

Maureen and Mike

# Mansfield Library

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

## **Archives and Special Collections**

Mansfield Library, University of Montana

Missoula MT 59812-9936

Email: [library.archives@umontana.edu](mailto:library.archives@umontana.edu)

Telephone: (406) 243-2053

This transcript represents the nearly verbatim record of an unrehearsed interview. Please bear in mind that you are reading the spoken word rather than the written word.

**Oral History Number: 009-001, 002**

**Interviewees: Victor Reinemer, Ludvig Browman, Frances Logan**

**Interviewers: multiple unidentified**

**Date of Interview: January 29, 1973**

*Note: This is a recording of panel discussion with Vic Reinemer, Ludvig Browman, and Frances Logan for Dr. Evans' class. Multiple unidentified speakers ask questions and contribute to the discussion. All unidentified speakers are referred to as "US" throughout the transcript.*

Dr. Evans: We certainly appreciate you coming, Vic, and again as I indicated earlier one of the things that is very difficult to get from papers is just what sort of a man was this? You can get indications of something and so forth, but perhaps you could just talk about Senator Murray for a time if you would. Then Mr. [Ludvig] Browman [zoology professor at the University of Montana] is here, who is a longtime acquaintance of Senator Murray's and Frances Logan also had some contacts with him at least briefly.

Then afterwards at least Al Newell (?) and Ann (unintelligible) can perhaps ask some specific questions on their own projects and Tom and Roger too—

Victor Reinemer: I first met the Senator [James E. Murray] in 1948 when I was finishing up school here [University of Montana] and I was on the Kaimin [Montana Kaimin, student newspaper]. I was asked to go down to the Florence Hotel and get a picture of him and some other candidates. This was when he was gearing up for the '48 campaign. I went in the hotel room and just met him. In fact, I'm not sure I actually met him; he was sort of busy wanting to go someplace else. I took a picture—flash picture—and my camera was out of sync so that the bulb went off. As I was going out the door the shutter went off, and I said, "Oh gee, I don't think the Senator liked to have to pose the first time so I'm not going to go back." So my first (unintelligible) was on a rather unsatisfactory basis, but nothing that really mattered.

I went to work for him then on March 1, 1955. Now, this was just after his election to his final term in the '54 campaign. He had been chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, but he chose then to become the chairman of the Senate Interior Committee. Dick Callaghan, [Richard L. Callaghan] who I met at the University, was then his executive secretary. Dick called me down at the Charlotte News, which I was wanting to leave anyhow, and told me that he was going to go over to the Interior Committee, Dick was, and would I be interested in working for the Senator. He said the main problem is that the Senator is utterly disgusted with the people who had been writing for him and because of some things that I had written in Washington, in the *People's Voice* and the old Matusow [Harvey Matusow, an American Communist who became an informer for the FBI and was a paid witness for the House Un-American Activities Committee] campaign that appeared in the *Voice*. The Senator frankly entertained the hope that possibly I could write to suit him. So I went up, and I spent some time with Charlie [Charles

A. Murray, Senator Murray's son]. I met the Senator...Charlie Murray, his administrative assistant. I met the Senator very briefly, and then and there decided to take the job.

Now it soon became apparent he was not entirely happy with my writing too, but this is one of the things that I noticed about him as I have noticed with other senators, including Lee Metcalf. Many of these men are really themselves excellent writers, except in the pressure of events—on the Hill—they seldom have time to do their own writing. But Jim Murray was then, I believe, 78 when I went to work for him, but several times he went over something that I had prepared and did an excellent editing job.

Ben Stong came up onto the Interior Committee about the same time. Ben had been a Scripps-Howard reporter and editor and also had been editor of the National Union Farmer. He'd been involved with Murray during the MVA [Missouri Valley Authority] campaign. Ben and I shared quite a few of the writing chores, but more and more the job changed into sort of an overall office job including legislation, correspondence, and all that.

Jim Murray was a very gentle person. As I say now, I knew him only as an old man. I didn't see the bristling Jim Murray of the Hill-Burton, Murray-Wagner-Dingell days, about which some of you are more familiar than I am through reading some of the reports. He was kind, gentle. He also had a fine temper, but it was usually quite well controlled. In the days that I was with him, we worked mostly on matters having to do with the Interior Committee. I know the first thing I ever wrote was a statement in behalf of the settlement, the bill we had to try to settle this Crow Indian payment on Yellowtail Dam.

This ties into some of the Murray-Wheeler relationships. As you know, [Senator Burton K.] Wheeler had differing relationships with Montana Power [Montana Power Company] at different parts of his career, but at that time in 1955 he had a very good relationship with them to the extent that his law firm was retained by Montana Power and at the same time Wheeler was retained by, and getting a substantial fee from the Crow Indians, who were also interested in a different kind of development there at Yellowtail Dam. So you really had three different kinds of proposals there for construction of Yellowtail Dam. One, a federal proposal, which was eventually accomplished. Another one was the partnership idea, proposed by Montana Power, under which the federal government would have the costly portions of it and the company would have the powerhouse, which produces the revenue. Third, the Indian interest, which was primarily how much is going to be the best deal for us? But one of the ways in which lawyers involved in Indian affairs get a great deal of money, sometimes, is through some of these long cases involving legislation or court action. For example, President [Carl] McFarland of the University of Montana really made his pile before he became the president as one of the members of the law firm that represented Indian tribes—an Indian tribe in an Indian land claims suit, which eventually was settled with several million dollars going to the members of the firm.

Well, Murray did not want the Indians, when they did get their payment, to have to pay a big chunk of it to Burton Wheeler and his partner associate Burt Crownmiller (?), so he wrote into this Yellowtail Dam settlement bill that no portion of the 5 million dollars shall be used for attorneys' fees. But what Wheeler did of course was arrange to get paid out of another Crow Indian pocket. It wasn't a real big fee, but it was certainly quite handsome in view of the fact that, really, he wasn't doing any of the work. The Montana Congressional delegation was putting through this Crow settlement bill.

The mention of his period with the Small Business Committee reminds me of one of the stories he often told me, which relates also to some legislation that we have been heavily involved in. Senator Murray was very proud of some of the things that he did accomplish for small business in that period there early in World War II. I remember his telling how several small businessmen from Montana came to him and said there's just too darn much paperwork connected with OPA [Office of Price Administration]. He said, "You've got several government agencies all asking us the same questions. Can't you do something about this?" So Murray had this hearing of the Small Business Committee and got through Congress the Federal Reports Act of 1942. Now what that act said was that if any government agency wants to ask 10 or more companies a series of questions, that questionnaire has to go to the budget bureau—now the Office of Management and Budget—for clearance as to duplication. It is a very sensible law. There is no reason to have that kind of duplicate questioning. Good. The small businessmen were happy. The aftermath of that, of course, is that within a year after the Federal Reports Act was signed into law, various industry groups had formed 16 all-industry advisory committees and obtained a letter from the budget director saying it would be helpful if you industry groups would help us review these questionnaires. It is this group of budget bureau industry advisory committees that [Senator] Lee [Metcalf] and I stumbled onto in the mid-'60s when we were trying to find out why the Federal Power Commission could not collect information which we thought they should have about some of the expenditures by numerous—the contributions of numerous power companies to a variety of right-wing organizations.

The FPC said we got to go through the budget bureau and get clearance. Well, in overcharge, there is just one sentence about that. We just noted that and never followed it up. Then in '66 we started checking into these budget bureau advisory committees. The law—the Federal Report Act—had said—the Murray Act, it said that the whole purpose of this new law was to aid small businessmen. But no small businessmen were on these industry advisory committees. Lee and I discovered that, for example, these industry advisory committees had for eight years stopped a questionnaire vital to pollution abatement. It was proposed initially in 1963 by HEW [Department of Health, Education, and Welfare] to get reports on who is polluting where and how much. Now, that kicked around in these budget bureau advisory committees for eight years. Then Nixon transferred this whole matter to one of his new advisory committees, the National Industrial Pollution Control Council, and we still don't have that kind of an inventory of pollution. So some of you may have noticed in yesterday's *Great Falls Tribune* Representative [George] Darrow of Yellowstone County said, "We need some kind of reporting on who is polluting what, when, and how much." I wanted to mention this because it shows, number one,

how what appears to be a good law—what should have been a good law—was diverted to purposes certainly not intended by the sponsor. Also, to show how we continue to work on the basis of legislation and legislative history of a quarter of a century ago.

