

Interview With Allen Dines

This interview was conducted in Denver, Colorado on March 31, 1978. Mr Dines was first elected to the Colorado House of Representatives in 1956, and in his first term in 1957, he served on the Joint Budget Committee. In later years he served as Democratic Majority and Minority leaders and as Speaker of the House of Representatives. In 1966 he was elected to the Colorado State Senate and he remained there until 1974.

Lets begin with some biographical details. Tell me when and where you were born and something about your family's early life.

A.D. I was born here in Denver in 1921 and my father was a lawyer here. I went to Prep school back east and then went to Yale to college. I served three years in the Navy during World War II and then went to law school at Harvard. I spent five years working for the Federal Government in Washington and then came back to Denver in 1954 to practice law.

What was your job with the Federal Government?

A.D. I was in the State Department, CIA and Foreign Aid. When I left there I was in charge of planning the next years foreign aid program, military, technical, and economic for all of the Far East and South Asia. It was a heady job for a young fellow.

Was this a political appointment?

A.D. No, Civil Service.

So you came back to Denver in '54 to practice law? I was intrigued by the fact that in the legislative directory, you mentioned, I believe it was the first entry, that you were the son of Tyson Dines.

A.D. Right.

Now the name was not one that I was familiar with and I was wondering if your father was a prominent man here in Denver?

A.D. He was a prominent lawyer here as was his father.

He did not hold public office himself though.

A.D. No he didn't.

O.K., then in 1956 you ran for the General Assembly for the first time.

A.D. Yes.

Let's talk about your decision to run. Were you approached and asked to run or was it your initiative?

A.D. No, out of a clear blue sky, I had a phone call from a man I'd never met who suggested that I ought to run. They were looking for candidates to run on the Democratic ticket in Denver and would I be interested. I would be. I didn't think I knew enough about the local political scene or problems and didn't think I knew enough people to get elected. He assured me that he thought he could tell me what to do to get through a convention and a primary and he could help me and after that I was on my own in the general. He was a captain at large in the Denver district organization. He did exactly what he said he could do. When I got into the general, I could get elected. It was one of those lottery things, I think we had, oh, 16 or 18 that were representatives and once you got among the first 18 on the Democratic side then you were pitted against the first 18 on the Republican side and if you had any name recognition or if you were reasonably intelligent, you had a pretty good chance.

Apparently it also helped that your name came first at the beginning of the alphabet.

A.D. Yes it did, That made a difference.

How did you campaign. Did you stump any particular issues?

A.D. Nope, you didn't have any time to do anything more than say Hello and smile and sit down. Shake as many hands as you could, meet as many people. It was a personal kind of campaign. Because at any meeting that you went to, you had, what, 36 guys at least, that was just the House and then you had the Senators, then you had your state and your county and everybody else, so by the time they got down to the House of Representatives, the audience was fed and you had a stream of them coming on. You couldn't do any more than say hello in one or two minutes of nothing.

I picked up hints here and there that there was a pretty powerful, I don't know if machine is the right word, but political organization in Denver back in that period. You mentioned having being approached by a district captain. Is such a post even still exist today?

A.D. Oh yes.

Are they still as important as they were?

A.D. Probably not. Everybody is a little bit more independent minded than they used to be. The party organization isn't as powerful. On the other hand the power of the Denver party organization in those days was quite different in different districts. You had Mike Mamponio, for example over in North Denver, who had a lot of influence over the committee people and, therefore, the Democratic vote and some of the other vote in North Denver. I won't say he could deliver in the Mayor Daly sense but he sure could influence what would happened over there, and did with regularity. Then you would get over into Southeast Denver someplace and the captain didn't have that kind of clout. He didn't have it partly because he wasn't that kind of a guy. His tenure wasn't as long and his constituents,

the voters, in the area wouldn't put up with it. They were more independent minded, able, and demanding to make their own decisions and decide who they were going to support, who they liked and who they didn't. So it was a different kind of political influence and the city was, to a considerable extent, divided into two camps so that the old guard headquartered in the poorer sections, North Denver and along the valley, and the younger perhaps better educated more liberal group, on the east side.

The Democrats did quite well in Denver and in Colorado generally in '56. Think there's still reasons that you can remember for that? Think there's issues?

A.D. If I can remember, wasn't that the year that the right to work issue was on the ballot?

No, that was '58. The Democrats did even better that year.

A.D. That was '58. That sure explained that one. I guess I don't remember what the problems were in '56.

One of the more incredible aspects of your political career from what I've read about it is the fact that you were appointed chairman of the Joint Budget Committee as a freshman legislator.

A.D. That happened because they had a heck of a time finding a candidate. Let me go back just a moment there because the first thing that presented itself to me as a newly elected legislator who had not yet taken office in the fall of '56 was what happens now? I asked these guys who'd been there before and I was told the immediate thing is we've got to elect a Speaker. Good Grief, the Democrats won and we're in charge of both Houses of the Legislature and the Governorship for the first time in 20 years. We got together in little groups and bigger groups to talk about who ought to be Speaker and it developed into a race that was essentially between Bob Holland and either Al Tomsic or Charles Conklin. The pros around the legislature thought Holland had it and the people I talked to who knew something about it and who's reasoning I was inclined to go along with, thought that would not be the best thing. We ought to get behind one of the other guys. Several of us thought that just on the basis of what we were told about these people, cause I'd never met either one of them initially, that it ought to be Conklin. So we got behind Conklin and as it turned out he won by a single vote. It was an upset. Then he was in charge of naming the committee chairmen including the Joint Budget Committee. I had by that time met him and I was impressed by him and I guess he was impressed by me, but beyond that he had canvassed the group of senior Representatives who might have been interested and qualified and they were not interested. I think it could have involved Holland himself who declined to take the job. I don't know who else but there were a number of others. There was even a serious thought in our side that we ought to, the Democrats ought to, name Palmer Birch, a Republican, by an experienced Chairman of the Budget Committee as chairman even though it was going to be a Democratic House, because we didn't have any experience to take it. Well they didn't do that, they appointed me instead. That's how hard up they were.

It's interesting, the more experienced people in the party would shy away from a position that

powerful.

- A.D. Well, it's a very demanding position in terms of time and commitment and it's also a hot seat because you have to say no to a bunch of people and that doesn't make you politically popular. So I think that's essentially the problem. Bob Holland had to run his law office while he was in the legislature and I'm sure that other people had the same sort of problem.

