

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

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: 396-015
Interviewee: Marshall Murray
Interviewer: Bob Brown
Date of Interview: April 24, 2005
Project: Bob Brown Oral History Collection

Bob Brown: Okay, now we're recording. We're recording with Marshall Murray. Marshall Murray was a state legislator from 1960 to 1964 and ran for attorney general in 1964 and was a delegate for Montana's Constitutional Convention in 1972 and long interested in the politics and public affairs. Marshall, what first got you interested in politics?

Marshall Murray: Bob, I became interested in politics probably because of my father's interest. As far as I can remember, he was ardent Republican and believed that people in public office should adhere to the highest of standards ethically and otherwise, conduct wise. I can remember him talking about John Bonner as governor, him supporting him even though he was a Republican and John ran as a Democrat.

BB: Now you knew John in college?

MM: Not then, no. I was in college—well I may have been.

BB: Your dad knew John Bonner in college, was that it?

MM: Yes, my dad was a classmate of John's, as I recall. They were close friends as I understand it. So that familiarity was there and I understood that situation. Is he bothering you?

BB: No.

MM: At any rate, I always had an interest, I guess as a result of my father's interest and he was interested in bar activities and community activities. He was chairman of the National Foundation when that started and was in those types of things, Lions Club. He chartered Libby and Kalispell. He was always involved in community activities. He chartered the Kegler's Club and all kinds of things. So it was just kind of natural that I was interested in those things. In fact, I can remember stuffing envelopes and licking stamps.

BB: Your dad was a county attorney, an elected county—

MM: No; well he was. He was elected county attorney of Sanders County while he was still in law school. He couldn't play football his senior year if he'd graduated. They now allow you to do it and go post-grad classes or something and play a little different game, but in those days, if you graduated, you couldn't play. He wanted to play football his last year. So he shorted himself a credit that he took in the fall to play football.

As I guess I've told you before, he always maintained to me that he was the only candidate for state office that ever campaigned in the county in which he was running for office by train. As you know, Sanders County, in those days the Northern Pacific ran from one end to the other all the way down the river. Dad went on the train on a trip to California to play football and campaigned every time the train stopped, or so he said he did anyway.

He was elected there. Then that was during the Depression, '32 as I recall—'28. Then he served a few years. Then he went up to Eureka and practiced law. Then he went down to Libby and was elected county attorney. Then he came over here and formed a partnership with Gordon Longlin (?) in 1940 or '41 when Gordon's partner Dane King—

BB: Became District Judge.

MM: Became District Judge. Then I think my dad served. Gordon was county attorney. Then when Gordon went to the service, my dad served his term out.

BB: Then he was county attorney of three different counties.

MM: Three different counties, yes, all in western Montana.

BB: That's quite a story. He was also president of the Montana Bar Association.

MM: Yes, he served as secretary for a number of years until he became president. He was, I think if memory calls and what other people have told me, he was the first small firm, small town president of the Montana Bar Association.

BB: Then you also, weren't you?

MM: Yes.

BB: Weren't you also president of the Montana Bar Association?

MM: Yes. I was the first—my dad had all the others up until my time were elected at the state convention. That, of course, was attended primarily by the larger firm lawyers and people who wanted to control the association. Then, while I was a trustee of the Montana Bar Association, we started a movement to go to the mandatory association—where all lawyers had to belong to the association. It was just a voluntary thing before.

The election had to be popular. And I'm the only president of the Montana Bar who ran for the Bar Association, voluntary association, on a popular statewide vote and was elected. Then the association was terminated. Then the State Bar Association was formed. And then I was the first president of the State Bar Association and also elected on a popular vote statewide.

BB: That's good. When was that, back in the '60s?

MM: In the '70s. I was elected in 1975 so my plaque on the wall says '75-'76.

BB: I see.

MM: That was the year of my presidency and I had the wonderful privilege of putting together that association and the committees and selecting the people from the committees and all of that good stuff. I enjoyed that greatly.

BB: But your father was the key, I suppose to you becoming a lawyer and also to you becoming interested in politics and probably influenced you to become a Republican?

MM: Oh, I think absolutely. I don't recall making a decision to be a lawyer. I was just there. That was my educational background in high school and then in college. Some of the teachers that taught me, taught my dad. Dean [C.W.] Leaphart, who was dean of the Law School when I started law school, he then retired during my session there. He was dean when my dad was in law school. My dad even lived with him for a while at his house.

BB: His son, I believe or perhaps it's his grandson, is a justice on the Supreme Court?

MM: It's his grandson that's a justice on the Supreme Court.

BB: Now Marshall, did you ever meet Governor Bonner?

MM: Yes, but I didn't meet him when he was governor. I met Governor Bonner when I was serving in the legislature and he was up doing some lobbying or some type of business, bill drafting or something. I don't recall what it was, but I met him. At that point in time, I think it's the first time that that I met him and got to visit with him at any length.

BB: I remember you mentioning to me sometime that when you were a young boy you were attending a Bar Association convention with your dad. Your dad placed you in the custody of a couple of guys.

MM: The year of my dad's presidency of the Montana Bar Association, at the annual convention, which was at the end of his term, my dad and I went to the convention. But he wasn't feeling very good and I drove him over there. When we went into the annual banquet, which was Saturday night in the old hotel uptown, he said to me, "Hey you guys. Take care of the kid."

There were two young, tall, lean, handsome guys standing there and they took care of me. I found out afterwards, they were John C. Harrison, recently of the Supreme Court of Montana and a county attorney of Lewis and Clark County for numbers of years, and Mike Mansfield,

who then was a Congressman. One of the speakers at the convention, I don't know if I told you, was William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court. And I got to meet him.

In fact, he had a room in the hotel that was— what Douglas did is dictated the speech before he came up to Montana and it was to have been mailed to the hotel and available for him for the convention because he was the keynote speaker of the banquet. The speech didn't arrive. So he had to cobble one up on his own. He tried it in his room and it was so hot he couldn't do it.

So he came down to the lobby and found a cool corner, but everybody bothered him. So he couldn't get his speech together. So he came to my dad and said, "What am I going to do?"

Dad says to me, "Get that car and park it some place in the shade where it's going to be shady for a couple of hours. I did and he said, "Take the justice up there." So we put him in our car in the shade of downtown Helena and he wrote his speech. Rewrote his speech.

BB: What a story.

MM: At that same time—I have the painting. It's one of the few mementos of our father. J.C. Garlington, who was then incoming president, presented my dad with a picture in honor of his presidency.

BB: Marshall, would you know about when that was, when the bar convention was when William O. Douglas was there?

MM: It was when I was going into my junior year of high school, which had to be '47, I would think, just about 30 years before my own.