Just a few other things on Senator Murray's background. He lived, during most of the time that I worked for him, at the Shoreham Hotel. His wife had died some years previous. She had been apparently heartbroken by the death of the youngest of their five sons, when he was, I think, a teenager, and died not too long after this boy's death. The Senator got increasingly unhappy with the Shoreham and all the activity there and commotion, plus the fact that they got a new cook and they didn't fix his oatmeal right. He loved to start off the day with oatmeal. (Laughs) So he said, "I just want to get out of this place. Why don't I go to the Carroll Arms." The Carroll Arms is this restaurant hotel right across from the Old Senate Office building. It's a quite historic hotel about to be torn down to make way for some changes. That's where former Senator Joe McCarthy used to gather with his little band at noon to plot his anti-Communist hearings. This is where the Quorum Club was with Bobby Baker [secretary to Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson] and Judge Battin (?) and few others belonged; although, I hasten to mention there is nothing that attaches—I probably shouldn't of even connected the two, but it was a place that Bobby Baker made a little bit notorious. But a number of members of Congress belonged to this Quorum Club at the Carroll Arms. Senator Murray then moved into the Carroll Arms, and about a week later, he said, "Take me back to the Shoreham." He said, "The oatmeal is no good here either." (Laughs) It was even noisier than it was at the Shoreham.

During his concluding year or two in office, we would occasionally talk about what he might do there. He was being pressured, primarily by Charlie Murray and others, to stay in the race. He really didn't care to, and he was getting some advice pro and con from different people. I thought it would be best if he did not run and that Lee should run. Of course, things were getting real sticky at this point. So between the delegation—we had a good relationship going between the staffs of the different members of the delegation. At that time it was Murray, Mansfield [Mike Mansfield] and then in the House, Metcalf and LeRoy Anderson. We had what we called this good government lunch that—Frances, I believe you sat in on some of those. [Frances Logan was a Montana Democratic national committeewoman and chair of a group backing the proposed Paradise Dam on the Clark Fork River. She later married H.G. Merriam.]

Frances Logan: One or two of them. Three Ms and an A [Murray, Mansfield, Metcalf and Anderson].

VR: Right, three Ms and an A in that period.

We kicked things around once a week. But after one of those lunches we suddenly learned enough from LeRoy himself that LeRoy Anderson had declared for the Senate. At that point, you know, Murray was still mulling what his role would be, and Lee was considering what his role would be. But I remember one evening I was visiting with the Senator about the whole race, and he looked at me and said, "What you're telling me is I shouldn't run." This was pretty

tough, it really was, because he was a great old guy. I know that Frances and I went in to see him together once, and I think my recollection of this is better than Frances and she has—

FL: You have an absolutely different recollection of this meeting. We were just talking about it last night.

VR: My recollection is this. Frances came in, and she was the mainstay of our move to get Paradise Dam, or Knowles Dam, built there on the confluence of the Flathead and Clark's Fork [Rivers]. Frances, you came in to my office and said, "He must not run. He just shouldn't run again, and Lee should." You said, "I'm going to go in, and tell the Senator that he should not run." That's by my recollection of it. So you and I—

US: Sounds just like Frances. (Laughs.)

VR: (Laughs.) So you and I went in, and Senator Murray bounced out of his chair and he was the most vigorous 82 or whatever it was you've ever seen. He put his arm around you and said, "How are you doing on Paradise Dam?" And you just wilted. Really, you couldn't—when we went out, you said, "I couldn't do it." Now this is the kind of thing, at times Senator Murray in his last year or two was really—showed his age, but at other times he would just bounce back and be a very invigorating person.

Now, do you want add—now, you remembered some things that I'd forgotten?

FL: I remember one time when Senator Murray had brought Mike Mapes into the Interior staff as special counsel, and Mike had drawn out a Paradise Dam bill. He was out here for some kind of a—there was a water hearing, and he gave a paper. My husband [S.R. Logan] and I were both tied up in this very deeply; we cared a lot about it. We met him at that time, I believe, and he wanted to see the actual terrain. So I don't remember just how we did it, but, or who finagled what, but there was a request on the part of Senator Murray, would we show Mike Mapes? So he came out, spent a couple of days, and we had a wonderful time going and got to know him very well. Then there was a question, should this bill be introduced again? There had been an original bill. This was the second time it was introduced, wasn't it? A different session. It hadn't gone through. So the next session, should it be introduced again? Red was with me that time...No, I guess he wasn't. I went into your office, and I could sense—I wanted to go in and ask Senator Murray whether he was going to introduce the Paradise Dam Bill. I could just sense that Vic was trying to protect it and do everything he could to keep me from wanting to go in and see the Senator. Finally, I said, "If I'm going to go ahead with this, I've got to know where he stands, what he's going to do." So he said all right. We went in, he said come along on in, and this was one of the days when the Senator was not at his best. There must have been two different meetings, I'm sure, because he stood there. He didn't ask us to sit down or anything. We just stood there, and I asked him what he was going to do. He looked at Vic and he said, "Could I introduce that bill?" It just about killed Vic. He said, "Well, you're the Senator and chairman of the Interior Committee." It was just perfectly obvious that the Senator was not

competent to go on in that job. This, I'm sure, was when I realized that he ought not to run. It was tragic, really, to see this wonderful old war horse about to let himself in for a campaign for which he was not qualified, for a job that he couldn't perform and yet you know how hard it is to give up. I'm beginning to know how hard it is to give up. (Laughs)

US: Wonder what his son's reason was for urging him to stay in? Or were there—

VR: Well, Charlie enjoyed the exercise of power and was very good at it. I had a good working relationship with Charlie Murray. He was not interested very much in legislation and what happened. I was more interested in those things. Charlie's attitude was, well, if you want to go off and save unions or whatever it is, go right ahead. You know, there was no pressure from him. Charlie was interested very much in some of the mining legislation and some areas, and he was a real pro. He had a very close working relationship with Lyndon Johnson, then majority leader, and the other key people there. He was a person who understood how to exercise political power. He, I think, nurtured the hope that he himself might someday succeed the Senator, but that really wasn't in the cards.

Now there's one other thing I'd like to just throw out briefly here because...Before we go into questions, Lud Browman wrote me the most difficult letter I've ever tried to answer. Lud, I tried to answer this several times. (Laughs.)

Ludvig Browman: I didn't expect an answer.

VR: It's one that really got me to thinking. This was written last July. Lud said, in cleaning out my files, I came across this letter written in 1947 from Senator Murray to Lud. I thought you might be interested. What changes have come about in this area in the last 25 years? Couldn't this letter have been written in 1972? The answer, I think, is pretty much, yes, it could have been written [in 1972]. I'll pass it around, it just shows how, perhaps how far we have not gone in certain areas, and the question to which Lud had addressed himself is that the Senator is not there. Was this matter—and this was back during the Marshall Plan-era—of why we were contributing so much to our military budget and not taking care of urgent domestic needs? This then is the response of a man who was dedicated to solving domestic needs, but was pretty much going along with the program of, well, we do need to keep our strength up, and we've got to contain Communism. We should have guns and butter both. But it's useful and properly humiliating, I think, to a person in the public service to see that kind of a letter that is written 25 years ago and to see how far we've not—

LB: I think this has been primarily true with the military because almost every senator that I've communicated with along these lines...it's always the military that they've hedged and they have a monster and they recognize they have created it. The Senate, the House, Congress, in other words, have created a monster, and they don't know how to control it. I've written along these lines many times; however, the first time that I got a—I don't know what—a response that indicated there was something going to be done about it was about five years ago from

Mike Mansfield. I quoted him and sent him the Constitution. Of all people to quote the Constitution to, you wouldn't need to Mike, but I did, you know. I indicated what the position that Congress had gotten themselves into in terms of the military, and I said, I hope over the next several years—you don't do these things overnight— and he wrote back, just the words, "It shall be done." In other words, Congress now today for the first time has begun to be aware of the weakness you hear in the newspapers, and Mike recognized it and he began working on it five years ago and has been pecking away at it, because he is very influential and this is the first man who indicated and recognized what Congress had been doing that started in Roosevelt's day to be a bad situation. But if all the Senators whenever they would reply—if Congressmen—see I'm one of these people always writing Congressmen—and I write them on many things. This is one monster that they were afraid to touch, the military. They would always answer—I know LeRoy Anderson, I'd had as many as three pages of letters when he was there in the House, and the other Senators and other Congressman they always wrote. They don't just acknowledge your letters if you don't write them too often, but military, they wouldn't touch it. Here is a monster. So when you say Mike, I mean Senator Murray here [is] representing the attitude that has been characteristic through all the years, see this letter it could have been written today. The same response 25 years ago. Same response 40 years ago. We are now getting a change in attitude by our Congress just because they suddenly realize they have got a monster, not only with the military, but that's the thing that really started in this and the President has gotten more and more of it, but the military, they are running this country. The point is here we have for the first time a suggested change. Now Murray wouldn't touch it either.

