OSCF Oral History Project

Janet McLennan

Unabridged Interview — January 28, 2022

MCLENNAN: Janet McLennan
JD: Janice Dilg

EDITOR'S NOTE:
( ): Used for an aside within the original interview
[ ]: Used for a descriptor or clarification of information within the original interview
< >: Used for author's notes added after the interview

REVIEWED BY:
Capitol Foundation Staff: August 2022
Janet McLennan: November 2022

JD: Today is January 28th, 2022. This is going to be an interview with Janet McLennan for the Oregon State Capitol Foundation oral history project. My name is Janet Dilg, the oral historian, and the videographer is Jeff Collet. We are at Janet McLennan's home in Southwest Portland. Good morning. Thank you for willing to be part of this project.

MCLENNAN: Thank you for coming.

JD: So, if you would start with just a brief biography, a little bit about where you're from, that would be great.

MCLENNAN: Well, I was born in Tacoma, Washington and was educated there through high school. My first year of college was in Oberlin, in Ohio. That was a rude shock in terms of weather because there were very frozen days and temperatures below 20. I wasn't used to that. [Laughs].

At any rate, I transferred then to the University of Oregon and graduated from there in 1948, and went back to Cambridge, Massachusetts to something called the Radcliffe College Course in Publishing Procedures. That was something that was fairly novel at that time, but just a summer course of six weeks. That was followed by a job in New York for a year at *Mademoiselle* magazine, which was a <younger> women's fashion magazine, which prided itself on being the college girl's Bible.

After a year there, I came west to be married and went with my husband to Coos Bay, Oregon. He had just gotten his C.P.A. [Certified Public Accountant] and he was the comptroller of a small lumber company there. We were there about a year, and he decided he wanted to go to law school. So, we left there and went to Washington D.C., where he was in law school <at George Washington University and> I worked at the Library of Congress. <After a few years in northern New Jersey> we decided we wanted to come back to Oregon. By that time, our first child had been born and I was pregnant with <our> second child. So, we were back here and lived for a little while on Mount Tabor and then bought a small house in Eastmoreland and lived there for some years before we built this house in 1965.

By that time, I had decided that I wanted to realize a long-time ambition, and I started law school in Salem at Willamette <University>, but the daily commute grew difficult <and exhausting>. At that time, Portland didn't have an accredited law school. It had a night law school, but it was not accredited. After that first year at Willamette, they got provisional accreditation because Lewis and Clark <College> acquired this law school that had existed in Portland for some years. So, <after the first year at Willamette> I transferred there, and with some interruptions [Laughs], I graduated in 1972 and passed the bar at that time.

JD: Well, let's delve into some of those other things that you were doing while you were raising a family and going to law school. You were involved in a variety of political activities as a private citizen. I think one of the earliest, and certainly probably well-known was around the sighting of a road along the coast, particularly Nestucca Spit. Maybe just tell that story the way you would like to tell it.

MCLENNAN: Well, I can't remember exactly when, but at some time Bob Straub, who was then State Treasurer, became aware of the fact that the <State> Highway Commission was intent upon building a reconstructed highway, Highway 101, up

the Nestucca Sand Spit. They had planned moving from the south, and at the mouth of the Nestucca, the south side of <the river> is a headland. So, this highway was going to go up the beach and to a distance, I suppose, 150 feet, or maybe more, and then swoop down onto the Nestucca sand spit and travel straight north <up the length of the spit>. Bob thought that was a terrible despoliation of a wonderful piece of Oregon. So, we began one way or another to mount a campaign hoping to change the Highway Commission's mind.

<Bob called Stewart Udall, then Secretary of Interior in the Johnson administration, and discovered that the land comprising the sandspit had been deeded to the State of Oregon by the U.S. Department of Interior for recreational purposes, which strengthened our position. We prepared an advisory petition to the State Highway Commission and collected a good many thousand signatures, for Bob to roll out at a Highway Commission meeting>.