BB: And Douglas would have been a fairly young man, wouldn't he?

MM: Not to me, he wasn't at the time. I suppose that he was in his 60s or late 50s. He was a vigorous man at that time, as I recall and a delightful man to be around, as were John C. Harrison and Mike Mansfield.

BB: Now Bonner was followed in the office of governor by Hugo Aronson. Do you remember anything about that campaign?

MM: I don't remember the campaign other than this one thing. I remember that as the campaign was ongoing and got near the end, I became somewhat interested in it because of John Bonner, who my dad had talked about as his friend from college and Hugo, who my dad began to admire. From what I could tell, he was supporting Hugo instead of John. So I asked my dad, "What's the deal? I thought you were pushing for your friend all the time."

He said, "John messed up. He just can't do that and be my governor." We found a guy in the Republican Party who was a pretty good man and I'm pushing for him and really hoped he got elected. Sorry, John.

BB: That was the incident down at the Governor's Convention—

[Bonner was arrested in the French Quarter for drunkenness. When booked he gave his occupation as "governor," and the story made national news.]

MM: In New Orleans.

BB: It made national news. You had that first meeting with Mansfield at that time when you were a young guy. Did you ever have any other meeting with Mansfield, any other experience with Mansfield?

MM: I met him several occasions. He was a great friend of my stepmother's, Rose Kirkpatrick-Moran, who ran the Temple Tea Room in Kalispell for a number years. Mike was active in Montana politics. So I met him there and other places, as I recall. I don't remember, but I think it was before my oldest daughter graduated from high school when Mike was still the majority leader of the United States Senate.

My oldest sister and her husband were living in the Fairfax, Virginia, area just outside of D.C. He worked at the Pentagon at that point in time and was in the military. We were going to go back to visit them for about 10 days and tour the area. I wanted my kids to see the government and I hadn't been there. So it was a fascinating thing to set up. Because of Rose and my knowledge of Mike and I didn't know if he would know me, but I made arrangements through Mike to visit with him and to go to the White House.

Mike got tickets for us. You had to have some kind of a sponsorship in order to get a ticket. When we got to Washington, D.C., on the appointed time that we were supposed to meet with Mike in his office, we went to his office and Mike was not there. He was on the floor of the Senate. The Senate was in chambers but he left work to go to the Senate. So we went over to the Senate and the Secretary of the Senate Stanley Kimmitt met us and I introduced myself and said we were to come over and see the Majority Leader, the Senator from Montana where we're from. "Oh, you must be the Murray family, yes." He went in and got Mike. Mike came out and visited with the family for about 45 minutes in the ante room while the Senate was going on.

BB: He probably remembered your dad—

MM: Oh, we talked about all those things, yes.

BB: He was absolutely phenomenal, uncanny ability to remember people.

MM: He remembered that I ran against Forrest Anderson for Attorney General. It was the same time Alex Blewett ran against Mike for the United States Senate. Lyndon Johnson of course swept Montana. Everybody swept with him.

BB: Did you ever meet Senator Metcalf?

MM: Well I believe I met him. I didn't know him. I know that he didn't know me. We just were just in different circles and Metcalf was primarily an environmentalist and it just wasn't the circle that I was in.

BB: How about Congressman Arnold Olsen, an attorney general?

MM: I met Arnold Olsen at that same convention where I met Mike Mansfield and William O. Douglas and Arnold then. I don't know that he was attorney general. I think he was campaigning for his first term and I met him in the lobby of the hotel. My dad introduced me to him and then of course, I met Arnold any number of times after that. In the '64 campaign, he was running for Congress, I believe at that point in time. We were on opposing podiums a time or two. I met him when he came back and became judge. I met him several times, particularly at one Bar Convention in Great Falls where we'd have nice visits.

BB: And how did you find him?

MM: You know, Bob, I have to say this in all candor, regardless of political party, I have found all the people that I've named and others that we haven't discussed that have earned their way through the political process to higher office, all of them have always treated me very well. I have never had a personal problem with any of them. I personally really respect people who run for public office. I don't think you can achieve the opportunity to run for high office without being a nice person, especially in Montana. I don't think you can cover anything up.

BB: I had a similar league of experience with Arnold Olsen. He was very kind to me when I was a young person back in Washington, D.C.

MM: In fact when I ran for attorney general, the kindest person to me in both political parties was then-Congressman John Melcher. John took me around eastern Montana in his swings by himself when I was looking for the opportunity to gather some votes and he took me several places.

BB: This was before you filed for Attorney General?

MM: No, this was after I filed. John was running for re-election against Bob Kelleher as I recall.

BB: I wonder if Forrest Anderson ever knew about that.

MM: I don't think John Melcher cared one way or another. I had served with him in the legislature so I knew John Melcher. But I think he was in the Senate when I was in the House. But we knew each other. He was just a really nice guy. He said, "Come on. I'll give you a ride." So he did. When we'd get to town we separated so we weren't together. He was kind enough to do that. I was deeply appreciative.

BB: Now you first ran for the state legislature in 1960 and maybe you can explain a little bit about what led to that decision to run for the legislature, maybe what the issues were.

MM: When I graduated from law school, I worked for an insurance company for a while. Then after about 18 months, I went into private practice in Missoula and within a few months, became deputy county attorney working for Anthony Keast. But I had already established my political credentials as a Republican and Tony caught a little hell about that. He didn't care because I was his classmate and did the job.

BB: Tony Keast was the Democrat candidate in the county?

MM: Yes.

BB: Didn't he later run for public office as a Republican? Do you remember that?

MM: No, I don't think so. I think Tony got in trouble. I don't think he got out of public office. He was put out of public office. I think he—I don't remember if he got beat or he didn't run. Anyway, while—it kind of became known that, and I don't know if other was Jaycee organization or what organization, but I was Republican and I was solicited by several of the Republicans who weren't very happy about the Republican hierarchy in Missoula.

They weren't doing anything and the Democrats were controlling all the offices everywhere. So we formed a group called the Missoula County Republican Club and we were successful in the next legislative session, quite successful. Then I came back to Kalispell in '59. We were the same way up here. Fred Broeder was the only Republican serving, as I recall, in either House or Senate. Matt Himsl was the party chairman and Matt was terrific. Matt was running a garage and things weren't going well. Matt didn't think that he needed any help. Dean Jellison, who was then I think, county attorney, and Roger Baldwin, with whom he practiced, the son of another Republican, Charlie Baldwin, who was prominent in Kalispell politics for a number of years, but was then dead.