Going back to that caucus of November '56 for a minute. I could just pick up little bits and pieces about it from the Denver Post. Course it wasn't secret but was there an anti Denver sentiment involved in that Speaker's race?

- A.D. I think, at least in those days, and maybe since, the anti-country catch phrase was used where it would be helpful. Therefore, there were some county votes that were probably told that they had to vote for Conklin and not Holland because they didn't want Denver controlling this thing. On the other hand there were, I forget now, six Denver votes that did not go with Holland. I was one of them. Yeah, I heard people say you've got to vote for Denver but I didn't think it was for the right reasons.

The reason I asked, the Denver Post was often wrong in it's political prognostications, but they were just certain that Holland was going to get the Speakership in their articles a day or two after the election. Then I went to January of the paper and was quite amazed to see what had happened.

- A.D. Well I think all the pros around the legislature, both the old hands and the lobbyists, and the lobby control of the legislature in those days was very strong. I think they had concluded that Holland was the man to have. The word went out. I think the Post was right in terms of the way the legislature had previously been run.

Another person who was mentioned for Speaker I believe was Betty Pellet. She had been minority leader, I believe in the previous session.

- A.D. Yes.

I get mixed reports about Betty Pellet.

- A.D. Betty Pellet, gee I'm not sure if she's still alive.

She's not.

- A.D. She's not? Sweet lady. A lovely gal and gutsy and just fine. A sense of humor and a career that is fabulous. You may have seen her book, I don't know.

No I haven't.

- A.D. There's a book that she co-authored, or somebody ghost wrote for her. "That Pellet Woman". She was a great gal, but I don't think very many members of the legislature, in our

Democratic caucus at least, took her candidacy seriously. She was not a forceful enough person as a gal in those days to run the House.

Women were still just really coming into their own I guess in the General Assembly.

A.D. Yeah, that's true.

Then again in '61 she was dumped as chairman of the Rules Committee. I was somewhat curious about some of those two events.

A.D. Well you'll find in the legislature that it's easier to elect somebody to a leadership position when they're leading the minority. Competition for that role is not as great, it's a frustrating role.

Sure.

A.D. If you're really going to run the show, the competition gets pretty rough.

When you entered the General Assembly, did you have any person or persons whom you considered a tutor or tutors, showing you the ropes?

A.D. No I really didn't. Well let me see, as far as the Budget Committee was concerned, I had a fine relationship with Palmer Birch.

O.K.

A.D. He came to me when I was appointed and offered his help in any way he could. He would not disclose my confidences. I could ask him anything, he'd give me a straight answer, a but non political answer. He would promise me one thing, he volunteered this, and that was when I got to the microphone to carry a bill or an appropriation, he would not come down and challenge me, and he never did. He was just damn decent. A find fellow. Other than that I would say I didn't have any particular mentor or tutor but I quickly developed a fine relationship with the other leadership. Conklin and I guess Tomsic was floor leader then, was he or was Bob Allen initially.

Hum, you got me. My notes are at home. I think you're right, Tomsic was floor leader in '57, Finance Committee chairman in '59 and then Speaker in '61.

A.D. I think that's right. Tomsic and Conklin and I being three lawyers could sort of communicate pretty easily and we had similar point of view on lots of issues. We found ourselves working together rather closely and trying to deal with the Governor together. That was interesting. It seems to me that we were unhappy with the way legislative proposals were coming up from the Governor's office in '57 and we were having trouble doing much with them because we didn't think they were very well put together. It didn't have a drafting office system like they do now, that everything had to go through there and the drafting office wasn't as competent as it is now. So some of the bills that were sent up for introduction by the

Majority party, the Governor's bills were supposed to go in through the Majority party were ones that we were not very proud of. The next year in the short session of '58 I guess it was, we just decided we were going to do things differently and when a bill came up from down stairs, didn't even get introduced until the three of us had gone over it and said now it's ready. So we were almost a drafting committee or redrafting committee and we did it before the bill was introduced. Which was pretty unusual and a strange way to operate and we couldn't possibly do it now. The thing has been institutionalized now and there are other people to do that. We actually did that.

There were a lot of hints at the time, in fact there was a big article in the Perspective section of the Denver Post that relations between Governor McNichols and the Legislature were not apparently good.

- A.D. Well in many ways I think it's true. The Governor had served in the Senate and knew those people well, or many of them well, and knew that style of operating. Frankly I think that, I hope you'll check this out with others who saw the House both before and after the '56 election, but my impression was the House was quite a different place after '56 and that that was the source of the trouble. The Governor had not operated that way with those kind of people before. I'm sure we were difficult to get along with in a lot of ways. We thought we knew the answers and we had the power. We agreed among ourselves.

I think that there's no question about that. The House was a younger group, it's a more liberal group. The Senate was still the burying ground for most liberal legislation. You had five or six or seven Democrats in the Senate who could almost consistently be counted on to vote with Republicans to kill labor legislation, to kill civil rights legislation, etc, etc. I can understand the source of friction in that regard.

- A.D. The Legislature, maybe the House, and maybe the Joint Budget Committee, and me were somewhat responsible for Steve McNichols political troubles, because we forced some things on him that he hadn't really adopted as policy voluntarily. One of the things we did was to increase his budget considerably, in two major fields, I think. One was we increased the dollars for salaries at the universities and colleges. I think, well I'm not just sure of the figures now, I shouldn't try to quote them, but there was a special pitch made by the universities, lead by Quig Newton that year, for a flat \$2000 or maybe it was only a \$1000 increase in average salary because we were getting behind the nation. The Governor's budget did not include that or not much of it and to everybody's surprise, the Budget Committee bought it and recommended the whole thing. Well that was a big chunk of money and then the another thing we did was to fund a mental health program on the basis that we were going to begin to treat these people and rehabilitate them and move them out of the hospitals. That was new, and of course, very costly. Those two things beefed up the budget and I think were, to a considerable extent, responsible for the fact that we were spending down our surplus and pointed to the necessity for a tax increase two or three years later.

'59?

A.D. '59. Steve caught hell for that, he survived it, but he caught hell for it. We had really pushed him into it.

General question. In the entire period of your career, and you may even distinguish between different periods of the time when you served in the General Assembly if you want, did you feel the General Assembly was honest, effective? Did the members do their homework, did they represent their constituents fairly?

