

California State Archives
State Government Oral History Program

Oral History Interview

with

HON. STANFORD C. SHAW

California State Senator, 1959 - 1963
California State Assemblyman, 1951 - 1956

December 18, 1987 and March 8, 1988
Newbury Springs, California

By Enid Hart Douglass
Oral History Program
Claremont Graduate School

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 Director, Oral History Program, Claremont Graduate School.

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

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

or

Director, Oral History Program
Harper Hall 155
Claremont Graduate School
150 E. Tenth Street
Claremont, CA 91711-6160

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:

Stanford C. Shaw, Oral History Interview, 1988,
Conducted by Enid H. Douglass, Oral History
Program, Claremont Graduate School, 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
Document Restoration	(916) 445-4293
Exhibit Hall	(916) 445-0748
Legislative Bill Service	(916) 445-2832
(prior years)	

PREFACE

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

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

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

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

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

Oral History Program
History Department
California State University, Fullerton

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

Oral History Program
Claremont Graduate School

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

Oral History Program
University of California, Los Angeles

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

John F. Burns
State Archivist

July 27, 1988

This interview is printed on acid-free paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTERVIEW HISTORY		i
BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY		iii
I	FAMILY AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND	1
	[Session 1, December 18, 1987, Tape 1, Side A]	1
	Parents and Family Move to Ontario	1
	College Education	4
	Early Job Experiences and Marriage	7
	World War II	10
	Establishing Law Practice	14
	Justice of the Peace	20
II	ELECTION TO STATE ASSEMBLY	26
	[Tape 1, Side B]	26
	Decision to Run for Assembly Seat	26
	First Campaign	30
	Arrangements for Family and Law Practice	36
	Description of Seventy-second Assembly District	39
III	FIRST SESSION (1951-52)	43
	First Impression of Speaker Sam Collins	43
	Lobbyists: Arthur Samish and Others	45
	Speakership	48
	Effect of Incumbency	51
	[Tape 2, Side A]	53
	Initial Impression of Assembly	53
	Strategy of Bills: Spot Bills and Swapping	55
	Impact of Korean War on State Government	57
	Air Pollution	60
	Ballot Propositions (1952)	65
	Bills and Resolutions (1951)	67
	Judiciary Committee: Ralph Brown and Others	78
	[Tape 2, Side B]	81
	James W. Silliman	86
	Public Health Committee: Health Insurance	88
	Judiciary Committee and Capital Punishment	89
	Miscellaneous Legislation	91
IV	SECOND (BUDGET) SESSION (1952)	93
	Civil Defense--Bomb Shelters	93
	Transportation	96
	Smog	97
	Fairs: State and County	98
	1952 Election Campaign	101
V	1953 SESSION	103
	California Law Revision Commission	104
	Brucellosis and Livestock Importation	110

	[Tape 3, Side A]	110
	Torrens Title Bill and Others	112
	Legislation Affecting Trucking and Insurance	116
	Brown Act and Ralph Brown	121
	California Democratic Council	124
VI	1954 SESSION	128
	Smog	128
	Salary Raise for Legislators	130
	William G. Bonelli and Alcoholic Beverage Control	132
VII	RETURN TO LAW PRACTICE	137
	[Session 2, March 8, 1988, Tape 3, Side B]	137
	Succeeded in Assembly by Eugene D. Nisbet	137
	Democratic Party Politics	140
	Jesse M. Unruh and Special Election for Senate	142
VIII	ELECTION TO STATE SENATE	147
	1958 Campaign	147
	State Water Plan	151
	Senator James Cobey	153
	Governor Edmund G. "Pat" Brown	156
	[Tape 4, Side A]	160
IX	SAN BERNARDINO STATE COLLEGE	166
	Education Committee and Failure of First Bill	167
	Passage of 1960 Bill	169
	Site Selection	174
X	ISSUES AND BILLS (1959-61)	180
	The Death Penalty (1960)	180
	State Route 30 (Devore)	184
	[Tape 4, Side B]	185
	Route 218	187
	Mojave-Antelope Valley Water Agency	190
	Miscellaneous Bills	194
XI	LEADERSHIP IN SENATE	200
	President Pro Tem Hugh Burns	200
	Comparison of Senate and Assembly	203
	Lieutenant Governor Glenn M. Anderson	205
XII	1960 DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION	206
XIII	LOBBYING AND LEGISLATURE	208
	[Tape 5, Side A]	208
XIV	END OF SENATE TERM	211
	Reapportionment	211
	Decision Not to Run for Reelection	213
	INDEX OF NAMES	218

INTERVIEW HISTORY

Interview/Editor

Enid Hart Douglass
Director, Oral History Program and Lecturer in History
Claremont Graduate School
B.A., Pomona College [Government]
M.A., Claremont Graduate School [Government]

Interview Time and Place

December 18, 1987
Mr. Shaw's home in Newbury Springs, California
Morning session of 3 3/4 hours

March 8, 1988
Mr. Shaw's home in Newbury Springs, California
Morning session of 2 1/2 hours

Editing

The interviewer/editor checked the verbatim manuscript of the interviews against the original tape recordings and verified proper names. Insertions by the editor are bracketed.

On May 4, 1988, the edited transcript was forwarded to Stanford C. Shaw, who made only minor emendations and added some additional information in writing. He returned the approved manuscript July 1988.

The interviewer/editor prepared the introductory materials.

Papers

Mr. Shaw has indicated he will turn over what papers he has to the California State Archives.

Tapes and Interview Records

The original tape recordings of the interview are in the Oral History Program Office, Claremont Graduate School, along with the records relating to the interview. Master tapes are deposited in the California State Archives.

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY

Stanford C. Shaw was born in Aurora, Illinois, on April 25, 1913. His parents, Robert E. Shaw and Alice Lasher Shaw, moved to Ontario, California because of his poor health as a child. Mr. Shaw attended the Ontario public schools, graduating from Chaffey High School in 1931. He earned an Associate of Arts degree at Chaffey Junior College and then transferred to Stanford University. While attending Stanford, Mr. Shaw married Leila Frost. They have one child. Stanford Shaw earned his Bachelor of Arts degree in Economics from Stanford in 1935.

Mr. Shaw then held a series of jobs, working first as a junior accountant from 1935 until 1937 and then in a bond house. At the beginning of the World War II, he held a position at Vega Aircraft Company. In the meantime, he attended night law school at Loyola University and graduated with his LL.B [Bachelor of Law] degree in 1945.

After the war, Stanford Shaw opened a law practice in Ontario. Upon the retirement of Thomas Donnelly in 1947, Mr. Shaw was appointed Justice of the Peace for Etiwanda Township in San Bernardino County in 1947; he served in that capacity until 1950.

Stanford Shaw first entered politics in 1948 when he ran unsuccessfully for the Seventy-second State Assembly District seat. In 1950, he ran again and was elected. During his two terms in the state assembly, Mr. Shaw served on the Agriculture, Judiciary, and Public Health Committees and sponsored the legislation which created the California Law Revision Commission. Mr. Shaw served on the commission from 1953 to 1958. In 1954, Mr. Shaw decided not to run for a third term and returned to private law practice.

Mr. Shaw maintained his interest in California politics and was active in the Democratic state central committee. When State Senator James E. Cunningham, Sr. retired, Stanford Shaw won the special election in 1957 for the Thirty-sixth State Senate District for San Bernardino County. As a state senator, Mr. Shaw was instrumental in the establishment of the state college in San Bernardino County. Due to health reasons, Mr. Shaw was able to serve out only one complete term. He then retired from state politics and returned to the practice of law.

Since his retirement from the legislature, Mr. Shaw served as a director of Mojave Water Agency from 1969 to 1977. He continues to practice law in Newbury Springs, California.

I. FAMILY AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

[Session 1, December 18, 1988]

[Begin Tape 1, Side A]

Parents and Family's Move to Ontario

DOUGLASS: Mr. Shaw, where were you born and when?

SHAW: I was born in Aurora, Illinois, out of Chicago. It was April 25, 1913. I kept some record on events, and I find that, in January of 1913, my mother was practicing in her diary what she would name her expected child. And I see that I just escaped the name of Verdell Orisey Shaw. And Stanford Ellis was considered. I ended up with Stanford Clare.

DOUGLASS: That sounds like a pretty good ending. Why was your family living in Aurora?

SHAW: Well, they were not. They were living in Big Rock. They were farmers. Aurora was the nearest hospital. My birth was unusual in that it was in a hospital. That is how it happened to be.

DOUGLASS: Did you have any brothers and sisters?

SHAW: I had a later brother, four years later. He is

now deceased. Allison Franklin Shaw. He was born in Illinois, also.

DOUGLASS: Then your family decided to move to California when you were a youngster?

SHAW: Yes. That came about for my health purposes. One of the earlier sacrifices of my parents, of many, was to bring the whole family out here to California on a family doctor's recommendation. Because I was having pneumonia every year, plus asthma, they thought that I was not going to make it unless we got to a better climate.

DOUGLASS: How did they settle on where to go in the west?

SHAW: My father had visited Ontario, California and this area some ten years before.

DOUGLASS: Did he know someone out here?

SHAW: Yes. He knew somebody, but not at all well. He knew the area a little bit. Well, they did know a few people. Once they got here they got to know them much better because they did not know anyone else.

DOUGLASS: What did your father figure he would do when he got out here? Farm, again?

SHAW: No. He had no idea what he would do. He just started looking for a job. He did some carpentry. He worked at an implement hardware store. He thought that would be appropriate. He took a job as a bus driver. He bought into a sizable garage there in Ontario. Then later he

was ticket agent for the bus company, and then drove a bus. Then he retired, except that by this time my mother was well established in business as a caterer. He helped her.

DOUGLASS: She catered for parties and business events.

SHAW: Oh, yes. Particularly in the Claremont area.

DOUGLASS: Really. That is interesting. How many years did she do that?

SHAW: She started probably about 1930. And she continued right down until, practically when she had to go to a rest home.

DOUGLASS: Which would have been?

SHAW: Oh, in recent years.

DOUGLASS: I think I knew her. I think that I even used her. Mrs. Shaw.

SHAW: I would not be surprised.

DOUGLASS: That's fascinating. Was she running it out of her home?

SHAW: Oh, yes.

DOUGLASS: That made it quite exciting, I imagine, with all the kitchen things that went on.

SHAW: I was really never home much at the time this was going on. I was being supported by it in school.

DOUGLASS: You started school then in Ontario.

SHAW: Oh, yes. I went through all the Ontario public schools.

DOUGLASS: You were about four or so when you moved?

SHAW: I got here in time for first grade. About five or six.

DOUGLASS: So your family moved in 1918.

SHAW: In 1919.

DOUGLASS: Did you stay in the same family home there in Ontario all those years?

SHAW: Oh, no. They moved around. They would buy one home, then buy another.

College Education

DOUGLASS: So you went to Chaffey Junior College?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: And got your A.A. [Associate of Arts] degree.

SHAW: Right.

DOUGLASS: Were you establishing some interests at that time as to what you thought you might want to do?

SHAW: You bet. Girls and music. [Laughter] Oh, no. Really. I had an uncle-in-law who was a doctor. In Illinois. I always thought that I wanted to become a doctor. I started a club for future doctors at J.C. [junior college] We did as much as we could. We even went to medical schools, hospitals, and so forth. But some place along the line, I lost interest in that. I got diverted from it. I really was not very well focused on anything, clear through undergraduate school. And for some several years after.

DOUGLASS: You graduated in what year from Chaffey?

SHAW: It would have been '33.

DOUGLASS: And did you go to Stanford [University]?

SHAW: Right.

DOUGLASS: Right away?

SHAW: Right away.

DOUGLASS: And why Stanford?

SHAW: Well, what would they do with me at Cal [University of California]? [Laughter] No, it seemed like a school I always wanted to go to. I tried to go to Harvard [University] and didn't make it. I was supposed to have been named Stanford because there was a relative in the family who taught romance languages at Stanford. They didn't know him, but that way they heard of the school. And, I guess, they liked the sound of it. Although that was not much of a connection with Stanford. I had some focus on it for some time.

DOUGLASS: The idea was that when you finished junior college you thought that was what you would do.

SHAW: Oh, sure.

DOUGLASS: Now going to Stanford, was that a financial hardship for your family?

SHAW: Oh, enormously so. This was the depths of the depression. By this time, I had managed to earn some money, and thereby learned how to spend money. I was a burden to them. They were very

supportive, of course. But it got so bad that they finally told me that I would have to stop writing checks. [Laughter] You can't imagine how small these checks were.

DOUGLASS: While you were in college?

SHAW: Yes. While I was in college. So that sticks very much in my mind. I have letters that I am not too proud of, where I was asking for more money.

DOUGLASS: Were you working while you were at Stanford?

SHAW: Yes. I was sort of a semiprofessional musician by this time. I was working in orchestras at dances.

DOUGLASS: What instrument did you play?

SHAW: I played reeds. Saxophone. Clarinet.

DOUGLASS: So that got you some ready money.

SHAW: As kids go. I guess I was the only kid in the school who had \$1,000 in the bank, when I started college.

DOUGLASS: My word. Was Stanford able to give you any kind of scholarship help?

SHAW: No. But they were very generous on student loans. I borrowed as much as they would lend me.

DOUGLASS: What was your major at Stanford?

SHAW: Econ. [Economics]

DOUGLASS: So, you graduated from Stanford in 1935?

SHAW: In 1935.

DOUGLASS: What was your plan after that?

SHAW: I was going to succeed. They were going to be lined up trying to hire me. I wasn't quite sure what I would do.

DOUGLASS: That would have been the business world?

SHAW: Yes. I was going to perhaps get a job in accounting. I later did.

Early Job Experiences and Marriage

DOUGLASS: So what was your first job?

SHAW: For the Edison Company in Pasadena. They discovered that they could hire people cheap enough so that they could distribute their bills cheaper with employees than postage. [Laughter] This is a very promising start. So I was delivering bills door-to-door. And then later running a machine that printed bills. But this did not last but a few months. I managed to get a job. Rather a brother-in-law got me a job, with an accounting firm.

DOUGLASS: Located where?

SHAW: In Los Angeles.

DOUGLASS: In Los Angeles. Where were you living then?

SHAW: Well, we lived all over. At that time, between twenty-five and thirty-five dollars a month would rent a furnished home. And they were all about the same. If we would get tired of a home, we move to another one.

DOUGLASS: Were you married at this time?

SHAW: Oh, yes.

DOUGLASS: When were your married?

SHAW: We were married when I was a junior in school. Leila [Frost] and I had been engaged for a number of years. We never had been introduced to each other, just grew up together. We went to Reno in December of 1934. We were secretly married. She went back to nurse's training in Pasadena, and I went back to finish school.

DOUGLASS: To Stanford.

SHAW: Stanford.

DOUGLASS: So you were separated while you finished college?

SHAW: Yes. She didn't do so good in nursing school that quarter, and I got my first "F," in business law of all things.

DOUGLASS: You were diverted. For half a year, you were at Stanford, and she was in Pasadena.

SHAW: Yes. As soon as we graduated, we started living together. For quite a while, we lived with her sister and brother-in-law. And they were very helpful to us. Lyman Robertson and my sister-in-law, Mercedes. He was a very successful attorney with the Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Company and became an officer. He is now deceased.

He got me a job with a national accounting firm. Typically, it was not too good a relationship, because the accounting firm manager was obligated to hire me just because an officer of this account suggested it. That was junior accounting work. I rather rapidly discovered that accounting is no way of life.

I then went to work for a street bond firm. This is an outfit that issues securities that pay for curb, sidewalks and pavement and so forth. And, at this time, in the depths of the depression, they were principally engaged in trying to salvage something from these bonds that had gone sour. The most significant stuff I did was statistical work, where we refunded these obligations in a given district.

Property owners' taxes to service these bonds grew enormously high, and, on the other hand, the bonds in the hands of the owners could only be sold at an enormous discount. And this firm I worked for, basically, would work out a scheme of contributions from these property owners that would be more than enough to accumulate a fund that could buy all the bonds and retire them. Plus, of course, they would collect more than was necessary, to make a profit. In the course of things, they would buy titles where people didn't want to invest more

in their land. This was sort of a self-liquidating business.

World War II

By the time it looked like we were going to be involved in World War II, there were a lot of employment opportunities in the war industries. I went to work in the engineering department of one of those aircraft companies, Vega [Aircraft Company], which was a subsidiary of Lockheed.

DOUGLASS: What year would that have been?

SHAW: Well, let's see.

DOUGLASS: I guess about '39?

SHAW: [Looks at a chart] I started at Vega in November of 1941. War was declared the next month.

DOUGLASS: December 7th. Could you go back up and say what years you were with the bond business? What it was called.

SHAW: Sure. It was Hall, McQuardt & Company. Seventh [Street] and Spring Street in Los Angeles. I started with them in 1937.

Incidentally, I mentioned that we moved around town. I see that we moved from an apartment in Alhambra to the [Lyman] Robertson's in San Marino. And to Alhambra, again. All in one year. And in the next year, we moved to Pasadena. To Los Angeles, 43rd Street near

Broadway. I don't think a white person could live there now. In '38, to Highland Park. From Highland Park to another location in Highland Park. In '39, Leila worked for a family, the Dr. Carl Mohlers at Big Bear, and I was in Glendale. And then we bought a home in Sierra Madre, using her pay for a down payment.

DOUGLASS: When was that?

SHAW: In 1939, September. I sold that and used the money to start night law school.

DOUGLASS: Now when would have that been?

SHAW: I started school in October of 1940 and finished selling the home in December. Moved to Alhambra. I think that it might be personally interesting that we moved so many times. It is something Leila would do virtually single-handed. The day I went to law school, I was there and met a fellow the first night of school who lived near Alhambra, and so I asked for a ride home. He lived in South Pasadena. We got started home and he said, "Where do you live?" I said, "Well, I have the address here. I have never seen it." [Laughter] That was kind of an odd start, but we found it.

DOUGLASS: Why did you decide to go to law school?

SHAW: I just was not getting anywhere. I wanted to do something significant. Up to this point, I really was not doing anything significant. The

obvious choice is some profession. And the legal profession is about the only one where you can qualify through night school. I did try, earlier, quite a bit earlier, to carry on with accounting and maybe become a CPA [Certified Public Accountant], but I really did not have much interest in that.

DOUGLASS: So you were working and going to school both at the same time.

SHAW: Right.

DOUGLASS: You were working for the bond company.

SHAW: First the bond company. Then the aircraft company.

DOUGLASS: What was your position at the aircraft company? Were you in accounting?

SHAW: No. I was in the engineering department. I started with time studies, you know, where they try to budget how much time they can spend on each [project]. That was largely clerical work. From there I went to another department in engineering where we wrote specifications. This is so "Rosie the Riveter" can have in plain English what she is supposed to do. That's an oversimplification, but that is what it amounted to. At that same time, I was also writing letters for engineers to the draft boards, on the behalf of the company, trying to keep their

deferments.

DOUGLASS: Were you with Vega throughout the war period?

SHAW: No. I could see that I was going to get drafted in that position. I was well enough acquainted to see that there was a high probability of that. But I would not be drafted if I could get farm classification. Agriculture. So, I did. I moved the family to Etiwanda, where my in-laws lived, and they had a ranch and a general merchandise store. I worked at the ranch in the store and also did some work on my own in the pest control business. It was not much of a business.

DOUGLASS: So you left Vega.

SHAW: I left Vega.

DOUGLASS: When would have that been about?

SHAW: You bet. I left Vega in 1943. March.

DOUGLASS: Essentially, you went into the farm business. And you were going to night school. Law school.

SHAW: Right.

DOUGLASS: Because that was declared a necessary part of the war effort.

SHAW: I saw that there was just no drafting of those who had farm classification. And I have even forgotten what it was. I think it was "C."

DOUGLASS: So what were they farming in Etiwanda?

SHAW: Citrus.

DOUGLASS: Lemons?

SHAW: Lemons. Oranges. Both.

DOUGLASS: At that time, what percentage of your time were you spending in law school and what percentage on the agriculture business?

SHAW: About half and half. It was a long day.

Establishing Law Practice

DOUGLASS: So when did you finish law school?

SHAW: Let's see. In September of '44.

DOUGLASS: After you finished law school, did you have in mind any particular kind of law you were interested in?

SHAW: No. It was going to be enough to get my shingle up some place.

DOUGLASS: Just general practice. And where were you going to put your shingle up?

SHAW: Well, I didn't have any idea. I did sense that I might as well go some place where I was known. I finished law school in '44, and I had taken the bar the year before and failed it. At that time, you could take it before you had finished all your courses. The school did not think much of that, but I did it. Following law school, there was a bar examination that December, and I failed that also. So I went to work late the next year at Security Title Insurance and Guarantee Company in San Bernardino. I managed to pass the bar that December.

DOUGLASS: What did you take? Refresher courses?

SHAW: No. I just studied at home. I had an aggravatingly close score to passing. You know, they had to tell you your scores if you failed. I was not the only one, but there was a lot of 69.75. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: It took 70.

SHAW: It took 70. Somebody put me on to using a typewriter, and it would be a snap. So I typed it in '45, and maybe that is the reason why I passed.

DOUGLASS: Did you take a typewriter in?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: That would help in getting it down.

SHAW: You have never heard such typewriter noise until you go in there.

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] I'll bet. I think it would be hard to think with all that noise going on.

SHAW: Oh, the pressure is so great, you don't notice. But we did, at the first break, go to the drugstore and buy earplugs.

DOUGLASS: Well, then you were now working for a title company in San Bernardino, and you did pass the bar. What was the next move on your part?

SHAW: Well, I gradually got into the practice of law by renting space in Cucamonga, where I put a shingle up. I had part-time stenographic help, through the wall. The clerk of the justice

court in Cucamonga helped me.

DOUGLASS: Now give the exact location in Cucamonga of that office.

SHAW: It was the southwest corner of San Bernardino Road and Archibald Avenue, north of Foothill Boulevard. On Archibald Avenue.

DOUGLASS: Now why did you decide on Cucamonga?

SHAW: There wasn't any lawyer there. And I knew a lot of people.

DOUGLASS: Through the farming business?

SHAW: No. I was raised in Ontario.

DOUGLASS: And Chaffey.

SHAW: They all came to Chaffey.

DOUGLASS: So did you devote full time to that?

SHAW: Oh, no.

DOUGLASS: You stayed with the title company.

SHAW: I stayed with the title company. As I got more business, I spent less and less time at the title company.

DOUGLASS: And what were you doing at the title company?

SHAW: I was checking the work that the clerical searchers made up that would be used in typing up the final policy of title insurance. At that time, the real estate market in homes was extremely active. I would do on the order of a hundred policies a day.

DOUGLASS: Oh! Really?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Why was this so active? Because the war had not quite ended.

SHAW: No. I am getting down here. [Refers to notes]

DOUGLASS: Were you in '45, '46 at this point? You are talking about right after the war then, probably.

SHAW: Yes. Right after I passed the bar, of course.

DOUGLASS: You passed the bar in '46. It sounds like you stayed with that company for a few years then?

SHAW: Oh, no. Not long. I stayed with Security Title Insurance and Guarantee until May of '46.

DOUGLASS: In that '46 period, after the war ended, there was a lot of activity.

SHAW: Yes. The answer to your question is that people were relocating in California and buying homes.

DOUGLASS: In San Bernardino County.

SHAW: All over California.

DOUGLASS: But that was why you were busy?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Probably as a result of the veterans, who decided to come and live here.

SHAW: Oh, yes. They saw some of California on their way through to the Pacific.

DOUGLASS: So, when did you become full time with your own law business?

SHAW: When I finally quit in May of '46 at Security. They finally told me that the clerical work and

the pay for me was coming to more than what I was worth, [Laughter], the day or two I was there each month. Anyhow, by June of '46, I was full time in Cucamonga, California.

DOUGLASS: And still practicing law on your own. Without anybody else.

SHAW: That's right. And then I opened a second office in Upland in August with my. . . . And discovered that if you have two offices people always come to the one where you are not. I got my first significant pay from the law business in September of 1946, when I got a listing on a frozen food locker. Another fellow and I sold it and got a substantial commission.

DOUGLASS: You mean for handling this.

SHAW: Yes. We did more than handle it. We were brokers.

DOUGLASS: You were brokers. And where was the food locker?

SHAW: In Ontario. And I made enough money to buy furniture and outfit an office.

DOUGLASS: Excuse me. Did you still have the two offices?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Where was the one in Upland?

SHAW: That was the middle of Second Avenue, just north of B Street, west side.

DOUGLASS: Now that, actually, from a distance viewpoint,

is not too far. Cucamonga and Upland. But you felt that was worth trying?

SHAW: Yes. What I am really trying to do was to move out of Cucamonga, and I am doing it gradually.

DOUGLASS: Meanwhile, where were you living, your home? When you set up the two offices.

SHAW: I am still out in Etiwanda.

DOUGLASS: Were you living in a house out there? Were you living on the ranch?

SHAW: We were living, the first year, with the in-laws. And after that, in the deceased grandparents' home, which they had as a rental, and we took that.

DOUGLASS: All right. The practice is growing, you can buy office furniture. You have two offices, and we are up to about '47, somewhere around in there?

SHAW: Yes. I am still in Etiwanda.

DOUGLASS: And it is a general practice.

SHAW: Right.

DOUGLASS: Would you say there was an emphasis in terms of the kinds of law you were doing?

SHAW: Well, yes. Somewhat. Because by this time I dealt a lot with real estate problems. First, with the bond house and then with the title company. But this was not a point in my practice where I was selective. I took what work I could get. I did lots of things then that I would not do now. Such as, I can't

conceive of where I would work on a divorce case now.

DOUGLASS: But a person in general practice was expected to be available for across-the-board things in those days?

SHAW: Especially in a small town.

DOUGLASS: So you did everything from real estate to wills to family matters. Across the board then.

SHAW: Sure. And criminal law.

DOUGLASS: Anything particularly to do with the agricultural side of things?

SHAW: No. Not really. Most agricultural problems grind down to being real estate problems.

DOUGLASS: All right. Let's hear what happened until you ran for office in '50. Let's get your legal practice to that point. What happened in the next few years?

Justice of the Peace

SHAW: The next significant thing that happened was my first brush with public service. I got appointed justice of the peace of Etiwanda township. They had a justice of the peace there, a beloved man by the name of [Thomas] Tom Donnelly, who had been justice of the peace for forty years at this one location.

DOUGLASS: Now, refresh my memory. You don't have to have legal training to be a justice of the peace?

SHAW: No. You don't.

DOUGLASS: And did he?

SHAW: No. He didn't. But he knew a thing or two after doing it for about forty years.

[Laughter]

DOUGLASS: Did he retire?

SHAW: No. He passed away. Maybe he did retire and then shortly thereafter died.

DOUGLASS: And who appointed you?

SHAW: The board of supervisors. But they, of course, sounded out around the community who might be appropriate.

DOUGLASS: And why did your name surface then?

SHAW: Well, I was the only person in town who had any legal training. And I suppose that made some difference. By this time, I was probably pretty well known. I was with the leading family in Etiwanda, the [John] Frosts. My wife's family.¹

DOUGLASS: To pick up on that for just a minute. Am I correct in gathering that her family really were the founders, or were among the founders, of Etiwanda?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: They came out to farm? Ranch?