I decided that we had to do something about this. So we formed the Flathead County Republican Club and went out and got a bunch of people. We decided that one of the things we learned in Missoula is that you had to have better candidates than the Democrats had. We didn't care—if they were prominent people in the rural heart of the community and had paid their dues. They had a better chance of being elected regardless of what their party was than

somebody who didn't. You needed—it's like Anthony Robins said, "You've got to have the edge. You gotta get the edge." So we went out and solicited people around who were prominent in the valley, Sterling Rigg and Con Lundgren with Fred and we couldn't find the fourth to run. We wanted to run as a team, but we couldn't find the fourth. So it came down to who's going to do it and I got the short straw. I had no intention of running whatsoever. I was just starting a practice in Kalispell. It was a sacrifice. Anyway, I did and we had a very tough campaign against [Dale] McGarvey, [Clarence] Sheldon, and [L.P. 'Cy'] Tonner.

BB: Do you remember there were a couple of issues there? There was a particular approach?

MM: There were a couple of issues. You mentioned one. The last time we interviewed about the public utility districts that was private versus public power issue was one. Private versus public power, yes, that was the public utility district type things. The state of Washington had some success with that, whereas we were all private power owned in Montana except for a very small utility here and Eureka, and Missoula.

BB: Some rural electric co-ops.

MM: Rural electric co-ops. That was one issue, but the other line issue was spending and taxing. We just felt that those people—they were really good at taxing and spending. I guess we didn't think so badly about the taxation although, we think it was a business killer, an economy killer to some extent. The difference in philosophy was that the Democrats just threw money at it if they felt that if there was a problem, money would solve it.

And it never did solve it. It created more because you taxed people more. You never dealt with the problem. So we went down there with an idea that we could do a better job of getting more bang for the buck. Welfare was out of hand. Worker's comp was out of hand—there were several issues that were really, I mean at that point in time, I think Flathead County was known statewide as the most liberal welfare county. People were coming in all over the nation. These things need to be done statewide in order to solve that problem a little bit. That's what we tried to do.

BB: And you were all successful. It was a Republican sweep?

MM: Yes, it was a Republican sweep except for George Siderius, who was there.

BB: He was a holdover.

MM: Yes, he was a holdover.

BB: So then your first session was 1961. Who was the governor?

MM: Governor at that time was Don Nutter.

BB: What are your recollections of him?

MM: I have fond recollections, but I just really, really respected the man. I knew him when I was still in law school and he was in the Senate from the Sydney, Glendive area. I remember the law professors almost genuflecting when Don Nutter, who was a mature man at that point in time and was a successful businessman in that area, had decided to go back to law school. It was after that he got into politics. So I met him in law school. Then I got to know him real well because he spent a lot of time in the Flathead during his campaign for governor.

BB: Okay.

MM: That's when I got to know him. Then when he became governor, he sort of took me under his wing a little bit. We had several conversations.

BB: Describe him. I've heard him described as outspoken, dynamic, strong, decisive.

MM: He was a big man going toward being heavysset, but strong physically. He had a strong voice. I recall him being humble, but determined. He knew where he was going. He set an agenda and he was going to achieve it. He knew how to set goals. He knew how to analyze things better than anybody I'd seen at that point in time. He was able to resolve issues better than most people I'd have seen. He didn't have to agonize over things. He had an analytic mind and it would come to him in options and he would narrow them down. He said, "Usually there is only one that's do-able anyway. The tough time is when there are two that are do-able. Then you have to look to some other direction to see which way you should go."

BB: He told you that?

MM: Oh yes.

BB: Do you remember ever visiting with him in his office when he was governor?

MM: I remember visiting him in his ante room when he was governor, the governor's conference room. We had a Republican caucus down there. He came in there and told us what he wanted to do for the university system regarding funding. Five of us stood up and said, "No. We're not going to do it." He was a little alarmed by it, but he was the type of a man—we proved to win out in the long run because I think it was the right call at the right time. He never held anything against you. I thought he made an exceptional governor. I thought he was a good governor, but he never lived long enough in the office to establish any legacy.

BB: He was killed in a plane crash in, I think, January of 1962. He had only been governor for about a year. Then he was replaced by Tim Babcock.

MM: Tim Babcock.

BB: So your second session in the legislature, Babcock was governor. Did you have any experiences with him?

MM: Other than as a legislator with the governor, those things, nothing special. Although Tim did solicit me to run for Attorney General and I did.

BB: And tell me about that, your campaign for Attorney General.

MM: Although I am a Republican and I have strong feelings about taxing and spending and some other issues, I would put myself in rather a—not a conservative evangelical side of the party. I think that I'm pretty much middle of the road. I do believe in a strong environmental situation, although not to the extent some do, as far as killing the economy of the state or preserving coal for no reason that I can ever remember and still don't. I forget what the point I was getting to.

BB: Well I'm just asking you about your motivations to run for Attorney General.

MM: People asked me and wanted me to run. They didn't have a candidate. One of the reasons that I ran was because I now knew after the second session and what it was doing to my law practice, that economically it was building business, but I wasn't there to take care of it. I had to either get into politics or out from a candidate's standpoint. So I thought, "Well, I'll give it a go." But when I ran, being a moderate, I thought Nelson Rockefeller was going to be the Republican national candidate for president. It turned out that it didn't end up that way. It ended up being Barry Goldwater. That made a very interesting campaign in Montana because you had the Goldwater Democrats. They were evangelical—

BB: Republicans you mean?

MM: Oh yes, Republicans I mean. It was difficult. You almost had to genuflect to Goldwater in some areas of eastern Montana or they'd vote against you for no particular reason. It was a tough year. I liked Barry Goldwater personally. I had met him in Great Falls and stood on the stage with him. I liked what he said and what he believed. There were those that supported him who made that their total cause for living. It just clearly didn't work out very well as far as—

BB: Had Rockefeller been the nominee, there's at least a possibility that we would have had more strength for the top of the ticket.

MM: That was my view.

BB: You were swimming against the tide a little bit in 1964.

MM: Oh yes because of Kennedy's assassination and Lyndon Johnson being in the Civil Rights Movement. It was a tough year to run for office anyway, but with the Goldwater versus Johnson and the Civil Rights Movement and Kennedy's assassination, all of that you were defeated before you started with the Goldwater campaign.

BB: You were running against an incumbent.

MM: I was running against Forrest Anderson, who was Attorney General at that point in time and was probably a good Attorney General, except he was a part-time Attorney General. There was no requirement that the Attorney General served full-time. He had a law office up town with a wonderful fellow by the name of Mickey Chilton, who later became a priest and served in Eureka.

If you wanted to get something done at the Attorney General's office, you had to retain Mickey. That sort of was the way they did it. I thought it was appallingly wrong. I just did not think—I was kind of like my dad. I think you've got to do the right thing if you're in public office or you shouldn't be there. That was a cause that I took on.