At one point, we had a Mother's Day march, where we brought all our families down to the southern portion that is the headland and of course television covered it. It was a good protest against the possibility of this swooping highway down onto the Nestucca sand spit. People came from Eugene and Salem, and all our friends in Eastmoreland and so on. There was a good rally, and this opposition persisted for some time. It was in 1968, as I recall. In the spring of 1968, the Oregon primary in May was one week before the California primary. So, Bob Kennedy was out campaigning for the presidential nomination. Bob [Straub] took him down to the Nestucca sand spit, and this was well covered in Oregon news. Bob [Kennedy] went on of course, sadly to California where he was murdered.

The issue persisted, for some time. The chairman of the Highway Commission was a very powerful man in Oregon politics at that time. He was chairman of the board of Pacific Power and Light, and a sort of king maker, if you will, especially in the Republican party. So, Tom McCall was put in a very difficult position because he didn't want to see a highway on the sand spit, but he didn't want to offend <his> chairman of the Highway Commission either. It wasn't until about probably 1971 that he simply realized that the public opposition to the idea was overwhelming.

It's kind of an interesting thing, but at that point in Oregon history, people were beginning to sense the importance of conservation of resources and the need for recreational opportunities. Whereas, the idea of straightening 101 so that log trucks could move more easily had been kind of a no brainer earlier, it suddenly presented conflict between economic opportunity on the one hand, and

citizen's recreational opportunity on the other hand. So, it was a classic of that kind of conflict. Moreover, there were some other sand spits farther north up the state highway that were at least possibly on the calendar for the same treatment later on. When Tom finally, absolutely said, "No. No highway on the Nestucca sand spit," that put that whole threat to bed.

JD: Part of this, what was sometimes referred to as the Battle of Nestucca spit, that it was bitter politics. There was also a ballot measure that was associated with that too, and how did you help with that?

MCLENNAN: Well, that <ballot measure> actually was <an initiative petition that we prepared>. It came out of the 1967 legislative session, and it was again a piece of legislation that had been prepared by the Highway Commission. It was House Bill 1601, and what it intended was to give the Highway Commission some means of policing and protecting the so-called dry sand area above the high tide line, but below the practical useful line of building houses or other kinds of structures. Somewhat unstable land that <for over a century Oregon families> used widely for picnicking and kite flying and sandcastle building, and so on. At any rate, that piece of legislation became very controversial in the 1967 session, and eventually was passed. The controversies especially arose over the difficulty of defining the limits of those lands. It was clear on the seaward side that the high tide line defined them, but the upland boundary was more controversial and people, of course, who owned oceanfront property had a proprietary interest in that definition of land.

In the midst of that session, Tom McCall joined oceanographers from Oregon State and went down, and they had the means of defining a reasonable boundary academically on the basis of research that had been done at Oregon State. So, that bill was amended very significantly to provide that that definition would be systematically made from the California border to the Columbia River, and the state would protect that area. But, it would be protected for public use though its ownership might be in the upland owner.

That issue was litigated for a period of about five years, and produced some interesting law, and was finally, successfully agreed upon. Kind of uniquely, the judge in the Oregon Supreme Court who heard that case and wrote the opinion, identified the similarity between our circumstance of picnicking on those dry sand lines and with habit in both England common law and earlier Roman law, and a doctrine which there is identified as the rite of custom. And it

was the custom, in both Italy and England, that fisherman had the right to use those lands for the drying and mending of their nets, which was similar in terms of the kind of usage that we had with people picnicking. Those lawsuits went on for years. In the course of them, the state attorney general, some man by the name of Robert Thornton, had sought from people their family pictures, photographs of families using those lands. He'd acquired a collection of thousands of pictures that went back a century to the late 19th century of people using those lands here in the same way. That parallel between that occasional use by different fishermen at different times was very similar to the fact that our public use was different people at different times, over a long period of time.

So, Ted Goodwin, the Supreme Court justice, analogized the rite of custom as being the basis for Oregon's beach law. Eventually that was challenged in the federal court, but the three judge federal court agreed with that. By 1972, we were secure in having the protection. Ongoing, or early in that period, Bob Straub and others of us, had initiated a constitutional amendment that would protect any finding of public rights. We got the signatures in a two-month period because protection of the beaches had become a very popular and compelling political issue in Oregon by that time. But, as we approached election day, there was one other element in that our constitutional amendment also proposed a one cent a gallon gas tax to provide additional money for the state parks to provide access and also to provide for the purchase of any lands that seemed needed and appropriate. At the time we wrote this, we didn't know whether the beach bill would survive litigation. In any event, the Parks Department <had> long identified the need for more <beach> access, and that was the basis for <including> the one cent <per> gallon gas tax.