A.D. Oh yes, too many questions. On honestly, I was pleasantly impressed throughout my service with the honesty of the people there. I don't say that there was nobody ever served that was dishonest, I don't mean that. Obviously anybody who was, was being as careful as they could to cover it up. With few exceptions, I always felt I was dealing with honest people. There were a few times when I thought I could only explain what a person had done by presuming that there had been something happen that I didn't know about. That was unsavory.

Such as a vote turning?

A.D. Well a vote switch. I don't mind if a guy starts out here and this is what he says about an issue and that's what he thinks and is consistent about it all the way through and it fits in with his personality and his other voting record. You get to know a fellow awful fast when your taking, what ten, twenty votes a day for a period of time on important issues and you watch how they vote. You get to know what makes him tick, what arguments get to him and what pressures are on him. I don't mind a fellow who responds honestly to those pressures and those concepts of what government ought to be like. It's the guy who casts a vote that is out of context with his whole character and voting record, that bugs me because then you've got to look for something else. Only a few times did I find that the something else seemed to have to be something dishonest. Very few times. I don't suppose five times in eighteen years did I spot that. Obviously I don't spot everything but I tend to be somewhat suspicious and I was looking. So I was pleased with the honesty of the group. Let me see, you asked, what was your next one?

Effectiveness and doing your homework.

A.D. Oh, well that's a whole different question. I think that it's changed a lot over the years. I remember thinking during the first four to eight years that I was in the legislature, four to six maybe would be better, that there were probably ten guys out of a hundred that did their homework, were well informed and really decided what the legislation was going to be. They were sometimes in leadership positions, sometimes in relatively obscure positions. There were only about ten guys who had it put together so that they knew the relationship between this issue, social issue, that economic situation and this budget result, who could put the whole picture together and then had the power, persuasive power, to move it and that's sort of too bad. There were some on each side of the aisle. Palmer Birch was one of those, John Mackie was one of those, Conklin and Tomsic well I won't try to name others because I'd leave out some but those are some of the outstanding ones that occurred to me. Now effectiveness. Effective legislator or individual legislator, maybe I've spoken to the

effectiveness of the individuals. I thought that the legislature as a whole did a relatively good job considering the pressures and the difficulties. The tough problems as it became more open and more of the public took an interest in what the legislature was doing and the pressure groups got organized and the constituents demanded more, it became more difficult to operate and things slowed down and sessions got longer, the number of bills got greater, the press and the public didn't want you to kill a bill because you didn't like it and didn't have time to fix it. They wanted you to give it a hearing and a due process and a fair trial and fix it if you could and all of that, which has a lot of merit. It takes time and staff and talent and then I suppose after all the reapportioning, it changed the situation in Denver terrifically because before reapportioning, before Denver got split up in to separate districts, there really wasn't much of an obligation to be responsive to your constituents. You could vote in the legislature exactly the way you wanted to vote. Nobody was really going to be upset by it. You had company whichever way you were and it was all right. But you get down to a single district and the pressures are more intense, the opposition can zero in on that vote and make you look like you were an idiot to vote that way. Irrespective of the fact that maybe the majority of the legislature voted with you. So it made it more difficult. It slowed the process, in some ways less effective, on the other hand a lot more democratic.

Did you have to change your campaign methods once you were representing your district in Denver?

- A.D. Yeah, although I was never typical of the campaigning styles of most of my colleagues. For example, most of my colleagues at least at the end and to a considerable extent in the early days, felt an obligation to their constituents to answer every letter they got. I early decided that I could not physically do that. Well because I was trying to run that Joint Budget Committee and learn that game and I could not answer my correspondence if I was trying to do that. So I didn't, and constituents didn't seem to mind, course some of them may have but I didn't seem to lose a lot of votes that way. Most of my colleagues do religiously answer letters. In terms of campaigning after it got into districts, you could do more door to door work and that was therefore necessary to do because it could be done and if you didn't do it your opponent was, so it had to be. You could put lawn signs up in a district more effectively than you could scattered all over town and I suppose the last time I ran it was from a downtown Denver district. This district here and my fight was in the primary and this is an area that had possibly a third black and a third Chicano and a third Anglo, many of whom were old folks or very young, just new voters. So it was a hard district to campaign in and I figured the best thing for me to do was to try to get a brochure into the mail to each voting family rather than to try door to door. I don't know if you are aware of it or not but it's very difficult for an Anglo to go door to door in a Spanish area.. Sometimes in a black area, because they assume that you're a bill collector or a law enforcement person or somebody like that and they don't let you in, they pretend there's nobody home. Rather than get into that sort of turn down I was able to do my campaign by mail in the primary and then when the general came I had no problem because it was a heavily Democratic district. I don't think I spent a nickel in the general election.

Who was your opponent in the primary?

A.D. A fellow named Joe Jerrone.

Chicano.

A.D. Yeah.

Your comment about not answering your mail, reminds me of a question I wanted to ask you about staff. Particularly with regards to the Joint Budget Committee. Now the Joint Budget Committee existed under a different name.

A.D. It was the Joint Sub Committee of the Appropriations Committee.

Right. Did it just become the Joint Budget Committee in '57?

A.D. No it became the Joint Budget Committee in '59 or '60. I can't remember when we did that. It essentially codified what we'd already been doing.

What was your staff situation then, particularly compared with now to what you know about the present situation?

A.D. Well the staff was first hired in '56 I guess before the election. Palmer Birch hired Harry Allen and Bruce Wittered and Kay May. Kay was the steno receptionist, organizer, Harry was the director and Bruce was his assistant. That was it. They had, I suppose not much more than six months experience and had not been through a session before when I showed up. So they were of help to me but they weren't old hands at it. We sort of plodded through it together and blazed the trails. Prior to that time, I think the chairman and Palmer Birch had written the long bill for several terms and prior to that, I heard one story that flabbergasted me, you may want to check it. The legislature got into such a hassle about the budget and didn't know how to write it and had no staff to do it and they didn't know how to get it done. So they finally called over Jack Healey, whom I mentioned to you earlier, from his job, I guess as deputy head of the Revenue Department. Jack sat down and wrote the budget. That's how bad it was, I'm sure he did a good job but he ought not to have had to do it. The staff, I think, with Harry Allen with its head, had a very clear concept of what the staff role was and it was to assist the committee. It was not to make decisions for the committee. It was to point out alternatives and policy questions that the committee could vote on and that would set where the dollars went. I have felt since then that the committee had a tougher time differentiating between what was a staff function and what was the committee policy decision making function. Sometimes I felt that the staff really pushed for a particular policy point of view rather than set it up in an unbiased way and let the committee decide which policy they wanted. I grant you that I have not been close to the Budget Committee for a long time and I may malign them but I did feel that sometimes, not only the staff didn't have that clearly in mind but maybe the chairman didn't have it clearly in mind. Therefore there was a fuzzing of those responsibilities and the staff was having more of a decision-making function than they should have had.