BB: As I recall, you came close, too, didn't you? It wasn't a landslide.

MM: It depends on what you call a landslide is anymore. Sonny Omholt was re-elected substantially, and I don't even remember—

BB: And Babcock was re-elected.

MM: Babcock made it, but they were both incumbents. Ted James, I think, made Lieutenant Governor. That kind of came about through the fact that he married the former governor Ford's daughter and there was an influence there on the gubernatorial ticket. Outside Omholt, nobody else got elected.

BB: Also, I think Scotty James, Ted James' brother, I believe, was the editor of *The Great Falls Tribune*.

MM: That helped too.

BB: So that might have helped too.

MM: I think that helped too, yes. It did certainly.

BB: So then when you weren't successful running for Attorney General in 1964, you came back to the Flathead Valley and devoted more time to your law practice?

MM: Yes. During the two legislative sessions and also during my campaign for attorney general, I was the city attorney of Kalispell besides being in private practice. I served under Tom Flynn for six years and Mary Bjerneby one. I started in '61 so that spanned until '68. So during all that time, they were kind enough to allow me to do those things.

BB: So you were a legislator, city attorney, and trying to establish a private practice all at the same time?

MM: Yes.

BB: Wow. Now as a legislator, were there other legislators that stood out in your memory or people that you have a special recollection of?

MM: Jerome Anderson was Majority Leader in the '61 session. Of course Fred Broeder was outstanding in my mind because he kept me under his wing and taught me how things went. He gave me a learning process that I don't think was (unintelligible) most of these other people even have. I couldn't have picked it up on my own in five or six sessions probably what Fred told me in 30 days or taught me in 30 days. Tom Judge was there.

BB: He later became governor.

MM: He later became governor. Ted Schwinden was there. He later became governor. There were several outstanding people, but those two probably rose higher than anybody else. They are [others], Kermit Daniels, who was an assistant Floor Leader as I recall it.

BB: On the Democrat side.

MM: On the Democrat side.

BB: Marshall, my impression of Tom Judge and Ted Schwinden is somewhat different. I think of them as having quite different personalities. I didn't serve with them in the legislature like you did, especially in the same session.

MM: Both of my sessions, '61 and '63, Republicans were in the majority of the House. Ted Schwinden, as I recall, was the Minority Floor Leader in the '61 session. I don't think he served in '63. In the '61 session, he was the mean mouthpiece for the Democrats. He was tough and rigid and unfriendly. Tom Judge, always from day one, knew that he would be governor someday and I think every move that he ever made was toward that goal. Tom was friendly and industrious and calm when he could be without getting out of line and all of those things. Ted was different. Ted was at the pinnacle of his political career until he became governor. He ruled his roost.

BB: That's interesting. Let's see, was Jim Lucas there then?

MM: In '63 Jim Lucas came to the legislature. Then in '63, Frank Hazelbaker became the Speaker. Alex Blewett, one of the great lawyers of Montana history, became the Majority Leader. That's the same Alex Blewett that ran against Mike Mansfield for the United States Senate in '64. Alex was one of the great trial lawyers in Montana history from a defense standpoint. He was a very close person to me. I just admired him.

BB: What do you remember, Marshall, the first legislator you mentioned when I asked you about memorable legislators was Jerome Anderson, who was Majority Leader, I think in '61?

MM: Jerry Anderson was a lawyer from Billings. He had a deep—

BB: Any specific memories?

MM: He just did a great'—of course in my first session, so I really had not paid much attention to how the legislature ran. I felt that he did a wonderful job of running the House at that point in time. Clyde Hawks was the Speaker, but as you know, sometimes the speakers are strong and run the House and sometimes the Speakers are secondary, and the Majority Leader runs the House. I would say that during Jerry Anderson's—during the '61 session—that had to be equal, or Jerry was the stronger.

First of all, he had a bigger political base being from Billings and was a lawyer. Clyde was a rancher from out of Billings someplace, as I recall. When Frank Hazelbaker was speaker in '63 with Blewett as the Majority Leader, served closely by Jim Haughey from Billings—another prominent lawyer in Montana history, big in the oil and gas world—when they were there, that was very much a partnership. Frank never really tried to rule the roost or direct things. It was a committee that ran it. It was fun to be a part of that leadership in '63 because they took me as a young lawyer from Kalispell and involved me in lots of discussions that I probably wouldn't have gotten a chance to be in for ten or 15 years if I just normally served my term.

BB: Any Democrats? Bardanouve?

MM: Francis Bardanouve was there. He was a wonderful guy. As I recall, he had a hair-lip handicap. He mumbled about half the time, but his heart was—he was really a hard working, red-billed knowledgeable person. I should have mentioned him as an outstanding one because from their standpoint—from the Democrat standpoint, in my opinion, he probably was the most evenly balanced dedicated, forward looking representative that there was.

BB: Now Marshall, during that period when you were there, the Anaconda Company was, I think, an important influence in Montana politics. At least most historians who write about the political history of Montana probably from at least World War I or maybe even earlier than that, the mining industry had great influence in the politics of our state. I guess probably people might differ a little bit about this, but historians seem to be pretty much of the same mind that

the Anaconda Company had a powerful influence in Montana politics, at least up until the 1960s. It may have been on the wane a little bit when you were there. Do you have any thoughts or impressions about that?

MM: You know, as a young man going through law school and starting out a business and practice, I think everybody was aware of the fact that there were those in Montana who claimed the Anaconda Company and Montana Power Company and the state Chamber of Commerce were of great influence. They may well have been. But from my personal standpoint and in my service in '61 and '63 and my candidacy in '64, and later my service as president of the Montana Bar Association, I just didn't observe that great influence. In '61 and '63 when we still had lobby rooms, rooms where you could go have a drink or a sandwich or whatever you had.

BB: Hospitality rooms. I think they called them watering holes was kind of their nickname.

MM: Yes. In '61 as I recall, we had—the petroleum industry had a room and the Anaconda Company had a room. There may have been some others. Those, I remember. In '63, because Green Stamps had been voted out in Montana, the Green and Gold stamp industry had a lobby room as well. So there were two lobby rooms in Jorgenson's where I lived. In '63 the petroleum one was by Basil Andrikopoulos, [who] was the lead lobbyist for them. The stamp room was run by Jerome Anderson, who would have been majority leader in '61, and John Cavan, also an attorney from Billings and a wonderful guy. They ran the stamp room. Uptown, the Anaconda Company, as I understood it, had done this for years, had a room in the old hotel—

BB: The old Placer Hotel.