1. Descendants of George Frost, who came to California in 1882 and settled in Etiwanda.

SHAW: Right.

DOUGLASS: From where?

SHAW: From Canada.

DOUGLASS: Oh, Canadians.

SHAW: Yes. You see, the [George] Chaffey family first started in Etiwanda. That was their first venture. They came from Canada, brought a number of prospective purchasers. But they had not been there long until they opened a general merchandise store. So they did both farming and general merchandise.

DOUGLASS: That probably made a difference in terms of how well they did. That they had both. The store.

SHAW: Oh, yes.

DOUGLASS: Did they know the Chaffeys?

SHAW: The generation before, sure. Very well.

DOUGLASS: The original families.

SHAW: Yes. The grandfather.

DOUGLASS: That is probably why Mr. Frost came then, because he knew the Chaffeys?

SHAW: I am not too sure. But they were from the same place in Canada.

DOUGLASS: So this means you were affiliated with a very well-known pioneer family in Etiwanda, through her family?

SHAW: That's right.

DOUGLASS: All right. How much time does being the justice of the peace take?

SHAW: In Etiwanda, the way I did it, it was all finished Thursday morning. If there was not enough coming in in fines--I didn't get any part of the fines--the court might be consolidated with another and done away with, if we didn't have enough business. And I didn't want this court expiring on my watch. [Laughter]

So by this time, we are on very good terms with some of these cops who give out tickets. If my court was not doing well enough, some out-of-towner gets stopped in Colton, but he ends up in my court. [Laughter] He does not know where he is.

DOUGLASS: You would have jurisdiction over Colton?

SHAW: Actually, I would not. But virtually all these tickets are disposed of without trial.

DOUGLASS: But you would get the policemen to refer them to you?

SHAW: Yes. I remember one of the most interesting cases was a black chauffeur who was driving the boss' car, exceeding the speed limit on the way to Palm Springs. They were not able to catch him until the train blocked the road at Colton. They gave him a ticket. He had gone through several jurisdictions by this time. So they could legitimately send him to me. When he showed up, he was a city guy who really knew his

rights.

DOUGLASS: The black chauffeur?

SHAW: The black chauffeur. How he did not have a ghost of a chance in this rural court. It is not at all unusual. They refuse to plead guilty or not guilty. This was easy. You just entered a not guilty plea for them. They also cannot make up their mind if they want a jury or not, so you say they are going to have a jury. Anyhow, what he didn't know was that we had a black community in Etiwanda, and I lined up a black jury for him, but, unfortunately, just before he was to come out to trial, his boss phoned and settled the case.

DOUGLASS: That would have been really interesting.

SHAW: That would have been good. Ordinarily, I am not so racist, but I could not resist that one.

DOUGLASS: So that kept your justice of the peace endeavor going, by getting the feed in from some other tickets and things.

SHAW: I am just saying this as a matter of interest. It was not too important. I am doing all kinds of other stuff with this court. I am marrying people all hours of the night. People are coming to me and getting free legal advice because I am the JP [justice of the peace]. There was more to it really than just Thursday

morning.

DOUGLASS: Now could you continue your law practice?

SHAW: Oh, yes.

DOUGLASS: How much time did you have for that?

SHAW: I tried to be in my law practice, except for Thursday morning. And after hours, they would catch me at home.

DOUGLASS: Now is there any problem of conflict that you had to watch. Were there some kinds of things you could not handle that you might have handled before?

SHAW: Oh, yes. Of course, first, I could not handle anything that was in the court. This is a blessing because immediately I could push to the side all these small things that I don't want to be involved in anyhow. I remember we would have a case where I could see this person needs to be represented by counsel. So I would have him go to a particular attorney. [Laughter] I did this just once or twice, I guess, because the attorney shows up, and it occurs to the both of us, we have a conflict of interest here. We know each other too well. That example was [Thomas] Tom Parry, who is now a judge.

DOUGLASS: Did you still have the Upland and Cucamonga offices through this period?

SHAW: I moved over to Ontario someplace along here. It must have been about 1947, but I don't have

it down here.

DOUGLASS: Did you close the other offices?

SHAW: Again, I phased out of Upland. I centered on my Ontario office.

DOUGLASS: But did you still have Cucamonga?

SHAW: No. I had closed that some time before. So I am just gradually working over to my home town.

DOUGLASS: To Ontario. Where were you located in Ontario?

SHAW: In the Emmons Building. That was C [Street] and Euclid Avenue. I was in the office building where the Judge Archie Mitchell had been located. In fact, I did some work for him before I passed the bar.

[End Tape 1, Side A]

[Begin Tape 1, Side B]

II. ELECTION TO STATE ASSEMBLY

Decision to Run for Assembly Seat

SHAW: So I must have been established in 1947 in Ontario. But I am still living out at Etiwanda. I am getting involved in community affairs. I am in the Etiwanda Service Club. And I am in my first election there, to become president. The Etiwanda Service Club has a very unusual concept of democracy. The way they elect the officers is to get it over in a hurry by giving everyone a slip of paper. They write who they want in what office. Then they gather all the slips up

and whoever gets the most votes for each office is it. And I became president of the Etiwanda Service Club with three votes, one of which was mine. [Laughter] This is a membership of about forty. OK.

So now I am a public person. I joined the Upland Rotary Club. By the next April, Cucamonga constable, Asger Ravn, comes to me about being a candidate for the assembly, and I become a candidate for the assembly.

DOUGLASS: That is April of 1950.

SHAW: April of 1948. I run against an incumbent. It is understood by everybody, except my mother, that I am not going to win. Oh, here, I see I opened my law office in Ontario in June of 1948.

DOUGLASS: Now what attracted you to give this a try, even though you knew that you probably would not win?

SHAW: Oh, it is a start. Basically, it is to try to do something more significant and more interesting.

DOUGLASS: And who was the incumbent you ran against?

SHAW: [R.] Fred Price. A very well-regarded, conservative Republican who did nothing on the job. Well, I should not say that. He got the road opened to Santa Ana Canyon Road, from Pomona.

DOUGLASS: That was, of course, cross-filing in those days.

How did you do in the election, relatively speaking?

SHAW: I guess, there was 50,000 votes, and I got five. And I was out at the primary.

DOUGLASS: So he took it all in the primary.

SHAW: Oh, yes. But I thereby became a delegate to the Democratic state convention because I had been the party's nominee. I went to that in '48.

I relocated my home. We bought a home in Ontario on Mountain Avenue and Fourth Street. In 1950, I resigned as justice of the peace. By this time, something had happened to Fred Price. He either died or retired. And these friends who had helped me. . . . And, incidentally, it was the Ravns, Constable Asger Ravn and more particularly, his wife, Dorothy, who was very active in women's clubs. They are the ones who suggested that I become a candidate the first time.

DOUGLASS: Was there any question in your mind? Were you a registered Democrat?

SHAW: This gives you some idea of my political commitment. I could not remember. I am not sure which it was. We first had to look up and see if I was registered.

DOUGLASS: Why did you decide to run? Even though there was cross-filing, you were fundamentally a Democrat? And you got involved in Democratic

state committee work. Was there any particular thrust to your thinking?

SHAW: Yes. Although I questioned how I was registered, I was a "liberal." So I identified better with the Democratic party.

DOUGLASS: Where did that liberal attitude toward the world come from?

SHAW: Oh, through learning a few things. Sociology at Stanford. Political science at Chaffey. I think the usual college experience, except that I never got over it.

DOUGLASS: That impressed you vividly, what you learned in college.

SHAW: I know a lot of people who as soon as they get something to conserve, they become conservative. I am still very interested in liberal politics. I am a subscriber to The Nation. I guess that is a good litmus test, but I don't read all The Nation. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: But this is not necessarily what your family had been, though.

SHAW: No. I guess you would say that they are non-political. My father, from his contact with the public, he became a Democrat. But he didn't have strong political views. He did bet me some money. I bet that [President Herbert C.] Hoover would win. He bet that [Governor Franklin

Delano] Roosevelt would beat him. That was one of many experiences where I knew that the old man knew a thing or two. [Laughter]

First Campaign

DOUGLASS: All right. You come around to the spring of 1950, and, apparently, Price is not running again. So what happened?

SHAW: So my friends say, "We helped you. You can make it this time." It does not take much to persuade me to run again.

DOUGLASS: Within the Democratic party, did you have much competition?

SHAW: Well, I don't think so. Within the Democratic party.

DOUGLASS: As I look at the list, it has John Leary.

SHAW: There is a Mr. E. L. Ostler.

DOUGLASS: But Leary pulled more. But they don't come very close.

SHAW: No. You see, by this time I had a little name recognition in the district. I had run once before. I lost. I had some quarter cards up and so forth.

DOUGLASS: And who was Roy Boles?

SHAW: He was the mayor of Ontario, and a blacksmith. And of very modest circumstances. Excuse me, he had no business being a Republican. He was highly regarded, I would say, as small town politicians go. I never would have beaten him

except that the registration favored me about in the order of three to two. But with the Republican press, that was just about a break-even situation.

DOUGLASS: I noticed that he almost took it in the primary. It was 308 votes short.

SHAW: Yes. But I knew by this time enough about politics that if I could get by the primary, I would probably get him. It might be interesting, from a political standpoint, that the vote was awfully close. I was watching returns very carefully. About the time I figured, according to my little rough calculation, I had the plurality by one or two votes, so that I was going to get my Democratic nomination. I had just no more than figured this than I got a telephone call from Harold Morton, the lobbyist for independent oil [The Superior Oil Company], inquiring if they could help with my campaign deficit. From whom I never heard a word before.

DOUGLASS: What did you say?

SHAW: I said, "I would like to talk with you sometime." I am enough of a politician at this time, I declare war on nobody. I am not mad at him at all. So, to finish that little story, I went in to see him. He started peeling off

fifty dollar bills, but with a secretary as a witness. They said that I must have a deficit, they wanted to help with this. I told them, "No. I am not in really bad shape all." I would be glad to talk with them, but I didn't need anything at this time. I had the satisfaction of walking out of there with nothing.

DOUGLASS: I think I have heard the same story from another [Gordon H. Winton], in conjunction with Superior Oil.

SHAW: Have you?

DOUGLASS: It must have been a standard modus operandi.

SHAW: He was the head man for independent oil in southern California. I guess he was the attorney for [William] Keck.

DOUGLASS: What was your strategy that enabled you to pull that out between the primary and the general election? Actually, he was very close to taking it all in the primary on cross-filing. What did you do? You won by 1,550 votes in the general election.

SHAW: I tried to do something of everything. I made the usual outlandish claims. I got the help of a fellow by the name of Forrest Doucette, a newspaper man. He helped me with some pretty decent ads.

DOUGLASS: Where was Doucette? What newspaper? I have

heard that name.

SHAW: I think he was with the [Ontario] Daily Report.
Later. Earlier, maybe with the Herald.
Ontario. He lived up in--he may still--up in
Upland Heights area.

DOUGLASS: He helped you with the media.

SHAW: Newspaper ads. I did a lot of quarter cards.
Bumper stickers. Went to every meeting that I
possibly could. In every media thing I had,
including little folders and stuff, I am
modestly claiming that I am definitely better
qualified than this guy.

DOUGLASS: You are both new. But he could claim that he
had the experience in city government. You had
no experience, except you had been justice of
the peace.

SHAW: It was tough. He would run an ad that he was
endorsed by every mayor in the district. One of
these mayors was [James] Jim Cunningham. A very
good friend of mine. San Bernardino. So I
chased over to him to help me with an ad that
this was not true. But he would not do it.
[Laughter]

DOUGLASS: The pressure is on him both ways. Did you try
to counteract any of that by talking to city
council people, aside from mayors? Or did you
give up on that since it was his peer group, in

a way?

SHAW: I can't remember that too well. I think we found some little chink in that that was not correct. But I imagine we laid off of it pretty much because he had the better of that one.

DOUGLASS: So your energy was to get out and be known. You went to the clubs and spoke? Did you have any debates? Did you jointly appear in high school auditoriums, that kind of thing?

SHAW: Yes. We would both be invited to appear before the nurses. Something like that. It was not a very well structured debate. We would be given a few minutes to say something.

DOUGLASS: I think the thing that is interesting, of course, it is an era in which television did not exist. The people either did the personal contact thing, the mailing, or they might do a little radio advertising.

SHAW: We did a little of everything. But we had the same problem that they've got now. We could not get anybody to come out to a meeting. Nobody could. You run an ad that you are going to meet with the people and so forth. There already was too much competition for the evening. Radio and TV [television]. When did TV come on the scene?

DOUGLASS: It was on the scene in '48, but a lot of people did not have sets. It was not as universal as it is now, but it was around. People were not

using television as a way to advertise themselves is what I meant.

SHAW: No. We did not use TV at all.

DOUGLASS: Did you feel pretty good as the general election approached? Did you think that you had solidified your position?

SHAW: No. I was hopeful, of course. But I sure did not know that I was going to win. And we didn't have any way of polling in those days.

DOUGLASS: Yes.

SHAW: Mind you, these are really poor-boy operations.

DOUGLASS: What did you spend, do you suppose?

SHAW: Three thousand dollars maybe. I remember my accountant, even as late as the last time I ran for the senate, he just thought it was outrageous that I spent as much as \$15,000. Now they spend millions.

DOUGLASS: A lot of that original \$3,000, was some of that your own money? And small contributions?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Was there a most active support group in terms of just giving financial aid? Who were the big boosters?

SHAW: There just really isn't hardly any support.

DOUGLASS: Fragmented then?

SHAW: Yes. And unlikely places. You would get \$100 maybe, I didn't, but most guys would get \$100

from chiropractors. Could not get anything from the optometrists. They would give me free glasses.

DOUGLASS: How about the building industry?

SHAW: No.

DOUGLASS: If they did give, would they give it to the Republicans?

SHAW: Yes. They would give it to the Republicans.

DOUGLASS: So, there you were election day, and you had won. What did that feel like?

SHAW: That's good, isn't it? You know about that.
[Laughter]

DOUGLASS: But then it changed your life. In terms of how you lived, and how you handled all of this.

SHAW: Oh, yes.

Arrangements for Family and Law Practice

DOUGLASS: What was your plan in terms of the family and your law practice?

SHAW: I didn't have any plan.

DOUGLASS: I meant, did they stay down here?

SHAW: Oh, no. We were going to stay together as best we could. They moved with me, including my daughter.

DOUGLASS: You all moved to Sacramento.

SHAW: Sure. We rented an apartment. Maybe for a short budget session or something, I would go up by myself.

DOUGLASS: You kept the house in Ontario. And you had an

apartment in Sacramento. You and the family were basically based one place or the other, in terms of living.

SHAW: Yes. And my family is working for me. First, Leila did my office work as an assemblyman. This was being done generally. It did not pay much, I think, it was \$200 a month. I should add that, it was unknown to the electorate, but the legislature always paid us enough because the per diem was big. And there were other perks. Wives were working for legislators as secretaries. And, of course, it got abused. A wife pulling down a salary for answering the doorbell at home. So some guy got a Legislative Counsel's opinion that, of course, it was impermissible. Because of the community property law, half of what she earned was the legislator's. So that was put to a stop.

DOUGLASS: But that is how you started out.

SHAW: Yes. And then I had my daughter work for me.

DOUGLASS: So how old was your daughter by the time you went up there?

SHAW: She was seventeen, sixteen or seventeen.

DOUGLASS: And you maintained your practice.

SHAW: After a fashion. It was not all that big of a practice, in terms of ongoing stuff. It was never really the kind of practice where I would

have some retainer for some business. It was just individual pieces of work. I was associated first with [W. R.] Bob Holcomb. You know him? Mayor of San Bernardino. "Mr. San Bernardino."

DOUGLASS: I know the name.

SHAW: He was my associate. Took over my practice for me when I was in Ontario.

DOUGLASS: Had he come into the firm then? Or was it still your firm?

SHAW: It was still my firm. He was just working it for me. Later when I was in the senate, Fred Almy became my partner. He carried on while I was away, plus when I came back.

DOUGLASS: So that helped to facilitate the practice.

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: So you maintained your law office in Ontario.

SHAW: Right.

DOUGLASS: Was that also your political headquarters? In other words, was that your office in that area?

SHAW: Yes, I guess so. Your political headquarters was in your hat. And mostly your home, they'd phone you.

DOUGLASS: All right. In that election campaign, what were the issues being discussed?

SHAW: I can't remember anything.

DOUGLASS: There wasn't a burning issue.

SHAW: There was no burning issue. Except, everybody

was going to improve the economy, much as it is right now.

DOUGLASS: When you were elected, you had not run on some statement that you were going to cure some problem, and, therefore, you are committed.

SHAW: Nothing like when I later ran for the senate. Then the big issue was water. However, I had some campaign literature. I made a thumbnail sketch of myself and things I stood for. But they were pretty apple pie stuff.

DOUGLASS: So there was not any real divisive issue at stake in that election. It was not something that divided your district?

SHAW: I don't think so.

Description of Seventy-Second Assembly District

DOUGLASS: Maybe you could describe your district as you went into office. The Seventy-second Assembly District. Sizewise. The nature of the people living in it. Could you just talk about that for minute?

SHAW: Sure.

DOUGLASS: In 1950.

SHAW: It was the west end of San Bernardino County. Roughly, everything from Fontana west. The political focus was on local municipal politics and federal. There was minimal interest in state government. There would be a flurry of

activity just at campaign time. State legislators did not have staffs. They did not run chores for people or answer questions, to amount to anything.

DOUGLASS: What were the economic interests functioning? Agriculture?

SHAW: Agriculture was perceived by politicians as being very important.

DOUGLASS: In your district?

SHAW: In my district. I had minimum interest in it really, although that was my family background.

DOUGLASS: Was that citrus and vineyards?

SHAW: Yes. And dairy in Chino. I had sufficient interests that I saw to it that I got on the Agriculture Committee. I had spot bills in so if some problem came up concerning agriculture, I could handle it. Or try to. Incidentally, I notice to this day that the state legislators will explain how they manage to get on such-and-such committee. It has always been the practice that you can get on whatever committee you want, with a certain limit. There are exceptions. You cannot get on the Rules Committee.

DOUGLASS: Economically, were there any other business interests that were next in strength to the agriculture interests? I am trying to get a feel for the kind of pressures that might be put on you, or the lobbying you would get.

SHAW: Of course, the Republicans are better disciplined politically than Democrats. I just had no contact with people who were Republicans and, thereby, with the business community. At least, no helpful contact. Really very little contact.

DOUGLASS: How about labor?

SHAW: Labor, of course, I would have contact with them. But they are a feckless bunch.

[Laughter]

DOUGLASS: The agricultural workers were not particularly organized.

SHAW: They were not organized at all.

DOUGLASS: So you would be talking about building trades. That kind of thing.

SHAW: Yes. But I don't get that much support out of them because they endorse incumbents. And it looked like I was going to be a loser.

DOUGLASS: How about your fellow lawyers?

SHAW: Oh, they are just completely inactive. Maybe friends would give me a little bit.

DOUGLASS: What was the population of the district then, Mr. Shaw? How many people are we talking about?

SHAW: Oh, I don't know.

DOUGLASS: Well, let's see. The vote totals--I don't what that tells us--but the total vote was about 55,000 voting in the district.

SHAW: Maybe 200,000 people.

DOUGLASS: Still not terribly densely populated. To wrap that one up, was there much change by the time you went out of the assembly in '54? Did you see a different district by the time you left the assembly?

SHAW: Yes. It is coming on quite gradually.

DOUGLASS: So all those elements we have talked about were fairly much the same.

SHAW: I am hearing a lot more from business interests. Once I am an incumbent.

DOUGLASS: But that is the nature of being an incumbent. Not necessarily a change in the district.

SHAW: That's right. One of the most discouraging things about this level of politics is that I don't hear from my friends who put me in. I hear from cranks. I hear from flakes. And I hear nothing but complaints. Like, stop the sonic booms. Stuff like that, I'm equally well equipped to stop. That bothered me.

DOUGLASS: You didn't hear from people who agreed with you because they were just silent.

SHAW: These were just good people. They don't have any problems. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: That happens. They don't reinforce you by saying, "Hey, we are so glad you are there."

SHAW: Oh, I got enough of that. That part was there. I could sense that they had a higher regard for me. This business that you are looked down on

because you are a politician, that isn't so.
On a one-on-one basis.

III. FIRST SESSION (1951)

First Impressions of Speaker Sam Collins

DOUGLASS: Well, you go into the assembly and the speaker is a man named [Samuel L.] Sam Collins.

SHAW: Yes. Let me tell you about my first experience with him. Like all politicians of any success, he is highly personable, of course. He is a capable, strong guy. Before I get there, I have gone to a fellow by the name of [Ernest E.] Debs, who was a supervisor in Los Angeles who had been in the assembly. And he rates all these guys for me. Who's who. Who's owned by lobbyists. Just scored them. The thing about this was that he was exceedingly accurate. Except as to himself.

Anyhow, I had a line on who Sam was and what made him tick. I was informed that, in general, he went along with the lobbyists. I had not been there long, and I discovered, as did other Democrats, that the guy who was chairman of the Rules Committee who did all hiring of staff, would not give these girls a job unless they agreed to report back to him what the assemblyman was saying in his letters. He was just generally difficult.

DOUGLASS: Who was chairman of the Rules Committee?

SHAW: His name was Dickey. Randal [F.] Dickey. Later I got even with him, by accident. I used one of his bills to eliminate a conflict in criminal penalties, and, inadvertently, the conflict was resolved in favor of a reduced penalty, much to the public's dislike and Dickey's discredit.

But, anyhow, Sam had a problem with him. Sam got caught in a Gary Hart-type problem. And Dickey was nosing around about maybe he ought to replace Sam as speaker of the assembly. So Sam got us in his office one by one, and he had a resolution there to discharge Dickey as chairman of the Rules Committee. And nothing would suit us more. So we neophytes immediately sign up.

DOUGLASS: Was this your first experience with Collins?

SHAW: This is my first political experience of any significance. So all we freshmen sign up. Then sometime later Sam gets Dickey in there and waves this to him, and lets him read all these names. And he disciplines Dickey, and Dickey no longer gives him any trouble. But Dickey knows all our names who signed this petition. Now we are really in trouble. So we could hardly get pencils. That was my first double cross.

DOUGLASS: Who were the freshmen who came in with you?

Were there many? Was it a big group?

SHAW: Oh, not too many.

DOUGLASS: Are there a few who stand out in your mind?

SHAW: There was [William A.] Munnell. No. I would have to look through the list. That is a long time ago.

DOUGLASS: So, that was the first encounter with Mr. Collins. Any others?

SHAW: Oh, yes. Generally, partisanship was very real at this time. When you are in the minority, fourteen to eighty, you are not highly regarded by the opposition. They never have occasion to come to you. For some reason or another, Sam and I got along well nonpolitically. We would go fishing together. And drinking together. He was an extremely likable guy. Just amazingly so. But, of course, as you know, he had a lot of bad habits. He got into a lot of trouble.
Lobbyists: Arthur Samish and Others

DOUGLASS: It was about this time that the whole [Arthur H.] Samish thing began to surface in terms of people knowing about Artie Samish and the liquor lobby.

SHAW: Yes. And the Collier's [magazine] article.¹
This was pretty well known by the time I got there. I don't know when the Collier article

1. Lester J. Velie, "The Secret Boss of California," published in two issues, August 13 and 20, 1949.

came out. I met Samish.

DOUGLASS: Did you? Tell about that.

SHAW: Well, I didn't have anything to do with him. That was an interesting political phenomenon. Most of the lobbyists who were significant lobbyists, the interest they represented had what it wanted, and they were just there to protect what they had.

And this was true of the liquor industry. So Samish, he spent all his money and time with the senate side of the legislature, because all he had to do was stop stuff coming through. So Samish never came to me about anything. I just met him socially at some party.

DOUGLASS: What was he like to meet?

SHAW: He was like the character in a crime picture. The old hood who just sits back and doesn't say hardly anything. I can remember it was over at the old El Rancho [Motel]. You probably have seen movies where [William Randolph] Hearst would be at a dance. What in God's name would this guy be doing at a dance. You wondered the same thing about Samish. Why would he come to a party? [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: He was not a party person.

SHAW: Not as far as you can see. I guess he was working and looking.

DOUGLASS: So you were not struck by his charisma.

SHAW: Oh, no.

DOUGLASS: You are saying that he had no particular reason to woo you as a new assemblyman because he was focusing on the senate?

SHAW: That's right. He, the industry, had a guy who passed out money to assembly candidates. Usually in the form of billboard space. They didn't let you handle it. But by this time, he was the kiss of death because a few guys found out how they could find who he was contributing to. And they used it against a candidate.

DOUGLASS: Who was it who was handling that? Do you recall? For Samish. Or under Samish.

SHAW: [Daniel J.] Creedon. He later was the lobbyist for beer.

DOUGLASS: So at the point you came into the legislature all this was beginning to come out into the open.

SHAW: I think that it was already out. That this guy is bad news.

DOUGLASS: Everyone was being more cautious.

SHAW: Not everyone. There was a lot of guys who would take money from anybody on any side of the issue. One of the more striking stories is that the sergeant-at-arms had his arm broken under these circumstances. A bill was coming up representing a battle between major and independent oil. And

it could be seen that there was going to be a call on the house. It was going to be a close vote. And so the sergeant-at-arms, his name was [Wilkie] Ogg, he ran out to the elevator to block it so these guys could not leave the assembly chambers and the building before they put this call on. The call would make them stay there and make them vote. He got in the way, and the rush was such that he got his arm broke. They were getting into the elevator to escape because they had taken money on both sides of the issue.

DOUGLASS: And they didn't want to vote.

SHAW: And Morton's employee, his lobbyist on the scene up there, he told me about my predecessors, one time removed. A man by the name of Godfrey Andreas. Godfrey had taken money on both sides, and this lobbyist figured that he was completely confused, and he was satisfied that Godfrey wanted to vote his way. So to remind him which way he wanted him to vote, he put a red flower in this lapel and asked him when the vote came up to look at that and vote "red." [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: Did that work?

SHAW: The story was all over.

Speakership

DOUGLASS: To continue on the speakership, I guess, in '51,

there was a "good government" group of assemblymen.

SHAW: Yes. And I got in on the ground floor.

DOUGLASS: Would you tell about that? How did you happen to get in on that?

SHAW: What they mean by "good government" is that the speaker of the assembly was assigning out bills, if he didn't like them, if he got enough campaign contributions that he wanted to do away with them. He would send it to a committee where it would be killed. On this basis he had a lot of political power. He collected campaign contributions which he parceled out to those who would go along with him. At this time, the speaker was not the clearing house for money that [Jesse M.] Unruh came to be. But there was still a lot.

We who were not in on this, anyhow, we wanted to reform this by having the Rules Committee collectively assign bills out. Break up this political game that was going on. And, I guess, [James W.] Silliman was the first candidate along that line. We finally secretly got enough votes together to get new members on the Rules Committee who would can Sam [Collins]. I think that was the first step.

DOUGLASS: During this period, Collins was indicted.

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: And the former speaker, [Charles W.] Lyons, had been convicted of bribery.¹ I think it was the whole same syndrome.

SHAW: Yes. I think it was on the liquor licenses.