VR: The practical, critical reason for this congressional attitude was, in many cases in those times, the likelihood of defeat on not being anti-Communist enough. This was an important consideration, I think, in the minds of many of the members. And we have probably some of the best examples right here in Montana—those sorry races for the United States Senate when anti-Communism seemed to be one of the big issues. Of course Mansfield's first race was one of them. Well in 1952 the Montana American Legion brought in Harvey Matusow and others and got out the old China Mike pictures and things like that. Then the same thing of course, they attached to the Murray campaign, then two years later in the '54 campaign.

LB: We had the same thing in terms of McCarthyism you had at the national level, we had it on campus with McFarland. Everybody put a little shell around themselves on campus. At the national level everybody put a little shell around themselves. We were not going to be accused of or contaminated with Communism.

VR: Have you seen, those of you working on this, that pamphlet with Senator Murray and the Red web over Congress? Have you all seen that? Well let me tell you a little story about that which the Senator had told me. This hit him pretty hard. He was—you know it came out in massive distribution too late to answer. And he found out—

LB: That put him in, actually. Because everybody knew there was absolutely no basis in fact.

VR: Well, I sometimes wonder how much I should say about people living in a high office.

FL: Go ahead, Vic. Talk.

LB: There's no reporters here. (Laughs.)

VR: But, Senator Murray told me that he found out, that [William] Jameson, the head of the law firm of course, he is now recently retired, I believe as a federal judge; if he still sits on that I'm not sure. Jameson was head of the law firm in Billings, which represents the principal corporate interests there at Montana Power and the railroad and that. Murray had found out that Jameson was connected with this publication. In fact, his name, I believe, does appear on it in some way. So after the campaign then Jameson came to Senator Murray to congratulate him on his election. And Senator Murray—now this is what he told me—he said, “I asked Jameson, how can you come and congratulate me on my election when you tried to defeat me by circulating that scurrilous literature?”

Jameson replied, “All I did was raise the money for it.” Now accept this as hearsay, but that is what the Senator Murray told me. One of those little vignettes on campaigns. Well, why don't I quiet down now and hear what lines of questioning you would like to pursue.

[End of Tape 1, Side A]

[Tape 1, Side B]

Evans: —Before the 1940s. And it is amazing the number of letters at the time, that particularly, the main complaint was China. I'd say 99 percent against it.

US: Never underestimate the man in the street in Montana, I guess.

Evans: He received mail from lots of different sources, particularly after he achieved some seniority on the committee. Many of these letters on the Truman Doctrine business were not from Montana, some were.

VR: No, I recall one of the bills that he put through very quickly in his last term there, and probably because he did have considerable influence and was a former chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee—this must have been about 1956 or so. There was an outbreak of some disease on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, leading to three deaths. This was in the time when the basic water and sanitation facilities on many Indian reservations just weren't there at all. Well there was a pretty good story in the *Great Falls Tribune*, the headline, "Three Blackfeet Children Died" and the Senator took that and a bill that we'd had in for the construction of basic sewer and water facilities to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee and just said we need to pass this law and get on with this program and just like that it went through and Lee and LeRoy took it on through the House. Lee principally, but when it came to conference then, we acted upon LeRoy's bill because this was his first campaign and we wanted him to have something, you know, and it was good legislation and it was national legislation that each year has put several million dollars into this kind of work on Indian reservations. But it was Senator Murray's going there to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee just with the bill and clipping and say, let's get out this bill and get on this program that got it through. And even though he was in his 80s then and this was probably more than a very vigorous and very junior member of the committee could have gotten through. There are some advantages to the seniority system.

Evans: Well that really leaves us with a good opening and a place to continue because Ann is digging into the question of termination and Indian attitudes and also Senator Murray's position on these matters in the '50s I think primarily so it would be a time for you to go ahead Ann.

Ann (last name unknown): Well I'm interested in termination in general and particularly for the Flathead Indians and one question that has come to our minds several times during the seminar is generally what Senator Murray's attitudes towards minorities were. We've generally gotten the impression that he had worked for minorities from the time that had ever decided to go into politics.

VR: Especially Irishmen! (Laughter)

Ann: And had continued throughout his career because he was active with minority groups as far as the Jewish people in Germany and also then when he became active in Montana as a Senator on behalf of the Indians. I wonder if you could talk about anything you know directly as far as his attitudes on minority groups and particularly about Indians.

VR: Yeah I can kind of talk on the Indian aspect of it. The—I don't recall anything other than Indians any real good examples but he was certainly working very closely with people such as Senators [Robert] Wagner and [Herbert] Lehman out of New York, who were probably the key people on liberalized immigration laws and better treatment for minority people in general. This of course was the early days of what we then called the FEPC—Fair Employment Practices Commission—and Murray was always in there among the leaders on that. On Indians and this termination thing—this whole termination thing involving the Flathead and some of the other tribes started really on the spur of the moment and I don't recall the exact committee involved but Bill Zimmerman, now dead, who was acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs back in the Truman period, told me how when testifying before one of the Congressional Committees, before a chairman who was anxious for termination, he was told to bring back the next morning a list of the tribes that they were ready to terminate. You know, bingo! It was that kind of a request from the Hill to the BIA that led to this list on which the Flatheads appeared so the Flathead termination proposal did not come out as the result of some long study. It came as an overnight response by BIA to the Congressional chairman's request. However, certainly the Flatheads were and still are the ones most logical to, you know, are ready for termination or some change in the federal role. What we were involved in and the principal point was that tribal consent was necessary and under the original Eisenhower termination proposal, as I recall, consent was not included so the Congressional bills and resolutions said that there will be termination only upon consent of the tribe to be terminated. And the number, Senate Con Res 112 sticks in my mind as being one of our statements of policy there that I was proud of and I think we got Senator [Barry] Goldwater to go along and we had a good broad group of western senators agreed upon a policy that predicated termination upon consent of the tribe to be terminated. Now here I'm liable to float off into the Metcalf era because Lee's strong feeling is that the best kind of service to Indians and help for Indians doesn't come from the BIA, it comes through other line agencies and the best thing for the BIA to do is sort of wither away and you see the Public Health Service took over the function of help, which used to be part of the BIA and housing – you know HUD – moved into the housing program and things like that. Senator Murray also tried to get other agencies, then BIA onto— into Indian country helping on solutions to Indian problems because we didn't feel that there should be any termination really until the Indian tribe, the members of the Indian tribes, had opportunity as regards to education and health and other key matters comparable to that in the white community.

FL: Wasn't the Flathead Tribe the first to have a constitution? John Holst was on the faculty at Bozeman and was a great friend of my husband and just when he left and went over to work on Indian education, I don't know, but he was on leave from whatever his job was to go to the Flathead Reservation and help them with their constitution and as I recall, you could look this up someday in those up in those papers, and it was the first tribe that had its own constitution.

Ann: You mean the first in Montana or in the United States?

FL: It was my understanding the first time in the United States but I can't tell you that for sure.

Ann: One thing that I read, I don't know have you read Vine Deloria's book *Custer Died for Your Sins*?

VR: No, I have not.

Ann: Well, in this book he remarks that it was the action of Senator Mansfield that stopped termination for the Flathead Indians. I wonder if you are familiar with any actions that Mansfield might have made. Because he doesn't really elaborate, but he does make that statement.