Another general question, before we get into some specific issues. During your entire time

in the House of Representatives, you served in some leadership role, either chairman of the Joint Budget Committee, Majority Leader, Minority Leader, or Speaker. What was the cost to you both monetary and otherwise in terms of your family life, your law practice, etc., etc., etc. of serving in the legislature?

A.D. Well it was considerable in lots of ways. I didn't try to practice law, I guess more than about the first couple of years. I was an employee for a law firm and they were willing to give me a leave of absence and then my commitment was much heavier than that of a standard freshman legislator because I did have that budget committee job and that took more of my time and it wasn't fair to them for them to continue me on salary when the legislature wasn't in session because I was still putting out an awful amount of time up there. So the arrangements were changed from time to time and pretty soon I had an office that they furnished me for awhile and then after awhile I had to sublet from them. So I got no salary from my law practice after the first three years, something like that. I essentially gave up the practice of law. That was a crossroads in my career and I chose the political one. That was costly in terms of income, I'm sure, in terms of experience in the law, in terms of a career that might have been a continued practice of law. I don't regret that, I enjoyed the political and governmental work more than I did the legal work. It was costly to me in another way in that I think it kept me from my family during years that maybe when my presence was needed but looking at them now, I don't think it's hurt them.

Tell me about your family, we haven't mentioned them.

A.D. Well, I have a wife and two children. My oldest is now 31 and the second one, a girl, is now 29, I guess. They do well.

Your family was supportive of you when you were in politics?

A.D. Oh yes.

You suggest the other question that has intrigued me since I began looking at your public career. You were almost one of a kind in that you did not aspire to go beyond the legislature.

A.D. Oh, I aspired and I put my foot in the water a couple of time. I thought I was going to run for Governor once and I said I was going to run for the U.S. Senate once, but I never got very far on either one of them. Partly because my estimate of what the temperature was, I wasn't going to get the support that I'd have to have. I was never one who wanted to get into a race that I thought I was going to lose, and spend of myself and spend dollars and spend friend's time and loyalty and energies and heart to get something done that I didn't think was in the cards. So I pulled my nose back each time. Since then, I've not been as ambitious. I'm out of politics now and I'm glad to be out. I miss it, but I don't regret having been in. I enjoyed those 18 years very much.

When you retired, it was simply on personal decision?

A.D. Well I'd had enough of it. It was getting to be less fun. The pressures on you, the demands

on you. It used to be requests, and then it became demands and then you became virtually either a dunce or a crook if you didn't agree with the person. No latitude left for an intellectual disagreement. That's no fun.

There are a lot of people who are following in your footsteps in that regard. A lot of people retiring at the end of this year from the legislature. I can't say I blame them. I'm sorry to see them go but I can't say I blame them.

You mentioned the reapportionment fight or the effect of reapportionment. Let's talk a little bit about the fight over reapportionment. It's something that comes up almost like clock work every two years in the legislature. I haven't gotten, as I said in my reading yet beyond '61, so I don't know what happened in great detail when things really got hot. Can you fill me in on it.

A.D. Well I find it difficult to because frankly my recollection of the, on again off again, situation is some what vague. It was literally on again, off again. Remember we had a constitutional change in Colorado, the so called Federal Plan that Ed Johnson got behind. When that passed it did one thing and then that was thrown out by the court and we went back to the Legislature and then that was thrown out by the court and we went back and did something else and it was a constant turmoil there for, gee, maybe ten years, I can't remember how long it was but a long time that we were doing it all the time. I think they finally came out with a pretty fair reapportionment system. I became convinced during the process the Legislature had an awful time reapportioning itself. The commission approach of the League of Women Voters finally put on the ballot and passed was a preferable system. The Legislature each time would take only those steps that they were forced to take and would take them reluctantly and grudgingly and bear them again. Then they'd find they were forced to take another one so they'd come back and do it again and grind their teeth, and it took a terrible amount of legislative time and effort. I would rather see some other mechanism for setting up those boundaries and let the legislature do what they're suppose to be doing.

Were you able to discern a noticeable change in the legislature after reapportionment and the types of people there and the sorts of issues being considered etc.?

A.D. I saw considerable difference. I read an article at one point by the National Municipal League. It came out in one of their quarterly or monthlies on the affects of reapportionment in Colorado. If you're really interested, I'd try to get a hold of that. I'm afraid I don't have any better citation for you.

I've run across this time after time in the 40's and 50's, early 60's, the rural block of legislators being able to frustrate the metropolitan area. For example in the '61 session, the sales ratio business on the school finance and the bitter opposition in the House, in particular, on that issue, the rural legislators to giving Denver a bigger share of the pot.

A.D. Yes, that was very definitely there. They had the votes. You asked earlier about the Denver and anti-Denver positions. The place where that really shows up is when you start dividing up money and that's essentially school aid and highway aid. Then it shows up. The local

pocketbook is being hit. So when you read a school bill, you do it backwards. You take a test formula and you run a spread to see how the dollars will come out and then you say well that's not enough for Denver or it's too much for Denver so you go back and adjust your formula and you run it again to see how the dollars come out. When you finally get a formula that brings the dollars out right, then that's the formula you enact. (Laugh) At least this is the way it was done for a lot of years. I suspect it still is. Again under certain restraints that the courts are beginning to put down. We may get some more changes here.

Looking at the subject of money and taxes generally, it was certainly one of your major concerns in the General Assembly. The most important thing that I've looked at was the tax legislation of '59. Rubin Zubro and the tax commission. Do you feel satisfied with what the General Assembly did in that year? The legislation that came out?

A.D. Well I don't think there's ever a perfect tax bill or program. I think that there's constant review and analysis and modification that's necessary. I hope not every year, but one ought to be looking at it all the time and making minor changes. I think that what was done in '59 on that tax program was essentially very good. We were awfully fortunate to have Rubin Zubro to help us. He's a first class expert in the field and has a way of explaining complex tax issues to a group of legislators that must be very similar to how he does it to a college class and it is great. I was satisfied with what they did in '59, although there was one area that it didn't purport to touch and that was what do you do about the financial needs of local government? It didn't scratch that once. We've been working at that ever since. I guess that's part of the property tax relief problem. It's part of why the state's putting more money into schools to try to relieve the local school district a little bit.