DOUGLASS: He was finally freed after two hung juries. Collins. Silliman didn't come into the speakership until '53, but, in the interim, there was this revolt which was beginning with what you talked about. The only thing that was really won was the power to appoint the Rules Committee. It was removed from the speaker, in that he was on it, but each party in caucus selected three each. Now that was achieved in '51, I think. Or '52.

SHAW: That was the first step in the reform.

DOUGLASS: I think that you wanted more. I think the good government group wanted to remove his ability to appoint committee chairmen and also to assign bills. But I don't think that succeeded. But you figured that if you could get a handle on the Rules Committee, that would help?

SHAW: Sure. Indeed it would. We had an interesting sidelight there. The Democrats had a caucus, and we again had a peculiar voting procedure. I

1. Lyons served as speaker from 1943 to 1945.

was chairman of it.

DOUGLASS: Of the caucus?

SHAW: Of the caucus. On this particular issue. There was a fellow from Los Angeles who was owned by the lobbyists who was on the Rules Committee. I can't think of his name now. Thomas J. Doyle, Forty-fifth Assembly District. And, of course, he went around to all of us trying to get a commitment for a vote. And he was the type guy that it was especially fitting to say, "Of course, sure. Sure." So we all made the mistake of, every one of us, committing. So when we had the secret ballot, there was only one vote for him. [Laughter] And the only one for him was his own. So none of us could claim that we were that second vote; it was these other guys who lied to him.

DOUGLASS: He didn't like that.

SHAW: No.

DOUGLASS: Did you get three good people on the Rules Committee?

SHAW: Yes. We did. That really worked.

DOUGLASS: And did this start to improve the situation a little?

Effect of Incumbency

SHAW: Oh, yes. Sure. But it was still bad, politically. The basic trouble was, and still is, that this incumbency is corrupting. Guys

will start out pretty independent, but after they have been there a few years they just become owned by these lobbyists. Very seldom do they break out of it. It is just terrible.

DOUGLASS: And the tendency is to want to stay in office and live with it, instead of breaking out even. Even with the era of when you supposedly had the citizen-legislator. It didn't really work to that degree, I gather?

SHAW: Oh, no.

DOUGLASS: And, also, did you have the problem that some people had economic need? Weren't some of them on payrolls that maybe they should not have been on? Just to get some money to live on.

SHAW: Oh, yes. They wanted the money. For years and years and years, the legislators who were . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side B]

[Begin Tape 2, Side A]

SHAW: . . . who were insurance brokers, the insurance commissions on policies sold to state agencies, the commission would be sent to these legislators. It was just awful. It went on for years and years, and years. When it was finally revealed, it was the assemblyman right in this area who cried (he was the author of the bill), "We've got to do away with this. This is terrible." And he had been doing it for years.

DOUGLASS: And the chairman for the Education Committee had done lobbying for CTA [California Teacher's Association]. I suppose that that kind of thing happened a lot. Or had made a presentation for CTA.

SHAW: There was a lot of conflict of interest.

DOUGLASS: The interesting thing, to me, is if you talk about that era of part-time legislators, and you talk about the later era, sometimes people try to make these sharp contrasts. I am not so sure, from what you are saying, you think there is much difference.

SHAW: No. I sense that the situation may have improved a little, but I am not too sure about that.

Initial Impression of Assembly

DOUGLASS: Just to dip in a moment of that first experience. You got committee assignments that

you asked for, basically.

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: That was [Committee on] Agriculture. In other words, you were not disappointed by not getting something that you asked for.

SHAW: I can't really remember. Right.

DOUGLASS: What were your initial impressions of being up there? And how you were treated by your fellow assemblymen?

SHAW: Oh, fine. You know, they are very personable or they would not manage to get the job. On a personal, comaraderie standpoint, just a fine way to live.

DOUGLASS: How about partisanship, in terms of, say, on the floor. As a neophyte. Would people help you? Could you ask their advice, regardless of party? Or would you tend not to do that?

SHAW: It would depend on individuals. There would be some Republicans that you got along with well. Even best friends. But there were others you would not give them the time of day, would not ask them anything. For instance, Dickey. I was asked to handle a bill to eliminate a conflict. A conflict on the minimum sentence on certain crimes. One statute said a minimum of one year for a particular sexual offense. I have forgotten what it was. They had virtually the

same crime described elsewhere with a minimum of two years. And they wanted to eliminate this conflict.

So I borrowed a bill from this fellow Dickey. It worked out with the Legislative Counsel's office, well, we'll use this bill. I just practically forgot about it. Well, it went through all right. And my God, in its final form, it had reduced. . . . It had picked the lesser penalty instead of the greater one. And, here, this had Dickey's name on it. Not mine at all. He just caught all kinds of hell on it. [Laughter] It just pleased me no end.

DOUGLASS: He wanted the two years.

SHAW: It should have been the other way around.

Strategy of Bills: Spot Bills and Swapping

DOUGLASS: You mentioned, taking one of his bills, and earlier you mentioned spot bills. Could you just talk about the logistics, or the mechanisms, by which bills were introduced and handled in that era? For holding positions.

SHAW: Yes. It was very simple once you were told what the problem was and what to do about it. There came a time in the session that you were only allowed two more bills. So you wanted to cover yourself by introducing something on practically every subject. So all you had to do was to go through the codes. You really didn't go through

anything. You would go to the Legislative Counsel: "Make me up a set of spot bills where I will have something on every part of the codes." [Laughter] And once in a while, they get you in trouble. This is pretty boring work, Legislative Counsel.

So they made one spot bill for me whereby-- it was defining milk of some kind--it defined milk as the product of bovine animals, and so forth. So they added hamsters for my spot bill. That would be the amendment. My god, somebody got a hold of this, that I was trying to certify hamster milk. But, anyhow, you'd get these spot bills on all parts of the codes.

DOUGLASS: It was a holding position.

SHAW: It was just a holding position. And then you would swap them. I would not have one on some particular thing, or use it up; I would go to, say, Dickey and get one from him.

DOUGLASS: So you took his bill. Or you could really quite change a bill, couldn't you?

SHAW: Oh, yes. There were rules about this, but they were honored in the breach.

DOUGLASS: So the net effect would be an awful lot of bills introduced?

SHAW: Oh, yes. A lot of them were just spot bills.

DOUGLASS: It gets very confusing to track all this as to

which bill ends up where, as you go through those assembly bill citations in the journal index.

SHAW: Oh, yes.

DOUGLASS: And I think there is another myth, then, about the two ways the legislature functioned in the eras. One is that fewer bills were introduced under the era you were in the assembly as, contrasted to later. But I don't think that is necessarily true.

SHAW: No.

DOUGLASS: Because of the holding action that was necessary.

SHAW: None of these things hold up statistically because there is more to it than that.

[Interruption]

Impact of Korean War on State Government

DOUGLASS: Mr. Shaw, this is your first session in the assembly. In January, Governor [Earl] Warren delivers his message, which seems to reflect the fact that we are in the Korean War and that is a little frustrating, I would think, because California had a lot of things on the back burner because of the Depression and then because of World War II. And now it was having to respond to a tremendous growth in our state. It seemed to me this would be a challenging time to come into the state legislature, where hopes

had been so high and now you have to back off a little bit because, in essence, we are back in a war period.

SHAW: As I remember, I would not be surprised if that would be the rhetoric. "Let's hold back. We can't be doing everything." But the real situation was that nobody was holding back. There was no sense that we've got to forget about this proposition because we are in a war. The Korean War really didn't loom very large in that arena. State politics.

DOUGLASS: The only specific reference to it was the commitment of the national guard sector. But it is implied a little bit in terms of the rhetoric, as you say.

SHAW: Now, I noticed in what I had an occasion to deal with, I wanted, of course, politically, to try to do something in the field of veterans' benefits. And I see here where I was trying to get for Korean vets the same point credits in the civil service exams that they had for other vets. I guess we got that adopted.

DOUGLASS: Is there a bill number on that?

SHAW: I don't know.

DOUGLASS: I do have this constitutional amendment.

SHAW: Oh, wait a minute. This was something that originated in the senate with someone, and I handled it in the assembly.

DOUGLASS: Civil service?

SHAW: Yes. This is the sort of thing where the official record does not show that you did anything. And it really might have been quite significant. You might have had a lot of trouble. Not in this case.

DOUGLASS: Who carried it in the senate?

SHAW: I don't remember now.

DOUGLASS: But you carried it in the assembly.

SHAW: I carried it in the assembly.

DOUGLASS: And this is the typical housekeeping thing of bringing current vets into the same civil service point advantage that anybody had.

SHAW: That's right.

DOUGLASS: It is interesting though, that you, with a few other people introduced Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 41, which never got out of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments. But it was to give bonuses to members of the armed forces. And it would be funded by a tax on cigarettes and tobacco products.

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: So you had an interest in doing something for the vets?

SHAW: Oh, yes. I would say both as a matter of bona fides and a matter of politics. I was always sensitive about veterans because I was not one,

in the first place. And, in the second place, I figured that they really had a bum rap.

DOUGLASS: So as a nonveteran you almost had to bend over backwards to be sensitive to their needs so you could not be accused of being totally . . .

SHAW: As a matter of fact, I was aggressive in the matter. I always tried to introduce something.

Air Pollution

DOUGLASS: One other thing, just to go back to the governor's message, he does make a call for smog research. And smog is in quotes, like it is a very new thing. Which it was probably in '51. I think that is the first time that starts to get mentioned. Since you represented a district that has a history of trying to push for that, were you interested in it that early?

SHAW: I was very interested in it. I don't know when it came, but I introduced a bunch of legislation that failed. I got quite a ways with it. Let me tell you a little about air pollution. I could see that our problem was a lack of responsibility, the focus of responsibility. The smog control matter was in the hands of the boards of supervisors. Politically, you could have a supervisor who was well regarded, completely reelectable, even though he identified with the manufacturing community and did nothing about the smog. A bad record on

that. So I could see that there was not going to be much happening, unless you could pull out and separate this smog problem. And even have smog control commissioners separately elected.

DOUGLASS: Pull it away from the supervisors?

SHAW: Yes. Also, have these smog commissioners responsible for a particular area. Now, politically, you would not have any luck going over county boundaries. You could not do that very well. But I know I went around with my car using topo [topographical] maps to get the names of the streets that would make the boundaries of this basin, where we had a smog problem.

I introduced legislation to have separate elected commissioners to handle air pollution control in that area. And I got some support from my co-assemblyman, [L. Stewart] Hinckley. Because he was in the citrus industry, and they were beginning to be alarmed. They were getting damaged agricultural crops, even citrus. So he was somewhat supportive, but, beyond him, it was almost politically impossible to do anything. The manufacturing community had all kinds of political clout. The ecology community had hardly come into existence yet.

DOUGLASS: At that time, had the automobile been nailed as the cause, the chief cause? Or was that later?

- SHAW: No. That was early on. In fact, probably the automobile got too much attention.
- DOUGLASS: But by '51, people thought it was a lot to do with the cars, as well as plant manufacturing pollution.
- SHAW: I think so. There was a man at Caltech [California Institute of Technology] by the name of [Arie Jan] Haagen-Smit, who was out early, showing service clubs how smog formed from raw gasoline fumes.¹ From early on, the automobile was the target.
- DOUGLASS: What did you see in your area as the sources of the smog? In your district. Or certain things that would affect your district?
- SHAW: It was just all sources. Of course, we had Kaiser Steel. That was a problem. We could see it just come in from the west. It certainly was not all Kaiser, by any means. Although, there was a lot of suggestion from people in the west that our problem was Kaiser. Kaiser was certainly a big problem, but most of our problems drifted in from the west.
- DOUGLASS: I just wanted to note that I do have in 1953, that you and Assemblyman [L. M.] Lee Backstrand introduced A.B. 1454, which was to create an

1. A bio-organic chemist at Caltech.

Inland Air Pollution District. It passed the assembly but was not acted upon in the senate.

SHAW: Yes. That is the one I am talking about.

DOUGLASS: You were going to bypass the supervisors and set up a separate entity.

SHAW: Yes. We were going along pretty good until we got over in the senate side. Our state senator was on the committee. [James E.] Cunningham [Sr.]. He identified with the manufacturers. So he got the word to the membership that he didn't want it to pass. So it didn't get out of his committee. I think [Randolph] Collier--you probably know him--was chairman of the committee then. I knew him pretty well.

DOUGLASS: Was that the Public Health Committee, Mr. Shaw? What committee would that have been in the senate?

SHAW: Probably Public Works or something.

DOUGLASS: Transportation and Highways is what I associate Collier with.

SHAW: Maybe that is what it was. Could be. Anyhow, when they called out the vote, it sounded to me like we had the votes. So I went down to Collier, and I--he had announced that the bill was not still with us, or something that suggested that it was dead--asked him, "Can you call the roll again on that?" "No. No. We

don't do it that way." Somebody had missed their cue.

DOUGLASS: So that died. It never went out of committee in the senate.

SHAW: We had lots of trouble with that. There really was a hot battle on the assembly side. There was a lady legislator who liked the idea and was giving us support. She represented Kern County.

DOUGLASS: Would it be [Dorothy] Donahoe?

SHAW: Yes. You've got her. That sounds right. I guess so.

DOUGLASS: She came into the assembly in '53.

SHAW: Yes. She had not been there long. Anyhow, that sounds right. She came and told us that she would have to change her mind. She could not vote to support it because her supervisors were on her so bad on behalf of, over here by Tehachapi, that cement plant. So this is nothing new, people being asked to be released from a commitment. But Hinckley criticized her about this. And the poor girl was just completely distraught. She just wept bitter tears over this son of a bitch getting after her about this.

DOUGLASS: Your legislation only provided for your region, right?

SHAW: Yes. Of course, we did that on purpose so we

could say, "This does not bother you. This is a local government program for us, and we all want it."

DOUGLASS: What would be the geographic definition of "inland?" What were the boundaries going to be?

SHAW: It was going to be the county line on the west because politically we could not cross it. Although the smog did. And then it was the four-thousand-foot level for the whole valley. Or maybe less than the four thousand foot. Anyhow, we fixed an elevation.

DOUGLASS: Of this whole valley.

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Well, you were an activist early on, in hindsight.

SHAW: They still need it. And there is nothing going to happen until they do something along that line.

DOUGLASS: It is now something coming from the west.

SHAW: A lot, of course. And, politically, smog is still hidden. Nobody out of government gets a chance to vote on it. We need an elected smog commission.

Ballot Propositions (1952)

DOUGLASS: All right. The cross-filing question was in the assembly, too, or in the legislature at that time. What finally became Proposition 7, in

1952, which required party labels on the primary ballot was in the works at that time. Do you recall any of that discussion over cross-filing? And how did you feel about it?

SHAW: I felt, from a selfish standpoint, cross-filing all of a sudden is OK. But it was very bad for Democrats. We had registration. We had a big edge in registration, and we only had fourteen representatives out of eighty. That is how bad it was.

DOUGLASS: Well, I gather, putting that item on the ballot was really a response to very heated pressure that was coming on to abolish cross-filing entirely. So you settled for the party label going on.

SHAW: Yes. I can't remember details now. But I remember how I was well aware that we had to do whatever we could to get rid of cross-filing; otherwise, as a party, we were dead.

DOUGLASS: To wind that up, there was a proposition, No. 13, that went on the '52 ballot to actually abolish it. So the two were on the ballot on the same time. The one to abolish failed, and the one for the party label succeeded. Interesting enough, Assemblyman John Elliott put up \$40,000 to get Prop. 13 going, which was the abolition of cross-filing. So he must have had

an active interest in getting rid of cross-filing.

SHAW: That is very interesting. Of course, there is nothing new to have some watered-down, competitive initiative measure. That is the way to kill the effective bill is to put in a watered-down one that will attract more votes.

Bills and Resolutions (1951)

DOUGLASS: Yes. All right. Just a couple of general things that were of interest. You supported a resolution, which many others supported, to put the Office of Regional Mobilization in Los Angeles. In other words, I guess there was some lobbying going as to what would be the center for the Southern California-Arizona region. Obviously, the people tried to get the legislators from this area to support it going to Los Angeles. And the arguments were that we had more industry, and this would be the logical place. Do you recall any of that, particularly?

SHAW: No.

DOUGLASS: All right. One other thing of interest. House Resolution 174. You were supporting the creation of an assembly interim committee to investigate economic discrimination because of race, religion, or national origin. That is here, Mr. Shaw. [Referring to notes] I thought

that was pretty interesting that you would be interested in that problem at that time.

SHAW: Yes. That would be part of my political commitment. But these house resolutions and joint resolutions were by the dozens. You would try to get some attention. You would be signing all kinds of these. Some of them go someplace and some of them don't.

DOUGLASS: That's right. But this is part of your political agenda. At least, pro forma, if nothing more, you subscribed to that?

SHAW: Yes. I can't remember it now. I didn't have any particular concern with the thing unless I was the lead author.

DOUGLASS: Right. I was simply trying to pick up on the issues. Why don't we go to the bills. You have the bill on the milk and dairy products. A.B. 2355.¹ Do you recall why? It is a definition of pasteurized concentrated milk. So this must have been in response to your Chino dairy farmers.

SHAW: I thought it was. This is a good example of my naivete. I had these spot bills, and I think that this may have been one. And this party

1. A.B. 2355, 1951 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 1755 (1951).

came to me who obviously was connected with the milk industry and wanted to know if he could have my help with a bill. It turns out, after I am well into it, that it isn't too bad a bill. But it does not have anything to do with the dairy industry in my county. He is working for Safeway [Stores]. And Safeway hit on a way to avoid the price controls on milk. They wanted to cut prices, and, you remember, there is a floor on prices. So, they develop a product called concentrated milk. You take it home, and you add two parts of water, and you have got whole milk.

So, on the face of this, it looks like they are simply trying to impose the same standards for quality on this new product. But what they are really trying to do is legitimize it, and use it as a price-cutting device. Just to add an anecdote on the side. Their lobbyist, and, of course, he is a very personable friendly guy and all that, but, to give an idea of how thorough he was. One day I get in the mail a newspaper clipping of a good-sized story that says, "Stanford Shaw. Great Success." And there is a story underneath. What this is. He has cut this out of some [San Francisco] Bay area newspaper. They are talking about a George

Bernard Shaw play that was put on at Stanford.

[Laughter]

DOUGLASS: He caught it and sent it to you.

SHAW: This is no big deal, you know. But, gad, he put a party on for you.

DOUGLASS: This is a learning experience for you, though.

SHAW: Oh, yes.

DOUGLASS: What did it tell you? How did it affect your future behavior?

SHAW: This, plus my experience with Sam Collins and a few others, makes me hypersensitive to watching what in the world I am doing.

DOUGLASS: And not be used.

SHAW: That's right. Bordering on the point of cynicism.

DOUGLASS: That happened with you very quickly. [Laughter] Why don't we just go through a few of these bills, the ones particularly that you have listed in front of you because they passed. Do you remember anything in particular about them? A.B. 743¹ raised judges' salaries in the superior courts.

SHAW: Yes. I learned something there, too. As you

1. A.B. 743, 1951 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 1432 (1951).

see, that is the first bill that I ever introduced?

DOUGLASS: Yes.

SHAW: Well, that is about the stupidest thing you can do [Laughter], for your first bill to raise judges' salaries, when I am an attorney.

DOUGLASS: I didn't think of that.

SHAW: Well, they thought of it at the local newspaper. I never did that again.

DOUGLASS: Well, then the next bill, A.B. 1466 had to do, again, with salaries, the compensation, of judges and attaches of municipal courts.¹ To be established in a district embracing the city of San Bernardino. Was that to be a new municipal court?

SHAW: I should imagine so. And these things were just housekeeping in that you could not even get them through the legislature without your board of supervisors having approved. And they usually had their source at the board of supervisors, and we were just doing the work. So we get all of the blame but none of the credit.

DOUGLASS: They get the credit?

1. A.B. 1446, 1951 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 1228 (1951).

SHAW: Oh, we get a little credit. Like on salaries for judges. In Riverside, I am practicing law, and I am going to the court of O. K. Morton, who all the lawyers just hate. When he finally died, all kinds of people went to his funeral just to be sure it was true. I go into his courtroom--I always had trouble with him--he stops the trial, has the bailiff come get me, and he wants to talk to me in his chambers. I am now a legislator, see. He wants to talk about salaries.

DOUGLASS: That is interesting.

SHAW: So things change.

DOUGLASS: We have done the milk bill. How about this A.B. 2361, having to do with the mentally ill. It has to do with liability of those filing¹ petitions for examination.

SHAW: Yes. I understand. I kind of remember this one. This is something that, I believe, was my own idea. I noticed that all too frequently² people were sending the old folks to Patton. We did not have rest homes then. I just thought

1. A.B. 2361, 1951 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 418 (1951).

2. Patton State Hospital for mentally disabled, located in San Bernardino County and administered by the Department of Mental Health.

it was terrible, and some of the judges did, too. These adult children, getting their parents committed to Patton.

So I was going to create some liability. They had to have some probable cause for filing these petitions. I don't know if the bill had any effect. Other things came along that kind of cured that problem.

DOUGLASS: Did you see that in your court when you were the justice of the peace? Or you just knew about it?

SHAW: I knew about it from practicing.

DOUGLASS: Practice. But you would not have handled it.

SHAW: No. There were not any of those commitments in justice court.

DOUGLASS: You saw something that was falling through the net in terms of older people?

SHAW: I thought it was just terrible. I should have tried to do more about it.

DOUGLASS: I didn't realize that was what was going on.

SHAW: You didn't?

DOUGLASS: No. I didn't, but I can see. If there was no other place to put them and they would not take responsibility, they would try to do that.

All right. A.B. 2362 has to do with the appointment and duties of court reporters in San

1

Bernardino County.

- SHAW: Here, again, the county wants me to do this and the reporters too. That is just legislative housekeeping.
- DOUGLASS: I did want to ask you about one bill [A.B. 2366] that you did introduce and did not go anywhere. But it was a bill to create an Anti-Totalitarian Civil Liberties Defense Commission.
- SHAW: Yes. I thought that I had a fair idea. What I was really up to was trying to counter the difficulty all the liberals were having of being suggested as pro-Communist. Obviously, to counter this was to introduce such measures as this.
- DOUGLASS: Meaning that you were going to blunt it by saying, "Anything that is antitotalitarian, whether it is fascist or. . . ."
- SHAW: I was going to try to get this problem handled by a responsible body, rather than guys like [Jack B.] Tenney² and [Joseph] McCarthy. Running with the ball and having fun.
- DOUGLASS: So this commission would be concerned with the

1. A.B. 2362, 1951 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 1497 (1951).

2. State Senator Jack B. Tenney was chairman of the Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities in California.

civil liberties of people who were being discussed in terms of totalitarianism? Whether it be communism or what, but, obviously, you are talking about the Communists.

SHAW: Right.

DOUGLASS: That went to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy, and they did not act on it.

SHAW: Oh, yes. I got nowhere. I tried to get some publicity out of it, too, but I had no luck. Mind you, if I have a good idea, it is going to be stolen from me because I am one of the minority of fourteen.

DOUGLASS: Yes. I understand. An assembly of very few Democrats all right. There were a few bills, just to mention, that you and [Ralph M.] Brown introduced. And two of them had to do with municipal courts, one in Ontario [A.B. 1467] and one in Upland [A.B. 1468].¹ Was this to set up municipal courts?

SHAW: Yes. It was part of the court reform program. To do away with justice courts and supplant them with municipal courts.

DOUGLASS: You were just facilitating that, which, I take

1. A.B. 1467 and A.B. 1468, 1951 session, passed the Judiciary Committee but were not enacted into law.

it, you agreed with. Or did you think that was arguable?

SHAW: Oh, not necessarily. It depended. I had had some trouble with that. I saw both sides of it.

DOUGLASS: What were the advantages of retaining the justice of the peace system?

SHAW: Well, if you had a good justice of the peace, the community felt better with him. And I don't know whether it is good for the judiciary system to have the nonlawyer participants. The people's court.

DOUGLASS: So did you have the feeling that putting a municipal court everywhere to supplant these might have been just too much of a reaction?

SHAW: Yes. That was it exactly. It was swinging too far to the other extreme.

DOUGLASS: That is interesting. So that was somewhat arguable in your mind?

SHAW: You bet. I wanted to retain a number of the justice courts.

DOUGLASS: Did you have a standard for that? A measure you could have used as to where you would keep the justice courts?

SHAW: It was the sort of thing that was kind of ad hoc. If you have a bad justice court, a bad JP, you often can't get rid of him, except by abolishing his court.

DOUGLASS: When they get elected, they essentially stay?

SHAW: They get reelected.

DOUGLASS: Then you and Brown had a bill that had to do with the rules against remoteness in vesting and against suspension of the power of alienation. A.B. 2363, amending the Civil Code.¹

SHAW: Oh, that was a hot one.

DOUGLASS: That passed. Was that all about?

SHAW: I can't remember. But later I did something about that. The rule against perpetuity, as you know, I suppose, is you got to have a trust limited in time to lives in being, plus twenty-one years. Then they had a rule that went along with that that was called a rule against remoteness in vesting of title, where you could not hold up the investing of title until about that same period. Later on, I don't think it was this time, I got that remoteness of vesting thing abolished.

DOUGLASS: Yes. I think it is in a bill later on.

SHAW: I can't remember, in '51, how I was really on this so much. Anyhow, this is just law school stuff. And a very few legal professionals in the field of estate planning were concerned with

1. A.B. 2363, 1951 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 1463 (1951)

this.

Judiciary Committee: Ralph Brown and Others

DOUGLASS: I think that goes over the bills. I am interested in that this was your first committee service. Let's talk about your committee members and chairmen. Let's start with Judiciary with Ralph Brown as chairman. Ralph Brown, of course, emerged as a major figure. A speaker. What was your impression of Ralph Brown?

SHAW: Oh, on a scale of a hundred, he was 101. Just an exceptional person. He had it all. He was a very successful businessman in Modesto. Owned many business properties. He was a very good lawyer. Owned a radio station. He was a very good friend. Oh, just short of self-effacing and extremely friendly. I got to know him very well.

DOUGLASS: When did you first meet him?

SHAW: Oh, just in the legislature. He was speaker pro¹ tem, I think, when I was first there. And he was chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I was on the Judiciary Committee.

DOUGLASS: So he and you were together.

1. Thomas A. Maloney was speaker pro tem, 1943-56.

- SHAW: It got where we would be staying at his home. He kept an automobile both in Modesto and Sacramento. He had an airplane and would fly back and forth. He came down here and wanted to go to a dude ranch once. He said, "You got to have dude ranches where you are." So I had to find a dude ranch. We went to the Kemper-Campbell Ranch.
- DOUGLASS: I was going to say Kemper-Campbell. I bet he liked it.
- SHAW: Well, he didn't like where we stayed. We stayed in the Katt house.
- DOUGLASS: Did Brown, because you knew him personally, in the later years ever discuss with you the fight over the speakership in the assembly, when he was appointed to a judgeship and Unruh became speaker. Unruh obviously had his eye on the speakership. Brown was very highly thought of, I gather. There have been some things that I have heard which would indicate Unruh might have helped to arrange to have Brown named a judge, in order to get him out of the picture. Did Ralph Brown ever discuss any of that political thing with you?
- SHAW: Ralph Brown could have been a judge any time he wanted to.
- DOUGLASS: I am sure that you are right.