VR: Well that probably goes back to this period around in the Truman—when Truman was President and Mike was a Congressman and I wasn't there and so I'm just not sure. But this, I don't think this was the same period. See, this original termination move on the Flathead was in the Truman Administration, right?

Ann: Well, as I understand it wasn't until 1954 when, with Resolution 108 [passed Congress Aug. 1, 1953] that came out and stated and gave a list of—the Menominees and the Klamath and the Flatheads and several other tribes and it ended up with the Utes took partial termination and the Klamaths were terminated and actions taken toward the Menominees.

VR: Right, but the Flathead proposal had been put forward in the Truman administration because Zimmerman went out then when the Eisenhower Administration came in. It could be that on this Senate Concurrent Resolution 108 that Mike did have a principal role in it. I just don't recall.

Ann: Were you familiar with any of the hearings they had during this time when, after they had suggested termination, that they held a Senate Hearing when the tribal members went to Washington and participated?

VR: I don't have any clear recollection of those and I'm just not sure if I was there then. I came in on sort of a second round of the termination.

US: Was Senator Murray primarily concerned because he was from Montana? I mean he got a lot of letters, I'm sure, and did he take any initiative as you recall in these matters?

VR: Yes, I mean, when he became chairman of the Interior Committee in '55 I think he might have been the lead sponsor on some of these and on this one resolution in particular, I'm thinking, of that required as conditions of termination consent, plus this equality of health,

education, and other factors there. I really think that maybe on some of the Flathead things that Frances would be of more value to you as you go into that aspect of it than I, having lived there for years and Ray, wasn't he the first school superintendent on the Flathead Reservation? So you have a real gold mine of information on that—

FL: Not really. I remember that people whom we knew, you changed their opinions as they learned more about what termination would mean and what they originally thought. I can't recall anybody except maybe one or two who thought originally that termination would be great and then they learned a little more about it—actually it is just what happened to the Klamaths, they changed their minds.

Ann: I think one of the things that I've come across as far as tribes that have been terminated is that so many people never really considered is the fact that surrounding area that is—to which the reservation land is annexed—don't really realize, and this goes to the state also— don't realize the extent and expense that they're going to incur by the termination of Indians. And this is one thing that people of the state and the area surrounding it, you know like the counties that are within the surrounding [area] of an annexed reservation—in a way I almost feel like they should have some say whether, you know, the period of time it is going to take for this annexation and termination to occur and ... for instance, I think in particular of the Menominee in Wisconsin and the county that was directly adjacent to the reservation had more or less said that they would annex the reservation territory and the reservation territory would be included in the school district there and this was their original decision that they would annex the school into the district and then they realized that they would be incurring a very large expense as far as financing a school district and they suddenly came out with a statement that they would not annex the school district.

FL: Is termination a live question now?

Ann: In the last year or so they were discussing partial—not really termination but more of a liquidation for those members who would want to terminate, you know, their association with the tribe but it wasn't really a total termination like was talked about in the '50s.

VR: We, in the time that Murray was chairman of the Interior Committee one of the major Indian projects had to do with heirships with an H. The problem of fractionated interest in Indian lands. It's a terribly complex problem in which, because of the division of allotted lands, sometimes an Indian may have 1/64 of a parcel here and 1/128 of a parcel there. We tried to get into this heirship matter and come up with some legislation to solve it and get some kind of meaningful land consolidation and put out some detailed studies and had the Library of Congress working on it and what happened to that was what happens too often to Indian legislation where there is, at least at that time, there wasn't much of an Indian lobby, there aren't many people interested in it and it takes a great amount of time. I know when Senator Neuberger, Dick Neuberger, was chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee he put a great amount of time into these Indian questions and he and Murray and others found that, gee, you

try to work things out and you find they are very difficult and there's not much political mileage in it and you don't get away from some of the areas that, in some respects are maybe more important to more people, so this has been one of the real headaches of dealing with Indian legislation.

US: Maybe that direct action on the BIA and that sort of thing will bear some fruit.

VR: There was a—one little Indian aspect to Yellowtail Dam that I thought you'd be interested in. Bob Yellowtail, who is still alive and probably getting well up in his 80s, was a tremendous Crow leader. I recall reading hearings of 1920 when Bob Yellowtail came back to Washington as the interpreter for old Chief Plenty Coup and my dad, who was born in 1884, came out to Montana in 1910, used to meet Bob Yellowtail at fairs. Dad was an exhibitor and he was so impressed by Crow leader Bob Yellowtail. Well Bob Yellowtail—they're intermarried with the Old Coyotes and all these other Crow families, there are several clans in there, was at one time chairman of the tribe—several times I think he's been chairman—and at one time he was also superintendent of the Crow Agency. And in a huff once, trying to get his way, Yellowtail wired in his resignation as chairman or superintendent of the Crow Agency and I think this is when [Harold] Ickes was Secretary of the Interior and Murray called Ickes right away and said, accept that real quick because he said Bob will change his mind, he's just trying to put some pressure on. And sure enough the other wire came in but it already had been accepted and this, I think, terminated his career as superintendent of the Agency. But, the reason that Yellowtail Dam was called Yellowtail Dam is that the Murrays chose to have it thus named in an effort to get Bob Yellowtail to be for the project, but even that wouldn't bring Bob along and he did oppose it and now the dam, at least the reservoir, is being changed back to Bighorn. See, it used to be Yellowtail Dam and Yellowtail Reservoir.

FL: It was something else before the Yellowtail Dam though. It was changed to Yellowtail Dam from something else.

VR: Right. It had been Bighorn, it's gone back to Bighorn, which is an interesting story in that the Crow Tribe, including Henry Old Coyote, really wanted it to be called Bighorn and so the Wyoming Chamber of Commerce and state highway department had everything printed up Yellowtail and this came to be quite a clash here and Henry Old Coyote—some of you may know Barney Old Coyote, who heads the Indian Education program down at MSU—well, Henry is Barney's older brother who never went off to college but was one of the most profound Indian leaders that I've ever talked to. And Henry went into this meeting with the Wyoming Chamber of Commerce and some of the BIA people and told the story of how the Crow legend had it that long ago in the old days a Crow boy was lost and when they searched all over the canyons for him and finally he was brought back by a bighorn—the boy was being carried on the horns of the bighorn sheep—and from that day forward, according to legend, this should be called Bighorn Canyon. Well, after telling that story they said, well I guess we have to change our map! (Laughter)

FL: Did you know that Bob Yellowtail ran for Congress in 1924?

VR: And didn't he run later than that as a Republican for Senate? [He ran as a Republican for the House in 1924 and 1945 and for the U.S. Senate in 1954.]

FL: I don't know, but in 1924 he was running for Congress and my husband [S.R. "Rae" Logan] was running for the state senate on the Republican ticket in Big Horn County so Bob Yellowtail came to Rae and said "Do you want to be elected? I know how you can be elected." And he said, "How?" You put up four big beads (?). We can play (unintelligible). So, Rae, being a good school superintendent, a good school teacher—and this is the first time Indians can vote—gave him a long lecture about how this wasn't the way you got people to vote. And when Rae ran out of breath, Bob Yellowtail said, "Make it two beads."

VR: Bob Yellowtail was, and still is, a great politician and during the occupation of the Native American Embassy here last fall just before the election, I was meeting with about 30 of the Montana Indians and probably the most articulate one was (one of) Bob Yellowtail's grandsons and you know it's just quite a family. Senator Murray had a real respect for Bob Yellowtail and they were often at loggerheads but he respected him as a real Indian political leader, you know—strike Indian—because he's a person who could have become, in another time perhaps, a senator or governor or something like that.

US: Anything else, Ann, that you can think of?

Ann: Well, the only other thing I might like to add as long as we are extending beyond Jim Murray—do you have anything to say about Lee Metcalf's stand as far as termination is concerned and since that time other policies as far as Indians are concerned.

VR: Well, he and Murray were together on this policy of no termination without consent. In fact when Lee was in his first term as a Congressman and he wrote a major piece on this which you may have already seen and he is especially interested in spinning off these Indian aid programs out of the BIA because those are the most successful. The BIA is a horrible bureaucracy and I think all of these will be by this very nature but the most successful programs in Indian country have been like the accelerated public works program, the area redevelopment program and things that provided jobs for Indians working on their own reservation doing things to improve the reservation. One thing that they used to do in the Murray-Zimmerman days, when Murray was senator and Zimmerman was acting commissioner, they did a lot of work on Indian, in Indian Country, on what they call force account. This means that instead of going out to bid, maybe bringing in some out-of-state contractor in, it was done right there through the BIA. They said, we've got a job to do and need 20 people and they hire right there through the BIA as the employer and get the job done. It's a very sensible approach that isn't done enough.