Well the legislature had a stab at that in '61. It was mainly a Republican bill if you recall in '61 the Democrats only had a majority of one in the House.

A.D. I remember that, as the "Majority" floor leader.

32 and Lela Gilbert.

A.D. That's exactly it.

The General Assembly passed the Metropolitan Area sales tax bill in '61. I've been looking to see if McNichols vetoed that bill. I haven't been able to find it in the paper. There was some question about whether he was going to veto it or not, the constitutionality of it. It obviously never went into effect. I don't know if he vetoed it or the voters then turned it down.

A.D. I don't remember what happened to it. I should but I don't.

Then there was also a measure introduced in '61 which didn't get very far. Joe Dolan and Yale Huffman to return 15% of the, this couldn't be in '61 because Joe Dolan left the legislature right in there, maybe it was '59 or '60, to return 15% of the income tax receipts

to the county of origin. What you were just talking about.

A.D. I'm surprised you ever ran across that one.

Oh that got first page coverage.

A.D. It didn't get very far in the legislature. It scared me to death because I was worrying about the state's budget and finances. I knew darn well that we could not afford to set the precedent of getting back a percentage to the locals. It was what, on a different level the precursor of the federal revenue sharing concept. I thought that with the strength of the county commissioners and the local governments in the state on their legislators, that most of the members of the legislature would be more inclined to vote the way their county commissions wanted than the necessities of the state budget. This would open a dike and state funds would just pour out and we could not run the state government, we'd have to be increasing taxes constantly. I guess I was very instrumental in killing that bill. I may even used dictatorial methods, I think I didn't let it get printed. (Laugh) You couldn't get away with that now a days but that's the way you did things then.

Another of the really key issues that just, every year, it's a big issue, that we just touched on, well a dual issue actually, a school consolidation and school finance, well it hasn't fully been resolved yet, at least the school consolidation part of it hasn't.

A.D. Well, I guess the people who are satisfied now aren't going to make a big fight about school reorganization or consolidation, district-wise. I think that there should be further consolidation. What do we have still, 181 districts?

Right.

A.D. You could drop down to 100, I think and run a more effective school system without serious loss of local control. Most of the people in those areas don't think so and it's their area and nobody's really anxious to force them into it these days. So we're probably through with that issue for awhile. The financing, you'll never be through with that as long as you're passing out dollars, and you're arguing who gets how much.

Right. You touched on mental health. Let's talk about that a little bit more because that was another big issue there in the late '50's early '60's. Ft Logan taking people out of Pueblo. You gave me the impression a few minutes ago that this was an issue that was pushed on Governor McNichols by the members of the House. Is that accurate.

A.D. I think that's accurate. I don't think many people know that and the Governor then picked up the issue and made it his. I don't think he initiated it. For example, look at his first budget, or first couple of budgets to the legislature and compare them with what was enacted. I think you'll find that the number of dollars in this field was increased considerably over what he had asked for.

You're right, it had become his issue particularly by '61 when the Republicans were very

much on the attack. You had Vanderhoof and Oakley Wade really going after Steve McNichols' mental health program in the House. That and taxes were the two big issues that the Republicans were trying to capitalize on. Meanwhile of course the funding of Ft Logan did go through and the construction was proceeding at pace. Did you tangle with Vince Massari on a

- A.D. Frequent occasions, frequent occasions. Vince was a unique legislator and a heck of a nice guy. A good friend sometimes and I was on his list other times. Finally, I think he gave up on me and he didn't bother to put me on his list any more. I'd been there so often and off again. (Laugh)

Another issue that you were particularly concerned with, probably to some degree considered carrying the ball for Governor McNichols, was executive reorganization. Let's see if I can find a reference to that here. You introduced one bill in the '59 session, oh yeah, to create a state department of natural resources, which didn't get very far. There were other bills like that that you were associated with that seemed to be one of your big interests.

- A.D. Well lets see, how do I explain that. I had some experience on organizational questions of government while I was still in Washington. So this was a subject I knew something about. I thought I did. Then through the budget committee I became painfully aware of how diverse, how absurd our government organization was in Colorado. When you had totally independent groups numbering over a hundred coming in for their budgets and you'd have one that was asking for x million dollars and you'd have one that wanted ten thousand. It made no rhyme or reason. There was no way for a Governor to control what the state government was doing because he could not literally meet with each person who was directly responsible to him in the Governor's schedule, he couldn't in a year, meet with every one of them. This was crazy. I thought we had to do something to simplify and reorganize and I began to whittle at it as best I could.

Do you think a lot of the reasons that efforts to consolidate things and organize things failed was because people were afraid of Steve McNichols and he was going to be too high handed and try to control things too strongly?

- A.D. I think if it hadn't been Steve, it would have been the same argument about some other Governor.

O.K.

- A.D. In the populace at large, and their reflected in the legislature, there's always a group that feels that you'd better keep government weak. You don't want them strong. I don't want them so strong that they're dictatorial but I want them strong enough to be somewhat efficient. We didn't have that. That was one of my interests over my whole career was to try to reorganize whether it was school districts or municipal government, statutes, or what, metropolitan government around the Denver area or the executive branch or the judicial branch and the legislative branch. Trying to make each one more adapted to do the job it was responsible for doing. I think a lot of progress has been made over those years and that they're not in bad

shape now. I'd like them to improve still but they're relatively much better off. They just couldn't handle today's problems on this organizational structures they had twenty years ago. Just couldn't touch it.

What was your role in the reorganization of the Judiciary?

A.D. Well I guess I didn't have a front seat role. I was supportive. Let's put it that way. I was doing some studying of it and talking about it and kind of encouraging it. But I wasn't in the front row.

Another of the structural changes that you were prominently associated with in the realm of financial procedures, for example separating the Capitol construction budget from the rest of the long bill, any others along those lines?

A.D. Oh I spent a lot of time in the early days on fund simplification bills. There were a lot of sort of little house keeping things that affected how the funds worked and we tried to get most of the state expenditures concentrated from the general fund as opposed to each having its own little cash fund, which was hard to control. I'm sure there were others but that's one I remember.

You mentioned also the Denver Metro area government, some effort at consolidation, that's an idea that its time never seems to have come.

