Baxter Ward, who became sort of a controversial figure?

HAYES: Well, Baxter Ward came onto the board completely unprepared for what is involved in political life. He came aboard as an investigative reporter and continued as an investigative reporter for the first two years he was on the board. He did very little, if anything, constructive during the first two and a half years that he was on the board and was generally more interested in attacking and inflaming the other members of the board than he was on doing anything.

VASQUEZ: What, as a gadfly?

HAYES: That sort of thing. He had a fellow named Lance Brisson, who was Rosalind Russell's son, as one of his aides, and the two of them would cook up all types of things to investigate or examine. Generally, they came to absolutely nothing. And this involved complaints against then [Los Angeles County Tax] Assessor Philip [E.] Watson, against the [Los Angeles County] Sheriff Pete [Peter J.] Pitchess, and numerous other things--including attacks on board members.

VASQUEZ: Were you the subject of any of his attacks?

HAYES: Oh, yes. Sure.

VASQUEZ: Over what?

HAYES: Well, he would frequently, in connection with development projects, seek to have me disqualify myself if any of the people involved had contributed to my political campaign. And he would go into a big thing over that. But after two and a half years--after he saw the constructive work that I was doing--suddenly overnight, Baxter Ward became a convert to my cause.

VASQUEZ: Which was?

HAYES: Anything I espoused, particularly energy matters in which I became, I think, an expert. And he

supported every proposal I brought in. If I initiated it with a motion, he would be the first to second it and spoke in support of it. And he truly became a friend. I visited in his home, and the whole ball of wax.

VASQUEZ: How about Pete Schabarum?

HAYES: Pete Schabarum is a different type of person. You would think as a Republican member of the board, he and I would be close. We were not. It is impossible to be close to Pete Schabarum.

VASQUEZ: Why?

HAYES: Well, he's a cantankerous person, and I think he actually covers up his ineptitude with cantankerousness. I'm being very frank on this.

VASQUEZ: That's fine.

HAYES: But I think he does study and learn about things to a great extent, especially at budget time. He is able to go through the budget. Nobody will [do] what he wants to do.

[Interruption]

But when it came to developing approaches to deal with the human issues, he was against them most of the time.

VASQUEZ: Are we talking about the area of compassion?

- HAYES: Yes. The various different types of social programs that were necessary. And I found that very, very disturbing. But it was something I had worked around. I realized in most of those types of things, I would have to go to other supervisors and get their support, which I usually did.
- VASQUEZ: Tell me about how these five individuals handled the power that is often so overwhelming, given the number of people that they represent, on a day-to-day basis.
- HAYES: Well, they all handled it differently. I handled it very carefully. I knew what power I had, but I didn't try to exercise it with any degree of purpose that would benefit me individually. But, actually, the power is there if you chose to do so. The other board members, I think most of them--and even today--don't know how much power they have. They talk about power, the press talks about power, but I don't think they really know what that power is. They operate and they act, and three votes do everything as it just did in connection with this redistricting proposal they had done. But I don't really think that

they know the different kinds of innovative things if they chose to do something.

VASQUEZ: Of all the people that you served on the board with while you were there, who knew how to use power best?

HAYES: Well, Hahn in his own particular district knew every facet of power to get what he wanted. So I would say he was number one, and probably still is.

VASQUEZ: Who was the most ineffectual at that?

HAYES: Well, Baxter Ward certainly during the portion of his first term. I think that's probably Baxter Ward.

VASQUEZ: What constitutes the effective use of power in your mind?

HAYES: The ability to accomplish favorable results for the people. Not for yourself, but for people.

VASQUEZ: Comment for me, if you will, on this redistricting controversy that has led the courts to press the supervisors for a redistricting, allowing for a Latino/Hispanic district--or predominantly Latino/Hispanic district--to which the supervisors have reacted in a very slow and deliberately stubborn fashion, I think, it is

fair to say, and have now come out with a redistricting plan that some consider ludicrous. What is your opinion of this whole process? And do you think the board should be expanded? And how do you feel about incorporating rapidly growing communities of interest?

HAYES: I thought you'd never ask. No, I think it is totally ludicrous what is going. That is a proper characterization of it. Their problems all began in 1981 when they sat down and proceeded to carve out what they thought were safe districts.

VASQUEZ: Liberals and conservatives alike?

HAYES: Exactly. Both sides. And they--all five--adopted it then. And that's where I think their mistake began. They had the opportunity after the 1980 census to make a sensible allocation of the district so that Latinos and women and others could have run for and gotten in the job. Now, it's extremely difficult for a nonincumbent to run against an incumbent in the existing five supervisorial district simply because of the logistics of the districts, the size of them, and the amount of people involved. I'm talking about

geographic size. It's impossible for a person to mount a campaign and to see enough people, especially when you have 600,000 or 700,000 voters in that district, and to see any amount of those people or to reach any amount of them without a massive direct-mail program, which would cost millions of dollars. So to defeat an incumbent in the existing districts is very, very difficult. And that's why you see incumbents raise massive amounts of money. And they all have war chests. That includes Hahn as well as everybody else.

