Clay Myers

SR 1168.1, Oral History, by Ellen Nesbitt
Oregon Legislature Oral History Series
1997 October 9-10

MYERS: Clay Myers
EN: Ellen Nesbitt
Transcribed by: Sara Stroman, 2013
Audit/edit by: Sara Stroman, 2013

Tape 1, Side 1
1997 October 9

EN: When you last spoke with an interviewer, you finished with the 1968 campaign. Let's backtrack a year, to January and February of 1967. Tell me something about the land use speeches you gave, about February 1967.

MYERS: Both Tom McCall and I had a deep interest in trying to preserve a sound environment and livability in Oregon. We had been talking since the spring of 1965 or even before about land use. They had scheduled in, I believe it was the first week of February, around the second or seventh of February 1967, the first ever Land Use Conference at Oregon State University, and I was asked to be a keynote speaker. I believe Hector MacPherson was one of the other speakers there at that time also. So I gave a rip-snortin' speech about the need to preserve prime farmland, and also timberlands and our recreational lands and to my knowledge that was kind of the kick-off for land use planning in Oregon.

I continued actively and aggressively in that field, thereafter, speaking at another conference at Portland State and by 1969 or 1970, Governor Tom asked me to chair the major study. So, I chaired with at least 19 members, I believe, on the committee, plus a lot of staff people and other advisors, what was called Willamette Valley Choices for the

Future. We did a two year study and produced a report. We had some, I believe, federal funding, but anyway hired a firm out of San Francisco that also assisted in publishing the report. That was the definitive study that led, during the work on it, initially – let's see, which bill finally passed? Senate Bill 100? Or was it Senate Bill 10?

In 1971 we had a bill that, I believe, narrowly lost. Then in 1973, we got a major bill through. There were a lot of legislators that were most helpful on that. Hector MacPherson, obviously, was the leader, but we also had a Democratic senator from Portland, who was very active in helping to steer that through. It was, probably, a national landmark. Was it Hawaii or Vermont, was the first state to probably do some land use planning, but I believe ours was not only the second, but the most comprehensive.

EN: Tell me about the stopping of construction at Seaside. What was that about?

MYERS: I think that might have been the prior month, and possibly the first month that I was secretary of state. We got a report that there was a developer with bulldozers in Seaside moving sand, which we believed contained clams and other sea life, below the high water mark, and moving it up to extend the spit from Seaside further towards Gearhart, which have, of course, done several negative things: reduced the rather sinuous mouth of the river there between Seaside and Gearhart, which had moved back and forth from the south to the north. Then he was going to build, I believe, embankments and put in a motel or some such structure.

Tom and I were both disturbed. Tom couldn't get down there, so I got a plane with a friend and flew down to Seaside and found that a senator from Astoria, Bill Holmstrom, a Democrat, was one of the investors in this operation and representing the State Land Board of the governor and secretary of state and state treasurer, I was unilaterally standing on the beach telling these contractors and Bill Holmstrom they couldn't do it. I remember the Oregonian, I think, published, I think, a front page picture of me with my finger under Bill's nose or some such thing, saying "You can't do this!" And we stopped the construction.

Needless to say, Senator Holmstrom was never a particular supporter of mine, either before or after that event.

I should mention on this whole land use subject, without going into total detail or all of my experiences in Oregon from childhood that led me to be a land use supporter, that there's a young woman, just finished in the summer of this year, 1997, finished a very definitive set of interviews with almost every person who was involved in land use in the legislature, as well as those who worked on it prior to that time.

Ted Hallock, by the way, was the Democratic senator that I referred to earlier. I had been in his first unsuccessful race. I chaired, at the University of Oregon, as a third party candidate when we ran him for student body president. Ted's a rather outspoken, interesting character, advertising man, who really was just invaluable and worked in a bipartisan way with the governor and the legislature. I was not nearly as involved in the legislative process as I had in 1973, as successful as I had been from 1967 through the preparation of our report in 1972, which was then used by the legislature.