A.D. It will come. It will come. My recollection of dates is fuzzy now but there was a constitutional amendment put through the legislature several years ago which set up a concept and the mechanism of how do you get to a regional service authority if the local people want to vote for one. I was very active in getting that put through.

This was the council of governments?

A.D. No. No it's not, The council of governments is a whole different thing. Although if you had a regional service authority, it would absorb the council of government.

Well, back in the early '60's there were such things as setting up a metropolitan sewage district. Roy McVicker had a big role to play in that. It was seen at the time by its proponents as a good first step. Maybe this will lead to a municipal consolidation.

A.D. Well it hasn't yet but the regional service authority proposal is written in such a way that it could absorb these various independent regional organizations. So that if the people wanted to in ten or fifteen-year span, you could have a real regional government that would be comparable to what a county government, a single county government in that area and would take over functions that are now preformed by the county or the city so that you could get them done on a geographic base that was broad enough to match the scope of the problem they were dealing with.

There was even in '61, a lot of fighting between Denver and the suburbs in the General

Assembly. This is when you had the question and debate, Denver's annexation of Glendale had come up and another bill that would have made it easier for cities to annex unincorporated and adjacent areas, and let's see the third issue, I can't think what it was. It very much pitted Denver against the suburbs. Oh it was that metropolitan area sales tax. Because the way the bill was set up it would require a majority vote of all of the people in the four county area and not any county individual. Of course, Denver was a much larger percentage in the metropolitan area then than it is now. It's interesting how things have changed because Denver wanted to annex Glendale because Glendale was a poor eyesore that was spoiling things for wealthy Denver. (Laugh) Let's talk for a minute about after the election of '62, you're Minority Leader. John Vanerhoof was Speaker. How big of a majority did the Republicans have at that time?

A.D. I don't remember.

How did that go. Suddenly being in the minority and having to work with the majority and a Republican Governor?

A.D. It's not nearly as much fun being in the minority. All you can do is squawk. You complain about what's happening and your main problem is to complain only when there is a valid complaint. It's easy to complain about everything that happens but there's some things that happen that are quite good and some that you would have done yourself if you'd been in the majority. So there's no point in complaining about them, so pick the ones that are worth complaining about and then complain like mad. If you're honest about it, you can't complain all the time because there aren't that many things that are going that wrong. You lose your credibility if you do. I got along very well with those fellows, cause I tried to help them when I thought they were right and only getting away when I thought they were wrong, and frequently, or often enough to satisfy me I guess, in retrospect at least, when I thought they were wrong, I would get some grudging admission out of somebody that privately they agreed with me, but they were locked in a caucus or they were this or that. I remember one occasion when I was complaining about something at the House microphone, that session you're talking about, and I made my point and it seemed so clear and logical to me, and all of my guys voted with me, I didn't get a single Republican vote and the bill passed and went on to the Senate. On the standing vote when it was passed, I guess this must have been second reading, I stood up for the motion to amend or something then I sat down. John Mackie who was the floor leader across the way, stood up for the other side, took that opportunity and took steps across the aisle and leaned down and told me I was right and he'd have it fixed in the Senate. (Laugh)

That's great.

A.D. We could work that way. We both knew what kind of a game we were playing. You had to play the game. He was anxious to have a good bill too and he hadn't thought of this point.

So generally you had a pretty good working relationship with the Republicans? What was the contrast between Steve McNichols and John Love?

A.D. Steve was more of a doer and more of a positive guy who wanted to carry his day and make changes and lead it. John, I think, was more of a passive fellow, didn't think there were as many changes needed, didn't want to rock the boat that much, and was content to let the system run and not push it or poke it in a particular direction that suited him. I think that's a fair distinction between the guys. Both nice fellows.

The main thing that I heard about when the Republicans came in, this was right before I moved to Colorado, I came here in '65, they had made their big pitch on taxes and they cut the interest tax. Is that right? Then a year or two later had to turn around and raise the sales tax.

A.D. Yeah, that's essentially right, I think. My recollections as to exactly what happened then is fuzzy at this point, but that's essentially right. You see their party preference would be for a sales tax as opposed to income tax so they didn't mind that. They could say in the first go around that they didn't think they were going to have to raise taxes. In the second one, well we were wrong. That fact that somebody else thought they were going to be wrong initially is forgotten by then.

What about '65, '66, you were Speaker. The Democrats had come back in the majority on the Johnson landslide. Any particular changes that you instituted in procedures as Speaker?

A.D. I don't remember any major ones, there may have been some. I'm sure there were a lot of relatively detailed procedures that we changed but how the thing ran, you know, how the front desk worked or how the journal was printed or things of that sort, cause I was always interested in improving that process, but it wasn't in those years that we only changed the role of the rules committee, for example, or things like that. I think we ran it pretty much the way it had been run, only better of course.

You still had a Republican majority in the Senate in those years as I recall. Course you still had a Republican Governor, so there were no tremendous changes that you could put into effect.

A.D. Not that would involve legislation or both houses. We were pretty hard working in the House. Well the House, I think, has always been a little harder working than the Senate, in my experience. I know the Senate was ready to go home and adjourn and we wouldn't let them. They hadn't dealt with some issues that we thought were important to deal with. So they stuck around and we dealt with the issues. I think reasonably well. The first legislation as I remember it on both air pollution and water pollution were passed in those two years. That was hard. Well for example, I think my recollection is right, Governor Love put on his call to the short session, it would have been '66, the subject of air pollution and water pollution. Two subjects, but he He didn't send us a proposed bill. I at least saw that as a way that the Governor could deal with the problem in saying ' "I asked the legislature to do something about these problems and those guys didn't do anything." We felt we had an obligation to figure out something to do and do it. We worked like dogs at it and we did pass significant legislation in those two fields. Not perfect by a long shot. It's been amended every year since, I think. It was a big step at that time.

What other major issues stand out in your mind from that middle and late '60's? Obviously you're dealing with burgeoning school enrollments, and higher education.

- A.D. Well there was a tax question in '65 or '66. That's when the last increase in state sales tax went in. That was a compromise, if I remember correctly, that's when we got the food sales tax credit on the income tax. It was at the Democratic insistence to offset the increase in sales tax. It was necessary. This was a compromise that we were willing to accept. That's how it got done. I think it's relatively rare for a tax increase to go through at a time when there is divided political leadership.

Sure that would make sense.