MM: Old Placer Hotel about the sixth floor or something. I was only there a few times. They always had some prime rib or something going with it—with refreshments of some kind, whatever you wanted. So that anybody who needed a sandwich or dinner or something at the end of the session and wasn't taken up by a lobbyist or to go some place, they had an event and a place to go. It was—all three of the places you could sit and wind down. I thought—and of course they were there to keep their presence.

I don't recall more than a few times in both sessions ever really being hustled by anybody to really vote for something, for or against. Those people—the people that they had as lobbyists were very skilled people. They would befriend you and they would be nice to you. Usually, they didn't even have to ask and usually the issues, where there weren't so many damn bills as there are now, the issues were clear. You knew pretty much where you were and if you were of my philosophy, then there weren't too many decisions to make because they wouldn't be trying to influence me particularly because I would be thinking predominantly along the lines of their interests. There were others that they probably worked on. I can't tell you that. I did not believe that the Anaconda Company, at that point in time, '61 and '63, had the influence the Montana Power Company did.

BB: I see.

MM: I think that it may have been winding down. I've heard K. Ross Toole and others vehemently attack the Anaconda Company and its practices and its newspapers on and on about the great influences and decisions in Montana history. I say, "Well that may very well be, but where was I?" I didn't see it.

BB: When you were there, you got the impression, perhaps that the Montana Power Company cast a little larger shadow?

MM: I think so because the Anaconda Company played both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans. Their interests were not primarily one or the other. Their interests were their economic interest of their company and some of those crossed party lines. They had Democrat and Republican lobbies. The Montana Power Company, on the other side, with the Republicans in control of the House with a substantial majority both in '61 and '63, they had not one lobbyist for a Republican side and one for the Democrats, they had a series of lobbyists all of the time. They were more influential in the state Chamber of Commerce and the Stockgrowers Association, various things. The chief lobbyist for the Montana Power Company was an attorney from Butte by the name of Bob Corette, whose brother ran the company. Jack ran the company.

Both were lawyers and both had the Corette law firm in Butte, who got their great success from trying lawsuits successfully as kids and then the Union Pacific gave them a whopping retirement- or a whopping retainer. They represented the Union Pacific was the key to their success in their law practice. But when Jack went to the Power Company as president from the law firm, then of course he kept the firm as his political arm.

Anaconda didn't have the ability to have anybody outside of Butte in Montana, officing. The Montana Power Company, through both its electrical and particularly its gas, had representatives in every community that they were in. They always had somebody that was a really nice person. People in politics on all sides, they understand nice people.

BB: But with the Anaconda Company, their presence was mostly in Butte.

MM: Butte, East Helena, and Great Falls. But Great Falls was almost probably done by that time, as I recall.

BB: But what you're saying is that the Montana Power Company provided service, electrical power service—

MM: Virtually over a great majority of Montana.

BB: So they had a manager or a presence in almost every community.

MM: Almost every community. A mail service or a teacher, they had somebody out there who was talking to the people and servicing and visiting.

BB: Their company policy was to be involved in the community and taking interests and know your legislator and that sort of thing.

MM: Well, they weren't there if they didn't. They were very effective in a low-key way. You didn't have to get any pressure on you from the lobbyists. If they felt that you needed a little pressure, they could get it from your county or your city or your representative by just calling home and saying, "Get on the phone or write a little letter. Do something. You can put some influence." So they would. They were very effective. Anaconda of course sold out and left Montana and had no presence within a few years after my little political career of four or five years. Montana Power Company made a decision six or seven years ago now where they would get out of the transmission system and get into telephones or some damn thing. They blew it.

BB: It seems hard to believe, doesn't it that the Anaconda Company and the Montana Power Company were such a prominent part of our state and are both gone now. It happened relatively suddenly and somewhat unexpectedly too.

MM: All of that great influence they once had isn't missed either, nor have things changed.

BB: Not much really.

MM: So from my standpoint looking back and I'm not lecturing the university students into trying to make a career of selling books against either of them, I think they played their roles very effectively at their time for their own economic interest. I don't think they were trying to ruin Montana.

They wanted the government to run. Everybody in business wants government to run. They'd like to have it run a little better their way than the other way. We know that no governments fail under our system. We have a parliamentary system sometimes, they fail. They don't fail in our system. In my career, sometimes they run a little better with certain hands on the controls than they do other times but they always seem to run.

BB: I want to ask you about your experiences as a delegate to the 1972 Montana Constitutional Convention. Of course you were the Floor Leader at the convention and Chairman of the Rules Committee and played a major role. Before we do that, maybe just share with me briefly your philosophy. We've talked about the fact that your dad was instrumental in making you interested in public service and that your dad was a Republican. You respected him very much. If you could define your philosophy—maybe I'd like to ask you this question in two ways: how Republicans, through your lifetime, generally think and believe what the Republican philosophy

is. And maybe kind of just describe your own philosophy in a general way. People 50 years from now may be listening to this interview and will wonder what kind of a guy this was.

MM: My philosophy was, I think, and I think it still is relatively simple. I don't believe—I believe that we need a government to do those things that the people collectively need to have done that can't be served by private interests, private business or private interests. I believe that if there are areas that can be served better by private industry rather than government, that there shouldn't be governmental interference. I believe in individual rights, freedom. I believe in a clean environment. I think that we should not tax to the point where it harms the individuals in their freedoms and in their dealings and that when we do, we ought to spend that money well. I think that just about sums it up.

BB: That's a good description. In 1972, Montana elected the delegates to the state Constitutional Convention. Our 1889 constitution was being criticized to some extent. There was a feeling that we needed a new constitution. Were you aware of any of those criticisms?

MM: Oh sure.

BB: What were some of the problems?

MM: If there was a time when the major interest in Montana—and when I say that, I mean major political interests, by that I mean not only Anaconda, Montana Power, Montana Chamber of Commerce, local chambers of commerce, Stockgrowers Association, Cattlemens Association, grain growers, all of those, tavern owners, all of those people that have vested interests and are all over. There are also various interests in labor. It was huge. The coalition between labor and the Farmers Union was second strongest, maybe close to being first. It might even have been equal at that time.

You had one farm group, farm bureau-type group, that was conservative. Then you had the Farmers Union. They were co-op, public power, everything public, big government. Their firm belief I think was that more of a socialistic stand than a private stand and various things. They didn't care how big government got. They thought government should run it because they could run it well. I was opposed to some of that. At any rate, there were those interests. What was the point I was going to make? Ask me your question again.

BB: There was an increasing feeling that the 1889 constitution needed something done.