Ann: One of the criticisms that I've read in some of the books I've read and one in particular is called *A Red Man in a White Man's World* and it's another book, at least, that's edited by Vine

Deloria, and one of the criticisms that he has of a lot of the aid programs that existed during the '60s was not that the aid, you know a lot of the salaries and so forth, didn't go to the Indians and it actually did go to the administrative programs on the reservation taken by Indians. But the criticism he gave was that it raised so many of the salaries of these reservation people so high and it consequently raised their standard of living and they got accustomed to this and at this point they are used to this standard of living and now a lot of these aid programs are being cut off. Another difficulty that he said existed was that these Indians would move to one reservation to the next because they were offered better positions and being how there was rather a premium on the number of these qualified Indians for these jobs that there was always another reservation that would offer them a job or a higher salary or an administrative position.

VR: Hmm. I'm surprised at that because I don't think that there were that many good paying jobs and I didn't think it was that easy for an Indian to go to another reservation to get a job.

Ann: The comment he made was the longest they would stay would be from one to two years and on a particular reservation and it was really not long enough to establish a program and really get it on good footing and before anything could really sink down to the little man the administration had moved on to a new area and somebody new would come in.

VR: Well, there were a lot of pilot projects and things like that which were just really a terrible way to run a government and what to do then you have some idea and transmit it into a program and then you wouldn't have enough money to do anything with it so you'd set up sort of a pilot program. You'd pick out a few reservations or—this just isn't in Indian country you can apply it in other areas too. But you'd sort of build up the hope of a group for some kind of a program and they don't extend it to other places and it could be that this was a period where trying to innovate quite a bit and go in for a year or so with a particular new program. One of the other main Indian things in this period that Senator Murray was involved with was the relocation problem. Here, Sister Providencia at the College of Great and was on campus this week, but I think she's gone back now, worked very closely with us on this. At that point from '54 to '60 there was a big emphasis in relocating people—Indians from their reservation to the city and the program didn't work well at all. It just transferred a rural slum to an urban slum where they were not happy at all so relocation was one of the real unhappy chapters of that period in Indian affairs. Somebody mentioned, I think it was Sister who mentioned to me yesterday, and she said "Isn't this ironic but it's the descendants of some of those people who were relocated during the '50s who came in to take over the BIA last fall."

Ann: One of the only other things that I can think of right off hand is from the point of view of someone that lives in Washington, D.C., could you tell me anything about the sit-in of BIA?

VR: Yes. [Laughter] Well, in fact I have a very kind remembrance of an Indian girl from the University of Montana, whose name I don't remember, who was helpful in a rather tense situation. The way it started, they came in without really any advance planning and we got some letters just signed like, Trail of Broken Treaties, no name or that where that is, just, we

are coming to town next week we want to see you, written to senators. Of course the Senator was out on the campaign trail and quite a few others were out although Congress was still in session. But really if they had wanted to see the Senator it's a good idea to find out where he's going to be. So anyway they did come to town and I first heard by phone from [unintelligible], including some friends among them, they were primarily interested in help on lodging on all that. It's really a little bit – you know things like that can be arranged but it's a little late really to arrange the lodging for several hundred people when they all want to stay together. So late one afternoon about 30 of them came out and I visited with them and I offered to take some of them out to my place and they said, thanks we would rather stay together. Then some of them went back into the BIA itself and I had—during the period then that they were arming and sort of tearing the place apart—I had phone conversations with several of them one of them, one who was trying to be the peacemaker and one of the more militant ones, and also talking to Commissioner [Louis] Bruce, who was really trying to cool it. What we had proposed at this big meeting that we had in our office was we were going to help set up this meeting with various officials if they wanted to. We said come in tomorrow morning, which was a Saturday, with the list of who you want to see and we will work out a schedule for next week until you've seen all the key people that you want to see. Well, they didn't come in that Saturday and by, I think it was Monday then, is when this thing got pretty hairy down at the BIA and there were the court orders, a different court order every few hours, and about 3 o'clock in the afternoon the then-current court order said, you will be out at 6 o'clock or we will take you out. This was when things were really getting fairly tense and we had been in—I'd talked to Lee on it, he was out in Montana and we were meeting on it there amongst the Congressional delegation and Dean Hart said I think we ought to go down and see if we can get something done. Dean Hart works for Mansfield and he'd been in a car accident and was on crutches and he and Stan Kimmet and I hopped in a car and went down to the BIA. Kimmet is the Secretary to the Majority – this is one of the key Senate staffing jobs. He works for Senator Mansfield basically on the floor and that.

So Dean Hart, hobbling around this big crowd, he couldn't—and he said, well why don't you guys go ahead, so Stan and I went up to the BIA there on Constitution Avenue. There is a big crowd of bystanders and then up on the steps in the parapet were Indians only and by that time many of them had their swords and spears that they had made out of some of the things there in the BIA. And they had sort of guards around and that. So I went in there with Stan and said to one of the Indians that I wanted to see so and so, one of the Indians I'd been talking to. And they questioned me about it but said ok. And so I went in and met him. What we were trying to set up during about a 45-minute visit there was agreement on the part of the Indians to move to a location that is satisfactory with them so we could then proceed with the different meetings and we suggested going right across from the BIA—this is that area from the Washington Monument to the Lincoln Memorial where they used to have a bunch of temporary buildings now cleared. So we suggested basically the same arrangement that had been used for Resurrection City when Martin Luther King was in town except a slightly different location. That was one possibility or another possibility would be out at Bolling Air Force Base, but it was more distant. The problem that the Indians were having was really deciding among

themselves who spoke for the Indians and this is the real problem they had. They were not—they were so fragmented that nobody could really make any—the problem with the Indians were having is they were so fragmented and going off in so many directions that nobody could make a decision for them. Some wanted to stay and fight and some wanted to get on to the meeting and some wanted to go home and some were having a beautiful time. I remember visiting with this sweet little girl from Fort Peck who was telling me, well I was married last night, you know, there in the BIA, we had this wonderful ceremony and they used the waste paper and some of the files and they made them into wedding designs and she was really just blissed out and enjoying the whole thing.

Anyway, Stan and I were trying to negotiate, except the people we were talking to weren't sure whether they were representing everyone who was there. Meanwhile, some of these big braves go back and forth with their swords, just looking us over real closely and that's when this sweet little brunette, who I think is in sociology here, you know she just sort of moved in and sort of was very protective and we were nice people and all that and I appreciated that. You know, do any of you know who that may be? A fairly short brunette? Tell her thank you. I didn't have a chance to adequately thank her. As we did move out then, I was more concerned about Stan because Stan's an old retired Army colonel and I was getting along fine. I'm sort of a passive type but I was afraid that somebody would take a swipe at Stan and he would swipe back. But, we went out and we got agreement subject to ratification and went across the street and got a hold of the White House budget people—you know everything is turned over to the Office of Management and Budget, whether it's White House and budget people, not the BIA, which was doing the negotiating—and said well, we told them here is a proposal we think they would agree to, to move out, and by that time it is about 5:20 and the troops were due to move at 6. And we said we think they will possibly agree to move out to either an Army field kitchen arrangement and camps across Constitution Avenue or at Bolling. And the White House man said, well there is a new factor now. We have a new judicial system and it has countermanded the order to get out at 6. They have until tomorrow. Well, what that did was sort of defuse the situation and everybody just decided that everyone stay in place. It wasn't the tense situation that it had been there in the late afternoon when it looked like they were getting ready to fend off police who were coming in to clean them out.

[End of Tape 1, Side B]

[Tape 2, Side A]

US: —and there was a lot of problems in terms of, if Alaska is to become a state, what lands are they [state of Alaska] going to take? There was one proposal, I can't cite specifically now, where the secretary of Interior would remove authority to set aside Indian lands. So in effect the state of Alaska could take Indian lands, native lands, and appropriate them as part of the state lands. In the files I've come across a lot of letters that were sent to Sen. Murray concerning this problem (unintelligible). I wanted to know if you had come across any of that in—I sort of this, I sort of think it was this 'wait and see attitude,' that he wasn't really that involved in terms of this specific issue.