- A.D. Each one is going to shoot at the other and insist on their own way of doing it and nothing is going to happen. It's an awful easy position to be in. Blame everybody else. So I'm rather pleased that in that year we were able to come to a compromise that essentially was pretty acceptable to both sides. The amount of that food sales tax credit was minimum and should be more now, but I've never been one who thought it ought to be repealed.

What was behind your decision to run for the Senate in '66. Here you are Speaker of the House and pretty much at the pinnacle of your power and?

- A.D. Well, there were several things I guess. My father had died in '65 and I was going to have a lot of work to do with his estate and I was pretty tired and I needed a little lighter load. If I moved to the Senate I wasn't in a leadership position and I didn't have to spend the time and be drained to the extent I was in the House. You never know whether the leadership gets returned to the leadership positions or not. Also you've got a four year term in the Senate which was attractive to me. The campaigning every two years was getting awfully old by then. So a combination of things.

Let me ask you about some different people, get some general impressions. Some of the people that you served with over the years. We talked about the two Governors we talked about John Vanderhoof before I jump back into the '50's and early '60's. Let me ask you about Mark Hogan. You served under him.

- AD. Yes, and vice versa. He served under me. Mark was a very able guy in the legislature. He was a good legislator. I don't think he was one of the power houses. From my stand point, he spent more time than I would have on the political aspects of dealing with constituents and political groups and less on the governmental aspects of what bill should you pass or how should you amend it. The nitty gritty of the legislature was not as much of an interest to him as the political field. He did both but his emphasis, I felt, was on the political where as mine was always on the legislative and not the political. My weakness, his strength.

George Brown.

- A.D. George is a very able guy, and at times very well informed on state government. He served on that Joint Budget Committee for quite a few years and yet towards the end, I guess I

shouldn't say towards the end because I don't know when the end will be, but I guess during the sixties when Black consciousness nationally was rising, George was in the position of some prominence in the Black community nationally. The demands on his time to be at Black meetings or national meetings or something else were such that he really wasn't devoting the kind of attention to the Joint Budget Committee or to the Senate that some of us thought he should. That essentially is why he came off of that Joint Budget Committee. If he hadn't had these other demands on him I think he could have continued to be a very effective legislator. He was respected, intelligent, and informed.

Ted Gill

A.D. Ted was a very able legislator but of the old school, from my point of view. I would want to get to the microphone and argue in a logical sort of way why you ought to do this or why you ought to do that. That was my style and my approach to things. Ted would want to get to the microphone and having already counted the votes he didn't want to argue the issues, he knew what was going to happen. He would get there and he would say something nice about what the opponent had said, but I disagree with it, he'd say. Then he'd say come on fellows and he'd put his thumb either up or down and let's vote. So they'd vote and Ted would win. (Laugh) Very frustrating for anybody who would vote the other way. (Laugh)

He must have been quite a character.

A.D. Oh a real character. Nice guy. You couldn't help but like him. You weren't going to shake him on logic. Furthermore he was, it took me quite awhile to realize, cause I think Ted was about the first guy that I'd run into where I finally understood that not only wasn't logic going to shake him but he would use arguments that were consciously illogical to fuzz an issue. He was able to fuzz an issue so well and sound so good that by the time he got through, your logic over here was just as fuzzy as his logic over here and some of the guys didn't know what to do so they'd vote by his thumb. (Laugh) He could do that consciously. (Laugh) That something you seldom see, that I seldom see.

Jim Morley, Are you still in contact with him?

A.D. Yes. Jim and I served on that Joint Budget Committee for four years together. A fine fellow. Plain, down to earth, straight guy, a good senator, orientated, that's what you'd expect. He knew how the game was played and was willing to take some responsibility. The tax program in '59 passed the Senate because Jim passed it. He was chairman of the Finance Committee then. Finance and Appropriations was one committee in the Senate I believe at that time. I remember I don't know if it was '56 or '57 we came to the end, just to show you how things were done at that time, and I don't know if they're done that way now. We came to the end of the session and there were so many bills pending that involved salary increases of the various state people and maybe the legislators. Jim and I got off in a back room and started down the list and what salaries could we agree on for the Governor, what for the Lt. Governor, what for the Treasurer. We went down the list and between the two of us we compromised our differences and settled on a figure. That's the figure we ran, it went through both houses and

that was it. He could work that way. You almost had to do it that way. Somebody had to get them started.

Herrick Roth

- A.D. Herrick was also on that Joint Budget Committee. A very able guy. A bright mind, an ability to articulate which was second to none. If anything he talks too fast because with a bright mind and a quick tongue, he was talking too fast for most of his audience. No matter what the audience is, I think. He was a joy to work with. Well informed, hard working. The whole Joint Budget Committee in those years was a prime bunch.

I'm not going to take up too much more of your time. There's a few more names I want to ask about.

Sam Taylor

- A.D. Sammy was of the old school. Been there forever. A thoroughly nice little guy. I say little in terms of stature, I mean physical height, not in any other way. Sammy was a lawyer and was articulate. I don't think he did the kind of homework that would have made him truly outstanding in the legislature. He was outstanding in his own way because he'd been there so long and was familiar with the issues and the people by experience. It wasn't because he went home and read all about it the night before. Some people had done it that way. John Mackie used to do it that way. Joe Shoemaker could do that. I think Sammy had a lot of respect from both sides of the aisle. Very experienced, nice fellow.

Turning to the House in that period. Most of the people I had down here were in positions of importance of one kind or another. Let me throw a few other names out there.

Peter Dominic

- A.D. Peter was a very effective House member. An outstanding guy. Educated, hard working, articulate, appealing, and I don't know for a fact, but I always thought he must have been able to call on the legal talent at his law firm for briefings and analysis that were beyond his kind of ability. He was better prepared on most things than most of us were.

What about Colorado Springs and William Lutz?

- A.D. I remember Bill. Bill was really of the old school. I guess I never thought he got very deep into a lot of problems, because he was playing it in terms of people and not so much, how do I describe this old school and new school approach. The new school to me was a guy who would study a problem and make up his mind what he thought, or propose an amendment or write a bill that was his, was his contribution. The old school to my way of thinking, and it may be an unfair way to look at it, would react to what was presented, and would probably react more in terms of what was presented orally and who presented it than in terms of what he knew about the substance of the issue. I felt Billy was the kind of a guy that was reacting to the issue as presented and who presented it made a difference.