MM: Oh, these people who had those groups, were very adept at keeping the legislature and the government and the administrative-executive branches well within the purview of the constitution, which had hundreds of restrictions. They just were able to manipulate that, knowing it. They were skilled at playing the game. There were those who wanted to do things in Montana and if you wanted to do something different or change direction, you always had a hurdle constitutionally to overcome. Our constitution was about as far from our federal

constitution as you could have one, in terms of format and simplicity and the division of the government areas.

BB: The 1889 constitution was kind of a complicated thing and—

MM: Terribly complicated.

BB: —detailed document.

MM: Very detailed, very complicated. If you wanted to find out if you could do something, you almost had to start out with the constitution rather than the statutes. You just had to go back and do your research that direction. It allowed vested interests to be able to play a judicial game, plus an administrative, plus a legislative game, that those less experienced couldn't play as well. So they had a leg up.

Then it became—there came a time in about '68 or '70 when the people in the legislature decided that we ought to have a new convention because you couldn't really amend it, not as broadly as it needed to be amended to become more like a federal constitution or like some of the states that by that point in time had some conventions, had put their documents together more simplistically, broader, and not so restrictive so the government had a chance to operate within the framework without vested interests taking advantage. That movement to have a constitutional convention was bitterly opposed by certain groups that I mentioned and they lost.

BB: Basically the state business community?

MM: I think it was the business community. That's my recollection.

BB: So that might include the Chamber of Commerce, the Anaconda Company, the Montana Power Company, the Railroad Association.

MM: If not directly, certainly that was the underlying opposition. They played that very carefully. I don't know what you can find in the media. It's my understanding, they certainly did. They didn't want the convention because they didn't know what might happen. They decided to have the convention and they set up the apparatus for the—

BB: The legislature voted to have the convention.

MM: Yes, as I recall, they set up the apparatus. They set up a commission. They said that Alex Blewett, who served as majority leader when I did, when I was in the House in '63 and ran against Mike Mansfield in the Senate, was selected to be the Chairman of the Commission. They created the whole thing that was the starting point of the convention itself. Then the people who were instrumental in setting up and getting the legislature to adopt and have a

convention and setting up the apparatus for the convention wanted to run. There was litigation involved at that point in time to keep them from running. That litigation—the people who opposed the current legislators from running, won. So all the people that were involved in the movement to set it up and had set up the commission couldn't run.

BB: Was that based on some idea, like conflict of interest or something?

MM: I don't remember why it was done, but the reason it was done was to kill the momentum for a convention.

BB: Oh, I see.

MM: If you didn't have those people that were the spearhead of the whole cause there and they couldn't serve, you had a leg up or an opportunity to control the convention better. It almost worked.

BB: So no sitting legislator could run as delegate and that was a court decision?

MM: Yes, as I recall.

BB: So you had been a legislator, but you weren't at that time so it was possible for you to run and was that maybe some of your thinking that you might be able to use some of your experience as a legislator?

MM: I never even thought about it in that fashion. I just thought that maybe there was something that I had to offer that, a gift I might have of some kind. I don't know why. It interested me. Political science and history was what I had started before I went into law school and it had always been a major interest through my dad, starting through my dad.

BB: He had a working knowledge of the constitution having been a lawyer.

MM: Yes, right and city attorney where that was involved, and a legislator too. All those things helped. I just wanted the opportunity once again when I had some influence in helping to select a group of candidates to run, thinking back to my initial thought when we formed the Missoula County Republican Club and the Flathead County Republican Club that if you were going to do the right job, you had to have the right people as your candidates in order to do that. Once again, I got kind of pushed into it. I had an interest this time rather than when I ran for the legislator I just had an interest politically to change what was there. This time I had an interest because I felt I might lend something.

BB: What a wonderful way to be involved in the constitution of your state. It was a unique opportunity.

MM: Oh, it was unique. The Democrats were the majority. We ran on a partisan basis. The Democrats had control. So they were going to have control. The way it worked out, the decision led by Leo Graybill, who was a Democrat and an ardent Democrat, liberal Democrat all his life.

BB: He was selected president.

MM: He was elected President of the Constitutional Convention.

BB: By the Democrats or by all the delegates?

MM: He was proposed by the Democrat group. He knew in terms in numbers that he was going to be the president. Everybody knew that although we didn't caucus really as such. They sort of did. The Republicans never did.

BB: Hadn't he been Speaker of the House?

MM: I don't know.

BB: He had some—

MM: He ran for the legislature. He may have been in the legislature, but he ran for Congress. His dad had some political influence before.

BB: His dad may have been speaker of the House. I'm not too sure about that.

MM: I think it might have been his dad.

BB: Yes, but he had a big presence and so it was pretty much for sure that he was going to be president.

MM: He was a well respected labor lawyer and I think he—he knew what the system was.

BB: So it seems like someone like him might have been terrifying to most Republicans. What did he do?

MM: What he did is made sure that a Republican got to be Vice Chairman, Vice President of the convention—that was John Toole from Missoula County. So he immediately engineered things so that Republicans would be involved. He came up with the decision to seat us alphabetically.

BB: So there wasn't a Republican side of the aisle and a Democrat side of the aisle.

MM: That's right. That was a major thing the way he seated there. Then when he got elected, the Republicans somehow tried to get me to lead a caucus and I didn't have any interest in it particularly.

BB: So maybe the Republicans kind of felt that you might be their leader in the—

MM: Yes, I think they tried to get me to do that. There was reluctance among the Republicans to caucus and to be in opposition because I think all of us, regardless of political affiliation, were elected to do a job and felt that we needed to pretty much meld together to do that. Then Leo, and I don't know what his motivation was, whether it was the fact that he saw that they were trying to get me to be a leader and he wanted to quell that or whether he respected my abilities as a legislator and lawyer, but he came to me and said, "Now, I want to let you know how we're going to run this thing. The committees are going to be chaired alternately by Democrats and Republicans. Where the Democrat is in charge of the committee, there will be a Republican as a vice chairman and vice versa all the way through." He named those people. He said, "Of course, you're going to be chairman of Rules. You're going to have a vice chairman that's a Democrat."

I said, "Well what is this rules committee thing?"

He explained to me, "You know, we haven't had a convention since 1889 or something—

BB: 1889.

MM: —"1889 and we don't know how to do this. You've got as much skill as anybody. So I'm going to name you as the Rules committee chairman. You've got to run the convention, all the issues, all the legal issues, all of the disputes on the rules, everything. You have to handle those things in your committee."

BB: In addition to that you had to make the procedural motions on the floor.

MM: Well to some extent. That worked a great deal differently in the legislature. The committee chairman—I mean there were functions and administrative rules for the operation of the convention that I was involved in always. When the committees report, the committee chairman of that respective committee or the vice chairman would lead what motions and somebody would second the motions.