VR: I don't have any recollection of the issue at that time. These issues, of course, became very much part of the consideration in the Congress about two or three years ago in connection with the Alaska Native Hayes Act. I don't recall back in those, in that period, and probably that all of that correspondence was handled out of the Senate Interior Committee by Stewart French, the counsel, who was dealing with the Alaska statehood bills frequently. When a member gets to be a chairman a lot of the correspondence that deals with committee issues will actually be prepared over in the committee and I think this is probably something that—I did not get into, the statehood issues in those periods. The one thing I recall, especially on the statehood issues, was that despite all of the delays and hearings and close votes at certain points, finally, when there is this consensus, they go through rather quickly and easily and as I recall, the Hawaiian Statehood Bill just went through on the consent calendar, which means it is brought up and nobody objected and they put it through. Now here is the kind of a bill that they'd spent years working on and this happens every now and then, they finally come to a consensus and then there it goes, it finally goes through.

US: Well, (unintelligible) not much sense talking if you weren't working directly in that. Some of the initial material I'm getting to is in terms of the Alaska highway and its effects on the Montana economy.

VR: Did you come across any of Jim Flaherty's correspondence?

US: No, nothing. Should I have?

VR: Yes (laughs). If you haven't come across the correspondence between Jim Murray and Jim Flaherty why you don't have the full Alaska highway file. Jim Flaherty is a Great Falls businessman who was former chairman of the Chamber of Commerce there. And for years he has envisioned this good paved highway all the way through. So the Flaherty correspondence is sort of the key to look for on Alaska.

US: It all centers around Great Falls. I haven't come across it. I'm sure I will. It all centers around Great Falls. In fact, on one of the letterheads they sort of make a big deal of all of this but there's a line pointing up from Great Falls centering into Alaska.

VR: This is an interesting one to discuss, maybe I can shed a little bit of light on it. The road projects are always pretty popular and sometimes they get perhaps played up out of their importance, or their real significance when you have an exuberant Chamber of Commerce and an interested newspaper, and I remember some big flashy stories about the possibility of getting that road on up there. Actually at that point I don't think anybody had thought too much about the Canadian involvement, (laughs) which has to be considerable on something like this, and the real cost, and the cost in relation to other needs. The highway lobby too, is one of the two most influential lobbies and these were the days when Bob Kerr was, the senator from Oklahoma, was the head of the highway lobby, which is a combination of oil, concrete interests, and state highway departments and all that. This was a period when they got the interstate highway going and that is the road through America. Here was a road that really would open up a new American West. So there is probably more in the way of news coverage and flowery talk about that than ever really—than the legislative record indicated would be justified.

US: How did Senator Murray—and this may be a naïve question—respond to this sort of activity? Did he—was he sort of caught up in this? This might be an unfair question too, since you weren't around at that time.

VR: No, he was a ... and this was a period that I'm talking about when I was there, in the mid-'50s, and through this period when we were really working on this road up to Alaska, he was for roads, improved roads, as most every successful member of Congress properly is (laughs). I'm trying to think of any member of Congress who got elected in those days on the basis of being opposed to roads. Now, things really shifted these last couple of years so you have people saying get out of the Highway Trust rut and get some money from that trust fund diverted over and into rapid rail transit. Now that is what is going on right now both in the national legislature and right here in Helena.

US: Now I'm going to go back a little further go back into the '40s. There seems to be, at least an indication to me, that there was a lot of competition between Seattle and say Great Falls, and Seattle and Montana, in terms of taking the trade routes away from the coasts (unintelligible) and diverting it into Montana. The economy of Montana would substantially increase and would be invigorated by this type of network.

VR: And on that and in the period of the '50s, what we found out after we were sort of promoting this road to Alaska was that the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson of Washington had commissioned a little study to his Commerce committee of the feasibility of a route on the other side of the mountains going down to the state of Washington rather than to Great Falls, Montana. Was it the Battel (?) Institute that did this study that showed how more people in industry would be served by routing it there rather than on this side of the Rocky Mountain trench here? So there was very definitely the competition between the coastal route and the one coming down to Great Falls and in this case the power of the Senate was more for Magnuson, exercising a great deal of influence, and of course that road has not been built

either. But I think that we and some of the Montana road interest people realize that if we get down to a choice of roads here it might be that the other side will get it. There was also in this period, and I don't see these letters coming in anymore, but there was a different kind of highway promotion organizations. One, I remember, going down to Biddle. From Canadian—these were all sort of billed as the Canadian/Mexico route, you know, and one went through Biddle, Montana, and another went through Opheim, and things like that.

US: The U.S. 93 association still has that sort of thing. From Panama Canal up to Nome, or something like this. (Laughs.)

US: In one letter, they wanted it to go to Vladavostok [Russia]. (Laughter.) It would increase the tourist routes to China.

US: That's a long bridge. (Laughter.) It really harks back to the expansionist schemes in the 1840s. (Unintelligible cross talk.)

VR: One thing I noticed and I don't know if this is in the files or not—the power lobby of 1946. You know I haven't read that thing and I saw this and read it the other evening and it's an excellent round-robin Senate debate. They don't do this in the Senate very much anymore the way they used to. Several senators would agree to be on the floor at the same time and have this discussion; they would each sort of have set speeches but then they would ask a few helpful questions to each other and then put it all together as an attractive reprint discussion of a current important public issue. And this is really—there is an awful lot of information on the power lobby in 1946 and this goes back to the MVA days as far as Murray's will go. So this—if anybody does get into the power aspects of this there is a lot of information here in this one.

FL: How come you never sent me that book? (Laughs.)

VR: Well, because I just read it lately. And there's some information in it that I wish I'd had when I wrote—when I was working on overcharge (?) because they go into Ed Bernard, Edison Electric Institute, some of his beginnings that Lee and I were not aware of. Why don't you get back to me sometime?

FL: I've got too many things on the fire right now. I'll read it some other time.

Ann: I've got one question that has come to my mind in regard to correspondence that Murray had with a lot of the Indians. One thing I've come across is a lot of correspondence where Indians would write in to ask the Senator for help as far as, oh for instance, obtaining a [land] patent and fee and well, it gets to the point sometimes it seems whenever they had a problem they always would write to the Senator for help. And I found that he was always very helpful to them and always made an effort find out from the Bureau of Indian Affairs the situation in regard to a particular problem that an Indian had. Also I've run across some correspondence that you had written for the Senator during his absences and that type of thing and I was

wondering if the Senator had any general policy, you know, in regard to correspondence with the Indian people?

VR: Well it was—we handled that the way we did other non-Indian material that falls in this general category of casework. In other words, here a Montanan writes in with a particular problem involving a federal agency and what you do, you either write a letter down or hang it on a buck slip or just a little note to the agency, please respond to the constituent's question. And this is routine casework, Indian and non-Indian, which Murray did, which Mansfield and Metcalf do, and most successful members of Congress do. In your big states some of them won't even try to cope with it. It gets to be too much but it's casework, which is the bread and butter of your congressman's representation of you in Washington. The effect of doing it is that congressional mail is answered more rapidly than an if individual writes in, plus the fact that sometimes individuals aren't sure which agency it should go to. There is an additional factor, that it is the information sometimes that you get in handling cases is what makes for changes in law or appropriations. So it is a very important part of the whole congressional work. This, I don't think we gave Indians any more treatment than we gave non-Indians but we handled them regardless.

Ann: I just asked that in regard to Indians because everything that I've been working with has been Indian material.

Evans: Al, did you have any questions?

Al (no last name give): I have one question in terms of the final outcome of the Alaska-Hawaii statehood issue in terms of political football when Eisenhower came out in, I think it was '52, with the proposal calling for a Hawaiian statehood but not for Alaskan statehood. It was felt by a number of people that this was purely political because Hawaii, in terms of polling, was leaning Democrat. Was this the feeling throughout this period, until it was passed, that it was simply a partisan issue?

VR: Well there was this feeling that depending on, if one went in before the other, that it would affect the balance possibly in the Senate. So it was, the issue certainly was a partisan issue, but neither party wanted to lose in the process of adding an extra state.