I mentioned to Jim Strassmaier, and I hope he has received, and if he has not, we should have him contact this woman at the University of Oregon, whose name I gave him, who wrote this probably an inch-thick one, of interviews, with Hector MacPherson and myself and the staff people who really did the grunt work, and with all the other key players. Norma Paulus is interviewed. I am, at length. That, probably, would give a better background of my total participation in land use, than the time we might have today to go into it in great detail.

Obviously, there have been challenges over the years since then, defeated by the people every time there's been an attempt to repeal it. I think, at times, it's been abused by some county planners and others. Bureaucracy has a terrible habit of taking the words and not only trying to apply the spirit but sometimes perverting the language of the law in delaying, unnecessarily, adequate and good development. You need a balance, and I remember advocating that from the beginning.

In fact, when we finished the report, I find I'm sometimes quoted, as one of the grandfathers of land use in Oregon, I'm sometimes quoted by the opponents, Bill

Moshofsky and others who have an organization now [Oregonians in Action], where I have said that if you're going to take property, there ought to be some compensation for it. That if someone's had the right to use property for a use and then government later changes it, the private citizens should now be harmed extensively and if they are, then should be compensated for it. As with almost any issue, there are shades of grey in land use planning.

EN: This probably has something to do with land use planning as well, but let's skip to the South Slough Sanctuary and first wetlands…

MYERS: That's down in Coos County area, and the South Slough Sanctuary – good thing it's the morning and we're all sober when you try to say those words – was, I believe, the first federally funded, with state support, on state lands, effort to preserve wetlands. There have been other efforts to preserve wetlands, but it was the first sanctuary of its type. As a member of the Land Board, as state governor and state treasurer, I believe in the days of McCall and Straub when we started this, I end up being really the prime mover in the Land Board, for that sanctuary to be established, and was asked later to be the primer speaker at the dedication of the sanctuary, which has paths and walkways and bridges and a little center there, to demonstrate the value of preserving and maintaining such natural wetlands.

This is another aspect of land use that goes back to my childhood, when my grandfather, prior to World War I, put in one of the first cranberry bogs in Oregon, and in a sense eliminated the natural wetlands by hand building dikes, which did not succeed, because a big storm came in and his first cranberry crop was washed out. I think he then lost the farm, which he later bought back after the war and after his service. Again, you need, obviously, the agricultural lands. The wetlands there, at Sand Lake, were ideal with the peat moss and the peat bogs were ideal for cranberries, but his dikes weren't substantial enough to withstand it. My father later built, years later, rebuilt those dikes, about three quarters of a mile long, to preserve the deeded tidelands that we had for the cattle that he ran. But, as I looked at our family's wetlands and the flooding that occurred,

developed early in life an interest in saying, "What do you preserve? What do you improve? What can be developed?"

Having lived in all five, by the time I was a state official, all five of the congressional districts in Oregon, had a pretty good feel for the different types of lands. Eastern Oregon, the Eugene area, as well as the coast where I was raised, the Portland area where I was born and the [Willamette] Valley where I lived most of my life.

EN: What about the Willamette Walkway?

MYERS: The Willamette Greenway?

EN: That's what I thought it would be was Greenway.

MYERS: Yes, it is the Willamette Greenway, was another Land Board issue that was one in which both Tom McCall and Bob Straub had most of the headlines and really led the effort publicly. I worked behind the scenes on that from the beginning. I think the most interesting story, and it would be, I believe, in Tom's first successful race for governor. He beat Straub both in 1966 and 1970, and then Straub won in 1974 when he beat Atiyeh after I lost in that primary to Atiyeh, so my guess is it would have been the fall of 1966.

There was a guy, Carl Onthank, is one of the real heroes of the Willamette Greenway without ever having gotten much public credit, if any. Carl Onthank was the professor, and later on other staff at the University of Oregon, I first remember – and he was really, in my estimation, the man who developed the idea for the Greenway. I say this with some knowledge and background. I first heard of Carl, I think, from my father, who had him as an instructor possibly in high school in Tillamook, back that the start of World War I. Carl then went to the University of Oregon, had a deep interest in the Willamette River, and I remember, almost as soon as Tom was elected secretary of state, Dr. Onthank proposed to McCall that he should initiate a Willamette Greenway effort.