A few weeks before the election, polls showed us winning. But, unfortunately, we found out later, the lobbyist for the gas companies, Mobil and Standard and so forth, had gone down to San Francisco one day in the late summer and collected some money from all the gas companies in Los Angeles. In the last days before election day, a campaign started on television, on ‘Beware the Tricks in Measure Six’, which unfortunately we were Measure Six, and we narrowly lost that election. Though the beaches are protected according to the law in Oregon, they're not protected from legislative tampering and people must be continually watchful about that.

JD: So, you've talked about the legal and the political and some of the technical aspects. What was it about that issue that got you interested and involved in the first place?

MCLENNAN: Well, I think it got me interested in beaches. Well, I was in law school, so of course I was interested in the history of that kind of property law. But mostly I think, the continuum of things that arose in Oregon. Of course, we didn't ever have a beach property, that is my husband and I didn't, but of course, like everybody else, we took the children to the beach and recognized the importance of the continuum of that kind of opportunity for Oregon. Oregon's state parks and wild areas between them are well known to most of the citizens of the state.

JD: So, the relationship that you forged with Bob Straub during that battle continued, and you worked with Bob in a variety of ways over the next few years. If you would, talk a little about ways that you worked with Bob Straub in the state.

MCLENNAN: Well, <Bob's longtime deputy, Ken John, resigned in the summer of 1972, and I replaced him as Deputy State Treasurer for the last five months of Bob's term in office.> Bob had settled in Oregon. He was born in San Francisco, and he had a farm down in Springfield originally, or near there, and was a county commissioner for Lane County and eventually a one term state senator. His education at Dartmouth had been in finance and he then ran for state treasurer and was elected into that role and brought a good deal of expertise to the job of state treasurer and how public money should be managed <more aggressively>. But, he continued to be enamored of, not only the beaches of Oregon, but the rivers of Oregon and the deserts of eastern Oregon. He very much responded to the public landscape, if you will, and wanted to make sure it was protected and managed properly. I can't remember precisely, besides the beaches, things that I initially followed him with. Some time later, he got an idea for a Willamette greenway and that was an attractive idea but one that was somewhat threatening to landowners along the river, either because they feared trespass or they feared interference with their commercial activities or whatever. He advanced it as an idea. I don't <think that> we put a bill in the legislature <at that time>. I know that Tom McCall, who was governor at that time, was similarly attracted and created a Greenway Committee <or commission> and it may have advanced some

legislation. <And when Bob was elected governor in 1975, he had greenway legislation introduced. It was killed in committee on a partisan vote.>

JD: And you were his campaign coordinator in his second run for governor in 1970. Maybe talk a little about just generally what campaigning was like then.

MCLENNAN: Well, we had a downtown office, and basically, I was running that office. For the last three or four months perhaps, we had a storefront office downtown. I can't describe the activities except that there's a coming and going and particularly in those days, a handling out of so-called literature, pamphlets and so on. It was a busy job and a busy activity, but it was not unique in any way from anything else that I think of as downtown political activity.

JD: And nowadays there's social media, as well as more traditional newspapers or television coverage. How did you get the word out in those days in addition to pamphlets?

MCLENNAN: Well, I was thinking about that this morning, to a very great extent, you relied on the mails and so you were continually stuffing envelopes. People made political contributions in the form of postage stamps sometimes in those days, because they knew that was how you communicated.

I can remember a couple times, and I can't particularly remember the instances, where we got last minute news of something. At that time, if Tom McCall was not in public service, that is, when he wasn't either secretary of state or governor, before then he had been KGW commentator, and he was a very friendly commentator to any citizen effort that arose. So, you could give him advanced notice that you wanted to have a large gathering at Benson High School a couple days from now, and you could be sure that would be well publicized on television and frequently we took advantage of that. [Laughs].

JD: To sort of move to a tangential area, you did have your law degree now, and you served as staff counsel for a couple of different legislative committees, including in the 1973 legislature when SB 100 was passed. Why don't you talk a little about your experiences in that role?