Evans: Let's see, Tom, did you have anything?

Tom (no last name given): I'm working on conservation, probably on the wildlife, and I'm just beginning but I'm starting to run across some charges I just wondered if you could just shed some light on. For instance, in the conservation of elk herds and the annual slaughters. There was some charges and I was wondering if these charge were lunatic fringe or if there is any substance to them, that the livestock growers bordering on national park lines and forests and so on. That in aid with some of the railroads in the area were for the slaughter on strictly

economic grounds and that local Forest Service officials were going along with this. I guess, is that true, or to what extent?

VR: I recall the whole issue very much. I handled it in the office and I don't recall anything especially on your point there. There were several things that, as I recall, that really were at issue. One, of course, was what they called direct reduction, which is the Park Service phrase for having the rangers go in and kill some of the animals. That's probably one of the more humane ways of doing it, to go in and make selective reduction. Frankly, I think it's better than driving them out by helicopter or other means to the firing line where they, and the sometimes some hunters, get slaughtered. But what we were especially concerned with on that one was the overall effect of several thousand surplus elk on the rather fragile soil and vegetation of the park and the adjacent areas there because they really were creating a soil conservation problem there. The numbers had to be directly reduced and if you—it really boiled down to three choices: you used direct reduction, you kill them at the firing line, or you have people go in and out in the park and you can't do that because that could create more problems, or have them winter kill. We also, of course, tried transplanting or got into that thing and elk don't transplant very well, sort of like grizzly bears. (Laughs.)

Tom: That was the issue I was going to ask. Was this a humane issue or was it ...

VR: There was the humane aspect: what's the best way to reduce the number of elk the most humane and sensible way, and the other one was the ecological one, the effect of surplus elk on the ground and ground cover. This is one of the most emotional issues, oh boy, and all it takes usually is some story in the fall in one of the papers about some report about what the park service people were going to do or what somebody was going to do and, bang, here come the petitions from different groups and it becomes a real hot issue and it's a little bit like gun control, that is to thousands of voters. A member of Congress' position on this issue is much more important than on some other things.

Tom: Some of the letters especially from Butte, go back to '37.

US: They were writing gun control letters back in the '40s, I know, that were probably about the same as they are now.

VR: Rocky Mountain Sportsmen's Association, wasn't that ...

Tom: Just generally what...I get the impression that Senator Murray was, that generally favored and seemed to be cooperative to the wildlife groups. To what extent did that go on?

VR: Right. He had a good relationship with your key environment organizations. I remember on that one I was working on it with Stewart Brandborg. Stewart Brandborg, who had, we both graduated from the University here in 1948. And Brandy came back to work for the National Wildlife Federation and he moved over subsequently to the Wilderness Society, where he is

now the director. He and I both got saddled by our respective officers, or else asked to perhaps get into this, so there we were working on the Yellowstone elk herd management and it was one of the ways in which I became interested in a lot of things that I didn't know about wildlife management.

Tom: Does that concern or extend beyond like game animals, for instance things like hunting? Like animals we want to hunt? Just say in general was the concern for conservation species limited in terms of emphasis to those animals that could be hunted, game animals?

VR: Oh no, I don't think so. It wasn't really until the '60s probably that people became interested in endangered species and all that but I remember back in the '50s, in the Murray days, working on the grizzly bear problems and other endangered species and that one of the perennial [issues] that we've had is to increase the amount of money available for research by units, such as the wildlife research unit here at the University, the one that John Craighead heads. These are tremendously worthwhile research units that really don't take much in the way of federal money but there is always a big fight to get funding for them and for the heads of the units [they] have to be sort of like college presidents in that they go around to a half a dozen places to get money from the geographic society and the wildlife management institute and be fundraisers and spend half their time fundraising and what they'd rather be doing is spending it doing research.

US: There is a bumper sticker in the eastern part of the state now that goes something like Save our Sheep, Have a Coyote for Lunch. (Laughter.)

Ann: My dad has one like that. He raises sheep. And it goes something like: Try Lamb, Ten Thousand Coyotes Couldn't be Wrong. (Laughter.)

VR: This period, the '50s, I think is when we really got into this 1080 program. 1080 being the poison that was spread rather indiscriminately to kill coyotes and everything else that happened to eat it. I recall you might in that conservation file run into some correspondence with Arnold Reader, who is now a member of the fish and game commission here. Arnold Reader was a sheep man over around Boulder. Still is, and he took some real heat from some fellow sheep men by coming out against the 1080 program in that period and he tried at that point to have it discontinued. I think that the fact that the poisoning program has been discontinued, at least on the federal lands and some state lands, is quite a tribute to the kind of work that Arnie Reader does and did. As you go through the Murray files I think you might find sort of interesting little case histories like that, which it would show that one person or a few people do make a difference. I think in terms of Anna Dahl, who was a rural electric leader up in northeastern Montana. I think in terms of Frances Logan and there are other areas where you will find when you go into the papers of some of the members, especially Senator Murray here, stories which show how some people have affected public policy rather substantially just by what they've done to advise and provide information to members of Congress.

FL: Would Anna Dahl's papers be in Lee Metcalf's files rather than Senator Murray's?

VR: They'd be in both.

Roger (no last name given): I'm presently just getting into this but I'm interested in foreign policy primarily during the Roosevelt era. However, I think what I may end up with here is Senator Murray and colonialism, primarily British colonialism, and could you say something about Senator Murray and England?

VR: (Laughter) Sorry, except to the extent that England was oft not on the same side as Ireland (Laughter). Do you have any of the Murray photos or did they go to the Murray family? Those that he used to have around the office? Eamon de Valera [president of Ireland, who was born in America] would come to Butte and have his picture taken with the Senator and they—the Senator would—and this is before I was with him, of course, I think it was the '40s and maybe even in the '30s. There were, this was much—at least as important as the position on the Yellowstone elk herd important and probably the only issue in Butte! What are you doing lately for the boys back in Ireland? This is a real issue but I mean I really can't add anything to the files on that as to the story there. Are you going to as part of the project talk to Doug [William Murray, his son, who was a federal judge] Murray, Judge Murray?

Roger: Yes, we have in the past and we—papers of the other seminar that Don was in and I think we are much more—his comments were much more relevant to some extent also, incidentally there was another, another of the papers was with Senator Murray and his—well, he was national chairman of the Liberation Committee, or whatever it was called in '21 and '22, something like that. But, yes, he has responded, Charles Murray has not responded to letters, he's responded by saying that he will answer eventually but hasn't done that. But Judge Murray has been and we have taped an interview with him, from which some of that paper was taken of Rex Meyers on the earlier career. It gets into quite a bit the Irish associations.

US: I'm tending and maybe I shouldn't, but I almost detect some sort of an animosity for England in general in some spots.

Roger: For instance, I came across a speech from September 20, 1949, a military aid bill as related to the partition of Ireland and he must have come to loggerheads with Truman over this one. And [the topic was] very, very, very hot in regard to this and sometimes I wonder if this could have been a spot and I want to get into it in regard to World War II and subsequently the military convoy thing, in 1940. I just wondered if you knew of anything directly?

VR: One thing I'd like to just mention as far as Senator Murray's method of operation in the period I was with him, is the real leeway that he gave to staff to get out and do what they thought should be done. I remember I shared a room with two other men at the time, one was Ben Stong, who later went over to the Senate Interior Committee and helped very much in getting the wilderness legislation through, among other things, and he is now with

Congressman [John] Melcher. Another was Bill Broadgate, who was working on mineral matters. Well Ben was working at that time on a lot of agricultural matters and I was handling Indian matters, and I recall these times when we had a—the room was about twice the size of this room all together but with a lot of files and things in it. Ben would get a bunch of farmers and Bill would have a bunch of miners and mining officials and I'd have a group of Indians sometimes talking through an interpreter and we had quite a three-ring circus going on there but we had a feeling that we were getting some things accomplished and I think this was a time when he was chairman of the Interior Committee and we were moving out some legislation and programs that we thought were important. It was a fun operation and we, like I said, thought it was worthwhile. I guess mentioning in connection with your study that sometimes you might want to talk to Ben Stong, who is with Congressman Melcher, because Ben worked with the Senator during the MVA days. Ben had been a newspaperman starting out in Des Moines Register and then Scripps Howard, the National Union Farmer. Then he was the editor of the Voice of the Valley and this was about 1948 when Leif Ericson, who was our National Committeemen later when Francis was National Committeewoman.