The irony here is that Tom decided the time to use this idea was in Eugene, I believe it was at the Rotary Club at the Eugene Hotel, and possibly it was to be a debate with Bob Straub. The reason I believe that the secretary of state and state treasurer were debating in that campaign for governor at the time was that I drove Tom to Eugene. We had an interview that morning with the Register Guard, Bob Frazier and the other members of the editorial board. Frazier had been a college classmate of mine, a year or two ahead, very independent minded editor. When we walked in, Tom had in his briefcase his speech, his debate, to propose the Willamette Greenway, and as we sat down for this interview, Frazier said, "Well Tom, what do you think about Bob Straub's proposal this morning for the Willamette Greenway?"

Needless to say, both Tom and Clay were taken aback. Tom had always had a ready retort, and usually a kind one, and he said, "Bob has proposed WHAT?" in effect.

"Well, he's proposed that we establish a state Willamette Greenway."

Tom never said that he had his speech on that subject, and that he had the information before Bob had. He then complimented Bob Straub for that great idea and said, "I will endorse it in my speech at noon today."

EN: What a gentleman.

MYERS: Yeah, real gentleman.

But the irony, of course, was, that I guess Carl Onthank, what I later picked up from other sources, was frustrated that he hadn't heard from Tom for months and months and months about this idea that he'd given him, and Bob Straub was also a friend of Dr. Onthank's, so he apparently must have given the idea to Bob as well. Bob had had his interview with the Register Guard, the newspaper in Eugene, before Tom and I got there.

So, Tom just warmly embraced the idea at lunch, but of course he had studied it so thoroughly, and having planned to present it himself, made it a bipartisan effort and that certainly helped to make it successful.

My later contribution on the Land Board was up here, in Portland, after the Greenway was established and we had developers who wanted to develop down here where the River Place Hotel is, across the street from the Marriott. I'd had an interest in that area for years, in fact I dedicated the Marriott Hotel with young Bill [J. W. Marriott Jr.], who's been president of the board there for years. Since my great grandfather had had a farm across the river from there, between what's now the Willamette River and Ladd's Addition. He used to bring his horses and cattle down there, as kind of a feed lot, before shipping them out from his place up in Heppner Country. Having been born on the Eastside and knowing this area, as a Land Board member I was the one who made the motion where we had to have the walkway. There's where I think you got the question about on the walkway. Someone must have mentioned to you.

I said if these businesses are going to develop residences on the Willamette River, and use, for projections, use docks, use other movement below the high water mark, into the area that the State Land Board owns, and are then going to do upland development, I believed very strongly, that there should be public access to those waterways. So, in return for the right to rent from us, and they had to pay us rent, where ever they moved on the waterway, they would have to build and dedicate in perpetuity for the public use, the walkways along the river. You now can walk or bicycle along a good share of the Willamette Greenway in Portland. So, that was my little contribution to what Dr. Carl Onthank started and Bob Straub and Tom McCall and the legislature implemented with the Greenway.

EN: And what a gift it has been to the people of Portland and those who visit here, as well.

MYERS: Yes, I enjoy very much going down there to some of the nice restaurants and walking there, visiting and seeing all the visitors and tourists that we have.

EN: Well, let's move on, then, next to the Elliott State Forest. Tell me about that and also what Dick Wendt's role was in that?

MYERS: Well, taking those in reverse order, I'm having trouble Dick Wendt, who I believe was a businessman. The Elliott State Forest I can discuss this morning, probably with a little greater knowledge and background.

The Elliott State Forest, of course, was named for a forester. His widow, in fact, later, we found, when we sold our big house in Salem after the children were grown and got one on the Mill Creek, we lived next to the lady who was related, and who had a son named Elliott, after that great forester. But that's tens of thousands of acres, scores of thousands of acres, not too far from the South Slough Sanctuary down in the Coos Bay area, North Bend area. We had a lot of issues. Since the Elliott is owned by the state of Oregon for the benefit of the common school lands, and the income from it goes into the trust fund for the common school lands in Oregon, you got into, early on, into all of the types of discussions that we've found in recent years. At that time, I don't remember any Spotted Owl arguments, but we had the loons on the lake there and the other birds and the eagles that were nesting. We had private lands within the Elliott that had been homesteaded, so you'd have a 640 or a 320 or a 160 quarter section, or whatever. You had the roads that were being built in order to cut the timber, and of course then you'd have the auctions or the sales to the private companies that would come in a cut the timber.