MCLENNAN: The 1973 legislature in the House was interesting. Dick Eymann was the speaker of the house. This was, I think, the first year when you had a fair

number of women legislators. They'd always had one or two or even a handful, but we had a lot. The House Environment Committee was a large committee, it had 11 members, six of them were women. Nancie Fadeley of Eugene was the chairman, Steve Kafoury of Portland was the vice chair. We dealt with a good many kinds of interesting legislative subjects. The one that we didn't deal with very much was Senate Bill 100, because it was developed on the Senate side.

[End of clip. New clip started.]

JD: Go ahead, you were talking about SB 100.

MCLENNAN: At any rate, Senate Bill 100 was the product of the Senate and the chairman of the Senate Committee, Ted Hallock, who was kind of a personage in his own right, cautioned us not to change a comma of it. And we didn't. [Laughs]. So, it went through the committee and was passed in the House of Representatives without change from the Senate. <Our> committee, with all its women, had a hearing on an abortion bill, as a matter of fact. That was the year that Roe v. Wade was decided, and I remember it was a very large hearing. We were in a big hearing room in the basement at that time, and hundreds attended. But, no legislative action was taken on that subject.

JD: I'm not quite clear how you worked both in that capacity as legislative counsel, and then your time with Thousand Friends of Oregon. But I understand that you were involved in sort of the development of Goal 4 about forest lands, but that was all tied in with this new land legislation.

MCLENNAN: I was working in Salem at that time. I went on from being counsel to the House Environment Committee to be counsel of the <joint> interim Committee on Natural Resources, which was a compendium of the Environmental Committee and the Agriculture Committee and a couple other committees for purposes of the interim. I was there in the Capitol as they were putting together committees to set up all the goals under Senate Bill 100. I landed on the Forestry Committee. I had, during the interim, been working on some legislation that related to forestry and we had actually toured the committee around a variety of sites by plane. So, I think that's why I was chosen, for that purpose.

JD: Talk a little about what Goal 4 was and how it developed and its role in land use planning please.

MCLENNAN: Goal 4 was an effort to preserve forest land for forest land purposes, and to categorize <such lands> under the state planning process. Oregon, before that time, had been one of the first states to adopt forest practices acts. The concern was not only that the forest land be kept in forest use, but the Forest Practices Act was a mandate that lands should be planted, with some exceptions. I think there's an exception for eastern Oregon because of the kind of trees that grow there. Long ago, and perhaps the first effort on that count, had been to require that as people logged off lands, they leave one tree to seed the land back, but that wasn't a very efficient conservation device. So, the Forest Practices Act, first in Oregon, required the planting and required later on that the trees be so called 'free to grow' at five years. In other words, the planting had been successful in providing a continuum of forest crop. <The Forest Practices also provides regulation affecting all water quality, fish protection and other regulation.>

JD: This is an interesting sort of transition time in a state where timber was still very powerful, but the sort of environmental or conservation movement was growing at the same time as you've alluded to already. I'm guessing some of this development was fairly tricky and required a certain amount of finesse or negotiation.

MCLENNAN: There's always a tension in terms of private property rights as to whether you keep growing timber or you build a golf course and a resort or something else. The state has a limited amount of authority to control what an owner does with his land. Yet the state has a great interest in the continuum of this resource and protection of it from fire and, of course, most recently we've had horrendous fires. But Oregon had had notable fires during the depression and subsequent years and had found that instructive in terms of state response and setting up a legal scheme that figured out who was gonna fight the fire and so on.

JD: It was around this same time too that you were the Natural Resource Assistant for then Governor Bob Straub. Expand a little on what that role meant and the issues that you addressed during that time.

MCLENNAN: It always is a continuum. We followed Tom McCall. At that time, the Natural Resource Advisor under Tom had a large number of entities that he supervised, or at least coordinated, and was a bridge between the agency and the governor, in terms of making sure that the governor's aware of any issues that <arise> in those entities. Tom had created some committees by executive order, and I think there were 20 or 23 of those entities <and agencies of a natural resource nature>. Some were regular agencies like the Department of Forestry, the Department of Game, but others were more informal. At any rate, in the course of that period when I was with Bob, either at our instigation or at others', there was a considerable consolidation. By the time Bob had completed his term, the number of entities was down to I think 12, and it was at least to my mind, a little more manageable.