- SHAW: Without any help from anybody, except the governor.
- DOUGLASS: Well, I guess, the question is why did he then choose to become a judge?
- SHAW: He was having problems with his health. As a matter of fact, he died pretty soon.
- DOUGLASS: That's right.
- SHAW: He was very sensitive about his health. He knew he had hypertension pretty bad. He had a lot of fixation about his physical condition.
- DOUGLASS: Anybody else on that Judiciary Committee? I do have a list of the names.
- SHAW: [Gordon A.] Fleury was an outstanding member. He was a superior court judge who resigned to run for the assembly and later quit the assembly because he wanted to go back to practicing law. He was a bright guy. He was a Sacramento assemblyman. Robert McCarthy was a member. He was of a leading family out of San Francisco. He was a representative of San Francisco. He was young, a big contractor. A good legislator. Gifted public speaker. Just had it all. Very few of them did. Who were some of the other names?
- DOUGLASS: The people on the committee were [William H.] Rosenthal, who was vice chairman.
- SHAW: He was well respected. Lots of seniority. A

Jew. A lawyer.

DOUGLASS: Were not all members of the committee usually lawyers?

SHAW: On Judiciary?

DOUGLASS: Yes.

SHAW: There was one fellow, he's on there. He had been to law school, but had not managed to pass the bar. Is he on the list there?

DOUGLASS: The list for 1953 might be a little bit different.

SHAW: I don't see anything important.

DOUGLASS: I think the outstanding ones are the main things. People who you felt one way or another strongly about.

SHAW: I can tell you what became of them. [Referring to 1951 list] [Julian] Beck was outstanding. He later became Governor [Edmund G.] Brown [Sr.]'s legislative secretary. He really was the one that decided what got signed and what didn't. [Bernard R.] Brady is the one. He was the nonlawyer.

[End Tape 2, Side A]

[Begin Tape 2, Side B]

SHAW: He had no health problems, except for alcohol. He was a San Francisco Irishman. Ninety-nine percent politician.

DOUGLASS: Do you think it is useful to have a nonlawyer on

the Judiciary Committee?

SHAW: Not this one. Oh, yes. Sure there should be.

DOUGLASS: Theoretically, should it be all lawyers? Or is it good to have somebody who is not a professional?

SHAW: It would be good idea to have someone who is not. It would have to be a very special person. It is like, you are doing this work, you would probably be bored stiff, except you have had some political experience. Most people just would not be able to stand it, talk about the "remoteness of vesting."

DOUGLASS: To sit through that. All right. Anybody else in there?

SHAW: Yes. There are a lot of interesting people.

DOUGLASS: That is an interesting group.

SHAW: [Thomas W.] Caldecott went on to appellate court. [Arthur W.] Coats [Jr.] was a great liberal. George [D.] Collins [Jr.] was a great liberal. I mean by this, people who were just absolutely selfless. [Arthur H.] Connolly [Jr.] was a San Francisco lawyer. Chairman of the Public Health Committee. [Ernest C.] Crowley was a blind man. He was a good example of someone who, through long years of service, just got to be owned by the lobbyists. The next one is Dickey. Dickey was chairman of Rules. You

would not see him show up very often. [Richard J.] Dolwig. He later had all kinds of difficulty. [Donald L.] Grunsky. His father was a famous bridge designer. He was a very accomplished, substantial attorney down by Monterey. What is the artichoke capital of the world?

DOUGLASS: Watsonville?

SHAW: [John J.] McFall was the mayor of Manteca. Went back to congress. [Patrick D.] McGee was a very colorful young man. He had all kinds of problems. He was a Republican, and they tried to keep him out because he really was not a resident of his district. Munnell went on to the bench. [H. Allen] Smith was an FBI [Federal Bureau of Investigation] man who was a TV [television] star. He had a program early on in TV broadcasting.

[Stanley T.] Tomlinson was a lawyer down in Santa Barbara. My association with him was quite unusual. There was a measure about the next session, introduced, whereby you would have to go to court. . . . A widow or widower would have to go court to terminate the joint tenancy title; so that the survivor would have sole title. Here in southern California we accomplished that, and we still do, by just

signing an affidavit and recording it. In northern California they did it both ways.

In northern California, the lawyers wanted it so people would have to, for the law business it would generate. They snuck this through the legislature. And Tomlinson and I were the only ones who caught it, in southern California. We didn't do as much as we might have done in alerting the others. "You guys better look out. This is a bad bill." We voted against it, but just the two of us. On the floor. The two of us.

When it got enacted, all hell broke loose. The lawyers had done this. I don't suppose you can remember this. There was a guy on the TV who just just practically made a career out of it. George Putnam, the ultraconservative who shows up in the Rose Parade all the time. Week after week, he went after the legislature about this. They could not wait to get back into session to repeal this. [Laughter] Of course, when we did, it was not Tomlinson or I who got to introduce the bill. It was one of these guys who voted for it.

DOUGLASS: At least, you could say that you didn't vote for the bill. Well, it sounds as if the Judiciary Committee was a pretty substantial group of

people.

SHAW: They were young. They were lively of mind. Drinking too much. The committee meetings in those days were in the evening. After a big meal and lots of drinking. Sometimes it degenerated into a terrible display. So it was not government at its best, but that was the real world.

DOUGLASS: It was not a regular daytime activity then. You wonder how good one's judgment is at eleven or twelve at night, anyway, after a full day of work, regardless of the other factors?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: But that would carry a pretty heavy load, that committee, wouldn't it?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: The Judiciary and Education Committees, I gather, were the ones which really had the big agendas.

SHAW: I avoided the Education Committee like the plague, but I was always on the Judiciary.

DOUGLASS: I wanted to ask you a question about that. You must have originally been appointed to Education. I noted that you asked to be replaced, and you were changed. Somebody by the name of [John E.] Moss [Jr.] was put in your place. Anyway, you got off of it. I think you

were on it for a few days.

SHAW: Yes. Later, I got on it purposely because I wanted to get a state college for this district. And I did.

DOUGLASS: But wasn't that in the senate?

SHAW: Yes. That was in the senate.

DOUGLASS: Well, that reinforces the story I heard that people don't go on the Education Committee unless they really. . . .

SHAW: Unless there is something they want. But there were exceptions.

DOUGLASS: They know it is a tremendous load. Work load.

SHAW: Yes. Unless you are in that field, it is awfully dull.

DOUGLASS: In fact, on January 11th, you resigned from the Education Committee, where you were listed as vice chairman, and were replaced by Moss. Now that is just a matter of days.

James W. Silliman

Let me ask you about the Agriculture Committee. That was chaired by George A. Clarke of Merced, and [John B.] Cook was vice chairman. Do you remember anything in particular about the composition of that committee or the chairman?

SHAW: Yes. He was extremely old. I was only on the committee in case somebody in the agriculture community here wanted something. I didn't have

any expertise or interest in agricultural matters.

DOUGLASS: James Silliman was on that committee. Was that how you got to know him?

SHAW: No. I knew him generally. He was a big agriculture man in Salinas. A lettuce grower and all that. More particularly, he was an agricultural warehouseman.

DOUGLASS: One point that I should have brought up about Silliman, too, because we did discuss the speakership. I think we got into the response to Collins, and, apparently, the fight over the Silliman speakership was so bitter that I read that Silliman would only appoint as committee chairmen people who supported him.

SHAW: Oh, that was the name of the game. Early on, I was told, now when you get into a speakership fight, the first rule is vote for the one that wins. Don't ever get caught for the one who is losing. And I held out. I knew that I was going to vote for Silliman, but I held out committing myself to the very end because I was advised to do so.

DOUGLASS: Were there several other contenders?

SHAW: No. There weren't many. There was [Ernest R.] Geddes from your community.

DOUGLASS: That's right. Ernest Geddes.

SHAW: I forgot the details. The sort of thing I

remember is that I am sitting in the office on C Street in Ontario--I guess it was a little later--looking down Euclid Avenue. And who do I see coming up the street, Silliman and [Luther H.] Abe Lincoln. All these guys. [Laughter] I could hardly believe my eyes. They are coming up, trying to get my commitment.

DOUGLASS: What did you think of Silliman? I gathered you were going to vote for him. But was that for pragmatic reasons, or did you respect him?

SHAW: No. I respected his position. He was a good guy. And we were trying to defeat the bad guys again.

DOUGLASS: So you felt comfortable rallying around Silliman.

SHAW: He was not a warm guy, personally, but he was right politically.

Public Health Committee: Health Insurance

DOUGLASS: Okay. Then there was the Public Health Committee, and Arthur Connolly, Jr. of San Francisco was the chairman of that. And [William Byron] Rumford was on that committee. [Ralph C.] Dills.

SHAW: Yes. Rumford was later the chairman.

DOUGLASS: [William S.] Grant. [Glenard P.] Lipscomb, Rumford. H. Allen Smith. Any comments there?

SHAW: Yes. This was in the days when I guess it was

Earl Warren was suggesting compulsory health insurance of some kind.

DOUGLASS: I think that he started to float the idea.

SHAW: And the medical community equated this with socialism. I had some political support from a local doctor friend, Truman Ackerson and his wife, Mildred. They, I guess, wanted me, as expected, to try to get on [Committee on] Public Health.

I thought compulsory health insurance was a pretty good idea. But I had a political stance that was against what they were calling "socialized medicine." What has happened since is just unbelievable. This thing started off where the orthodox M.D. [doctor of medicine] would not have anything to do with this. Now we have all of them just making more money than they ever imagined in their fondest dreams. Inflation aside, never did they have it so good, just because of this.

DOUGLASS: Ironic, isn't it.

SHAW: It sure is.

Judiciary Committee and Capital Punishment

DOUGLASS: I think that you explained why you were on these committees. Which was the one you enjoyed working on the most?

SHAW: Oh, I would say Judiciary. By far. Largely because of the composition of the committee.

Then I was an attorney, and we had some great issues. I would go in there--maybe not in this session but the next one--in favor of capital punishment, and I discovered that all you have to do is study capital punishment enough and understand it thoroughly, and you will be against capital punishment. I don't care what your politics are. And that taught me something. That you can be completely reversed by one. . . . One witness could do it to you. And the guy who did it to me was a guy by the name of Joe Ball. One of these guys who can make black become gray, just great for the jury. But also he is a real student. Knows what he is talking about.

I find this cropping up there every once in a while. For instance, out here, did you ever hear of a place called Ash Meadows? Out by Death Valley. There is a spring out there with some rare, little fish. I have forgotten the name of the spring. It is like the snail darter issue back with TVA [Tennessee Valley Authority]. I thought this was absurd that they went to all this trouble to save this fish. But if you read an article that really gets into this, you just become 100 percent convinced. These guys are right. You are just dumb to be on the other side of the fence.

That was a chunk of dough, too.

DOUGLASS: You mean on the fuel used at the airport?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: What was happening to it before? They were not getting a rebate on it? The state collected it?

SHAW: They were not sending it back to the Ontario Airport like they should. The refund money. This is where the private guy is someplace where he pays tax on the gasoline, and there is a refund coming.

DOUGLASS: Are you talking about the individual private pilot, or are you talking about the supplier?

SHAW: The private flyer would pay the tax. And he could have gotten a refund, but he didn't apply for it.

I handled, on the assembly side, the first legislation licensing vocational nurses. That was a substantial thing.

DOUGLASS: So they had never been licensed as a category?

SHAW: That's right.

DOUGLASS: How did you happen to get interested in that?

SHAW: Just friendly with the senator who was the author of this measure. His name was Miller. George [C.] Miller.

I have it here I was going to take away the appointive power from the speaker. [Referring to his calendar]

- DOUGLASS: Right. That failed except for the Rules Committee, apparently, at that time.
- SHAW: Yes. I have a number of other things, but none of them particularly noteworthy.
- DOUGLASS: I think that a first session must be kind of memorable in the life of an elected official. That first experience and what happened.
- SHAW: This is what I took with me. [Referring to notes] When I got back, of course, we had to make speeches to service clubs.
- IV. SECOND (BUDGET) SESSION (1952)
- DOUGLASS: You are an archivist at heart to keep things like that. Well, let's go to your second session which was the '52 budget session.
- SHAW: There couldn't have been much there, could there?
- Civil Defense--Bomb Shelters
- DOUGLASS: Not a lot, but the big topic seemed to be the need for capital to construct public schools. And, also, civil defense is coming into the governor's messages. This was another era. People today might find it strange to believe there was this whole effort in terms of shelters.
- SHAW: I really got caught up in this.
- DOUGLASS: I noticed that you wanted to make loans available. Why did you get caught up? What was

going on?

SHAW: I don't know how I got started. But I thought it was just absurd that we weren't doing more about protecting ourselves. You understand, this was at a time when a shelter made some sense. As I understand, it makes no sense now. They could plow everything under twelve feet. So it was just a matter of accretion. I'd get kind of interested in reading something in the New Yorker, say, something like that. I phoned Edward Teller and asked him if he could come up and make a speech. "We need to know more about this." So he does. I get in touch with a few people who are trying to market bomb shelters. I build one in my front yard. Lots of publicity. I owned another piece of property. I tried to get the neighbors to join in building a community shelter for that lot. No interest.

I sort of got obsessed with it. Again, I was right. I should not say again. [Laughter] On the occasion, I was right. There was just something about the politics of that that I don't understand. Now people seem to take quite an interest in the Strategic Defense Initiative, but it was different if we got to talking about building something in my backyard. They just did not want to do it.

DOUGLASS: Do you think psychologically that people did not

want to cross that line?

SHAW: I guess so.

DOUGLASS: To say that you have to do that?

SHAW: I don't know. I suppose, they didn't want to think about that.

I came out here, and I am driving down the street in San Bernardino by Allen Ironworks, and here I see a bomb shelter. Just like the one I had in Ontario. So I went in there and asked them. "Do you have any luck selling these?" It was a big joke by this time. They had only sold three in all the time that they made them up-- this is a great big gasoline tank they made, ready to put in the ground for you--and one of those, they hadn't been paid for. Would they like to sell it? I got it out here in the yard. [Laughter] So do I know about bomb shelters!

DOUGLASS: The mentality then did seem to be that there was hope of taking cover and surviving in various ways.

SHAW: I think it could be done. Now as to whether it would be worth it when you come out? There was all kinds of stuff. I got literature on it. Specifications.

DOUGLASS: Is it another example of public lethargy? Or is it that people really don't want to face up to something like that?

SHAW: I should have given that more thought, I guess. It surprised me.

DOUGLASS: Well, civil defense certainly was on the front burner, in terms of what the governor was talking about.

SHAW: That was the trouble with it. There was a lot of talk, but we could not seem to get off the ground.

Transportation

DOUGLASS: All right. A large group of people in the assembly passed a resolution which addressed the study by the University of California Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering on metropolitan transportation. And that was adopted. I am only bringing that up because it seems to indicate the early efforts, or concerns, about what is happening to our metropolitan areas, in terms of transportation. And you were signed on with that. It was a large group.

SHAW: I got on the Transportation Committee, and I was interested in getting freeways for my district. I did, ultimately, get the Devore cutoff.

DOUGLASS: You were on a joint interim committee on the state highway system.

SHAW: Yes. And that was an effective one. They made up the state highway plan, periodically. That was the Collier committee.

DOUGLASS: Yes. Collier's big cause.

Smog

SHAW: I also had smog committees, and I went all over the state.

DOUGLASS: Was that under Public Health [Committee] or Transportation [Committee]?

SHAW: That was a Public Health subcommittee.

DOUGLASS: You had hearings all over the state?

SHAW: Mostly San Diego and Los Angeles.

DOUGLASS: Were you chairman of a subcommittee on that?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: When was that? Right in '52, '53, or '54? I didn't pick up on that in '51.

SHAW: It must have been in '53 then. I remember going to San Diego. Their smog problem came on late, and they never really had it very bad. We scheduled a hearing down there, and they never had any smog until we got down there. The day we got there, it was really socked in.
[Laughter] Which helped.

DOUGLASS: A few of the other committees. Reports, at least, that I picked up. You were on a subcommittee on narcotics, which was from both interim committees on Public Health and on the Judiciary chaired by Ralph Brown. They filed a preliminary report. Apparently, narcotics was showing up as a problem.

SHAW: Yes. But I don't remember that really being that much of a political activity.

Fairs: State and County

DOUGLASS: You were also assigned to a couple of agricultural interim committees, subcommittees. One was on fairs and expositions, which did the survey of the state fair in '52. And, in '53, they filed a final report. I gather that there was concern about the state fair and how well it was doing?

SHAW: Yes. It was a bad situation. I was on that. I think I stayed in touch with fairs because San Bernardino was jealously trying to protect its Orange Show, which should have been abolished, but, anyhow. . . . And the agricultural fairs. Some of the Agriculture Committee was interested in that. Yes.

DOUGLASS: So was it a way, in a sense, of defending your original fairs?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: As well as looking at that the state fair. The survey was aimed at why don't people come to the state fair?

SHAW: Yes. They were always trying to generate multiple use of their facility so that it would be better accepted by their community.

DOUGLASS: But I gathered that a lot of people on the committee looked at this committee and report as

a way to maintain the integrity of the other fairs. To protect them, in a way?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: You were not about to get rid of the state fair. That was there to stay.

SHAW: No. I am afraid so. But some of us felt that the money could be better spent someplace else. They were not paying their way. Most of them. If you knew anybody, you could get in for nothing.

DOUGLASS: The state fair.

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Would you have rather seen the money go to regional fairs?

SHAW: Education or something.

DOUGLASS: Something entirely different.

SHAW: It was not getting all that support. It cost [the state] about fourteen dollars for every person who went through the turnstile. They were not enjoying it that much. It would be better to give them two bucks to go to a movie or something else.

DOUGLASS: It was sort of a dead horse?

SHAW: In my book it was. But, you see, it was a cover for the horseracing industry. That was its political cover.

DOUGLASS: So they kept it alive. And they loom in

conjunction with any major fair, don't they?

SHAW: You bet.

DOUGLASS: Like the Los Angeles County Fair.

SHAW: They had a lot of political clout.

DOUGLASS: So that meant that it was not about to go away, either?

SHAW: That was the principal reason. I think that if it had been left to its own devices, we would have gotten rid of it. Or at least changed it.

DOUGLASS: Also, you were on an Agriculture Subcommittee on Public Lands, Grazing, and Forest Practices, which filed an extensive report with an analysis of the status of that. I have the report. It is quite a long report. Do you remember embarking on that?

SHAW: No. I certainly don't. Probably, on something like that, I was just along for the ride and didn't have much interest.

DOUGLASS: I think it had been ongoing, too, when you came onboard. All right.

SHAW: Much as today, a lot of those things would be developed by the chairman and his staff. The membership really didn't have much to do with it.

DOUGLASS: There is a bill, A.B. 48,¹ from that list which

1. A.B. 48, 1952 Leg., 2d Spec. Sess., Cal. Stat. 34 (1952).

you are looking at that you and [Ralph R.] Cloyed had introduced, which passed. It was on the need for planning for a the postwar public works program in the state.

SHAW: I see this thing, but I can't remember the first thing about it.

DOUGLASS: The background that I got on it was that it referred to cities incorporated after June 15, 1952. I think it must have been addressing the need for new cities, because we are now in '52, to be able to plan public works programs. Make surveys. I suspect it had something to do with the growth of the state, these new towns were coming up. That you and Cloyed were saying, "Look. There needs to be a plan. They need to take surveys. They need to do fiscal studies."

SHAW: Uh-huh. [noncommittal]

1952 Election Campaign

DOUGLASS: All right. Fine. Let's go on. In '52, you ran for reelection. I did want to talk about that for a minute. You won in the primary that time. Your only contender seemed to be Mildred Murphy, who I gather was a Democrat.

SHAW: No. She was a Republican.

DOUGLASS: It is hard to tell. She pulled more of a Democrat vote than a Republican.

SHAW: She was located in Fontana, a blue-collar

district.

DOUGLASS: I gather this was not a tough election campaign for you to run?

SHAW: No. We still had cross-filing. She had not been in any other race at all. She was only known in the Fontana area. She was an attorney there, by the way. I can't even remember John [J.] Leary.¹

DOUGLASS: Someone who has served only one term in the assembly, usually would be still vulnerable. How do you explain the fact that you did not have much of a race?

SHAW: Well, of course, it was a whole lot of things. People didn't know much about state politics. There was not a great deal of interest in it. If you are an incumbent, now you are getting some political contributions. You can put up a bunch of quarter cards. You can get a bunch of people to work for you.

DOUGLASS: What do you mean by "quarter cards"? Placards?

SHAW: The things that they put on telephone poles are about "yeah big." It is a quarter of a full card. You have learned how to campaign. You

1. In the primary, Shaw received 10,554 votes on the Republican ballot and 14,699 on the Democratic ballot. Mildred Murphy received 1,566 votes on the Republican ballot and 4,527 on the Democratic ballot. John Leary ran only on the Republican ballot and received 1,566 votes.

have built up at least some political support and machinery. I guess it is principally name recognition. They don't know if I am any good, but they remember the name Shaw in this job. On the ballot it says "incumbent." It does not say anything about her, except "lawyer," or something.

DOUGLASS: So it was not something you had to spend a lot of time on.

SHAW: Oh, I did, but it turned out that I didn't need to.

DOUGLASS: So you were running scared, anyway.

SHAW: Oh, yes. You always hear about that. Sam Collins used to say that, too. Then the one year when he was not running scared, they got him.

V. 1953 SESSION

DOUGLASS: In 1952, right? Well, let's go on to the '53 session then. Indeed, Collins is no longer in the legislature. He resigned from the assembly and was defeated when he ran for the state senate. Silliman became speaker. Unless you have anything more to remember about that speakership fight? We may have covered it.

SHAW: What year are we in?

DOUGLASS: In 1953.

California Law Revision Commission

- SHAW: I don't know where we missed it. Someplace back there, I created a thing called the California Law Review Commission.
- DOUGLASS: I think that is coming up in '53.
- SHAW: OK. It is earlier in the session.
- DOUGLASS: In fact, it is right here. [Referring to notes] About to get to it. We just started on '53. Why don't we go to that now. You were on the Joint Interim Committee on California Law Revision. And then you were appointed--there is one assemblyman and one senator--with six gubernatorial appointees to the California Law Revision Commission. Now how did that evolve? This joint interim committee and your appointment to the commission?
- SHAW: I guess, it had its start with a fellow named Ralph Kleps. Maybe you have run across him. He was the Legislative Counsel. He was a really fine student of government. He had been on the [California] Code Commission, in which they tried to make some kind of order out of our statutory law, as you know. And it had finished its housekeeping work.

So he thought, instead of letting this commission die, its role should be expanded to deal with substantive changes in the law, following real study, instead of this haphazard

arrangement of legislators running up there and introducing a bunch of bills. So Kleps suggested to Ralph Brown and the Judiciary Committee that we ought to have what later became the [California] Law Revision Commission.¹ It should take on the job of removing conflicting stuff in the laws. Remove anachronisms. Laws against shooting whales from streetcars and stuff like that. So we not only thought this was a good idea, but we had better give it some support, so that we had the interim hearings and gave it the full dress treatment.

DOUGLASS: Who was on that interim committee? Was it a certain group from the Judiciary?

SHAW: Oh, yes.

DOUGLASS: Of each house? It was a joint committee.

SHAW: Was it a joint committee?

DOUGLASS: Yes. The Joint Interim Committee on California Law Revision.

SHAW: Oh, really. I had forgotten. There was not much senate interest.

DOUGLASS: So you held hearings that recommended that there be this commission.

 1. Assemblyman Shaw introduced this bill, A.B. 35, 1953 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 1445 (1953), which abolished the California Code Commission and created the new commission.

- SHAW: That this commission be created. Of course, the upshot of it was that it was created. And among other things, there was to be some legislative members appointed so there would be some liaison. And I got myself appointed to that.
- DOUGLASS: You were the only assemblyman on it.
- SHAW: Yes. There was one assemblyman and one from the senate. I think [John D.] Babbage helped me get that from [Governor] Goodwin [J.] Knight. It was no big deal, but, anyhow, he helped. That is probably the first or second most significant thing I ever did in public life. Because it is still going full tilt. Nobody knows about it. The Law Revision Commission does a lot of work. And a lot of good work. For instance, the Probate Code. They are getting it so that a lot of probate stuff is done away with.
- DOUGLASS: This is more aggressive. The code commission was more housekeeping.
- SHAW: It was strictly housekeeping.
- DOUGLASS: This is more aggressive. And as I understood it, it was to even include judicial precedent decisions. In other words, to be more responsive to what is happening out there in terms of how the laws read.
- SHAW: This is making policy decisions. Of course, they always played this down. We drafted it in

such a way as to make it politically acceptable. It can only study what it is authorized to study. They have to make up an agenda of what they are going to study. But this is like the Public Utilities Commission regulating utilities. As a matter of fact, all the input is from the ones that are supposed to be regulated.

DOUGLASS: What were the gubernatorial appointments like? The six other people. What types of people are they?

SHAW: It works out all right. It is the kind of people who are interested in trying to improve the law. Like Joe Ball shows up again. He is probably the best lawyer in the West. He is sufficiently interested that he is willing to serve. I think John Babbage and I, we were both on it at one time or another. We recruited some people.

DOUGLASS: Was this a very time-consuming exercise?

SHAW: Pretty much so. More than most of these things because we would not only go to these meetings, but then the staff would make these studies. It was a voluminous bunch of stuff to review. John and I kind of enjoyed it, although we didn't put in as much effort as the staff did. We were the only ones there who knew what really happened in the court. The academic guys were quite taken

by how they would get these good ideas, but we would explain how they just wouldn't work.

DOUGLASS: So you enjoyed that work. The satisfaction of it.

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: How long were you on that commission, Mr. Shaw?

SHAW: From 1953 and, I suppose, until I went out of office. I think pretty much until. . . . Oh, on that biographical stuff.

DOUGLASS: Oh, there is a question mark. Fifty-three until question mark. So it at least would be to '54.

SHAW: Oh, I know that I stayed on during the time I was out of the legislature.

DOUGLASS: Then you must have been a gubernatorial appointee after that.

SHAW: I think through '58. Until I was elected to the senate. I don't think I was doing it when I was in the senate. There was a fellow by the name of [Senator James A.] Cobey.

DOUGLASS: Again, talking about the '53 session, you were vice chairman of the Conservation, Planning and Public Works Committee, which was a new assignment. That was a new committee, wasn't it?

SHAW: I don't know. Who was chairman?

DOUGLASS: Francis [C.] Lindsay. You were also on a couple of the subcommittees. One on the State

Acquisition of the Central Valley Project. And another, Subcommittee on Parks, Parkway District and Recreational Bills.

SHAW: We had about thirteen sites, of varying attractiveness, as possible state parks. And I just thought it was terrible that we didn't have any in this county. About those public works, water is beginning to be a problem. And I wanted to serve for that reason.

DOUGLASS: I think that was, I will have to check again, a relatively new committee.

[End Tape 2, Side B]

[Begin Tape 3, Side A]

Brucellosis and Livestock Importation

DOUGLASS: Were you involved with livestock because that was part of your district's interest?

SHAW: Yes. I am thinking that the dairy industry wants something from me. I did get involved with something that was fairly significant. It involved brucellosis. I can't remember too well, except that the market in Los Angeles was the only one in the western United States where you could sell a cow that was infected with brucellosis. It was a terrible situation. They were gathering up all these deceased animals from all over the country and shipping them into California. I handled the legislation to stop that.