FR: That was before Leif was National Committeeman.

VR: That's right. This was before. It was 1948, when we had Leif as MVA chairman, Ben putting out the paper and, of course Murray's big program at that time.

FR: Jerry O'Connell was in that.

VR: Jerry was in there too someplace. The first time I saw Ben Stong's name I was a student here at the University in the—after World War II—and I was reading Voice of the Valley, edited by Ben Stong and Leif's name on there as chairman. This was very much part of the Murray program in that period so and Ben has a great memory and he's a great storyteller and so I think that you would find it very profitable to have a session with Ben Stong and Congressman Melcher at some point and dealing with that period and this period too.

FR: I think that was the first activity I ever got hornswoggled into in, we came back to Montana and Leif and somebody else came over to Polson to talk about MVA. I don't remember how but I got involved. (Incidental talk about MVA boxes in the archives.)

VR: You may want to look at the book, The Conservation Fight by Judson King. Judson King died before he finished the book and Ben Stong completed it and it deals with a number of the conservation fights of the '20s, '30s and '40s. By the way, what about the O'Connell and O'Connor Papers?

Dale Johnson: Jerry O'Connell, is he the one that was a Congressman out of Great Falls?

VR: Both of them were Congressmen.

DJ: Well, the one from Great Falls, his wife is still living up there and everybody in the Pacific Northwest has been after his papers and she won't let them loose. University of Washington is after them, Montana State is after them, I'm after them.

VR: Isn't he the one who went to Congress from the Public Service Commission and he went around and held hearings, rump hearings, on utility rates around the state and in his district and got well acquainted in the process?

US: From the position is going to be in the fight over Nixon's budget. A lot of the programs that went through the Johnson administration, it seems to me are going to come up—

VR: Well, we are in this up to our ears. Lee, finally after 20 years in Congress and starting his third term [in the Senate] now is getting some of the perquisites of power there. He is the joint chairman, he's the chairman of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations and chairman of the Mining, Minerals and Materials Subcommittee in Interior and also chairman of the a new government operations committee, this is the Subcommittee on Budgeting, Management and Expenditures. Through this subcommittee we will be getting directly into many of these matters. Now in the last Congress he got into budget matters and impoundments in two ways. He and Senator [Sam] Ervin, the chairman of the Government Operations Committee, had both pressed for and finally received and published these lists of impounded funds, which showed that there were more than \$10 billion of appropriate funds not being spent. Secondly, we had hearings on —extensive hearings on his bill, having to do with the budget bureau advisory committees and we got through Congress the Metcalf-Monagan Advisory Committee Act, which sets ground rules for operation of all government advisory committees and generally tells them to open up and keep records or go out of business. Now the OMB over the Christmas period circulated, to agencies, a 42-page circular on how to get around the Metcalf-Monagan Act to continue having closed meetings. We will probably be going into oversight hearings over that. Another bill, which he held hearings on and which he'll be reintroducing and try to move into law later this year, has to do with the budgets of regulatory commissions and the role of OMB as regards to regulatory commissions. The way things have worked in recent years is that the supposedly Independent Regulatory Commission, you know the FCC, ICC, SEC and that, submit their budget to the OMB, which hacks it back and then sends to Congress their version of the regulatory commissions' budget so that the Congress did not even know, for example, that at the time that the Federal Communications Commission was trying to staff up for a big investigation of AT&T. OMB reduced their budget by 30 percent or 12 million dollars. There are other aspects of OMB control on the regulatory commissions that we got into and here was a budget issue that had good bipartisan support because if there is anything that the members of Congress are jealous of it's this power of the purse. This is why they really are concerned with what has happened in the last month on this whole budget matter. One other thing having to do with budgets is this: the first bill that Senator Metcalf put in this year is one that would require Senate confirmation of the director and deputy director of OMB and apply [it] to [Roy] Ash and his deputy. Chairman Ervin of the Government Operations Committee co-sponsored it and then the following week Ervin introduced a similar bill after getting as co-sponsors the

chairman of every one of the Senate standing committees, plus Senator Mansfield and a number of Republicans. Last Friday before I left Washington I went to the organization meeting of the Committee on Government Operations and toward the conclusion of this meeting, this was all noticed in advance, Senator Metcalf moved the adoption of not his bill but of the chairman's bill—they accomplished the same thing—and this was unanimously approved without hearing—

[End of Tape 2, Side A]

[Tape 2, Side B]

FL: —some Senate committee and I looked for Senator Metcalf and I was doing something else at the time. What was going on?

VR: Okay, this was the Impoundment Subcommittee that was just formed this year and Lee is a member. He turned down—it's a funny thing, you know for years we would go along without a chairmanship of even a standing committee, now finally he's got a joint-committee, two regular standing committees and he was offered the chairmanship of this subcommittee that is holding the hearings, but he said I got enough, give it to one of the younger men and so Senator [Lawton] Chiles of Florida is the chairman of that ad-hoc subcommittee, which is holding hearings on a bill by Ervin with a lot of co-sponsors, which goes into all this impoundment procedures and says if there is any impoundment it has to be approved by Congress and all sorts of things to try to put tight strain on any kind of executive impoundment. They have had quite a parade of distinguished witnesses, this is where [Hubert] Humphrey and [Edmund] Muskie and [Ralph] Nader appeared and testified this week.

FL: Frank and I asked Humphrey and someone asked Ash if this bill passes will you recommend that the President sign it? In effect he said no. He said it a little more politely than that but not much.

US: I have just a short question and mainly just wondered if it's true in relation to some of the things that are going on in the press, was there, did someone introduce a bill last fall making the Federal Communications Commission—taking away their job security, in other words that the President could hire and fire them at will?

VR: I don't recall that ... it could well be that such a bill was introduced. If there were I don't think it had any special consideration or anything.

FL: It seems to me I recall something of that sort.

Evans: Well, I think the time has passed very nicely and we appreciate your help very much.

VR: I enjoyed it and delighted that you're into these papers. I'll be looking forward to reading, finding out what's in those files. (Laughter.)

US: Whoever did those files did historians, potential historians, a great favor in that relevant articles and broadcasts and so forth are all included and it makes it very, very nice. Sometimes on some topic you don't even have to go to the newspapers; they're all there.

US: I even came across a copy of the constitution of the Soviet Union. (Laughter)

VR: That's interesting. I thought it generally true that newspaper clippings fade and get in the way.

DJ: They do at the time. Eventually they'll have to be Xeroxed or Xerox on paper or on film.

Evans: It takes a while though. We have clippings that are 70 years old that are still there. They yellow the paper that they are against.

VR: Diane is throwing away clippings madly, you know. It's a paperwork problem. You have so many clippings. You know, how much of this activity is important? That is, when, should we keep this particular story for reference, like on the Colstrip thing. It's a madhouse now. What to keep and what to pitch.

DJ: I'd say pitch the clippings. Let the historians do their own work in the newspapers.

US: I'd say keep the ones from the Washington newspapers. They're hard for us to get. No problem with the Montana papers. Or the New York Times either. We can get that here. But Washington newspapers and some Boston newspapers too. Philadelphia.

FL: One time I walked into Senator Metcalf's office. I said, look here, Montana senators aren't appreciated in Montana. There are never any stories. But wasn't it the Indianapolis paper, there were three or four stories on the front page of an Indiana paper about our Congressional delegation? Remember that?

Ann: I know. Why don't you start pushing that every senator in the United States hire a historian? It would take care of a lot of our job problems. They can make all these decisions.

VR: Well, Senator Metcalf is going to break through and be the first one to hire an archivist. It is very true, and Dale, we were talking at one point, did you ever propose an article to Roll Call, this is the Capitol Hill newspaper. I think it would be valuable to have an article there on the importance of having an archivist or historian or trained researcher go into the files of a sitting member, as Lee had Dale do, in order to get things organized. I think the idea which you mentioned makes sense and a logical place to put such a discussion of this is in this Capitol Hill newspaper. So bug Dale to write that article.

[End of Interview]