During the last years of the McCall administration, there had been an energy shortage and that had led Tom to collect some expertise and some research activities. Those things we proposed to center in a new Department of Energy, and that was enacted in Bob's first term. The old Fish Commission and Game Commission were merged into a Fish and Wildlife Department. Some other consolidations of that kind took place. There's in that office a good deal of interaction with the federal government, and that goes on sort of topically, what's happening in the Forest Service and the Corps of Engineers and so on. Those agencies of the federal government that have a lot of activity here in Oregon, relative to federal lands that are owned by them.

JD: Janet, I'm gonna ask you to do one of those kind of introductory sentences that we talked about earlier. If you could just say something to the effect of, "I served as the Natural Resource Advisor to Governor Bob Straub." And if you want to do the years or something, just a brief one sentence that we could use to really set the stage for that section. Take your time.

MCLENNAN: I was Natural Resource Director for Bob Straub throughout his four years of governorship. Is that enough?

JD: Perfect. So, your involvement in natural resources and particularly forestry, continued when you were appointed by Governor Goldschmidt to the Oregon Board of Forestry in 1987. Could you talk about sort of why you wanted to be on that board and what that involved?

MCLENNAN: Well, actually, after Bob was defeated for his second term, I'd gone to work for Bonneville Power Administration. But during that time, I was asked to sit on the Research Advisory Committee of the College of Forestry at OSU [Oregon State University]. I was on that committee for about seven years. That was a continuum of the forestry subject matter and a continuing awareness of the matters that were being researched in the college at that time.

So, when I was asked to serve by Neil [Goldschmidt], I was happy to join that board. The Oregon Board of Forestry has a long history. It goes back to a forester by the name of Elliott, who was a forester, I think, around 1911 or 1912, something like that. In response to the development of the national forest, sections 16 and 36 of the townships that made up of Oregon, which when we became a state, were dedicated to the state's ownership for education purposes to raise money for schools. When they created the national forests, they reclaimed those 16 and 36, but they gave us instead a block of forest lands, in Lane County and thereabouts, which became known as the Elliott State Forest. The Elliott State Forest, then, is dedicated to the common school children, any proceeds from that forest. The issues around that have always been of interest to me.

JD: I believe when you joined the board, there had been a recent sort of revamping of —

MCLENNAN: Well, in terms of what Neil had done, he had reconstituted the board. When I was working for Governor Straub, and before then, the board was a relatively large board. It was dominated by timber landowners. The way the statute read is that there would be three from each of the southwestern Oregon counties, the northwestern Oregon counties and the eastern Oregon counties and the landowners would nominate a slate from which the governor could choose the members of the Board of Forestry. So, that was not a very public entity. There were additional members, there was somebody from <the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management and> the Izaak Walton League to represent fish, and there was a county commissioner to represent counties and so on and so forth. And the chair was the Dean of the College of Forestry. Well, that was the old Board of Forestry.

Neil, and his natural resource advisor, Gail Achterman, worked to develop with the legislature a new Board of Forestry, which would have no more than three members who took a significant portion of their income from forestry, and

four public members. And that was the new Board of Forestry that I was appointed to in 1987. I was one of the public members.

During that period, we particularly advanced something called the Forestry Program for Oregon. There had been forestry programs before, but they had concentrated on the availability of forest products <supply>. That is, would there be forest to cut? The Forestry Program for Oregon that we developed looked more broadly, not only at trees as a part of the resource to be managed, but animals and <other> resources like clean water and clean air. So, we aimed to look a little more broadly at the question of how you managed and regulated that resource. I'd instance the fact that the first Board of Forestry was made up of the governor and secretary of state and state treasurer. Of course, over the years it had changed, and it was now changing again, under Neil's guidance.

One thing when we first convened as the new Board of Forestry, well, for one thing, you'll note, I had to resign as chair of Thousand Friends board at that time, because Thousand Friends lobbied the Board of Forestry. So, I couldn't continue at that time. Similarly, Barte Starker, who was a forester in Corvallis and who was on the board, had to resign from the forest industry's council then.