So, without going into all of the details, unless you have some questions on those, I think there are a number of things on the Elliott State Forest, that were fairly early in major state forests: improvements of the lands; protections of the lands; questions of where you build the roads so that you don't do what has been done so often, is having roads built on the easiest places right along the streams, which then clog the streams and hurt the fish. So, you had questions of birds and fish protection, sustained yield on the forest. And, it was one of the early places, where the three of us, three constitutional officers on the Land Board, started blocking up lands.

Among the earliest things I remember as Tom's assistant secretary of state were discussions of potential blocking up, and then once I became secretary of state and he was governor we worked with Bob Straub, and then I worked with later governors and secretaries of state when I was treasurer on the Land Board, but we pretty well completed the trading of other state lands on the periphery or elsewhere with lands owned privately inside so that you could block up and therefore do a better job of managing all the lands. We also increased the fees that we charged, really, for the sale of timberlands and started developing new ways to auction the timbers to try to get more revenue for the common school funds. I don't know that the State Board of Forestry that we worked with, they managed the land for us. We owned it and we had to approve things. We were trying to get the State Board of Forestry to not just listen to the private timber companies, but to actually agree with us in their management with us. We changed the agreements with the State Board of Forestry to do a better job of protecting the lands, managing the lands, enhancing the revenues from the lands.

We did that on the Elliott earlier than we did on grazing lands in Eastern Oregon, and what we really learned as elected officials in becoming what we hoped were good land managers in a bipartisan way, we then greatly expanded into grazing lands in Eastern Oregon and other state lands. You had, what? The number 16 and 36, was it? Anyway, two sections out of every large area in the state had been owned by the state. When you had such dispersed ownerships of sections of land, you needed to, throughout the state, take the state lands, which are much smaller in total acreage than the federal lands or the private lands, to enhance our management and revenues, and improve the lands, we ended up trading with private parties, with the federal government, with others in Eastern Oregon. We found that certainly, looking historically, there had been a lot of raping of the State Land Board in the end of the last century and the turn of this century by private parties that tried to take advantage of their contacts with elected officials on the Land Board. We tried to get away from all of those problems.

Needless to say, you not only have the Elliott and the grazing lands, but you also have all the submerged and submersible lands off the coast of Oregon and under all of the

navigable waterways. I read that there are still discussions going on as to what you should charge people for mooring their boathouses and so forth over state submersible lands. It's a fascinating subject that I spent 17 years involved in, as a person who served on the Land Board much longer than anyone else in state history.

As far as state lands of the State Land Board are concerned, navigability was another major conflict and fight. I don't remember whether I've covered this subject in past tapes or not, but we ended up being involved, on the Land Board, with several lawsuits with private landowners, as we discussed the navigability of the major rivers in Oregon. Any place where you could float logs down, or in effect, float a canoe, was a navigable waterway that was state lands. The McKenzie River was one of the big fights we had. We had a lot of hearings on that river and some others on the coast, because people upstream above a rapid would claim that it wasn't navigable that far up. Then you had to go back into the history and check whether or not lumber companies had actually run rafts of lumber down or had it been considered navigable. We did solve the question, some in court, some by agreement with landowners, on most of the major rivers and the tributaries of major rivers in Oregon on that subject, but this will be a continuing, I believe, problem, even into the next millennium.

Another area of navigability that has plagued the Land Board, since World War I or before, would be the Tongue Point naval station near Astoria. That has been an interesting story, because the state had, in effect, deeded it to the federal government and the Navy, but then felt, when they quit using it, that it ought to be returned to us. So there was a long saga of negotiation...