I think this present redistricting by the board is ineffective, and it's my prediction the judge will throw it out. The drawing of the lines is clearly and stupidly gerrymandering, and I don't think it accomplishes the purposes that they're trying to accomplish by providing an area in which a Hispanic could probably effectively run. So I think under the circumstances, although I was opposed to it at the time I was there, I think the board does need to be expanded if there is going to be a possibility of anybody fairly getting elected from the Hispanic

community.

VASQUEZ: Why were you against expansion while you were?

HAYES: Well, I didn't think it was necessary. You know, I had several large Hispanic populations throughout my district, and I had deputies who related to the Hispanic system. I had a deputy named [Henry] Hank Perález who was extremely effective, and he contacted and dealt with whatever needed to be done. And I think we did a pretty effective job. And I just didn't feel the expenditure of additional money--which would have cost \$1.5 million per district more--was called for at that time, when taxes were such a crunching burden. But I think under the circumstances now and with the clearly legal ploys that are going on, that . . .

VASQUEZ: The conservatives want to maintain their majority?

HAYES: Well, whatever. You know, probably by my so-called colleagues. . . . Does not really bounce very well as far as the rights of the people are concerned.

[End Tape 4, Side B]

[Begin Tape 5, Side A]

VASQUEZ: We're talking about the Voting Rights Act.¹

HAYES: Yes. I think the Voting Rights Act requires that there be a fairness involved, and I don't think that fairness is displayed in the way this current action of the board reveals itself right now, anyway.

VASQUEZ: What's an appropriate size for the board?
Seven? Nine?

HAYES: I think probably seven would be adequate, at least for this time.

VASQUEZ: That would give you less than a million voters in this district.

HAYES: Around a million.

VASQUEZ: At least for the first few years.

HAYES: Right.

VASQUEZ: Given anticipated projections of demographic growth, right? What was most satisfying and least satisfying about being county supervisor? And why did you leave?

HAYES: Well, most satisfying was the fact that I was able to accomplish as much as I did while I was there. Getting the corrections in the juvenile

1. 42 U.S.C. § 1973 et. seq. (1982).

justice system gave me a great, good feeling. I only wish that some of the programs that I felt were good had been continued. I felt that the energy programs I initiated--not only locally, but nationwide--were very good and gave me an opportunity to express myself on a very critical issue at that time, and it still is. It will be a recurring theme. There's not really much being done about it now.

VASQUEZ: It's being looked at as probably one of the most critical issues of the nineties.

HAYES: It will be. And I don't just spring to mind the different things, but the accomplishments I think were the most satisfying. And they're all a matter of record somewhere.

VASQUEZ: Right, right.

HAYES: The least satisfying were the squabbles and investigations--useless and needless investigations--that Baxter Ward initiated. He made that two and a half years that he was involved in that process probably the most miserable of my political life. But that had nothing to do with my leaving.

I left--to everybody's belief suddenly, but

not to mine--in 1979 as a result of deciding that I wanted to take a different turn in my life. My then wife had just completed her Ph.D. degree in clinical psychology and was intending to practice in the Pacific. And I felt that I wanted to have things continue with her, so I felt the only way to do it was to be able to proceed with her in the Pacific. So I was planning to practice law in Hawaii and Los Angeles and Washington D.C, which was why I left.

VASQUEZ: Were you ever sorry that you left?

HAYES: In retrospect, I'm a little sorry that I left, before the end of my term anyway. It wasn't a very graceful way to leave.

VASQUEZ: What did you learn about American government, having served at both the state and the county level?

HAYES: I found that it works. That despite the fact that it's cumbersome and sometimes frustrating, that if you believe enough and work hard enough in trying to get a particular result, that you can, in time at least, succeed. And I think I proved that. So I found that a very positive plus.

I enjoyed my political years. As I look back on it now, I would not have done a thing differently, except possibly stay in office a little longer.

VASQUEZ: In both cases?

HAYES: Which case?

VASQUEZ: Assembly, and then at the [county] . . . ?

HAYES: Yes, I would like to have stayed in the assembly longer. And I would like to have stayed, possibly, in the supervisor's office another term or two. I enjoyed political life.

VASQUEZ: Did you?

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: Since then you've been in private practice, is that right?

HAYES: Yes.

VASQUEZ: Any particular area of the law?

HAYES: I practice in the field of business corporation and real estate law, and particularly in litigation areas. I go to court frequently, very actively.

VASQUEZ: [Laughter] Yes, I know. Is there anything that we maybe have not covered that you would like to put on the record?

HAYES: I don't think so. I think we've covered everything.

VASQUEZ: Okay. Thank you very much for your attentive assistance.

[End Tape 5, Side A]