Ray Simpson

A.D. I was sort of hoping you would get back to Ray because I wanted to tell you a story. I have a lot of regard for Ray's intellect. He's a sharp country boy. On one occasion, I think it was that session I was Minority Leader in the House, it had to be because there were very few things where I could flex my minority muscle. When something came along I liked to do it to keep my boys happy, make them feel good and put the other side on its toes. One of the things that came along was a question of establishing a new judicial district or maybe it was a judge, I'm not quite sure. It was something in the judicial department where under the constitution it took a two-thirds vote in each house to pass it. Well that automatically gave my minority group the whip hand, so as I remember the Bar Association had all gotten behind this proposal and there was a lot of grass-root support for it in the legal profession and the Republican party was sitting through this proposal to increase the number of judicial districts seats. Maybe it was from 15 to 16, I'm guessing at the figures now. A vote came along and I objected. It became a test of strength and whoever was in the chair, it was Vanderhoof in the chair, third reading, it didn't have to have the two-thirds vote until it got to third reading and at that point he really didn't have the votes. I was waiting to see what he was going to do. Pretty soon Ray Simpson gets up from his back seat, the seat way in the back, where you used to be able to see what everybody was doing. That was part of why he was so good, he'd watch. He didn't say much but he'd watch. He got up and went and whispered to the Speaker, came back, moved an amendment. His amendment, he didn't say what it would do, he just said delete line so and so and substitute line so and so. Before I'd quite figured out what that would do, I was working at my desk as he was talking. He quit talking and the Speaker took the vote. His amendment passed and I figured out what it did. It put the bill back to where it did nothing. It kept the judicial in the same number that presently existed. It was a pointless piece of legislation. I got to the mike and I said this is absurd fellows. This doesn't do anything. Why are you doing this? They said oh we just want to do it. They took a vote on, the question was then on passing the bill. My side all voted no and the Speaker declared the bill passed because since it didn't change the judicial districts, it didn't require a two-thirds vote. (Laugh) So we passed the bill on to the Senate and just out thanked me perfectly. By the time it came back from the Senate for concurrence why my guys couldn't possibly object to what the whole legal profession was for so we had to go along with it.

That's marvelous.

A.D. It was beautifully done.

I'll have to ask him about that.

John French.

A.D. Great Fellow. Great Fellow. Hard working chairman of the Joint Budget Committee. A relatively conservative Democrat. A country conservatism. Better concept of state responsibilities than a person who was only interested in representing his particular district. Jim worked so hard at that JBC job that I was afraid it was killing him. It was affecting his

face. He was in bad shape for awhile.

Do you know if he's still alive?

A.D. Yes, he is. Lives in Durango and spends his winters out in California.

That was the tip I had from Dave Morrissey over at Legislative Council, who said he might be over in Durango.

Wilkie Ham

A.D. Wilkie was another terribly interesting guy. He pretended to be a country bumpkin. He was anything but. He talked that way. He wore his cowboy boots. He was a down home, us poor folks, at your mercy kind of guy. He'd admit to being a lawyer if you really pressed him but there was almost nobody that really knew that he'd been a prosecuting attorney in Cook County Illinois. He'd been a prosecuting attorney in Chicago before he ever came to Colorado. That's the kind of mind he had and this old country stuff was very good acting.

He was good at it, too, he was.

Carl Holcomb

A.D. Carl was a fine Senator. I guess he's still on the bench, isn't he?

No he's retired to Arizona. I just got a letter from Johnny Van the other day on his whereabouts.

A.D. I didn't work very closely with Carl but I had a lot of respect for him. I think on some of the judicial reorganization he played a large role.

Oakley Wade, you mentioned him. You worked with him on financial matters I imagine.

A.D. Yes, I did. He was on the Joint Budget Committee for awhile when I was and then he later became chairman of it. Oakley was a studious very sincere guy. Not too colorful but color isn't always the most important thing. He was sound.

Howard Propst

A.D. Howard was a bright guy and did well in the House. I don't think he was as outstanding as John Mackie, for example. But Howard was a very able sincere guy of the new school not of the old school type.

Do you know if he's still alive?

A.D. Oh I hope so, he's still a relatively young guy.

There are all kinds of Propsts in the Sterling phonebook but none named Howard. I'm going to have to do a little more work to try to run him down.

A.D. I haven't seen or heard of him for several years so I don't really know.

Another person that he was associated with, working on the school finance in the '61 session, Forrest Burns

A.D. Forrest is still in the legislature. One of the few old timers there now. Forrest, a very able, conscientious, relatively conservative, Democrat. I worked with Forrest cause he was Floor Leader when I was Speaker and we got along very well.

Betty Kirk West

A.D. Betty Kirk was one of the first, that I'm aware of at least, to consider her legislative work her full-time occupation. She thought very strongly about some things and was pretty good at some things and I think not as good at others. I think she was probably a more capable legislator in her first portion of her tenure than towards the end.

One last name that I have on my list, Ranger Rogers, I don't know if you had much contact with him.

A.D. Yes, I know Ranger, have for years, even out of the legislature. He understood the Senate working very well and at one time I think he was Floor Leader in the Senate, wasn't he? A reasonable guy, we could get along very well and work things out, and we did.

Any other people that I haven't mentioned that you can think of that are more important in one way or another? I haven't particularly gotten in your later period in the legislature.

A.D. Try to go back to the earlier period. Al Tomsic is one that you would be interested in talking to. he's a District.....

I'm going to talk to him.

A.D. Oh, you are. I don't know where else to suggest you touch base.

Did you serve on the Joint Budget Committee at all when you were in the Senate?

A.D. No.

So your contact with Joe Shoemaker was just as a fellow Senator?

A.D. Yes.

He kind of looked like he assumed that role that you and Palmer Birch and a few others people have had as fiscal expert.

A.D. He sure did and did it very well.

Since then you served in the Senate until the end of '74.

A.D. No, the end of '75, well January of '75, the end of '74, you're right.

Since then you've?

A.D. I've been a private citizen. Enjoying it. Trying not to get up and lobby and tell them what they ought to do. (Laugh)

It must be hard sometimes.

A.D. It is.

One last question. Is there anything else that I should have asked you that I haven't? Anything else about your public career your life in general, that you'd like to have on this tape that I've not asked you about?

A.D. I don't think so. I don't remember anything off hand. As I say, things come to my mind that I haven't thought of for years. It's kind of a nostalgia trip to be interviewed this way. I don't think of anything special, I think it's the end.