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

Tape 1, Side 2
1997 October 9

MYERS: Back to state control. Then there were so many different proposed uses for it. Of course, the Astoria community, Columbia County had a very deep interest in producing jobs. We had an interest, on the Land Board, in earning dollars for the common school fund. We negotiated with lumber companies, with Japanese firms, with American firms to bring – one agreement we negotiated was to improve the railroad on the Oregon side all the way down and someone was going to bring trainloads of, I think we had proposals, it might have been [blue sky?] for wheat, but others were to bring gravel down, store it there. I remember going down one time to San Francisco to try to negotiate an agreement with a lumber company to see what we could do in making a major activity there. There had, of course, at one time, even been the use of Tongue Point as a training center for young people.

Having been out of state government for many years, I'm not sure what the final results have been, but I must say that having been a person whose deepest interest are in the human relations area, solving people problems. As I had tried to work on for years, as a volunteer when Hatfield had me on the Welfare Commission, which I covered in a prior interview, I believe, that the land use areas and the Land Board became a couple of very deep activities on my part for the 17 years I was on the Land Board.

EN: Let's move on next to your involvement as chairing a committee on youth when you were secretary of state, and your involvement with highway clean up.

MYERS: Well, there were a number of things the Youth Commission got deeply involved in. There'd been a wonderful group there, of people on the Youth Commission, chaired by a woman from Washington County, I think, named Ruth King. The governor felt that he wanted to promote more - this was Governor McCall right after I became secretary of state, replacing him in that office, and Tom had known about my advocacy of youth for

halfway houses and for training centers, rather than having to incarcerate high school age youth at MacLaren and other things.

This had come about both because of a son we had adopted who needed some help, as well as my father, having been the county judge in Tillamook, not wanting to send errant young people to a state institution who had not committed major or violent crimes. So, because of Elizabeth's and my adoption of two children and having one of our own, with our oldest son having had some behavioral problems, probably, we didn't get him until he was five and a half, almost from birth. A little oxygen deprived at birth, we later found out from Boys and Girls Aid. Tom thought that the secretary of state would have more public attention as chair of the Youth Commission, so he asked me almost immediately after I became secretary of state to chair the Governor's Commission on Youth in Oregon, kept on at my request and Ruth King's request, a number of the most effective people who'd been on the commission and then added quite a few more from different parts of life, including young people.

It was an interesting thing to do in the late 1960s, up until the beginning of the 1970s. We initiated a number of programs. We got involved in some controversies. I remember criticizing the Portland Police for bashing heads at Portland State University during some of the demonstrations, at the time of the murder by the National Guard of some of the students at Kent State in Ohio. Those years are ones that I fondly remember my advocacy of youth, trying to do it in a responsible way.

One of the things that we initiated in the Youth Commission was the – oh, and we also had paid staff. Had a wonderful director that I brought on board, a Dr. Sullivan, lived in Mount Angel and worked with us. He had a great imagination. I think we started 20 or 30 little programs, most of which succeeded, and one of them was looking at highway litter and working with the Highway Department and saying how about taking high school kids on weekends and trying to set an example. So I would travel the state and have high schools lined up in advance, where I would go out and join them with our bags, and we would pick up litter alongside the highways and tie them up and leave them there. It was,

much as some of the other innovations in Oregon that caught on, along with the Bottle Bill and the Bicycle Bill and the Beach Bill: the clean up of litter.

We got a lot of great publicity in the local newspapers. Kids enjoyed seeing their pictures in the paper. They enjoyed helping to clean up their community. That was, in many respects, I think, the forerunner of what's now being done in cleaning up the beaches once or twice a year, in efforts.

The Youth Commission got off into a slew of other activities. I believe, is that the group where we were advocating condoms in high schools, for example? We were trying to develop more responsible sex education. If you couldn't teach people to abstain, at least you could try to teach them not to create unwanted pregnancies. That was kind of a hangover from my days as vice chairman of the State Welfare Commission, where we had worked on voluntary planned parenthood, the first public fund in the nation to advocate voluntary planned parenthood, even, finally, to the point of paying for abortions in Oregon, without the controversy that we see now. I was doing that in the early 1960s, 1962, 1963, 1964, before ever getting into state government, back when I was vice president of a life insurance company and just serving as a volunteer. So a lot of what I had observed on the Welfare Commission that needed to be done with young people in addition to my father's advocacy and mine of alternative types of treatment and care for young people. We worked on the Youth Commission from the beginning to the end of youth ages.