DOUGLASS: That was in the '53 session?

SHAW: I believe so.

DOUGLASS: Yes. You introduced A.B. 161, dealing with the importation of animals. It amended Section 212 of the Agricultural Code. This passed the assembly but the senate referred the subject to an interim committee.

[Although, as you have noted, my brucellosis bill did not make it all the way through the legislative process, as a matter of fact, it served its purpose just as well as if it had. What happened is that once I introduced this

measure, it exposed the fact that the Department of Agriculture should have clamped down on this long before. Although they let this "cow-barn" operation in Los Angeles go on for considerable time, at the hearings on the bill (to abolish the importation of these diseased cows, as I remember it), the Department of Agriculture people insisted the legislation was not necessary because they would take care of this without the necessity of legislation. And they did, but there is little reason to think they would have stopped it unless called to account by a bill being introduced on the subject.]*

SHAW: Finally, the animals could not come in unless they had been inspected and found to be free of brucellosis.

DOUGLASS: William [W.] Hansen was the chairman of that committee.

SHAW: Yes. He was a genuine farmer in the Central Valley.

DOUGLASS: The Judiciary was now chaired by Thomas Caldecott.

SHAW: Yes.

* Stanford C. Shaw added the preceding bracketed material during his review of the draft transcript.

- DOUGLASS: Caspar [W.] Weinberger has come into the assembly and is on that committee. What do you recall about him, as an assemblyman?
- SHAW: He was very capable. His main forte was that he was chairman of Ways and Means.
- DOUGLASS: Oh, really?
- SHAW: Yes. I guess you would have rated him in the top 20 percent of the legislature, but he did not stand out over ones like McCarthy and Fleury and some others that you never heard of since. He was on his feet talking quite a bit.
- DOUGLASS: Did he bring any particular mind set as a lawyer to that committee?
- SHAW: No. I don't think that he was in attendance very often. Ways and Means would be something that would take all his time.

Torrens Title Bill

Why don't I go through this checklist that I've got of what I thought was significant which passed. I guess it would not show up there, but I handled a measure to do away with torrens title.¹ This is a constitutional provision whereby it was designed to have a public insurance system for real property titles. And

1. A.B. 39, 1954 Leg., 1st Spec. Sess., Cal. Stat. 58 (1954), amended Act 8589, certification of land.

it didn't work at all well. If you are interested in that, we can go into it. Anyhow, I authored this measure to do away with torrens title.

DOUGLASS: Now, did that pass?

SHAW: Well, the people voted, approving to do away with it, in the 1954 general election.

DOUGLASS: Oh, I see. It was a constitutional amendment.

SHAW: Right.

DOUGLASS: What kind of title did you call that?

SHAW: Torrens. T-O-R-R-E-N-S. When you recorded your land, you would pay a certain fee. This would create a fund where if there was a mistake, and they should not have accepted your claim to title, there was this fund to pay you money for your damages. And the title industry torpedoed it. They filed claims to exhaust the fund. So it never did any good. It was always broke. One of the worst chapters of the title industry.

DOUGLASS: The constitutional amendment was supported by the legislature?

SHAW: Yes. And it was put on through us, rather than through an initiative. Then the people voted on it and passed it. And did away with torrens.

DOUGLASS: It did away with it.

SHAW: This whole system. Because it just wasn't working. Now, it was torpedoed years before. For many, many years, it had done no good. But

it gave title companies fits because you had to go over to this separate system to hunt up titles.

I got something done for prison guards, and I got a Fontana Department of [Motor] Vehicles office. I helped San Bernardino County. This county used to rob the rest of the county on school support and such, by keeping their assessed values low. We would impoverish our districts through low assessed values. The Law Revision Commission, I have told you about.

I passed a measure, A.B. 152, whereby for the first time a defendant in a criminal proceeding was entitled to an attorney at a preliminary examination.¹ And A.B. 153 was on substituted service.² Oftentimes a bill like this would come from the Legislative Counsel's office. They would see something that needed to be done. The Law Revision Commission gets this stuff now, but they used to go to individual legislators.

DOUGLASS: So you carried the bill.

1. A.B. 152, 1953 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 1482 (1953).

2. A.B. 153 amended Motor Vehicle Code to permit substituted service (servicing of legal papers other than personal, direct service) in certain situations. This bill died in committee.

- SHAW: I carried the bill at their suggestion. I had further bills. I see a number that passed, but I don't see any of them that are newsworthy.
- DOUGLASS: There was one of interest to me. It was A.B. 743, which was vetoed, and the veto was sustained by the legislature. It had to do with investigations by grand jury. It caught my attention because it was vetoed, and the vote to override the veto failed. A.B. 743, amending the Penal Code. It had to do with grand juries. I didn't get more on the bill than that.
- SHAW: I remember it vaguely. This came from a suggestion from a judge down in Riverside, Judge [] Waite. When they make up a transcript of the grand jury deliberations, there is one that goes to the district attorney, the prosecutor, and one that goes to the defendant and his counsel. And I simply wanted one to the judge. I have forgotten what the arguments were against that. But, anyhow, somebody didn't want that.
- DOUGLASS: There was another pocket veto. A.B. 755, which amended the Revenue and Taxation Code, concerning assessment and equalization of property by the state Board of Equalization. And the governor pocket vetoed it.
- SHAW: Yes. This is probably. . . . I am trying to

stop them from making us increase our assessed values in this county. The governor is right, probably, and it should be vetoed. I am just doing a day's work for my county.

DOUGLASS: Ok. There was another pocket veto. A.B. 776, on the salaries of the judges of superior court of San Bernardino County. Was that a fiscal matter that he would probably veto?

SHAW: I don't know why.

DOUGLASS: It probably had to do with the budget, I suppose.

SHAW: Could well be.

DOUGLASS: It was in '53 that you tried to create the Inland Air Pollution District. And we have already discussed that.

SHAW: Right.

Legislation Affecting Trucking

DOUGLASS: You had a bill, A.B. 2222, which related to levying and collecting of a highway tax. The assembly passed it, but the senate did not. It was to be effective immediately. It caught my attention because it was a highway tax. Perhaps it does not ring a bell with you.

SHAW: No. It does not. I tried to impose a ton-mile tax on trucks.

DOUGLASS: That could be what it is.

SHAW: I got a lot of action, but I was outmaneuvered by the trucking industry.

[This was a scheme for taxing trucks in such a way as to have some logical connection between how much they had to pay and how much they used or damaged the roadway. The truck would have to have a sealed meter aboard recording the miles, and the miles were multiplied by the tons carried, and a tax rate applied to the resultant figure. Oregon had this system, I believe. They may still have it.

In spite of its fairness and logic, I got nowhere with the bill because the trucking industry had very effective lobbying based on both campaign contributions and personal attention and entertainment in Sacramento. Their head man, when I was there, was Wade Sherrard, a close to seven-foot giant who happened to be a Oklahoma University classmate of a close friend of mine, Herbert Swim.]*

DOUGLASS: They must have had a pretty heavy lobby?

SHAW: They had an excellent lobby up there. Effective, I mean.

DOUGLASS: Then you introduced to the assembly a constitutional amendment which was not acted upon, but it was A.C.A. 21, having to do with

* Stanford C. Shaw added the preceding material during his review of the draft transcript.

the taxation of insurance companies.

SHAW: Oh, yes. I embarrassed my brother-in-law. Did I mention a brother-in-law who was a benefactor of mine? Got me a job and all that. He was an executive of the Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Company. And I had occasion to learn through him that the Pacific Mutual Life Insurance office building is exempt from all real estate taxes because it is the home office of the insurance company. This is so, even though they rent out everything except the fourth and fifth floors. And worse than that, there is a lot of insurance outfits--they are going out on Wilshire Boulevard, building home offices, brand new insurance companies--and they are only occupying one office and renting out all the rest. And not paying any real estate taxes.

So it just seemed to me that something ought to be done about this. That they should only have an exemption for that part of the building that they actually used. That would be easy to figure. Well, I introduced this, and everybody is going to my brother-in-law. "Get on Shaw." [Laughter] There is another case where. . . .

DOUGLASS: I take it, anyway, it would meet a lot of opposition in the assembly. Because of the

insurance industry's lobbying?

SHAW: Yes. The insurance industry and oil, the petroleum industry, have a terrific hold on the legislature.

DOUGLASS: You were not afraid to try a few things.

SHAW: No. You know, there is such a thing as going too far. I think it was all right to do that. But I did some things that were just a waste of time. It doesn't make any difference how good an idea may be; if it is not politically feasible, and you know that, it is a waste of time.

DOUGLASS: It takes a lot of energy to push something.

SHAW: At the least, it consumes time. I even [Laughter] tried to license the consumption of alcohol. You know, you have a driver's license. If you mistreat it, you get your license to drink suspended.

DOUGLASS: That is interesting. Would you show this if you went to a bar?

SHAW: You would not get a drink unless you did.

DOUGLASS: I never heard of that idea. That is a very interesting idea.

SHAW: I got one vote to refer it to interim study. That is the gentlemanly way of killing it, you know.

DOUGLASS: Interim study?

SHAW: Yes. That's the motion you make.

- DOUGLASS: That means it just floats out there. You may never see it again.
- SHAW: Forever.
- DOUGLASS: One thing I did want to ask you about. You were on the standing Committee on Public Health. They submitted a report on encephalitis in California in which they say, "We have done this much. But we think more needs to be done." The report was signed by everyone, but by your name it said that you disagreed with the vote for the need for further study. It said, "No opinion." I wondered if you remembered that? It was a matter of judgment, I gather, as to whether they needed to do more or whether you felt that they knew enough to do more.
- SHAW: I can't remember now. But I was appointed to a lot of stuff which was just studied to death. Like air pollution.
- DOUGLASS: So you might have done that on principle, feeling it was not getting anywhere?
- SHAW: Yes, but I just don't remember. By the way, I tried to pass another bill whereby, not only would your real estate be assessed for real property taxes, but the mortgage holder--he really is the owner of your home--he would be assessed and pay tax on his mortgage.
- DOUGLASS: That is creative.

SHAW: Boy, that one. You can imagine how that one went over. [Laughter] Now there is an example of really spinning your wheels.

DOUGLASS: Did any of those come back to haunt you in your district?

SHAW: Oh, I don't know.

DOUGLASS: Did people really have at you about them?

SHAW: Not enough that they remembered it when I ran for the senate.

Brown Act and Ralph Brown

DOUGLASS: That says something. The Brown Act¹ was passed that year, and since you knew Ralph Brown quite well, what do you know about the passage of that act?

SHAW: I was involved. I was a coauthor. Coauthorship means nothing.

DOUGLASS: You sign on.

SHAW: Once in a while wish you had not. Brown knew how to do it. He introduced a whole series of bills on this one problem, opening up public bodies. Like maybe sixty. They were passed one by one, and when we were all done, we called it the Brown Act. To this day, he opened up what

 1. A.B. 339, 1953 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 1588) (1953). Requires all meetings of the legislative bodies of a local agency to be open and public, with certain exceptions.

previously had been closed. You certainly ran into it in your municipal service.

DOUGLASS: Yes. I gather the newspapers were not supportive of this legislation?

SHAW: There is a [John D.] Johnny Long, who was a lobbyist for the newspapers [California Newspaper Association]. I always sensed that it was the press that was behind this.

DOUGLASS: This is what I also heard, that the press was very eager for this. And Brown may not have been all that excited about it, but the press grabbed the issue and gave it tremendous publicity, because it would be a source of more news. Maybe Brown may have been for it, but it may not have been the top thing on his priority list. Do you have any feeling for that? It is called that Brown Act, and everybody associates him with it.

SHAW: Well, he devoted a lot of time to it. As far as I know, he was entirely sincere about it. He was getting a lot of political mileage out of it, and he knew that. He was a savvy politician. That was all right with him.

DOUGLASS: Did he ever speak to you? Do you have any personal knowledge of why he got concerned? What led him to actually start introducing laws?

SHAW: No. It is kind of hard to explain. He was a

close friend, and I talked to him about a million things. But neither one of us would ask the other, "How come you are doing so-and-so?"

DOUGLASS: I understand that. I am only asking you because Ralph Brown isn't with us. Since you knew him, I just thought maybe somewhere back there you would remember a comment.

SHAW: It is a good question. I am surprised I don't know more about it.

DOUGLASS: There are not too many people around now. I have heard a few comments from people who knew Brown slightly. Anything that you think of later, whatever, you can add later.

Dorothy Donahoe was elected to the assembly in 1952, and, of course, went on to have her name on the Donahoe Act, which came through when you were in the senate. Do you recall anything about her, particularly? When she came into the assembly? I think that we mentioned her earlier with this problem. Smog.

SHAW: Yes. On the smog. I guess it was Dorothy Donahoe. I can't see her now.

DOUGLASS: Apparently, she had this tremendous health problem. There were not too many women in the assembly. There is [Kathryn] Niehouse. I was just thinking that a woman might stand out a little bit, too.

SHAW: Later, the widow of an assemblyman from Portola

was there.¹

DOUGLASS: Of course, you and Dorothy Donahoe did not overlap too long in the assembly. But she came in when you were there and her name is quite well known and her name is attached to that bill.

SHAW: She was so well liked that the assembly membership set up a scholarship in her name, probably at some school in Kern County.

DOUGLASS: She apparently was highly respected.

SHAW: Highly regarded. I think I contributed quite a bit to it.

California Democratic Council

DOUGLASS: Just in terms of the politics in that year, the CDC [California Democratic Council] was founded?

SHAW: How in the world would you know about the CDC?

DOUGLASS: I have heard about the CDC for years.
[Laughter] Since you seem to be an active Democrat, were you at the founding meeting in Fresno?

SHAW: No. But I was at later conventions in Fresno. We had all kinds of trouble. You know, there was not really much substance to the fight. But there was this--what you would call,

1. Pauline L. Davis succeeded her husband, Assemblyman Lester Thomas Davis, in 1952.

internecine, self-destructive--political battle between the central committees and these clubs. And it was violent in this county. Just terrible. And the newspapers played it up, and it hurt the Democratic party terribly in this county.

I was the candidate for the central committee, which was opposed to the clubs. The clubs were considered more radical. But neither had a political agenda that I could remember that amounted to anything. One distinguished from the other. I had a reconciliation with them, of sorts, after I beat their candidate, when I was in the senate. Man, I wasted a lot of blood pressure on that.

DOUGLASS: Then the Dime-a-Day for Democracy was founded by Elizabeth Snyder as a rival to the CDC?

SHAW: I just have the vaguest recollection.

[Laughter]

DOUGLASS: Apparently, it was not too long lasting. It was mainly for fund raising. It sounds like the Democrats were milling around.

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Then the [Richard P.] Graves for Governor campaign started.

SHAW: Yes. I have not thought of Graves for a long time.

DOUGLASS: Richard Graves. But then the big thing that happened was on October 5th of '53, Governor Warren resigned because of his Supreme Court appointment, and Knight succeeded as governor until '54. Were you surprised by that? By Warren resigning. Do you remember being startled?

SHAW: No. I was probably up on it more then. I didn't have much truck with Republican politics. Partisanship was pretty real. And I would not have much to do with Goodie Knight or Warren. You think of Warren as a liberal. He was a good and kindly man, I guess, and he would call all of us in one by one to go in and talk with him for a few minutes. That was it, if you were a Democrat.

It was pretty well understood that he would have a fourteen-point liberal program every time he ran, but he was never serious about more than one. I have seen it happen on the floor. Something like the Fair Employment Practices Commission. And somebody closely identified with his office would be walking up and down the aisle and telling the Republicans, "Don't worry about this one. The governor is not really for it."

DOUGLASS: So he was torpedoing it. So it was symbolic? These statements.

SHAW: Just politics. To get the Democratic votes. This is the day of cross-filing. Everybody is trying to be a black-white cow to get both sides to vote for you.

DOUGLASS: So you didn't feel any particular easy access to Warren, if you wanted to go talk to him?

SHAW: No, and I didn't consider him particularly principled.

DOUGLASS: Really.

SHAW: That was my impression.

DOUGLASS: So his relationship with the legislature, then, was a matter of partly what party you were in.

SHAW: Yes, but there was superimposed the trouble he was in with his own segment of the party.

DOUGLASS: The fight within the Republican party?

SHAW: Well, and with the doctors. "Socialized medicine," they called it.

DOUGLASS: The more conservative element.

SHAW: I don't know how he got himself into that. He must have really believed it.

DOUGLASS: All right. Why don't you just go on and talk about Knight a minute, since we are talking about the governors. What was your impression of Knight at this time? Of course, he ran and won in 1954, but there was a year in there or so. How did you feel about Knight?

SHAW: Well, he was a consummate politician. A

glad-hand type. Sort of the countertype of Pat Brown. But, here, again, I would never see him, except for some receiving line or something. Again, partisanship.

DOUGLASS: You didn't feel that the welcome mat was out, particularly? As a Democrat.

SHAW: There is virtually no communication. And that was not just me. Of course, there would be communication between a few of the leadership of the Democratic Party. Maybe. But not much.

VI. 1954 SESSION

DOUGLASS: Let me see. We could do a bit more, and then I had better leave. Just to start the '54 session. Knight is the governor now. His budget message--the things he had up front in that message--addressed alcoholic beverages and the administration of laws regarding them, the increasing of unemployment insurance benefits, and then providing the funding for the Veterans Farm and Home Purchase Act. Which are rather obvious kinds of things.

SHAW: Yes. They always got passed.

Smog

DOUGLASS: And you are the chairman of the Air Pollution Committee, which is a joint subcommittee of Public Health and Conservation and Planning and Public Works. There you are, again. And this

is where there is a commendation to the University of California, I think, again, to study air pollution. You are out there plowing this field. Was that frustrating?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Were there others on that committee who were concerned?

SHAW: There were not any as excited as I was.

DOUGLASS: Not from the Los Angeles area. Was that because, at that time, the smog was basically going only east to your district?

SHAW: No. The business community was playing down smog. And, in this political area, the business community had all the votes. It was campaign contributions and the effect of campaign contributions that made the going so tough, politically, for air pollution control. Maybe I didn't make that clear.

DOUGLASS: You mean the lobbying and the sources of the funding for people to be elected were in conflict with the need to control smog?

SHAW: Yes. In that political area, all the money was coming from those who did not want controls. There was no money coming from anybody who wanted to clear the air.

DOUGLASS: You didn't have any cohesive group that was antismog yet?

SHAW: Never did have much of a group. The women got

together. Clean Air Now was something they had. Just in the Los Angeles area. They were not very effective.

DOUGLASS: I do note that you and some others--Munnell, Miller, [Charles Edward] Chapel, [Vincent] Thomas, [Carley Y.] Porter, [Edward E.] Elliott--passed a resolution requesting the governor to call a special session in '54 to consider air pollution legislation. That was H.R. 25, but it never got past the Rules Committee.

SHAW: Yes. I'll bet you that I had trouble getting some of those to sign the request. [Laughter]
Salary Raise for Legislators

DOUGLASS: At least you got the resolution passed. Also, I was fascinated that you carried A.B. 74, which called for submission to the electorate of a constitutional amendment to increase the compensation of senate and assembly members at a special election (to be consolidated with the general election) in 1954.¹ Was that because you had already decided to not run again? Why did you carry that bill?

1. Shaw (with six others signing on) introduced A.C.A. 13, 1954, Leg., 1st Spec. Sess., Cal. Stat. 13 (1954), which raised salaries of legislators from \$200 to \$500 a month. He also authored A.B. 74, 1954 Leg., 1st Spec. Sess., Cal. Stat. 65 (1954), calling for the election. The amendment passed as Proposition 6 (1,618,027-1,482,536).

SHAW: Oh, I am just being a good fellow. I can see, first, that there should be a pay raise for legislators. They are only getting \$500 a month. No. Two hundred. Trying to get it up to \$500. Anyhow, I tried twice. The first time I tried to get it was in the assembly. I am leaving. Maybe, when the ballot arguments come out, I can make a better case because I can say, "I am quitting because I can't afford this. I know what I am talking about. I am not doing this for myself."

DOUGLASS: That is what I meant. You were doing it because you were going out and in a position to do it.

SHAW: Right.

DOUGLASS: There were not many bills. There was that bill and a bill, that had to do with land titles. It was an initiative to amend the certification of land titles and the simplification of the transfer of real estate, based on the 1897-1914 laws, with regard to the powers of the legislature. I think it is this torrens problem.

SHAW: That's the torrens thing.

DOUGLASS: It was a budget year, and that was it. In terms of the election that year, there was a fight within the Democrats between whether Graves or [Reverend Laurence] Cross would be the nominee

for governor. Were you involved in that at all?

SHAW: I think I was a supporter of Graves. No. I didn't get involved in that to amount to anything.

William G. Bonelli and Alcoholic Beverage Control

DOUGLASS: Proposition 3 passed, which took liquor enforcement from the Board of Equalization and established the Alcohol Beverage Control Board, which, I suspect, may have been stimulated, was it, by the [William G.] Bonelli indictments?

SHAW: Yes. I will tell you more about Bonelli next time.

DOUGLASS: Good. You can talk about that one. I would like very much to do that. Do you want to do that now?

SHAW: Oh, it really is not all that much.

DOUGLASS: Well, let's do that now.

SHAW: Bonelli was probably the strongest character I ever met in public life. Some people just have it. You meet them, and they can just back you down on anything.

DOUGLASS: A potent personality?

SHAW: He was just strong. I ran across him in this business where the county of San Bernardino is stealing the rest of the state blind by "impoverishing" themselves with falsely low assessed values and thereby getting more

education money. He just rose to the occasion to let us keep doing this. They were trying to make us raise our assessed values.

So we had these hearings where we were bucking this. We do our bit. And then all of a sudden, he says that he wants an executive session. They put all of us out in the hall. And we could hear Bonelli, just like a bull, bellowing at these guys. Beating them down. We go back, and we've got no problem anymore. He just overwhelmed these guys. Just unbelievable.

DOUGLASS: Was it general knowledge that he was up to these things that he was finally indicted for?

SHAW: I had a feeling that everybody in the political community felt that he was guilty. By the way, that business on Samish, they were selling liquor licenses. That was the basic scandal involved.

I remember a guy, [G. Delbert Moms], who was an assemblyman; he went to jail over this. And a client of mine was one of the guards who saw Delbert. He said, "I could not understand why Delbert went to jail. He was the nicest guy and he was always reading the bible."

[Laughter] He used to carry the bible every day into the legislature. But his mistake was grafting on the installment plan. He would give

them a license--they were supposed to pay him so much a month--and like with all credit, the debtor gets sore because you are trying to collect the installment. It is unbelievable stuff.

DOUGLASS: I take it that you would agree, in any case, that when Proposition 3 passed, it was a better way to handle liquor?

SHAW: It was just separated.

DOUGLASS: Separated it from the Board of Equalization. It is still a problem area.

SHAW: Sure. I don't see that it made that much difference. It got Bonelli away from it, I guess. By this time, he is in jail anyhow, isn't he?

DOUGLASS: He fled to Mexico. I think he finally may have come back. I can't remember the end of that story.

SHAW: I don't think he ever went to jail. He died.

DOUGLASS: I don't know whether he died in Mexico, or what. All right. Let's wind this up. Why did you decide not to run for election in '54?

SHAW: It was a combination of a whole lot of things, and I have trouble lining them up. I guess I wanted to make a little more money. I was a little tired of it. I was kind of apprehensive. I might have had trouble, too, because I was too independent with the Third House. I was in

trouble with all of them. I don't know if you know about this, but the Third House used to have a convention all their own.

DOUGLASS: Oh, really.

SHAW: And decided who they were going to support and who not. I didn't really have any information on who, when and where; just that it did take place. There were probably on the order of fifty powerful Third House members, almost exclusively representing business interests.

DOUGLASS: They were that organized, as a group.

SHAW: Yes. Well, certain of them. They didn't all.

DOUGLASS: The powerful ones.

SHAW: The ones who really had the money.

DOUGLASS: So they really had a lot of clout.

SHAW: Yes. I don't know as if I thought that they could beat me, but I thought that they could make an awful lot of work out of it. And I was not going to get any support from them.

DOUGLASS: And they might go out to get you?

SHAW: Yes. They would support my opposition. The lobbyists' impact on the legislature was and is catastrophic. Campaign contributions have utterly corrupted the legislative process.

DOUGLASS: Was there anybody particularly whom you saw as a candidate? Who might be interested in running?

SHAW: Yes. I tried to put a guy in office, and I discovered that is pretty hard to do.

DOUGLASS: The person who succeeded you was Nisbet. Eugene D. Nisbet. You supported him.

SHAW: Yes. Later, he double-crossed me. [Laughter] He promised me after that, that if I ever wanted to go for the senate, why he would be sure he would support me in exchange.

DOUGLASS: What happened?

SHAW: He ends up as my opponent. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: Was he a likely person to run, before you decided not to run, Nisbet?

SHAW: Yes. He was a CDC darling.

DOUGLASS: So he was in the woodwork, ready to go.

SHAW: He had a big political background. He was the mayor of Upland for a long time. And, as I say, he was elected.

DOUGLASS: Yes. Also, was it the life of having to maintain two places? It didn't make for a very peaceful household, I imagine?

SHAW: Well, it was interesting. There was no pressure from the family to get me to quit, as I remember.

DOUGLASS: I just meant the logistics. This is so far away from Sacramento.

SHAW: Well, the first few times that was kind of fun. But after a while, getting in and out of an apartment was no fun.

[End Session 1, December 18, 1987]

[End Tape 3, Side A]

VII. RETURN TO LAW PRACTICE
[Session 2, March 8, 1988]

[Begin Tape 3, Side B]

Succeeded by Eugene D. Nisbet

DOUGLASS: Mr. Shaw, at the end of the last interview we were at the point at which you had decided not to run for the assembly again in 1954. I think that your reasons were varied, including the aspect of earning a living and how much work would be involved to continue at the level you thought was important. You can go on from there. At that time, you returned to law practice. You also supported the person who succeeded you in the assembly, Eugene D. Nisbet, who was then the mayor of Upland. Is that correct?

SHAW: Yes, I did. Correct. It was later that I had difficulty with him.

DOUGLASS: I believe you stated he promised to support you if you ever ran for the senate, and you had some difficulty with that, and we can talk about that in a minute, in terms of that campaign.

SHAW: That's correct.

DOUGLASS: Did you know him because he was from Upland and had been active?

SHAW: I didn't know him well, personally, but he was a leading figure in the community. He had been mayor of Upland for many years. He had run for

the assembly unsuccessfully a number of years before. He was a highly regarded public figure.

DOUGLASS: So he had no difficulty winning the seat after you?

SHAW: Yes, he did. We had a very aggressive newspaper in Ontario at the time, the Daily Report, owned by Mrs. Jerene [Appleby] Harnish. And she was a lady of strong convictions, to say the least. He didn't get along well with her, which made it very difficult for him.

DOUGLASS: Was she supporting a Republican candidate?

SHAW: Yes. That was her general inclination, but her particular interest, for or against a person, overrode her partisan feelings. She was a very conservative lady. Other things being equal, she would sure support Republicans. But she had an overriding desire to scrap.