But, in terms of beyond the planning, one thing that Tom Walsh had instituted as the first chairman of the new Board of Forestry was that we would not vote, but reach consensus. That proved to be a very successful effort in terms of combining both the public members and the industry members, for one reason or another. Tom suggested that — because the Board of Forestry has some quasi-judicial functions as well. They hear appeals of decisions of the state forester. I was concerned that perhaps that would be awkward, but it never turned out to be, and I found it a very successful way to manage that board. And I continued it after Tom resigned and I was named chair. I know some people think that's just terrible. They want to take notes and count names. [Laughs].

JD: Well, it's interesting as you're talking about some quasi-judicial role, and then there's just very hands on, like how much firewood and where can people go get firewood, individual citizens, and dealing with exportation of logs. It was a wide range of issues that this board was making very powerful choices for the state.

MCLENNAN: Yes, that's true. We adopted wetlands rules. I think it's potentially one of the most powerful boards that I am acquainted with, certainly wildly different from Fish and Wildlife, which mostly sets seasons and bag limits. [Laughs]. That's very important to people who have fishing and hunting licenses.

JD: Do you know if the Board of Forestry is unique across states in the nation, as far as its function and its power?

MCLENNAN: No, it's too long since I've looked at any of those other states. I did sometimes look at what California was doing or what Washington was doing one way or another. At least I have thought that its history and the fact that it started out as a governor, treasurer, secretary of state board was a portion of the reason that it seemed to have acquired so much authority. I'm not sure that's true, but now the challenge that they face today is so much more augmented than when I was there because of the terrible fires of last year. We responded to the Tillamook Forest fires, which were unique in that they happened every six years and they happened in the same general area, Northwest Oregon and Clatsop and Tillamook counties. They totaled about 440,000 acres, and last year we were looking at million-acre forest fires in Oregon, several of them. That portends a very challenging future for the resource and for the board and for governing it.

JD: Well, your mention of the Tillamook State Forest perhaps segues into another chapter of your career, which was with the Tillamook Forest Heritage Trust. If you would, kind of walk us through how you got involved in and what you did with the trust.

MCLENNAN: The idea of having a forest center someplace had arisen, I think not in the Department of Forestry so much as by someone outside. And I can't remember whether she was a legislator or a county commissioner or what, but at any rate, it seemed to be an idea that appealed. So, sometime after I was on the board, I was asked to join a committee to examine this idea. We did, and eventually concluded that we should form a trust for the purpose of raising funds to build such a facility. I think at that time, the group of us that were working on it thought of it as associated with the history of the Tillamook burns and the regeneration of those lands.

It was a pretty long process because after we got that organized and the beginnings of some fundraising, we dealt with choosing an architect, choosing a landscape architect and reviewing design. At some point we had an estimate of costs, and they exceeded our likely abilities. We had to modify a little bit our aims. So, this was a several years project and then construction took a couple

years and the development of the exhibitry and so on. So, it was a fun project, but it consumed about six or seven years. [Laughs].

JD: Maybe talk a little about what the Tillamook Forest Center is and what it does or strives to do.

MCLENNAN: It, of course, memorializes these four — 1933, 1939, 1945 and 1951, four forest fires. Actually, on my honeymoon, I drove through one of the — yeah, that would've been in 1949, that was when I was there. So, it would've been the 1945 fire. We were driving from Portland to Coos Bay. We felt it important also that it represent and characterize the people who lived on those forest lands or near those forest lands, who worked in those forest lands during those years of the depression and the war and immediate postwar. So, exhibitry characterizes that. It also exhibits fish restoration activities and the other concurrent activities in terms of land management that are involved in managing large forest lands. It was designed to have a bridge across the river that flows through there and a fair network of trails. I was reviewing the other day a recent publication of the trails that are now down there. It provides a good deal of a very fine walking activity. [Laughs].

JD: So Janet, I know there's a couple more topics on here that I said if time and your stamina held out we would get to, do you feel like doing a few more topics or are you just kind of ready to be done? You've been talking for about an hour and 20 minutes now, that's a fair amount of time. It's up to you.

MCLENNAN: That's okay, you can go ahead.

JD: Okay. Actually, I wanted to harken back to the 1973 year. You were involved, I think, in a press release that sort of pointed out how few women were on state boards and commissions.