Then the debate would take place. So it really didn't operate quite the same as a partisan situation. Anyway, he said, "You do that."

I said, "Well, okay, if that's the call you want to make, then as long as we're seated in an alphabetical basis and as long as Republicans have half the representation on all the committee

chairmanships, as long as John Toole is Vice President of the convention, then I'll be more than happy to do that." And so I did.

Then he said, "Well thank you."

I said, "Well where are the rules we're going to operate on? I better get familiar with those rules."

He said, "You have until January 1 to come up with a set."

I said, "What do you mean?"

He said, "You've got to draft them. You've got to submit them to the convention. You're the first thing out of the chute with the set of rules. He said, "Rick Applegate's gathered"—

Rick Applegate was one of the staff members of the commission and was assigned to the Bill of Rights Committee and they also assigned him to get us several sets of rules. So I went to him and we got several sets of rules.

BB: They were from other constitutional conventions?

MM: Legislatures and constitutional conventions that had adopted recent rules. I took those home and my committee was all over Montana and I didn't have a chance to work it out with the committee so I sat down and drafted what I thought was an appropriate set of rules for this convention under the format that we were going to operate, on a non-partisan basis, so to speak. But I wanted it, as opposed to the legislative rules, I wanted it to be very open. I wanted as much citizen participation and knowledge of what we were doing as possible.

So I drafted what, in terms for my conservative background probably is about as opposite set of rules as you could have, a very open set of rules, using several of the key points of areas that had success from citizen participation and were successful using the rules. So I put together a set of rules that were adopted almost verbatim. It was fun to do that. Doing that of course, I had no difficulty running the Rules Committee whenever a question was there because I knew those rules pretty well.

BB: I suppose there were times when the convention had to recess so that you could clarify a rule?

MM: No. This group of people was different. This group of people was a unique group of people, all 100 people in their own way. Their motivation was to draft a new constitution for the state of Montana. The way we operated, we really didn't have to call a recess and have a ruling. We would defer that issue until the committee could meet and rule. So early in the convention, most of the work was done in committees. Once in a while there would be an

administrative flap. Generally, Leo was able to put that off. “I’ll assign that to the rules committee”—is what he would say—“and they’ll come with a ruling. What’s the next line of business?” No, we didn’t stop. I don’t recall once bringing the convention to a halt for a ruling.

BB: You tailored the rules to make the convention as open as possible and so were there—then if you had the different committees, the education article was written by a committee and environmental part was written by a committee and the different parts of the constitution. So did those committees function like legislative committees in the sense that people came before them and gave great testimony?

MM: What happened was that when the commission set up the various committees, it broke it all down before the convention was ever started. When it did that, it assigned research assistants to each of those committees. They made a book, a study commission book about various things. My primary committee was Bill of Rights. So they broke down every subject that we had in the Bill of Rights and gave us pros and cons at what other states had done where we were and what the—

BB: So you also served on the Bill of Rights Committee?

MM: Oh, yes. So we had all that workup done for us. Then what we did was as a convention, it is similar to the legislative process, each delegate could submit proposals. Those proposals for suggestions in the constitutional convention were assigned by the president to the appropriate committee whether it be Revenue Committee or Bill of Rights Committee or Judiciary Committee or Education or whatever. Those, and the delegates submitted everything.

BB: So you might be a delegate and you might think, “Gee, I have an idea for a concept that pertains to revenue and taxation. I’m not exactly sure how it’s worded, but I want the committee to at least consider this.”

MM: You’d rough something up. You’d submit it as a delegate proposal. You’d maybe go and get two or three delegates, or 10 or 15 to join with you. Then it would go to the committee and the committee would hold hearings just like the legislature.

BB: So I could come in and I could explain to the committee why I thought it was a good idea. Other people might come in and say, “Well have you thought about this? Maybe we should do it this way,” and so forth. That would be a part of a process of handing off that part of the constitution?

MM: Yes, absolutely. It worked almost the same as the legislature, except that all committees were open to the media and to the public and there was an effort made to allow through the media, adequate notice of a hearing so that you didn’t have an issue today and have a hearing at eight o’clock tomorrow morning that nobody had any notice of. There had to be something like a three-day thing. I don’t recall right now.

BB: That would be typical too of how the legislature rules.

MM: Yes, well, now.

BB: Oh I see. Okay.

MM: But, Bob, the legislature changed its rules substantially after the new constitution came and after the rules that they had seen had been successful for the convention.

BB: So essentially your rules affected the legislature in sessions following the Con Con's?

MM: I'm sure they did.

BB: Now, you know, we talked about the fact that incoming legislators were barred from running for the Constitutional Convention. But the process was open. So were there legislators then that came to the Con Con and presented testimony before your committees?

MM: I'm sure there were. Many of them were there. I didn't have the opportunity because of the rules thing and being the floor manager and on the Bill of Rights Committee, which is a heavy, heavy load committee, to observe other committee activities and what kind of hearings they had and who participated in them. The recollection that I do have is that when I was in the legislature and ran for Attorney General, I became well acquainted with those who ran the various organizations in Montana of the conservative bent and knew who the lobbyists for those groups were, as well as the other side too.

And I noticed that the business-corporate world was not participating early in the constitutional convention. Remember, they lost the vote to have the convention. Then they won the vote to keep those who spearheaded the convention out as delegates. Now there appeared to me and to others, particularly Marian Erdmann, the former mayor of Great Falls who was quite a political influence in eastern Montana.

BB: And a Republican.

MM: For some reason these people weren't participating. So we concluded that maybe that lack of participation was because if they didn't have their influence here to keep both sides balanced input to the delegates, that it would tend to be more liberal than conservative and as a result of that would be more easily defeated and the people wouldn't accept it. So Marian and I went in and talked to Leo Graybill and presented our case to him.

We said, "We know these people. They aren't here." He got to checking on it independently and they weren't.

He called us back together and said, “You must have a proposal to resolve this?”

I said, “Yes, I want to write a letter. I know who they are.”

Marian and I went around and gathered up who they were and wrote all of them a personal letter and invited them to participate and said, “Your failure to participate is going to be something we’re going to have to remark to the media about, if you don’t.”

BB: It was essentially like the business community was effectively boycotting, or maybe just not participating.

MM: My personal opinion was that the dean of the business community lobbyists and the man with that sphere of influence, particularly, was Bob Corette. He was a lobbyist for Montana Power Company. He was such a major player in the old constitution that he really wanted—even if we drafted a new constitution, if it wasn’t adopted, the old one was still in place because when the new one came in, if it did come in, it repealed the old. That’s just the way you do that. He just wanted to take one more shot at it.

BB: So your feeling was perhaps that Bob Corette might have used his influence in various ways to kind of discourage the business community from cooperating.