DOUGLASS: She had it in for him?

SHAW: Oh, bad.

DOUGLASS: That didn't make it a very pleasant campaign?

SHAW: Oh, no.

DOUGLASS: But you did endorse him, I gather.

SHAW: Oh, yes. I helped him the best I could.

DOUGLASS: How did you direct your attention after that? Was it primarily to your law practice?

SHAW: Yes. I also got involved in land. I bought a couple of small citrus groves. In 1955, there

was a lot of speculative land activity in the Cucamonga area. The whole west end. I got involved in that. Where I once had ranches, there are now all houses.

DOUGLASS: Did you run those as ranches, or were you looking to them as an investment?

SHAW: I was looking at them as an investment. But I did work half days, keeping the ranches up. By 1956, I had sold all that land and bought some land with an associate by the airport in Ontario. I bought a new home in Ontario. Then I got reinterested in politics.

DOUGLASS: Excuse me. Were you spending approximately half time on your law practice while you ran this real estate? Or were you not practicing law?

SHAW: I was practicing law three-quarters of the time. I was putting quite a number of hours per day.

DOUGLASS: Was that with an office in Ontario?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: What was the name of your firm at that point?

SHAW: I was solo, except that I usually had an associate of some kind. I had as associates Robert Beloud and Robert Bowman. And then, I guess it was a little later, I had a partner. But, generally, I had solo practice.

DOUGLASS: Did you call yourself "Stanford C. Shaw, Attorney"?

- SHAW: Yes.
- DOUGLASS: That was general practice then.
- SHAW: Yes. With emphasis on real property problems.
- DOUGLASS: So what caused you to get interested in politics again?
- SHAW: Oh, I don't know. I guess I missed it. I was a little better off financially. It was obviously more significant serving in the legislature than practicing law, and more exciting. I guess the prestige of the senate, as I perceived it, made it attractive. I guess I just got the bug again.
- DOUGLASS: Was there any particular, or burning, issue that caused you at this time to run for the senate?
- SHAW: No. The overriding issue at the time was water. Getting water to southern California. But that was not something that I had strong feelings about.

Democratic Party Politics

- DOUGLASS: Was there a group of people who went out of their way to urge you to run? Or was this something that you thought about on your own?
- SHAW: I sort of got caught up in the struggle within partisan politics. There was a rump group called California Democratic Council.
- DOUGLASS: CDC.
- SHAW: Yes. That became active in San Bernardino

County. They got in a big fight with the Democratic [State] Central Committee members and those who identified with them. I find it almost impossible to recall the issues because I don't think that there were much between them. Except that each wanted to prevail over the other. But it was very acrimonious. Every central committee meeting was a wild affair, just unimaginably strong feelings.

DOUGLASS: Mr. Shaw, you were on the San Bernardino County Central Committee during all this period, were you not?

SHAW: Well, I think so, by my virtue of being a candidate. My connection with them increased as I got interested in wanting to run again. And my attendance, of course, picked up.

DOUGLASS: But then you were on the state central committee, too.

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Was that later? Was that when you became a senator, or was it at this time?

SHAW: I was always on the state central committee by virtue of being a candidate or having been a candidate.

DOUGLASS: All right. Ever since you had been in the assembly.

SHAW: Right.

DOUGLASS: These acrimonious debates, were you a

participant basically from the state central committee side, or were you involved with CDC? Jesse M. Unruh and Special Election for Senate

SHAW: I was on the side of the local San Bernardino County Central Committee, opposed to the CDC group. The CDC's group was supporting this Nesbit. Unruh made some attempt to get one of us to drop out. I didn't know him well. I think, at the time, he identified with CDC. This is early on. Maybe not.

DOUGLASS: Later, he took a very jaundiced view of CDC's activities. That may not be true in the beginning. When you say "drop out," do you mean drop out of the senate race?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: When did you first meet Unruh?

SHAW: Oh, I suppose at some convention up there of the state central committee.

DOUGLASS: In the mid-fifties?

SHAW: Yes. It would just be a most passing acquaintance. My really first contact with him was when he set up this meeting in a restaurant in Los Angeles. Had some of the supporters of both sides and was trying to broker one of us out of the race. We were splitting the vote and by splitting our vote, we were going to put in office a fellow by the name of [Raymond H.]

Gregory. The Republican candidate.

DOUGLASS: Who was the other person beside you, who was a Democrat?

SHAW: In the race, let's see. A special election was held in 1957. And the candidates were: Gregory would be one; I was second; and Nisbet; and Fred Wilson. I guess that he was a Republican. Wilson was a San Bernardino attorney.

DOUGLASS: So Nisbet was trying to run for the senate at that time.

SHAW: We were opponents.

DOUGLASS: Even though he had promised he would support you.

SHAW: Oh, yes. I felt really sore about that.

DOUGLASS: Was the special election called because the previous incumbent had died, opted out, or what? Why was there a special election?

SHAW: Senator James E. Cunningham took a judgeship; resigned, as I remember it.

DOUGLASS: You decided to run that very first opportunity.

SHAW: Right.

DOUGLASS: So that it was someone who would be in office until the '58 primary.

SHAW: Yes. But the Democratic registration was so heavy that if you got in, you would have a better than good shot to continue on indefinitely.

DOUGLASS: So was it at this time of the special election that Unruh called the meeting trying to get either you or Nisbet to drop out?

SHAW: Yes. I remember that Nisbet would not go along with it. Unruh recommended that Nisbet drop out, and he would not do it.

DOUGLASS: And where was this meeting held?

SHAW: Bernstein's Fish Grotto, on 6th Street, west of Hill [Street] in Los Angeles. What park is that?

DOUGLASS: Pershing Square. I will look up the date of the election, but this meeting would have been in the spring of '57?

SHAW: The election was November of '57.

DOUGLASS: Do you have any idea of when he called you people together?

SHAW: It had to be in mid-summer because we were going away. The most significant thing that happened in this area is that I got overloaded. I was doing all this political stuff, plus a lot of law work. And one morning a person called me, and instead of calling back, I talked to this person who was just a gadfly. Just a troublemaker from way back. And I talked to him while I was eating breakfast, and I had an attack. I thought it was a heart attack, but it was, I guess, just nervous exhaustion. I was

just completely disabled for a month. This is just when this election was coming up. The special election.

I had effects from that--it was a kind of remission of symptoms--until about 1965. I was completely disabled at first for a while and then seriously disabled. It just gave me fits all through the senate service. I just had no emotional stamina. I didn't have any success with treatment. So I had to really apportion my time carefully to accomplish anything, and I had a poor attendance record. Just all kinds of problems.

DOUGLASS: To back up just a moment. Was it natural that Unruh would be the broker of that kind of thing when he called you people in to breakfast at Bernstein's Fish Grotto?

SHAW: It was not surprising to anybody. He was as likely a candidate as anybody.

DOUGLASS: Was he at that point in the position of dispensing campaign money? Would that have had an effect on his influence?

SHAW: I can't recall it was significant, as far as this race was concerned.

DOUGLASS: His appeal was really don't divide the party?

SHAW: Oh, yes.

DOUGLASS: And the decision was that neither of you withdrew.

SHAW: That's right.

DOUGLASS: And so Gregory won the special election.

SHAW: That's right.

DOUGLASS: Was it, effectively, that you two split about 60 percent of the vote, and he got the plurality?

SHAW: Yes. We shot each other in the foot.

DOUGLASS: And Wilson dropped by the way? This Republican you mentioned.

SHAW: Yes. He was an excellent lawyer, but he was no politician. He really didn't work.

DOUGLASS: Who was Gregory, incidentally?

SHAW: He was the field man, or assistant, to Jimmy Cunningham, Sr., the state senator.

DOUGLASS: He had been his field assistant down here in this area?

SHAW: Which, in those days, just really amounted to political. . . .

DOUGLASS: You said that Gregory was Cunningham's assistant. Gregory had never held elective office?

SHAW: Yes. He had been the mayor of San Bernardino. He was a very likeable man and very personable. He was aggressive in politics only. Not in government. I knew him very well because we all lived next door to one another when I was in the assembly and Cunningham was in the senate. But, anyhow, he became elected for that short while.

VIII. ELECTION TO STATE SENATE

1958 Campaign

DOUGLASS: So when did you decide to go for it again?

SHAW: Oh, I immediately decided that I would be running again because Nisbet's and my combined vote were so much more than Gregory's in this special election.

DOUGLASS: And what was Nisbet's stance at this point?

SHAW: Well, I think it became understood that he would no longer be running against me.

DOUGLASS: Did Unruh enter into this again?

SHAW: No. And I never got any campaign contributions from him.

DOUGLASS: From Nisbet?

SHAW: From Unruh. He used to pass out money. As you know, he was noted for that. But I guess he confined his activity pretty closely just to assembly races.

DOUGLASS: But he wanted to be the power broker in the senate race, in the beginning?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Was it sort of the understanding, in the special election, that if Nisbet didn't win, that he would not run again?

SHAW: No. We had a great deal of bitterness carried on. I guess I kind of helped discourage him carrying on the fight by sort of making up to

the CDC. I went to one of their conventions and got to know some of them. So they were not very enthusiastic in their support of me, but they did support me some.

DOUGLASS: In the special election, did CDC endorse either of you?

SHAW: Oh, yes. They were the campaign organization for Nisbet.

DOUGLASS: But when it came to the primary of '58, did you have some CDC help or endorsements?

SHAW: Yes. I don't know if I had endorsements, but I had some local help.

DOUGLASS: But Nisbet just was not in it, at that point?

SHAW: As I remember it, he didn't run in the primary.

DOUGLASS: Was there any other Democrat who ran? None appeared on the ballot, on the statement of vote. But I wondered if anybody else was nosing around, as a Democrat, to run.

SHAW: Not that I can recall.

DOUGLASS: So, clearly, in the primary--there was still cross-filing--and it was you and Gregory running.

SHAW: Did they still have cross-filing then?

DOUGLASS: Cross-filing didn't go out until just after. That was the last cross-filing election. It shows that you pulled pretty well in the primaries. [Referring to notes]

SHAW: It does not show any split down.

DOUGLASS: It does not show any other candidates. It was

only the two of you running at that time.

SHAW: I am sorry that I cannot remember.

DOUGLASS: That is out of the statement of vote. You pulled almost 8,000 votes on the Republican side, and he pulled 10,000. So when you were campaigning, Nisbet was not a problem. In other words, when you laid your plans for the primary, somehow you discouraged him enough not to be in it. So you were not going to have a repeat of the special election debacle.

SHAW: That's right.

DOUGLASS: Did Nisbet ever address the fact that he at one time said that he would support you, if you ran for the senate?

SHAW: No. As politicians go, I would say, he was an honest guy, with this exception.

DOUGLASS: Ambition, maybe.

SHAW: Oh, yes. I understand better now.

DOUGLASS: Then the prestige of the senate had some intrigue for you.

SHAW: Sure.

DOUGLASS: You were in a better position to go to Sacramento to do the things that you knew were involved. Who were your strongest supporters in that election then?

SHAW: You had to sort of develop your own organized backing. The organized backing did not amount

to much. The central committee. The Democratic party as such. It was principally people like my brother, who would do the advertising work. Some acquaintances I knew in Cucamonga, particularly Asger and Dorothy Ravn did a lot of overall managing of things. A fellow who had been the constable there. A lot of it was just on a personal basis. People who I knew and went to school with. Although we tried to have a rather formalized campaign, tried to get at least one precinct captain for each district. We fell way short of that, of course, but we came closer than anybody else. So we had just kind of a pickup campaign.

DOUGLASS: Did you have the feeling that if you had not had your health problems start in the special election, you might have even won that special election?

SHAW: No. The mathematics were against us, since we both stayed in.

DOUGLASS: And you split. All right. You were part of the Democratic landslide as it turned out. Did Pat Brown have coattails, do you think, at all?

SHAW: Oh, yes. It was not uphill like it was when I ran for the assembly; back then, we ended up with only fourteen Democrats out of eighty. I think by this time there was a Democratic majority in the senate.

- DOUGLASS: Yes. Well, no, it was a 20-20 split, but after that election, the Republicans lost seven seats. So it shifted drastically.
- SHAW: There was a time when Fred [S.] Farr, when he was elected--I think it was a special election--it was the first Democratic majority. Because I remember some of the boys getting drunk and singing "It Happened in Old Monterey."
[Laughter]
State Water Plan
- DOUGLASS: Yes. And the Democrats took ten seats in the assembly to give them forty-seven seats there. So it was Democrats all the way. That must have been kind of an exciting feeling going into Sacramento with a majority in both houses?
- SHAW: Yes. While I am very interested, and all that, the real thrill is the first time going to the legislature. I had been there before. The most interesting thing was the statewide water plan. It was the political issue. The political thing.
- DOUGLASS: Governor [Edmund G.] Brown [Sr.] presented a water plan.
- SHAW: Yes. This had been an issue for many years. It looked like he might be able to bring something off. Brown was very deliberately trying to put this package together during his honeymoon. And

he did. And there were some new ideas, particularly by a guy named Cobey.

DOUGLASS: Senator Cobey.

SHAW: I don't know if he was the author. But, anyhow, he persuaded everybody that the only way to have this water plan would work would be a utility basis. You would gurarantee all these districts to deliver water, at cost. They would contract for it. Just as if you were the Southern California Edison, you've got water available at any time. That new approach seemed to do the trick. The southern California support was outstanding. In northern California, they still think we are stealing them blind; but they really are not as aggressive as they used to be.

DOUGLASS: So were you actively involved in that issue in the senate?

SHAW: Oh, yes. Pretty much. But all the Democrats were. They were on to a live one, an important one. A chance to accomplish something that had been failing, year after year after year.

DOUGLASS: He did get the California Water Plan passed as a¹ ballot issue in '60, Prop. 1, the bonds passed.

1. S.B. 1106, 1959 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 1762 (1959). California Water Resources Development Act (Burns-Porter Water Bonds Act), submitted \$1,750,000,000 in bonds, to construct facilities of State Water Resources Development System, at 1960 general election.

So it went on stream, even though there were later problems.

SHAW: Oh, yes. There are to this day.

DOUGLASS: You were on the Fact-finding Committee on Water in '59. You were involved. And Senator Cobey was on that committee. [Stephen P.] Teale was chairman of that committee, the Fact-finding Committee on Water.

SHAW: He was chairman of that, I see. I don't remember this being very significant.

DOUGLASS: This was not something directly part of getting Brown's water plan approved?

SHAW: No. That was a thing that practically all Democrats were involved in. At least, all southern California Democrats. Very much so. Senator James Cobey

DOUGLASS: And it was Senator Cobey from up north, though, who came through with one of the ideas that made it work?

SHAW: That is my opinion. That is not an opinion that is generally shared.

DOUGLASS: Do you remember talking to him about this?

SHAW: Oh, yes. I was attracted to what he was saying. I met him at a state bar convention. I believe it was when Sputnik went up. In Monterey. I had lunch with him and had him explain this utility theory. He was a very savvy legislator. He had a background of being with the county

counsel's office. Maybe second in command. I think he moved up to Merced County just for the purpose of getting into politics in Merced.

DOUGLASS: Now which county counsel's office was he in?

You mean down here.

SHAW: Los Angeles.

DOUGLASS: Oh, he was. Did you know him then?

SHAW: No.

DOUGLASS: Did you meet him when you went to the senate?

SHAW: I had met him before. I met him shortly after I had been elected, but hadn't been sworn in yet. There were quite a few caucuses on water that were separate events. The governor would be there. Everybody was gung ho about this issue. There were other serious problems. There was a recession along in there, and an awful lot of unemployment, for instance, in the building trades. We had 40 percent unemployment in the building trades in San Bernardino.

DOUGLASS: I didn't realize that.

SHAW: It might interest you that we had all this unemployment. Politically, there had to be something done about it. There is not too much a state legislator can do about it, a countrywide recession. But I overheard the fellow from Lake County say, "You know what we ought to do? We ought to extend the

unemployment period for an additional six weeks. But my district is too conservative. I would not dare do it." So I asked him if I could do it. Using his idea, I did get the unemployment insurance benefits extended.

DOUGLASS: When was that? I am trying to place that bill?

SHAW: I don't even know if there was a bill. If it was, it would probably be somebody else's. The man whose idea I borrowed, Waverly Jack Slattery was his unlikely name.

DOUGLASS: He was the one you had talked to.

SHAW: It was his idea. And I had borrowed it from him.

DOUGLASS: But you didn't introduce the bill.

SHAW: Whatever it was, I didn't. He disassociated himself completely from it.

DOUGLASS: Yes. But would it be a bill that passed that I should be able to track?

SHAW: No. The only way you could possibly find it is to find when there was an amendment to the unemployment insurance act, in about that period, that extended the benefits period.

DOUGLASS: But what I am saying is that you introduced a bill to do that? No?

SHAW: No. I don't know if I did. I may have amended something in the budget. In some other way. I don't remember it as being a separate bill.

DOUGLASS: To go back to water, you were, again, on a Joint

Committee on Water Resources Development Problems. I am just trying to see what links into what [Governor] Brown was doing. Was this just part of an overall focus on water, as an issue, because of a new administration?

SHAW: Yes. We had meetings around the state at various places. They were not very significant. The significant thing was that the governor and all the Democrats would meet in numerous ways, and they were all behind this.

DOUGLASS: Would Brown be the person who would call these meetings? How would they be initiated?

SHAW: Probably Cobey would have something to do with it. Or, somebody on Brown's staff would decide he ought to do it. Brown was substantially involved, but recently I have heard criticism of Brown. That he is given too much credit for the state water plan. That was not the way it was perceived at the time.

Governor Edmund G. "Pat" Brown

DOUGLASS: Did you have a great deal of personal interaction with Governor Brown? Would you talk about Brown and your dealings with him?

SHAW: I had an enormous lot of contact with him. I would go in and see him an average of once a week.

DOUGLASS: Oh, really. What gave you that kind of access

to the governor?

SHAW: I don't know. We got along all right, first. I guess we were about the same kind of Democrats.

DOUGLASS: Had you met him before you went to the senate?

SHAW: Oh, yes. I attended a key meeting where he decided whether or not to run for governor. He was attorney general at the time.

DOUGLASS: Was this in connection with the state central committee perhaps?

SHAW: No. It was a separate "get-up." We met in Los Angeles. By this time, things looked so favorable for him, it was billed as someplace where he would make up his mind as to whether he was going to run or not. But you could see that he was going to. It was more of an initial support. Leadership support.

DOUGLASS: So would have this been '57, early on?

SHAW: Let's see when that would have been. Yes. It would have been. Even in '56. I remember on the way home, the Democratic delegation--we all rode in the same car--decided to have me as a candidate for the senate.

DOUGLASS: The Democrats who had gone to the meeting for Brown.

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Where was that meeting held? At a hotel in Los Angeles?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: The Biltmore or someplace?

SHAW: No. It was someplace over in west Los Angeles.

DOUGLASS: You said it was sort of a staging, showcasing, of his decision to run.

SHAW: One of the steps in a campaign. Getting the leadership together.

DOUGLASS: So after that initial meeting of Brown, then you, you saw him, during the period up to the time he was elected?

SHAW: I'd see him when I was in the assembly, too, of course (when he was attorney general). But I would go in to see him on the slightest pretext. I would go over the openings of what committees needed to be staffed out membership. I would go and make a pitch to appoint so-and-so to this or that commission. He later called me a bandit. "You are always coming in and wanting money." We needed a state building; so I got a state building out of him.

DOUGLASS: What for?

SHAW: For San Bernardino.

DOUGLASS: Oh, here, in the county. A state office building.

SHAW: Yes. A state office building. It was a high rise as San Bernardino goes.

DOUGLASS: So you persuaded him it was worthwhile?

SHAW: Sure. That is the way to accomplish things.

You stick it in the budget.

DOUGLASS: Was this open-door policy something that most senators had, or were you in an unusual position?

SHAW: Most Democrats did. He was extremely affable. Still is. His only problem was [Laughter] that he was so affable, he promised the same thing to more than one person. I got lots of judgeships for friends and acquaintances.

DOUGLASS: So he respected your word on this kind of thing. He would assume that your judgment was right? Or was this a friendship thing?

SHAW: I think it was more of a friendship thing. I think that is the way he operated. I had a very close friend here by the name of [Thomas] Parry who wanted a judgeship very bad. I saw that there was an opening, and I persuaded him to drive up overnight, that I had an appointment the next morning to see the governor, and take him in to get appointed. So we went in and, sure enough, "we will appoint you."

[End Tape 3, Side B]

[Begin Tape 4, Side A]

DOUGLASS: He did not turn you down very often, it sounds like?

SHAW: Just never. But a few weeks later it came out in the paper that the judgeship was filled by some nonentity attorney who we had never heard of. It turned out that [Frederick] Fred Dutton, who was his right-hand man, the governor's, said he had a friend down in San Bernardino who needed to be appointed to a judgeship. He appointed him. It was a year later that the governor fulfilled his promise to appoint Parry.

DOUGLASS: Do you think it was a whoever-talked-to-him-last situation?

SHAW: Yes. I guess so. It was kind of a standing joke that people were not too critical about.

DOUGLASS: He had an appointment secretary, didn't he?¹

SHAW: I guess he never told him. Maybe he did.

[Laughter]

DOUGLASS: His staff must have had a problem keeping track of some of this?

SHAW: Oh, yes. The appointing of judgeships got to be a highly involved thing later, but it was not at

1. May Layne Bonnell Davis, sister of Mrs. Edmund G. Brown, Sr., became appointment secretary after the first month of his term.

that time. They go through a real screening process now. I tried to get on some commission, the Energy Commission. My God, you'd think that you were a candidate for the Supreme Court.

DOUGLASS: When you'd see Brown, did you have to make an appointment each time?

SHAW: Yes. You phoned down there, but it was no problem. They would give you a time.

DOUGLASS: You go down that day. Same day. Would he spend less, or more, time with you than you thought you had been allotted.

SHAW: It never was a problem. He'd never fidget the papers or anything to give you the signal that he had to do something else. We would discuss everything. Our health. He told me that he had such low pressure that he could hardly keep awake.

DOUGLASS: Did he discuss other problems with you?

SHAW: Yes. Politics. Partisan politics.

DOUGLASS: Did he have a good sense of humor?

SHAW: Not a joking type. Just an extremely pleasant person. Very pleasant.

DOUGLASS: Now did this continue through your tenure in the senate?

SHAW: Oh, sure, and to this day, except I don't see him often enough. If there was ever a real, professional personality, I mean, just getting along with everybody, he had it.

DOUGLASS: Obviously, you had success with judgeships, but was there any particular issue or issues that you thought you had persuaded him significantly about?

SHAW: There is always things like. . . . For instance, on this state building. I suppose I explained to him that it was more than that we ever needed it. I've got to do something for this area. There has not been a damn thing done for years and years and years. I tried to get state parks. I'd get his support, and then somebody on his staff would knock it out. I don't know as I was persuasive with him, but he just would not turn me down.

DOUGLASS: But I was wondering, also, if there were any larger issues that were before the state that you felt he might have consulted you about, or you might have had an influence on? Well, let's name the big ones: water, the death penalty, reorganization of the executive branch. Any of those big issues, beyond your district, where you think you might have had a special input.

SHAW: I really could not assess that. But we would talk about it. I would go and see him about one thing, but as soon as I got my way on that, we would talk about some other stuff.

DOUGLASS: You saw him often enough that you probably

covered a lot of topics.

SHAW: Yes. At least chatted about.

DOUGLASS: Did he seem to benefit from that kind of dialogue, in terms of his thinking processes, do you think?

SHAW: Maybe so, because he was not a technician, really on top of all the facts. He was not that kind of guy. He would be more inclined to respond to what the consensus was in his group, rather than what he knew himself about the facts of the situation.

DOUGLASS: So he liked to listen to various people, and, particularly, elected people, I gather.

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Who on his staff was key, either in the cabinet or of the other Democrats elected to the executive branch? Meaning [Lieutenant Governor] Glenn M. Anderson, [Attorney General] Stanley Mosk, [State Treasurer Bert A.] Betts. [State Controller Alan] Cranston.

SHAW: He would have his own little group. There was this Fred Dutton, a very influential advisor with him. When the session was over, there was¹ Julian Beck. He had been a leader in the

1. Judge Julian Beck served as Legislative Secretary to Governor Edmund G. Brown, Sr.

assembly. He would decide what was going to be signed or was not going to be signed by the governor. The governor followed him closely, and it made for a bunch of bum decisions.

DOUGLASS: What was his title?

SHAW: I have forgotten what they called it. But they always have one. A guy in charge of recommending what is going to be signed and what is going to vetoed.

DOUGLASS: In other words, he had been in the legislature and had been hired on to the staff.

SHAW: That's right. He became part of the administration.

DOUGLASS: You did not think that his advice was so great?

SHAW: No. He was so unlike Brown. If he'd find something wrong in a bill he'd want that vetoed, although overall, politically, it was a good idea.

DOUGLASS: Why do you suppose Brown listened to him?

SHAW: He had been such a good assemblyman. He was a very good legislator. But he was not a good man on this particular job.

DOUGLASS: So you think Brown trusted him because of this?

SHAW: He did.

DOUGLASS: Did Brown eventually reassess that situation?

SHAW: I can't remember. I should add that part of this is that legislators always get upset when some pet gets vetoed. He was just awful at that.

DOUGLASS: In other words, these were for minor points that he would recommend a veto?

SHAW: Oh, no. I would get a state park. I just knocked myself out to get a park. He vetoes it.

DOUGLASS: How do you explain that because Brown seemed to have a very good relationship with you?

SHAW: Yes. He apparently got a lot of support from people down in Orange County from some people who were farming in this area. I knew it was politics.

DOUGLASS: So it would be politics, and it would be a combination of things when you would lose out?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: This was the bill for the Prado Dam.

SHAW: The Prado Dam, at the moment. I got that passed about three times. I started in the assembly with that.

DOUGLASS: Yes. You did.

SHAW: But I don't think that I got it passed then. I remember Senator [John A.] Murdy [Jr.] came to my rescue. It got killed in committee
¹
 someplace along the line.

 1. S.B. 1293, introduced by Shaw in the 1959 session, provided for the acquisition and improvement of real property in San Bernardino County for a state park and an appropriation. The governor pocket vetoed the bill. S.B. 58, introduced by Shaw and [Nelson S.] Dilworth in 1960, to acquire federal land for Prado Dam, failed to pass.

DOUGLASS: Just to wind up on Brown. He had sort of a rump group, or a special group. Beck would have been one of them. And you said Dutton. Were there one or two people in education he used that would be in that position?

SHAW: No. "Mr. Education" was a Republican. Maybe Teale was up on everything.

DOUGLASS: I am thinking of nonelected people. You were speaking of whom did he consult. Did anybody come to mind?

SHAW: No.

DOUGLASS: Anybody else who would have fallen into that kind of intimate group for the governor?

SHAW: Nearly all of the Democrats could go in.

DOUGLASS: But you spoke of Beck and Dutton as being people who had his ear.

SHAW: You would be very close. . . . It is blocked in my mind.

DOUGLASS: You can fill it later when you get the transcript.

SHAW: It was just a whole lot of Democrats.

DOUGLASS: You could not pinpoint cause and effect necessarily?