MCLENNAN: [Laughs]. Yes, that came to light when Nancie [Fadeley] first took chairmanship of the House Environment Committee. I think. It came about that though there were about a hundred or more people on natural resource commissions, why only four of them, or five maybe, but no more than that, were women. So, Nancie wrote a press release that sort of chastised Tom McCall for not having looked very carefully at the contribution that women could make. Of

course, she was speaking then from the House Environment Committee that had a majority membership of women, six out of eleven. Tom was very embarrassed by that. And it was interesting because every time a vacancy turned up on one of those boards or commissions in the next few years of his governorship, why that person would be a very well qualified Republican woman. <We followed the same practice after Bob Straub became governor and the imbalance was soon addressed.>

JD: You also talked a little this morning about an interesting redistricting effort that happened back in, I believe it was the 1960s, where people in Eastern Oregon were interested in changing how Oregon state senators were apportioned throughout the state. I thought that was a fascinating piece of Oregon history that I personally don't know anything about and I think would be interesting for you to talk about a bit.

MCLENNAN: I believe that to have been an initiative process, though I don't know that for sure. I don't think that would've come out of the legislature in 1961. At any rate, it was a proposal that would give the people of eastern Oregon more senators per person than <in> western Oregon so that they would end up with more senators than they would ordinarily have had if they got represented only the same number per person that western Oregon senators represented. It was supported by, and I presume that some of the signature gathering as well had been done by the Young Republicans of that age. At least in the campaign, leadership in the Young Republicans were making speeches and so on. It excited the Young Democrats to oppose it. [Laughs].

We did it with the slogan “One man, one vote”, and it was a very modest campaign. We had only probably a couple thousand dollars to run it, and in a statewide campaign that doesn't amount to much. But we were successful at defeating it. As it turned out, the United States Supreme Court in the following spring <in> a case called Baker versus Carr, adopted the same “One man, one vote”, requisite so that never again could you augment the representation of some geographic part of a state in violation of the “One man, one vote” principle.

JD: Exactly what was the time period this was occurring?

MCLENNAN: It occurred in 1962. That is, the campaign did. It would've followed the 1961 legislature, but I don't think that that legislature would've adopted such

a proposal. But it's interesting to reflect on it with the current effort by certain counties anyway, in eastern Oregon to abandon Oregon and join Idaho, where for one reason or another, I guess they believe they will have better representation in the Idaho legislature.

JD: Or in the greater Idaho legislature, I think is the current terminology. I think the final topic from that time, another issue that you were involved in kind of early in your citizen activist era, which was the campaign to abolish the death penalty in Oregon.

MCLENNAN: Oregon has had a good many efforts to abolish the death penalty and some of them successful over the years. Then they've had other campaigns to reenact the death penalty. In 1964 we were responding to a referendum from the legislature to abolish the death penalty. So, it was not a popular effort. It was a legislative effort. For one reason or another, 1964 was a great year for abolition. We had a little bit more money than we'd had on the representation issue, no more than perhaps $10,000. Every one of the statewide elected officials in Oregon was opposed to the death penalty. The entire congressional delegation was opposed to the death penalty. And, obviously, a lot of legislators were opposed to the death penalty. In that year, there was only one district attorney who was in favor of the death penalty, at least outspokenly, and would speak to that effect among 36 district attorneys.

So, the campaign was mostly a matter of getting all these politicians to make a speech or put out a press release that indicated their position. We had very strong support from the Catholic church and from the Council of Churches, and from the rabbinate. Again, they were all opposed to the death penalty. And we had 'One Sermon Sunday', where in <almost> every church in Oregon that day in theory, there was a sermon against the death penalty. I don't know. We had 19 billboards, and I don't have a billboard downstairs, but I do have a bus front, and maybe I should show you the bus front.

We had some volunteered public opinion testing by Reed College students that interestingly enough, identified the fact that people were personally opposed to the death penalty but they also didn't want to be associated with the actual killing. In other words, they liked to divorce themselves from the idea of capital punishment, and probably as long as they didn't know very much about it, they wouldn't rise to the point of disparaging it. But if we could bring it home to them that it was their decision and their doing, that would be making a difference.