MM: Through the chamber and his relationship with the Stockgrowers and various others who had sort of been in the conservative group and from that side of the political agenda, which is my agenda basically, from a conservative nature. I personally believe, I still do and will probably go to my grave believing it, that there was a movement to allow us to become so populist and liberal in what we did that the citizens of Montana, in their adoption election, would fail to adopt the constitution, which had happened in other states. In fact, I think maybe Hawaii before us 10 or 15, 20 years earlier was the last one to adopt a new state constitution. I don’t know of any passed since.

BB: I think Montana was maybe the most modern constitution today.

MM: I think it is.

BB: It has a reputation, I think perhaps, for being the most progressive, if that’s the right term, I’m not sure that liberal is quite the right term, but at least a very progressive constitution when compared to the other states, in part, I suppose, because it is the newest one. Do you think that might also have something to do with the fact that the business community in Montana didn’t show up?

MM: Yes. They want one more shot at—you keep the old constitution in place if you don’t adopt a new one regardless of whether you draft it. Well, they did show up, after the letter got out. Their role was a token role, in my opinion.

BB: Do you think that if they had taken a very hands-on participatory active interest in the constitutional convention that the document might have been some different than it is?

MM: You know we adopted annual sessions of the legislature. I don't think that would have occurred if there had been some influence there. Nothing else—I think the judicial article might have been a little bit different had they participated.

BB: A clean and healthful environment maybe?

MM: I don't know that would have changed. There may have been some thing in the quality environment and quality education things that might have—you know Bob, I don't know that effectively they would have had anything different in substance. But those people were so skilled in their legislative abilities that it may be the language would have been better. It would have lent to a little more—it would have given a judicial review a better opportunity to define what it is without so much trouble. They'd have a great deal of difficulty. For instance, right now over the quality education thing.

BB: It's a provision of the state constitution.

MM: That's right. It's vague. It's wonderful that it's there but it's just so vague it's been abused. Then what happened, really, if you have—and the constitution itself is not the problem. My opinion of the problem of the constitution is that the same business community. I'm getting ahead of my game a little bit. They came and played a token role and we had drafted a constitution. Then they had the election. Now that same group who opposed the commission in the beginning and who didn't want to show up at the convention hoping it would be something that the people wouldn't adopt, now tried to get the people to refuse to adopt the convention [constitution].

They lost. It was a tough thing. Part of the impetus of the people of the convention to lead the state of Montana and the people of Montana to adopt the convention [constitution] was their unhappiness with that group participating. There was some of that. I don't know what it was, but it was probably enough to have adopted the constitution. It was probably enough to have spurred a whole bunch of delegates that worked harder for the adoption than they might have otherwise. Ordinarily you go home and let somebody else do it. But the delegates led the battle.

BB: You had conservatives such as yourself and many others, Betty Babcock of course was a card-carrying conservative, the wife of former governor Tim Babcock. I can think of—

MM: Jim Garlington.

BB: An attorney from Missoula.

MM: A dozen people that—

BB: (unintelligible) from here in the Flathead Valley.

MM: Absolutely.

BB: Who were card-carrying conservatives and they joined you in supporting...

MM: Dave Drum from Billings gave a ton of money helping. Their movement backfired against them. Then they brought litigation to challenge the election and lost that.

BB: Yes, in the Supreme Court.

MM: Yes. So it was my observation, and I didn't serve in the next legislative session, although in retrospect, I guess I was naïve enough to not fully understand the importance of implementation of those provisions of the constitution that aren't self-executing. But the Democrats didn't miss that because Leo was there and Leo knew the significance of implementing various parts of the new constitution. Because the old had been repealed.

All those old restrictions were gone. Now you had to spell out what had to be done to the constitution by the legislature in the statutes of Montana in many instances. Because that group had sort of had its nose blunted and all of this constitutional thing, as you recall, the Democrats controlled the next few sessions in the legislature when most of the implementation was passed. I think that if anything is liberal, that was a time things became liberal.

BB: What is the term self-executing mean? I think I know.

MM: That means the provision of the constitution itself doesn't require statutory embellishment in order to understand what it is.

BB: Most of the constitution does. So there was a whole line of them when I was in the legislature, a whole raft of legislation that came to implement the constitution. I probably carried some of it myself. Most of the constitution required that. Some of it was self-executing.

MM: Yes. Lots of the sections of the bill of rights didn't require—they were just self-executing.

BB: Now I would think that would have been a really wonderful experience to have been part of something like that, to have been part of the group that rewrote the constitution of the state of Montana. Looking back then, I'm sure that had to be one of the great experiences of your life. I know that the Con Con delegates get together from time to time, don't they? They have reunions and—

MM: Just like those from 1898 or whatever it was, in the first Constitutional Convention, those delegates formed a society called the Constitutional Convention Society. We found publications on that. We found minutes someplace. Somebody did. I don't know where they came from, probably the Historical Society or somebody. They met until they were down to only two or three survived, annually. We've done exactly the same thing.

BB: It's been, nearly 30 years? More than 30 years.

MM: Well '72.

BB: Yes '72 to 2003. That would be 33 years. You still have an annual meeting and get together?

MM: Yes.

BB: Well that's got to be a—

MM: Well, it's an interesting thing. Because the implementation was so successful in the liberal Democrat vein versus the Republican, those particular delegates more—they had more interest in meeting annually than more of the conservatives do for some reason. I don't know why but they do. They sort of lead that thing. Some of us participate infrequently.

BB: Marshall we've just got maybe about a minute left. Were there any constitution convention delegates that actively opposed ratification? I think all of the delegates signed the constitution.

MM: I believe all of them signed it, but there were a few, and I don't recall who they were, Bob, that did oppose it. They couldn't wait to get back home to talk to the people about it. During the latter days of the convention, there became a group of about 24 and we called them "The Cowboys." I'm not sure they were all Republicans—24 people and more in the ranching and agricultural world who formed a kind of anti-liberal block and voted sort of as a unit, they were opposing lots of things. I think when we got the document finalized out of the style committee and adopted the whole document in the form that it ultimately came out as, most of those, if not all of them, signed it. I think some of them went home and opposed it.

BB: They would have probably been in that rural group for the most part?

MM: I think so.

BB: Anything to say in conclusion?

MM: Well I've had a short, but wonderful political career. That isn't all that I've done too. I've done lots of other things. I gave you a copy of my resume and if you've read it, you know that if public service in various areas is fun, I've had more fun than anybody you know.

BB: You've devoted a lot of your life to public service.

MM: And I've enjoyed every bit of it.

BB: I really appreciate it. Thank you Marshall.

[End of Interview]