IX. SAN BERNARDINO STATE COLLEGE

SHAW: No. I wouldn't necessarily know who he was going to. I got a lot of help from Beck when I was trying to get the state college.

DOUGLASS: Maybe this is a good time to talk about that. Why don't we start with that story right now. According to my research, you and Dilworth, in that very first session, '59, introduced a bill, S.B. 1, and it didn't go anywhere, apparently. Could you pick up the story at that point? Or let's start with why you got into this whole thing, this issue. The beginning for you, in terms of your involvement.

Education Committee and Failure of First Bill

SHAW: OK. I observed people getting state colleges for their districts. This is a significant thing. I might as well get one for my county. If I don't get it, it is going to go someplace else. Why settle for JCs [junior colleges] when you can get state colleges? On and on. This is just a political exercise. I am going to handle this in a way where I will get the state college. So I had virtually no interest in education matters, but I request the Education Committee.

DOUGLASS: That is why you were on that committee?

SHAW: For that purpose only. Oh, it is awfully dry stuff, if you are not interested in it, Education Committee. Dilworth is the chairman of that. He has gotten the University of California at Riverside. He and John Babbage.

I guess John did most of the work. I get Dilworth on my bill as a coauthor just because he is chairman of the committee. I could see that the trick is, in all previous attempts. . . . Jimmy Cunningham had a bill to get a state college. Everybody on the committee amends their pet college in. So it ends up with a bill authorizing forty state colleges, and the governor vetoes the whole thing, of course.

So I got commitments to not amend onto my bill. So it will go by itself. The thing that helped it most was a report that came out which assessed the needs for colleges.

DOUGLASS: The Donahoe Act, the Master Plan for Higher
1
Education.

SHAW: That's the one.

DOUGLASS: That came out in '60, but it was in the works while you were doing this.

SHAW: And the San Bernardino area was well towards the top. So getting it authorized, of course, is just part. . . . That is hard enough. But getting it started. It moves at glacial speed after you get the college authorized.

1. S.B. 33, 1960 Leg., 2d Spec. Sess., Cal. Stat. 392 (1960). Defined responsibilities and interfacing of the state colleges, the University of California, and the community colleges.

DOUGLASS: To go back just a minute. The very first attempt, in '59, when you and Dilworth floated this bill. Incidentally, Cobey was chairman of the Education Committee in '59. Dilworth was on it. I wondered why did Dilworth go with you on that? Why was it you and Dilworth?

SHAW: Well, Dilworth became chairman of the Education Committee.

DOUGLASS: Yes. But at the time you introduced the bill, this first bill that failed, S.B. 1, you said because he was on the committee, at least. It's Shaw and Dilworth, S.B. 1, for a state college in San Bernardino and Riverside County. And it died in committee. There is no further action on that bill. Now this is '59, your very first session.

SHAW: Besides becoming chairman of the Education Committee later, he was "Mr. Education." He was our neighbor. I just went to him for help as to "How do we do this? How do I get myself a state college?"

Passage of 1960 Bill

DOUGLASS: In 1960, S.B. 4 did pass.¹ That was Shaw and Dilworth for the state college. You had

1. S.B. 4, 1960 Leg., 1st Spec. Sess., Cal. Stat. 64 (1960).

proposed a resolution in the First Extraordinary Session of 1960 which was the budget year for a state college. The same thing that your other bill had encountered.

SHAW: When did it die?

DOUGLASS: It died in '59, the first bill. S.B. 1. That one did not make it. But the next year, in the budget year, a bill did pass. And that would coincide with the master plan, because 1960 is the year the master plan came out.

SHAW: Maybe we didn't have the master plan available for S.B. 1.

DOUGLASS: You did not.

SHAW: It was in the works.

DOUGLASS: So you gave it a try, in other words. And then you came back in '60. Dorothy Donahoe died in April of '60, and the act was going through. So they named it in her honor. That certainly would have given you a lot of substantiation.

SHAW: Oh, yes.

DOUGLASS: I gather you are saying that was key in getting the college?

SHAW: Well, as I remember, the real trick was having a relationship with these committee members so somebody else would not amend onto it. Sandbag it.

DOUGLASS: So it sounds like you got that agreement with

S.B. 4. [Referring to notes]

SHAW: Oh, S.B. 1 was referred to interim study.

DOUGLASS: Oh, then it goes to '60. Do you recall any particular lobbying effort put in on that bill?

SHAW: Just in committee.

DOUGLASS: So you got good committee support.

SHAW: Oh, yes.

DOUGLASS: Then no problem on the floor.

SHAW: No.

DOUGLASS: All right. Did you organize the troops in the county here? Did you get people to come up, and write and do things?

SHAW: Yes. I got the local junior college, Chaffey [Junior College] interested. Because to get this thing underway, we were going to have the state college locate itself temporarily in the new junior college building. They had a lot of extra space. Boy, that went over like a lead balloon [Laughter] with these state guys. But I guess it did have the effect of "we had better get rid of this guy." Yes. We went up to the state meetings. The guy who was the head of Chaffey--he had a CPA [certified public accountant] background--[Daniel B.] Milliken. Dan Milliken, a great administrator.

DOUGLASS: Did you talk to him?

SHAW: Oh, yes. We made a trip up to San Mateo together, to the board. The one that is the

head of the state college system.

DOUGLASS: At that time it was [J. Burton] Vasche. That was pre-[Glenn] Dumke.

SHAW: Yes. It wasn't Dumke. We did everything we could think of to get this off center.

DOUGLASS: Was there anybody opposing it, actively? At the state level?

SHAW: No. We had things like this, I have to have somebody handle it on the assembly side. And we had a fellow by the name of Beaver. Jack [A.] Beaver. He was the assemblyman from Redlands. He was a good, conservative Republican, whereby you should not be spending any money on state colleges. And he made some remark I remember. I remember I really could have fixed him. He made a remark that the only reason why I was getting a state college was to butter up to the editor-publisher of the [San Bernardino] Sun newspaper, James A. Guthrie.

DOUGLASS: In San Bernardino.

SHAW: The San Bernardino Sun. As a matter of fact, I didn't have anything to do with him on this issue. He was always on highways. If I had just told him that Beaver was criticizing this bill because it was his idea, it was Guthrie's idea, he would have really fixed this guy.

DOUGLASS: But he did agree to carry it, though.

SHAW: Yes, very reluctantly. I think he was the one. There had to be a certain amount of reciprocity. Particularly, in my case, because, at this time, there was only one state senator.

DOUGLASS: It went through fairly easily then?

SHAW: Yes. The only real problem was keeping other people off of it.

DOUGLASS: What do you mean by that?

SHAW: Amend another state college in.

DOUGLASS: You always ran into that problem of someone else wanting a state institution.

SHAW: It is taking some bacon home. If somebody else can do it, I ought to go along.

DOUGLASS: You pointed out that it is one thing to get it approved, the next thing is how to get it funded? What happened next?

SHAW: Go in and see the governor. You get it put in as a line item in the budget. I think I also had an authorization to bill. As I remember, we got it in the budget. Just one on one with the governor.

DOUGLASS: Did Brown resist that at all?

SHAW: Oh, no. Not a bit. He was for more education.

DOUGLASS: How long did that take? What year did you get this in the budget? Was it a year or so later? Within a year? This bill passed in '60. So it must have been '61 or '62 that you got the money.

SHAW: I can't remember.

DOUGLASS: Anyway, it didn't take an inordinate amount of time, I gather, to go ahead.

SHAW: No. Once we got it underway. . . . It is like getting pregnant, there is no stopping.

Site Selection

[Laughter] Anyhow, it had come to my attention by this time, that the worst political trouble you could get in at a state level is to involve yourself in the site selection. And worse than that I had very good friends, unbelievable supporters in Rialto, who wanted the state college there. A big power group. A close associate of mine in business wanted it over where it is. And I just, in the nick of time, got out of that. We had a separate siting committee. So I stayed out of all this siting stuff.

DOUGLASS: So they quit lobbying you specifically after that?

SHAW: Oh, they called me. But I just couldn't have anything to do with it. There was a committee for this very thing.

DOUGLASS: A lot of pressure for that.

SHAW: I think more incumbents lost their jobs over getting involved in the siting of state colleges than any other political thing.

DOUGLASS: Were particular groups offering land at a particularly good deal to the state, in order to entice it there?

SHAW: I was divorced from that part.

DOUGLASS: But when they first started, did you hear any of this?

SHAW: I was still involved, but I got out early. While I was involved, there was none of that.

DOUGLASS: Because it was very interesting talking to Senator [Walter W.] Stiern. Apparently, there were several offers of land for Bakersfield State College.

SHAW: Did you hear that Stiern died?

DOUGLASS: Yes. I did. Luckily, I completed a series of long interviews with him. He was very interesting because he said that they had a number of offers for land. Not all with enlightened self-interest involved. [Laughter] I just wondered if that happened here.

SHAW: I am sure it did to some extent. Except here, the difference would be they would still make a lot of money.

DOUGLASS: Now who set up the site selection committee?

SHAW: I have forgotten.

DOUGLASS: Was that done through the state college system?

SHAW: Oh, no. Local.

DOUGLASS: Within the county.

SHAW: One of the ringleaders was Bob Holcomb, the

mayor of San Bernardino. Dr. and Mrs. Tyson were of the Rialto group.

DOUGLASS: So somehow they put together some kind of a group, which was representative, to choose the site. And that, I take it, was a recommendation to the state.

SHAW: Yes. There was trouble about it, but they finally worked it out with the state.

DOUGLASS: Did you have any more involvement, personally, in the college?

SHAW: I religiously stayed away until they started pouring concrete. I really had very little connection. I guess I would stop by on the order of once a year or so. But, in varying degrees, they don't find any particular interest in my connection with the institution.

DOUGLASS: Really? As you say, it is considered quite a feather in a legislator's cap to be responsible for a college.

SHAW: I thought it would be. I think maybe the site selection activity took all the play away. [Laughter] I just have to settle for that. I have gone down there. And I visited Anthony Evans, the president. We had a nice chat and all. I stopped in the history department. They came out once, but never again.

DOUGLASS: Now did you go over this sort of information with them.

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: To go back a moment, because we did talk about Senator Stiern. I know you were on the Fish and Game Committee with him. I am sure you encountered him. I wondered if you could give any personal recollections.

SHAW: Encounter him! He was my seatmate.

DOUGLASS: Oh, was he.

SHAW: And my very good friend. He was a veterinarian, but he would give me vitamin pills. He was my doctor.

DOUGLASS: So yours was a very personal relationship.

SHAW: Quite. Yes. I had other friends I was close with, but we just got along famously.

DOUGLASS: Was he your seatmate when you first arrived?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Was he helpful to you?

SHAW: Yes. We were both green.

DOUGLASS: Right, of course. You were both in '59.

SHAW: Maybe I was more help to him. Because I had been in the assembly.

DOUGLASS: That is correct. He was new. You both were elected in '58.

SHAW: I, also, was an attorney, and I could help him.

DOUGLASS: You were more experienced.

SHAW: By the way, going back, you asked me about education. Right behind me sat [Albert S.] Al Rodda. He was the Democrat education guy.

DOUGLASS: Your recollections of your activities in that committee were principally with the state college. For instance, let's talk about the [Senator Hugo] Fisher Bill.¹ You signed on that bill. What are your recollections of that?

SHAW: What was it about?

DOUGLASS: Hugo Fisher carried it. It was about the whole credentialing setup. What you asked of teachers and administrators. It required that you have a B.A. degree in a subject field and not in education. In other words, it was a tightening of the standards for education. It was quite a drastic change. I think there was a lot of lobbying on the part of the people from the education establishment on both sides. As I understand it, the bill was one that the committee had been working on, and Fisher, who was from San Diego, apparently this was a real cause for him. One story that I heard was that he dropped a bill in the hopper first. Do you have any recollection of that?

1. S.B. 57, 1961 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 848 (1961).
Coauthored by Assemblyman Gordon H. Winton.

SHAW: That shows how disinterested I was in education. I was set for one goal.

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] Your one goal.

SHAW: I remember Fisher very well, though. He was, in many ways, a sort of a maverick. Have you met him, yet?

DOUGLASS: No. I guess he didn't mind controversy. Or having to fight for something.

SHAW: Well, he was not exactly a scrapper. He just didn't give a damn about anybody else. But he was a bright guy. Still is, I am sure. He's had some recent difficulties. He was a real loner. For instance, we have reunions of our class, when there was one senator for each county, at least not more than one. He is one of the few who do not come.

DOUGLASS: Really? A sort of a loner?

SHAW: Well, I think he maybe has health problems, too.

DOUGLASS: Of the committees you were on, which was the one you were most interested in?

SHAW: Oh, Judiciary. My attendance was poor, very poor, for health reasons.

DOUGLASS: It was spotty.

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: But that was the one you wanted the most, in terms of your own interest?

SHAW: Oh, you could have whatever you wanted.

DOUGLASS: I meant, in terms of how you would like to spend your time?

SHAW: It is not all that interesting, though, because there are too many bills. A lot of them are completely uninteresting.

DOUGLASS: You mentioned Fred Farr. He was on Judiciary. What was Fred Farr like?

SHAW: Oh, he was excellent. An Eagle Scout, grown up. He just had it all. Still does.

X. ISSUES AND BILLS

The Death Penalty

DOUGLASS: Maybe we could talk about the death penalty moratorium that Brown proposed. Farr was one of the people who carried it, S.B. 1. That was a very special event. Maybe that was something you talked to Brown about. This was the Second Extraordinary Session, which would have been a week in March in 1960.

SHAW: I went into the committee meeting, and I was a swing vote. And I go in thinking clearly the politics, even now, are that you should sustain the death penalty. And a lawyer by the name of Joe Ball, who I knew quite well, he made a pitch against the death penalty, and I changed my mind right on the spot at the committee hearing. I voted for abolition of the death penalty.

That was the most interesting committee

meeting I ever went to. We had all kinds of views. There was a very good lawyer from Ventura, who later was the district attorney there. [] Christopherson. He thought there should be the death penalty. That the rationale for it was punishment, qua punishment. Then, of course, there was this tooth for a tooth, this so-called religious basis. Incidentally, later Pat Brown joins Joe Ball's law firm. Where he is now.

DOUGLASS: Oh, really.

SHAW: Ball, Hart, Brown [and Baerwitz]. He and a number of others did a real workmanlike job. There is a committee report by this time, to the effect that there is no deterrence by executing people. They got the facts on it.

DOUGLASS: You had testimony, didn't you, from the superintendent of San Quentin, Gordon Duffy, and some of the penal institutions.

SHAW: Oh, yes. That was one of the most impressive things. People closest to it, just think it is terrible. The wardens. You can't find a warden who is in favor of it.

DOUGLASS: Now was this persuasive to you in that meeting?

SHAW: Somewhat. What was most persuasive was that mistakes are made, and it is not doing what is claimed for it. It is not deterring, except for one person. Later, I noticed that the argument

has been raised that it even costs more to execute than to jail for life.

DOUGLASS: You said that you were the swing vote, and you voted in favor of Brown's position. But it failed.

SHAW: Later it failed. I am talking about of one committee meeting.

DOUGLASS: But it never got out of Judiciary, did it?

SHAW: I thought it did.

DOUGLASS: Did Judiciary recommend the abolition?

SHAW: As I remember, there was a time.

DOUGLASS: One of the votes.

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Then it failed in the full senate, I guess.

SHAW: I can't remember where it failed.

DOUGLASS: The people who signed on the bill were Farr, Miller, Teale, Fisher, [Joseph A.] Rattigan, and Stiern. And it was March 2nd to the 10th. So you must have had the hearings in there and the decision. But it never got out of the legislature.

SHAW: I can't remember. It may have been dropped because there was an assembly bill doing the same thing. Maybe that moved forward.

DOUGLASS: Were you surprised that Brown called a session specifically on this?

SHAW: I probably was at the time. It was such a hot issue.

DOUGLASS: Do you think that he paid for that politically?

SHAW: Sure. Even his son did.

DOUGLASS: Did you have anybody in your district confront you on your view?

SHAW: No. It was not a hot issue in the cow counties. Not as far as I can recall.

DOUGLASS: That is one case where a committee meeting was held, and you were persuaded by what happened.

SHAW: I think the only time where I was completely reversed by just one person's pitch.

[Interruption]

DOUGLASS: That same year, 1960, was the Squaw Valley Olympics issue. That was the first extraordinary session, to get more money for that. How did you feel about that issue?

SHAW: I didn't have any strong feelings. I remember it being pretty hot. I hope that I voted for it because I certainly enjoyed it. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: This was a situation where they needed another \$1 million on an urgency basis.

SHAW: I can't remember. I wasn't. But I sure can remember the Olympics because the highway patrolmen wanted to go to it. So they would take a politician and provide transportation. That is the way they'd get in.

State Route 30 (Devore)

DOUGLASS: Perhaps this would be a good time to talk about a few bills which you were working on during this term that you served. One that seemed to show up was your interest in the state highway, particularly, Route 30.

SHAW: That is the Devore cutoff.

DOUGLASS: S.B. 223, which is on this sheet.¹ What is the story behind that? Was there a lot of pressure and need in your district to see this through? To complete the plan?

SHAW: That was a pretty good political problem. It saved about fourteen miles of travel for anybody who had occasion to go from Los Angeles to Las Vegas. On the other hand, it bypassed the city of San Bernardino. So Mr. James A. Guthrie, who was the most powerful figure in the county does not want the Devore cutoff. He wants people to loop around and go through San Bernardino. So all west end politicians, they have great plans for the Devore cutoff. Everybody was for the Devore cutoff. Members of the board of supervisors from the west end. There is a lot of conversation about this, but

1. S.B. 223, 1959 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 2089, (1959).

nothing happened. Guthrie was on the [state] highway commission.

[End Tape 4, Side A]

[Begin Tape 4, Side B]

He gets the freeway the way he wants it. His support is against building the cutoff. Then later, Guthrie, he does not feel so strongly about it. He does not understand the westenders, but he can see it is a political problem. So I managed to get the bill passed. And then the trick was to get the money. I went up to Los Banos, to the highway commission meeting. I think that I got it into their budget. And this Mr. Guthrie, he was really a big man. He supported me on it. Then I did one of the things that I am least proud of. I could not resist phoning the newspaper to tell them. [Laughter] I scooped him.

DOUGLASS: So that is how that came about. That is state Route 30, from Route 31 near Devore to Route 26, near Milliken Avenue. That is that connection.

SHAW: Yes. That was big stuff in this county. To this day, there are guys who claim that they did that. What they did was fail at it.

DOUGLASS: So you manipulated that bill until you succeeded. Richard Richards was on that bill with you.

SHAW: He sat right behind me, trying to make out that

Los Angeles people want this. Saving miles. I was so pleased with this success that I could not leave a good thing alone I then decided to have a north-south freeway through Ontario.

DOUGLASS: Oh, really.

SHAW: I got it and got talking about routing. And Jerene Harnish decided that she didn't like it.

DOUGLASS: Your nemesis?

SHAW: No, I had really gotten along with her pretty good. But when you get enough houses in the path of the freeway, you've got problems.

DOUGLASS: Where would it have gone through Ontario?

SHAW: Oh, it would have been great. It would have been along the west line of the Ontario Airport, about three-quarters of a mile east of Euclid [Avenue] and parallel with it. There were not all that many houses.

DOUGLASS: Where would the southern end of it have gone?

SHAW: Clear down to the hills. Chino.

DOUGLASS: That would have been amazing.

SHAW: Oh, they are having fits there now. They still should do it.

DOUGLASS: Was she the principal person responsible for killing it, do you think?

SHAW: No. The local supervisors were against it.

DOUGLASS: Why were they against it?

SHAW: It is just hard to understand. They were responding to people who don't want their houses

to be taken out.

DOUGLASS: I take it that Jerene Harnish supported the Republican candidate in your election and didn't support you when you ran in '58? She must have supported Gregory?

SHAW: No. I think she didn't like him.

DOUGLASS: Did she support anyone?

SHAW: I don't think so.

DOUGLASS: She was neutral.

SHAW: She may have supported me some. Very lukewarm, I am sure. When I ran for the assembly, she supported me. No. She didn't support me. She disliked the other guy so terribly. [Laughter] She and my mother got along well enough is the reason.

DOUGLASS: That might have helped.

SHAW: And, in spite of her great power, she personalized things, just abominably.

Route 218

DOUGLASS: You did, in '61, get a bill passed that provided Route 218, from Route 187 near Yucca Valley to the Utah Trail Road in Twenty-nine Palms.¹

SHAW: Yes. This is not very significant, but it is sheer politics at the rawest. I wanted to do

1. S.B. 671, 1961 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 1768 (1961).

something for that part of the district. Get the state to maintain that stretch of road, which was part of the state highway system. And with no hope of getting it passed, I just stuck it in. One day, a fellow from Vallejo came to me, Luther [E.] Gibson, the senator there. He said, "How would like to trade a few million dollars for ten cents?" The bottom line was "if you vote for this bridge authority bill in San Francisco, you've got this highway. We don't know where it is. Wherever you say it is." So I had promised the guy ahead of me, [John F.] McCarthy, that I would vote for the way he wanted it. It had something to do with the transit authority and bridges. Two contesting groups.

DOUGLASS: It wasn't about a southern bridge crossing, was it?

SHAW: No. It was about administration. The appointed versus elected, or something. So I hadn't the slightest interest. So I went to McCarthy and asked him to relieve me of that commitment. I guess he could see that he was sunk. So I didn't have any difficulty on that. I made the deal. Then I started getting calls. Guthrie phones me. He wants me to vote that way. The way I made a deal. I don't know what this power

play was down there. Anyhow, the power brokers of this state, they were all on this side. It would have been terrible to have to vote against them.

DOUGLASS: This problem in the Bay area.

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: So things fell out just right. And you achieved what you wanted.

SHAW: Yes. It never amounted to anything except that they had to maintain the road, and they don't do that very good.

DOUGLASS: Well, in '61, you also carried a bill that passed that demanded the state Department of Public Works prepare advance plans for their highway projections and notify cities--the planning departments and elected bodies of cities--about what their plans were.¹ That was very interesting to me. That seems very significant that you got that on the books.

SHAW: I think Guthrie put me up to it. A thing like that, I would be the vehicle. But then I might have nothing to do with it. The guys from the League of California Cities, or somebody, would carry it.

 1. S.B. 310, 1961. Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 471 (1961).

DOUGLASS: Well, it certainly was something that must have been a problem for the cities.

SHAW: Yes. I remember, in El Monte, the state just ran through there roughshod and would not deal with them at all on access to the freeway. And that caused a lot of bitterness. That was early on, when I was in the assembly.

DOUGLASS: Well, under Governor [Edmund G.] Brown [Sr.] there was a lot of money set aside for the whole freeway system, too. That was the beginning of large funding for the California freeway system. Mojave-Antelope Valley Water Agency

Mr. Shaw, one of the bills you carried in the '59 session was S.B. 1068, creating the Mojave-Antelope Valley Water Agency.¹ Why did you introduce that legislation?

SHAW: Well, to take advantage of the state water plan, there has to be some local entity involved that can contract for their share of the water. No such an agency existed for the Mojave Desert. So we set up this agency covering all the area that would apparently have any interest in imported water, sharing in it. And this is

1. S.B. 1068, 1959 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 2146 (1959).

called the Mojave Water Agency. Antelope Valley had much the same idea. They didn't have a vehicle for creating an agency for themselves. So they amended into my bill.

DOUGLASS: That is why the two are in there.

SHAW: They are really separate measures in one bill. Although this is, in fact, a taxing agency, there was really surprisingly little resistance to this bill. The community leaders were all in favor of it.

DOUGLASS: This was because this would guarantee a source of water, I suppose.

SHAW: Oh, yes. This is the only source of supplemental water for this whole river system, plus, down Twenty-nine Palms way, all that area. Another reason that it didn't have much in the way of problems, as far as I was concerned, is that it called for an election. Nothing happened, unless there was a vote and the people approved it, to activate it. It was sort of enabling legislation. So it got created. The rationale of this thing is that we have enough water now, but some day we won't have. You've got to have this thing in existence where you have rights to acquire it.

But the community can never quite reconcile itself to the fact that "we are entitled to the

water, but they never give us any." The thing is that the groundwater that we pump--and most of it is pumped from really shallow levels--is only costing us about five dollars an acre-foot. The wholesale cost of this other water, before you start transporting it, is \$150 an acre-foot. Nobody wants to pay for this water. But some day, you've got to have it. And for municipal uses, people without grumbling too much will pay over a \$1000 for an acre-foot.

But that is not our principal problem. We no more get this enacted, and there is this law firm in Riverside that is big on adjudication of water rights. This is Best, Best & Krieger. The way this works is this is extremely lucrative to a law firm. They will make \$1 million in a year and a half or two to promote this thing. Win, lose, or draw, they will make a lot of money. From the property owner's standpoint, it is attractive to those who have been pumping water because they are all striving for a decree whereby the courts will decide that they own all the water. If you don't have water rights, you will have to buy them from them.

To make this work, the law firm is very generous with these people who have been pumping. They don't adhere just to the five-year rule. In five years, you are entitled to

the minimum that you have pumped. They sweeten it any number of ways. But they award nothing to the land that isn't developed. So it is kind of a freeze-out deal. Well, a number of us didn't like that. So I went on the board. And I started out. . . . I was the only member of the thirteen members who opposed this adjudication. We just kept pecking away at it and getting members elected to this board until we finally fired these attorneys and dropped the suit. Everybody was free to develop water, except, locally here, the county stopped it on new, large lakes and growing alfafa.

Anyhow, this water agency, we had to have it. Its first use is something that we had not anticipated. It gets used by those who want to try to corner all the water rights. You have no idea how people can fight over water rights and boundaries. Water rights and boundaries generate the damndest fights.

DOUGLASS: When was it when you went on the board? What year?

SHAW: In '66 or '67.

DOUGLASS: In other words, a few years after you went out of the senate.

SHAW: Yes. That is enough on water, isn't it?

DOUGLASS: Yes. Then there were some housekeeping bills in

that first year. I noticed some with the courts. You were adding salary ranges and categories to the courts in San Bernardino.

SHAW: Yes. These come from the supervisors mostly. As you are aware, there is a whole number of areas where you cannot get a bill through the legislature unless your board of supervisors approves it.

DOUGLASS: Yes. I am sure. It is essentially a veto power, isn't it?

SHAW: Yes. Here is a little measure that I got the most mileage out of politically.

DOUGLASS: What was that?

SHAW: Someplace along in here I introduced a measure to cut down on the length and number of TV commercials. You can imagine how much the states got to say about this. Anyhow, I had a girl working for me, Harlene Adams, and she ran with this. We finally got it passed as a resolution.

DOUGLASS: That symbolic gesture got you some brownie points, then?

SHAW: I guess so.

Miscellaneous Bills

DOUGLASS: Well, you mentioned, not on tape, this business of the snow tread tires, S.B. 236 in 1959. Was this because up until this time a law had read you had to have chains, period. There were not

allowances made for the fact that you could have snow tread tires. Because the bill seemed to say, "Yes, there could be approval of snow tires in areas where chains were required."

SHAW: The essence of it was that they were not allowing the option around our lakes, Big Bear [Lake] and [Lake] Arrowhead, and we wanted it. They had the same problem up in Quincy, California. So the guy representing that area, Senator Stanley Arnold (First Assembly District), and clear down here, we got together to get this changed so the [California] Highway Patrol would allow them an alternative.