This is the bus front, [gestures to the bus front on her lap] the billboard was almost identical to this, except that up in one corner, it said, “You are the executioner. Vote nine no.” With an exclamation point. Some people thought it was tasteless, but it was, I think, quite effective. [Laughs]. However, 10 years later, <there was an initiative, and it went> the other way.

JD: So, go ahead and say that last bit about 10 years later, because there was too much going on while you said that.

MCLENNAN: 10 years later, it went the other way.

JD: So Janet, I don't have anymore — I have two sort of big, broad questions for you that we ask everyone in this project, but I wanted to give you a chance if there was something that you had wanted to say about your career or any of the topics that we were talking about so far that you haven't had a chance to say yet. Now's your moment.

MCLENNAN: [Laughs]. Now's my moment. Well, one thing I think I would take advantage of the time to say is that when I was first named Natural Resource Advisor, I had a call I think, from Emery Castle at OSU. I think he was Dean of the graduate school at that time. He invited me to a luncheon in Corvallis where I would meet with all the different department heads and college heads that had anything to do with natural resources. I did that and the outpouring of their generosity was, “Just call us, whatever comes up and you have a problem, and you need somebody to give you background or some idea of a solution to a problem or whatever, call.” I can't tell you how many times I did that. And, if you remember, Tom McCall’s getting the help in terms of oceanography and the definition of dry sand areas, that same kind of help came to me too. I'm sure it came to him frequently as well. I presume that Oregon State [University] still performs that function. It was just a cardinal help in terms of performing that job. I made good friends with people over there, but I also so much appreciated the expertise and the generosity that it evidenced.

JD: That's great. You've been involved politically as a private citizen in your career in a variety of ways. I always like to ask people why they think politics and or voting are still important in the 21st century? Or maybe they're not. It’s your opinion. [Laughs].

MCLENNAN: You hope they are. In many ways, in looking and reflecting on my career, which in many ways was building on amateur talent and rather modest means, you find today's level of sophistication and level of social media, which probably can be very positive, but can be perhaps equally or even more negative, you wonder whether in today's world, you could have accomplished the things that we accomplished in these last 30, 40 years. Particularly in the early days of those years. I don't know the answer to that question. I'm disturbed about the disinformation that — and I don't understand or play with social media myself, but recent polls say most people get all their political news from social media now, not from the *New York Times* and many people don't have access to even newsprint in rural areas and small communities now.

As a practical matter of course, I lived within my age and my age was you married somebody who'd been in the second World War, you went to work for a year or two, and they went to a graduate school and then you had some children. And 10 years later, you went back to graduate school. I can't imagine how many of my friends followed that pattern, just dozens of them. That is not today's mode. Today, women are matching men or exceeding them in the professional schools in terms of numbers. So, the kinds of activities that all my friends engaged in because they were educated and could help with these undertakings, with building a Mother's Day march to the Nestucca sand spit or whatever you want, most women are not available to do those kinds of things now. I'm not sure how much that's a cost to democracy or not.

JD: Well, and I think this is a little tangential to that, but what reasons would you give to young citizens about why they should consider being involved in politics?

MCLENNAN: Well of course, I don't know whether you'd convince them of this, but of course it's fun. It gives you a dimension of life that is broader. Even in today's world, the interest that anybody would evidence in supporting a legislative candidate or a representative, or senator would be appreciated. In other words, your willingness to distribute lawn signs on Saturday afternoon is noted and gives you access to a class of people that are doing interesting things and who can help you join them in doing interesting things. You can also say that these things are a part of the responsibility of being a citizen and building the fabric out of which democracy is made. But that's not perhaps a good sell. [Laughs]. There is a great deal of cynicism in the world about government and its

distance from the average man. I'm not sure the intensity of the obligation on the part of office holders to try to overcome that distance. We're dealing with increasingly large populations and not many senators have a one on one relationship with their constituents. I think the ideal — the Greek origins viewed democracy as a much more intimate thing than we can possibly enjoy today.

JD: Any other final thoughts before we say *finit*? Are you good?

MCLENNAN: I've enjoyed my life [Laughs] and all these experiences.

JD: It shows. Well, I would say then on behalf of the Oregon State Capitol Foundation, thank you so much for all of your good thoughts and taking the time to record this with us. We appreciate it.

MCLENNAN: Oh, you're more than welcome.