DOUGLASS: You did, I notice, at the request of the governor introduce a bill which did not come out as your bill, but it was to create in the governor's office an Office of Atomic Development Activities, which would provide for coordinating the development of regulatory activities of peaceful use of atomic energy. It would have an advisory council and a citizen's committee. I could not track that after that. It is called S.B. 304. But you were called by Brown to carry that. Do you recall that?

SHAW: No. But he undoubtedly did, or I wouldn't have put it in. It is probably somebody's idea, and then he dropped it.

- DOUGLASS: Yes. I don't think it ever came to fruition. In fact, here is a bill that I think you referred to earlier, S.B. 550, which you had put in for an appropriation, you and Dilworth, undoubtedly for the state college. And Brown vetoed it, and it was upheld.
- SHAW: Yes. That is the one. Beck did that to me.
- DOUGLASS: Let's finish the bills, and then I want to ask you some general questions.
- SHAW: I'll see if there are any others in '59.
- DOUGLASS: Are there any others that you feel were important in '59? I did notice that you did introduce one that would allow high school districts to provide for the education of mentally retarded minors.
- SHAW: Oral histories have got to be closer to the time when the subject leaves.
- DOUGLASS: [Laughter] It was sort of unusual. It simply was an urgency bill that some school must have needed.
- SHAW: There were lots of problems like that. For instance, WPA [Works Progress Administration] built a school here in Barstow. For some reason or another, the halls are twenty-five feet wide. Well, they could never qualify under some act because they had too many square feet per pupil, but it was all in the halls.
- DOUGLASS: So you had to carry a special bill to straighten

that out. To pick up on the next nonbudget session, in '61, there were a couple of things that were intriguing. You carried a bill on bees, providing for the quarantine of honeycomb bees, hives in order to prevent the spread of disease. That is sort of unusual. S.B. 34.¹ Was there a problem in your district?

SHAW: We have a big bee producer. The [Woodrow] Miller family in Colton. And their lawyer is my closest lawyer friend. So, I am carrying this for them, I suppose.

DOUGLASS: There was another one having do with the feathers from lovebirds falling off from moving vehicles.

SHAW: [Laughter] Lovebirds?

DOUGLASS: Yes. This is the "lovebird" bill. I just could not resist. S.B. 1070. Regulating the transportation of lovebirds. It exempts from the prohibition against contents or a load escaping, the feathers from lovebirds if they fall off a load while moving down the highway.

SHAW: Where the hell did we get lovebirds? It's chickens! I don't doubt that you are reading it, but I have never heard that before.

1. S.B. 34, 1961 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 59 (1961).

DOUGLASS: Apparently the feathers were escaping.

SHAW: Oh, yes, from chickens. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: I guess, it shows you what minutae legislation can get into.

SHAW: I had a spot bill once defining bovine animals, in the Agricultural Code. It came out--some guy down in the Legislative Counsel's office--a bovine animal was defined as a hamster.

[Laughter]

DOUGLASS: I believe Senator Stiern had one where he had bees included within the definition of bovine animals, in order to get something passed having to do with one of these health matters.

There was one other bill, in '61, that had to do with inheritances and gift taxes.

SHAW: Yes. I got a lot of mileage out of that.

DOUGLASS: That was S.B. 668.¹ The major thing was that there would not be a community property tax for the wife, whereas at that point she would be taxed for half.

SHAW: You think ERA [Equal Rights Amendment] has not come very far. Believe it or not, there was a time when a surviving husband didn't have to pay any state inheritance taxes.

 1. S.B. 668, 1961 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 2189 (1961).

DOUGLASS: On community property.

SHAW: Nor on joint tenancy, either. But the widow, if she survived, she had to pay tax on half of it. Can you imagine that? The only reason they ever adopted community property in the state, in the first place, was because somebody figured out, in the days of mining, we ought to cut the little woman in for half. Because if the guy was not married, he did not have anything. Anyhow, the problem was, at this time, this bill was just about dead in the water, unless it was not going to cost the state anything. So we increased the tax a little bit on nieces and nephews and so forth. Took it off the widows.

DOUGLASS: Yes. You increased the other part of the inheritance tax. There was a listing of limits. But it seemed to me this was the most important part, was the widows.

SHAW: Oh, yes. To relieve the widows. I remember going to the women's clubs in those days, trying to be halfway modest, but making clear that I was the author. There was a lot of interest in this.

DOUGLASS: Yes. That was a very significant step.

SHAW: We get all done, and I have a question from the audience, and some gal gets up and says, "What I don't understand is why you legislators don't take the tax off widows."

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] She didn't understand it.

SHAW: And the other women were saying, "He just did that."

DOUGLASS: Did you have that happen very often? That kind of thing? Where you talk to a lay audience, and they really don't understand?

SHAW: No.

XI. LEADERSHIP IN SENATE

President Pro Tem Hugh Burns

DOUGLASS: One thing that I did want to ask you about, in general, was the leadership in the senate. Hugh Burns was the president pro tem, and had been in since '56 and was in his heyday, I guess. What was he like? What was your working relationship with him?

SHAW: Well, he was an extremely personable guy. He is sort of a power unto himself and special interests--is the term used nowadays--and lobbyists. I had not known him, but when I get into this race and it looked like I had some prospect, he wants to see me in the restroom. So he gives me--it does not seem like much now--but I think it was \$500 cash.

DOUGLASS: You mean the restroom wherever you were having a meeting?

SHAW: Yes. I was at some big affair down in San Diego. But I didn't get much more. He was sort

of a bagman for the senate, like Unruh was for the assembly. I didn't identify with him well, but I got along with him. He got along well with everybody.

DOUGLASS: Did you feel that you were treated fairly?

SHAW: Yes. But I admired his leadership on the policy level. I admired his skill at getting along with everybody. However, he responded pretty thoroughly to special interests. Business interests were close to Burns.

DOUGLASS: You mean, there were policy issues that you were on the other side of?

SHAW: Oh, yes. More often than not. I was "consumer protection" oriented; he was not.

DOUGLASS: Oh, really. But there was not much cracking the whip, in terms of getting people in line?

SHAW: No. No acrimony. I remember in the assembly. . . . I really had very little trouble. You see, most of these lobbyists, they had given you money in order to protect what they have already got, and that's the main issue. I had gotten some money from independent oil. They never asked me for anything. But then there came a clash between independent and major [oil companies]. That led to both oils deciding they wanted to defeat this speakership reform drive. And the lobbyists for independent oil asked me to vote against that. Just as if, "Why, of

course, I would. I would not think of doing other than they requested."

DOUGLASS: And what did you respond?

SHAW: I turned him down. I can't remember what I said, but it discouraged me because this guy does not understand.

DOUGLASS: He thought whatever they gave you meant that if they ever asked you, that you would do it?

SHAW: Yes. This is the only time they ever asked me, and they thought I would say, "Of course, I'll do it."

DOUGLASS: So, in other words, the issue does not come up until their vested interest becomes challenged. At the time, the Samish thing had not yet come to a head. Did you ever meet Artie Samish?

SHAW: Yes. One night I met Artie Samish. The Collier's article had been out. I was in the assembly at the time. This is along the same line. Nobody in the assembly knew Samish. He was never in the assembly. He always worked on the senate side. He did not need to work both sides because he was never trying to get a bill passed. He was just trying to protect what he had. He would kill everything in the senate he didn't like.

DOUGLASS: That is how he became associated with Burns?

SHAW: Yes. It went back to those times.

Comparison of Senate and Assembly

- DOUGLASS: I know it was a number of years later, but could you compare being in the senate with being in the assembly? Was it a different feeling?
- SHAW: Oh, yes. You are bound to have different feelings when you are in the majority in the body, as was the case in the senate. But I was in the minority--fourteen out of eighty--in the assembly. You could not even get pencils. [Laughter] Did I ever tell you about that?
- DOUGLASS: No.
- SHAW: The chairman of the Rules Committee would hire the secretaries. They would get hired if they agreed to report back to him what I was writing in my letters. Anything of interest, they were going to have to take back to him. So we all developed, the newcomers developed, a dislike for this fellow Randal Dickey, who was the chairman of the Rules Committee.
- DOUGLASS: There was a lot of this going on the senate, too, in terms of secretaries.
- SHAW: Oh, yes. It was a bad situation. They'd get girls who had alcohol problems.
- DOUGLASS: The competency level was not too high, then, for the secretaries?
- SHAW: They were competent, once upon a time, some of them. They had other problems. Anyhow, we were dissatisfied with him. Didn't I tell you about

this? Old Sam Collins gets up a petition to fire Dickey. We can't sign it fast enough. It turns out that Collins had some squabble with Dickey. Dickey has got it over him that he knows something about Sam stepping out with some gal, or something. Did I tell you that?

DOUGLASS: I am not sure if it was on the tape.

SHAW: So, now he has got this list of all us guys' names on this petition to to fire Dickey. And he says, "Dickey, look at these. I am going to go ahead with this motion, unless you straighten up." So now Dickey has all our names and we are in worse trouble than we ever were with him because we have signed. Sam never uses it.

DOUGLASS: Well, aside from the fact that, of course, it is different when your party is clearly in the majority position, but was there a different sense of working in the senate, in terms of the day-to-day practices, or the relationships the members had with each other?

SHAW: Yes. I would say it would not be as much difference as between the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, but there was quite a bit of difference then. They are about a mirror image of each other now, since one man, one vote has been in. The name "senate" is about the only difference, and fewer members.

There was a certain prestige to it in my day; or we thought there was.

DOUGLASS: Well, I heard it described more as a club. A gentleman's atmosphere. Did it have that feeling to it? More leeway for the individual member?

SHAW: Yes. But there was quite a bit of partisanship. It was not all that "clubby." Efforts were made at it. We had a club where no one could go there, except members of the senate. Keep the lobbyists out. I don't think that still exists.
Lieutenant Governor Glenn M. Anderson

DOUGLASS: Did Glenn Anderson make himself very visible? Did he preside ever or much?

SHAW: Yes. The tradition was that the lieutenant governor would not preside at all, except come in if there is a need to break a tie. But he presided nearly all the time.

DOUGLASS: He did. What kind of a personality was he?

SHAW: Just fine. That was the only thing that was peculiar about him.

DOUGLASS: He liked to do that.

SHAW: He defied tradition. I had known him before. He was the chairman of the Los Angeles central committee. I remember a personal thing that I had with him. He has got a right-hand man who gets arrested for drunk driving. And this guy claims that he only had two beers. He

sideswipes about six parked cars before they get him stopped. Also, he was claiming that he was on some medication. So I went up to Glenn and I said, "Maybe your guy's right? Tranquilizers can potentiate alcohol. Terrible in some people. See what you can do for the guy." So he did. He stuck by him and got him off. He had been on tranquilizers real heavily.

DOUGLASS: So Anderson did a good job of running the senate?

SHAW: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Just handling of the gavel.

SHAW: He had been in the assembly quite a while, you know. He knew the rules. What he didn't, [Joseph A.] Joe Beek was right there to tell him. He was the secretary of the senate.

DOUGLASS: Was this a disappointment to Burns, do you think?

SHAW: Oh, he resented it. But it was just under the surface there.

XII. 1960 DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

DOUGLASS: Speaking of Democratic politics, you were a delegate to the 1960 convention.

SHAW: Yes. That was a great event.

DOUGLASS: That was symbolically or titularly headed by Brown, as you went to the convention. Right?

SHAW: I believe so.

DOUGLASS: What happened there? Unruh was for [Senator John F.] Kennedy. Did Unruh do any lobbying of you?

SHAW: No. My congressman did, for [Senator Lyndon B.] Johnson. A guy by the name of Harry [R.] Sheppard, who was Johnson's man. By this time, I am kind of my own man, and what they say doesn't make any difference to me. I am for [Adlai] Stevenson. About this time I bought a big house trailer. So I contributed the house trailer to the campaign. We had a bunch of poor kids from New York and all over, and they would sleep in this headquarters.

DOUGLASS: Where was the trailer? Did you have it parked somewhere?

SHAW: I had it in the yard. Set it down without a permit in the yard of the Sports Arena. That's where the convention was?

DOUGLASS: Yes. I believe so.

SHAW: So that was the Stevenson headquarters. And nothing came of that. He was a great guy, but he could not make up his mind, I guess.

DOUGLASS: Did you have any contact with Stevenson personally?

SHAW: No. I met him a couple of times. He was just as good in a small meeting or even better. A great guy.

DOUGLASS: What happened at the convention? Brown released the delegates, I guess, shortly after things got going?

SHAW: Yes. I had no difficulty switching to John F. Kennedy.

DOUGLASS: Were you conscience of Unruh's lobbying people?

SHAW: Yes. We had our own little delegation in this area. But we were a very independent sort, our delegation.

DOUGLASS: So each person, when they were released, went to either Johnson or Kennedy?

SHAW: In our delegation, they did.

DOUGLASS: Do you have any other comments on lobbying? We talked about the oil companies. You touched on the power of the board of supervisors, to be a negative or a negative force, if they choose.

SHAW: Yes. We resented that. Not a great deal. So they want to get a bill passed so that they can set their own salaries. We get even with them there, too. We won't do that.

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] One of the few levers you had.

SHAW: Yes. It didn't have a chance.

[End Tape 4, Side B]

[Begin Tape 5, Side A]

XIII. LOBBYING AND LEGISLATURE

DOUGLASS: Well, any other lobbying stories. It is interesting, in an era, what kinds of groups are out there functioning.

SHAW: Even in that area, that is the thing that is worst about our democracy. I guess, it is even worse now. But it was bad then. When I went to the assembly, there was a man by the name of Ernest Debs who had been a member of the [Los Angeles] board of supervisors. His wife was a great leader, in adoption law. Anyhow, somebody told me to go in to Debs and he would give me an assessment of all these members I am going to be dealing with. Tell me who the good guys are. It was just like grading school papers, he'd say, "Burns is pretty well owned by the lobbyists. Forty percent." So-and-so, "There's a good guy. He is really independent of the lobbyists. Give him 95 percent." So I get up there, I am inquiring about Debs. He would score about 10 percent. But he was telling on all the others.

DOUGLASS: Was it the fact that they could control the amount of money you got for campaigns? Even then.

SHAW: It was just money. Well, what you got there,

they wined and dined you. It was just unbelievable how effective. . . . How little money could result in legislation.

DOUGLASS: Either giving it or the threat of withdrawing it, I suppose?

SHAW: I think in terms of getting it. For instance, the chiropractors, who I don't like at all. I have an uncle who is an M.D. [Doctor of Medicine] I would go out and try to get one hundred dollars from the chiropractors. I get up there and I discover that, gee, they get almost any kind of bill they want.

There was another one my first year. Oh, barbers. It is just amazing the control that they have out of these modest contributions. We are talking about fifty dollars or a hundred dollars. Of course, this was before inflation. They would introduce a bill where it's relaxing the requirements, the amount of barbering you have to do, before you get a license. We think that is a good idea. Let us have more barbers. In the last minute, they will amend it just to reverse it. That's what they really want.

DOUGLASS: Yes. Playing games.

SHAW: Looking back, the most surprising thing is how cheap they could buy these votes.

[A little money went a long way then for

lobbyists because they were uniformly chintzy. Perhaps an analogy would be with baseball, where at the time of the Black Sox scandals, it happened because all the players were paid so little--they took whatever was offered them, without question. Nowadays, it's quite the opposite in baseball; legislators, too, are managing to extract more from lobbyists.]*

DOUGLASS: This must have been a difficult thing for you to handle, every time.

SHAW: Just terrible.

XIV. END OF SENATE TERM

Reapportionment

DOUGLASS: We are getting to the end of 1961. Reapportionment is to the foreground at this point. [Governor] Brown has proposed a study committee for senate apportionment. Meanwhile, Unruh had been at work with reapportionment and making, I gather, some deals. Well, making reapportionment so he would have a good prospect of becoming speaker, in terms of what was happening in assembly districts. And Frank Bonelli had this initiative that failed, that went on the ballot. It would have increased the

*Stanford C. Shaw added the preceding material during his review of the draft manuscript.

senate to fifty members.

SHAW: Yes. I vaguely remember that.

DOUGLASS: Then it would have taken the extra ten and given them to the most populous counties, one of which would have been Los Angeles. What do you recall of those discussions? Because these things particularly affected the senate. And it was a year later that there was the Baker v. Carr case.¹ This is before the Baker v. Carr decision. What do you recall of those discussions and did any of that have any effect on your decision to run again?

SHAW: I don't think so. As a partisan, we were going to perpetuate ourselves with gerrymandering. That took care of that issue. On one one man, one vote, I can't remember.

DOUGLASS: Of course, it came after you were out. Baker v. Carr was decided after that. But what did you think of the Bonelli plan, for instance, where you would have added ten senators?

SHAW: Oh, it didn't sound attractive.

DOUGLASS: The status quo was pretty comfortable.

SHAW: Yes. Incidentally, a Bonelli shows up here in town. It turns out he is the nephew of Frank.

1. Baker v. Carr 369 U.S. 186 (1962), established the one man, one vote rule.

DOUGLASS: Oh, really. You mean right in this area?

SHAW: Next-door neighbor.

DOUGLASS: That is amazing.

[Interruption]

SHAW: The only thing that I remember about reapportionment was when the Republicans were in control, they said to me, "Here is where the line is going to go." And they put my house over [Laughter] in the other district. "Here is where the line was going to go, unless this compromise is all right with you." I was on the [Elections and] Reapportionment Committee. I rose above principle and decided that compromise was a good idea.

Decision Not to Run for Reelection

DOUGLASS: Well, why did you decide not to run again?

SHAW: It was 99 percent my health. I guess it was just not agreeing with me. It was so bad that I walked towards the capitol, and I would freeze up and I could not go any farther. I'd turn around and go back to my apartment, and I would feel better every step.

DOUGLASS: It was a pressure cooker situation for you?

SHAW: No. I was ill. Agoraphobia. It was just the worst place in the world to be.

DOUGLASS: You did comment that you had to miss some things.

- SHAW: Oh, yes. Something like that, people can't see anything, physically. They couldn't understand why I wouldn't come. They had to have a vote to break a tie. And, by god, I wouldn't go over. Trying to get a budget through.
- DOUGLASS: Well, that was not a hard decision to make.
- SHAW: Oh, I had no choice. I had it all set up that I would move on to congress. Sheppard was going to pull out. Trying one of these deals where he would pull out at the last minute and support me, and cast the mantle. It was all set up, and I wired him, "No." That hurt.
- DOUGLASS: This condition developed while you were in the senate. In other words, earlier you enjoyed the first year or two more? It got worse?
- SHAW: No. I am having trouble all the time. It happened when I was just about to have this election with Gregory. Mysterious stuff. It was a strange circumstance. I was overloaded with work. But, on the other hand, I inherited a bunch of money. So I should have felt better than I ever felt.
- DOUGLASS: Were you having to worry about your law practice, to get back and forth?
- SHAW: Just in the sense that there weren't enough hours.
- DOUGLASS: But you didn't have the pressure you had when you were in the assembly, where you had to earn

the money more?

SHAW: Well, I don't know. It was pressure of a different kind.

DOUGLASS: You commented on some of the logistical problems of trying to maintain a practice. Everyone has their own pressure. I am sure.

SHAW: Oh, I am sure. If you don't have it, you dream up some pressure.

DOUGLASS: You made that decision early on, in '61, that you would not run.

SHAW: I tried to cast the mantle to a professor down at the University of Redlands, Robert Moran. He had a doctorate in political science.

DOUGLASS: He ran, I take it.

SHAW: No.

DOUGLASS: He did not get that far?

SHAW: No. He has since died. God, he was a perfect candidate. He was mayor of Redlands, professor of political science, a very handsome guy, big guy. Big smile. The only thing wrong with him he was just not cow county. [Laughter] He was a professor. Do you understand this?

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] Yes. I do.

SHAW: Did you have that problem in politics?

DOUGLASS: I was just in a college town.

SHAW: He could be the mayor of Redlands, but he couldn't be anything else.

DOUGLASS: Oh, I could see how that could be. Then did Nisbet run?

SHAW: Yes. Part of my interest in this guy was that he was so good that he could beat Nisbet.

DOUGLASS: Yes. Right. But, instead he didn't run.

SHAW: No. He pulled out. He was a CDC man, too. So the CDC group prevailed on him not to run.

DOUGLASS: I see. So Nisbet had the field clear at the end. Did you remain active in the party? Were you being active in party politics? That is, central committee, CDC, during these years in the senate?

SHAW: Not very. Well, yes. I had to go to a lot. Yes, I went to a meeting. There, again, I am uncomfortable. So when I get done, no more.

DOUGLASS: So do you remember things like the fight for the state chairmanship by Carmen Warschaw?

SHAW: I sure had not thought of her in a while.

DOUGLASS: Tell me about your experiences with her.

SHAW: I remember her at conventions, I guess. But I didn't have any real contact with her.

DOUGLASS: You were sort of part of that, but you were not deeply involved in the workings of the party at that point?

SHAW: No.

DOUGLASS: There was no cross-filing in that primary of 1961. I gather there was a lot more intraparty fighting for position because there would be

CDC-backed candidates and Unruh-backed candidates. You didn't have to go through all of that?

SHAW: No. Since I am quitting anyhow, I am sure not getting into anybody else's battle.

[If Ernie Debs could have somehow observed and graded me, what would he say? Casting modesty aside, he might have given me a "go." I was my own man, and I was effective.]*

[End Session 2, March 8, 1988]

[End Tape 5, Side A]

*Stanford C. Shaw wrote this postscript at the end of the transcript.

NAMES IN STANFORD C. SHAW INTERVIEW

<u>Name</u>	<u>Page</u>
Ackerson, Truman	89
Adams, Harlene	194
Almy, Fred	38
Anderson, Glenn M.	163, 205-206
Andreas, Godfrey	48
Arnold, Stanley	195
Babbage, John D.	106-107, 167
Backstrand, L. M.	62
Ball, Joe	90-91, 107, 180-181
Beaver, Jack A.	171
Beck, Julian	81, 163, 166
Beek, Joseph A.	206
Beloud, Robert	139
Betts, Bert A.	163
Boles, Roy	30
Bonelli, Frank	211
Bonelli, William G.	132-133, 134
Bowman, Robert	139
Brady, Bernard R.	81
Brown, Governor Edmund G. "Pat"	81, 128, 150, 151, 156- 167, 180-183, 190, 195, 196, 207-208, 211
Brown, Ralph M.	75, 77, 78, 79, 97, 105, 121-123
Burns, Hugh	200-202, 206
Caldecott, Thomas W.	82, 111
Chaffey, George	22
Chapel, Charles Edward	130
Clarke, George A.	86
Cloyed, Ralph R.	101
Coats, Arthur W., Jr.	82
Cobey, James A.	108, 152-156, 169
Collier, Randolph C.	63, 96-97
Collins, George D., Jr.	82
Collins, Samuel L.	43-44, 45, 49, 87, 103, 204
Connolly, Arthur H.	82, 88
Cook, John B.	86
Cranston, Alan	163
Creedon, Daniel J.	47
Cross, Laurence	131
Crowley, Ernest C.	82
Cunningham, James	33
Cunningham, James E., Sr.	63, 143, 146, 168
Davis, May Layne Bonnell	160fn
Davis, Pauline L.	124
Debs, Ernest E.	43, 209, 217

Dickey, Randal F.	44, 54-55, 56, 82, 203-204
Dills, Ralph C.	88
Dilworth, Nelson S.	165fn, 167-169, 196
Dolwig, Richard J.	82
Donahoe, Dorothy	64, 123-124, 170
Donnelly, Thomas	20
Doucette, Forrest	32
Doyle, Thomas J.	51
Duffy, Gordon	181
Dumke, Glenn	171
Dutton, Frederick	160, 163, 166
Elliott, Edward E.	130
Elliott, John	66
Evans, Anthony	176
Farr, Fred S.	151, 180, 182
Fisher, Hugo	178-179, 182
Fleury, Gordon A.	80, 112
Frost, George	21fn, 22
Geddes, Ernest R.	87
Gibson, Luther E.	188
Grant, William S.	88
Graves, Richard P.	125-126, 131
Gregory, Raymond H.	143, 146, 147, 187, 214
Grunsky, Donald L.	82
Guthrie, James A.	171, 184-185, 188
Haagen-Smit, Arie Jan	62
Hansen, William W.	111
Harnish, Jerene Appleby	138, 186, 187
Hearst, William Randolph	46
Hinckley, L. Stewart	61, 64
Holcomb, Robert	176
Holcomb, W. R.	38
Hoover, Herbert C.	29
Johnson, Senator Lyndon B.	207
Keck, William	32
Kennedy, Senator John F.	207-208
Kleps, Ralph	104
Knight, Goodwin J.	106, 126, 127-128
Leary, John L.	30, 102
Lincoln, Luther H.	88
Lindsay, Francis C.	108
Lipscomb, Glenard P.	88
Long, John D.	122
Lyons, Charles W.	50
Maloney, Thomas A.	78
McCarthy, John F.	188
McCarthy, Joseph	74

McCarthy, Robert I.	80, 112
McFall, John J.	83
McGee, Patrick D.	83
Miller, George C.	92, 130, 182
Miller, Woodrow	197
Milliken, Daniel B.	171
Mitchell, Archie	26
Mohlbers, Carl	10
Moms, G. Delbert	133
Moran, Robert	215
Morton, Harold	31, 48
Moss, John E., Jr.	85
Munnell, William A.	45, 83, 130
Murdy, John A., Jr.	165
Murphy, Mildred	101-102
Niehouse, Kathryn	123
Nisbet, Eugene D.	136, 137-138, 142-144, 148-149, 215-216
Ogg, Wilkie	48
Ostler, E. L.	30
Parry, Thomas	25, 159
Porter, Carley Y.	130
Price, Fred, R.	27, 28, 30
Putnam, George	84
Rattigan, Joseph A.	182
Ravn, Asger	27, 28, 150
Ravn, Dorothy	28, 150
Richards, Richard	185
Robertson, Lyman	8, 10-11, 118
Robertson, Mercedes	8
Rodda, Albert S.	178
Roosevelt, Governor Franklin Delano	30
Rosenthal, William H.	80
Rumford, William Byron	88
Samish, Arthur H.	45-47, 133, 202
Shaw, Allison Franklin	1
Shaw, Leila Frost	8, 10, 37
Sheppard, Harry R.	207, 214
Sherrard, Wade	117
Silliman, James W.	49-50, 87-88, 103
Slattery, Waverly Jack	155
Smith, H. Allen	83, 88
Snyder, Elizabeth	125
Stevenson, Adlai	207
Stiern, Walter W.	175, 177, 198
Swim, Herbert	117
Teale, Stephen P.	153, 166, 182
Teller, Edward	94
Tenney, Jack B.	74

Thomas, Vincent	130
Tomlinson, Stanley T.	83-84
Unruh, Jesse M.	49, 142, 144, 147, 201, 207-208, 211
Vasche, J. Burton	171
Velie, Lester J.	45fn
Warren, Governor Earl	57, 89, 126-127
Warschaw, Carmen	216
Weinberger, Caspar W.	111-112
Wilson, Fred	143
Winton, Gordon H.	32, 178