EN: Did you see any problems with the Youth Commission? Or with some of the activities that you?

MYERS: No matter where you work you find, I prefer to call them challenges that need to be overcome, rather than problems.

EN: That's a better wording.

MYERS: Obviously, you get criticized when you start talking about sex education. The old saw that there are three subjects you never discuss: politics, religion and sex. Those happen to be three areas where I spent a good share of my volunteer life working to improve society through politics. In the Church since age 16, in 1943, and more recently in the Church and in government, both in Welfare and the Youth Commission, where I've been working for more responsible sexual understanding and education. Those were probably the most controversial or problem areas.

Obviously, I got into a problem in a few other times, when you're trying to assist the governor, for example, at the time of the American Legion Convention out here with major demonstrations, and being an advisor behind the scenes to Tom on his setting up the park out in Clackamas County for the young people to assemble. You're trying, from a youth protection point of view, to keep from having the youth who are demonstrating violently in other states, and even in this state, you know, where they burned down the R.O.T.C. [Reserve Officer Training Corps] Building at the University of Oregon. How do you deal with those kinds of situations?

A side bar there, unrelated to the Youth Commission, was the request by the state police at one time that I close down, as secretary of state, the State Capitol. It had only been closed down once before. I think Mark Hatfield said to me one time, I think I read it elsewhere, that he was working in the State Capitol in some junior capacity as a student and saw the Second World War broke out. Pearl Harbor Day they closed it briefly. Well, I remember when the secretary of state was in charge of the Capitol Building, as I was, and we were having all these demonstrations and we were going to have a great demonstration on the front steps, and the state police and some people in the governor's office wanted me to have uniformed officers there and lock the doors and so forth. I thought that would be too confrontational. Something, I guess, I've never discussed since was I figured out where you could station a couple of guards without uniforms to permit people to come in to use the bathrooms. I didn't want a bunch of port-o-potties out on the Capitol steps. So how could you avoid locking the Capitol, still permit people to work, but not permit anybody to take it over? So I asked for, primarily people in mufti, not uniforms,

but have adequate security but keep away from guns, at least any that would show and do that. Now that was a little problem that never hit the headlines because it was done very quietly, very effectively without…

EN: And it worked?

MYERS: And it worked. These are the kinds of things that you do to avoid the headlines, and then when you find the Portland Police beating the college students at Portland State about the head and you're chairman of the Youth Commission, you take the other approach and say, "Look, there are better ways to do it than the way you did it."

EN: Let's move on now to a totally different topic. In about 1973 or 1974, according to my notes, Intel came to Oregon…

MYERS: Yes, Intel announced they were coming in January of 1974.

EN: How did that affect Oregon?

MYERS: Well, obviously, it affected Oregon tremendously. Intel is our biggest employer in the state at this point. I'm trying now to remember the name. Frank Consalvo has never had credit for this, and deserves some. In fact, a great deal. He was an officer of Tektronix. Frank had actually worked on, I believe, my 1972 re-election campaign. I later found out in 1968 he supported my opponent, the speaker, whom he knew at that time and did not know me, Monty Montgomery, in my first primary for secretary of state. But Frank had become a friend of mine and had supported me in my re-election in 1972, ad he was the vice president of Tektronix. He called, and I could be off by a month or two, but he called, approximately in the early summer of 1973 and said, "Clay, as you know we at Tektronix are the biggest employer in the state, but we would like to bring in another firm, almost a competitor firm."

I said, “Where are they and who are they?”

He said, “Well, it’s a little company, quite new, in the Silicon Valley,” I’m not even sure it was called the Silicon Valley at that time. He named the town in California. He said, “Oregon is one of about four or five places in the world they’d like to look at, but they have serious reservations about Oregon’s high income tax and about some other subjects.”

I said, “Frank, the governor is the person who ought to be doing the economic development. If they don’t know Tom, I’ll be happy to introduce the president and the executive vice, or the other guy you just named,” he named the top two officers, “that wanted to come up and check it out.”

He said, “Oh no. They won’t talk to Tom.”

I said, “Why not? And why are you asking me?”

He said, “Well, Clay, you’re the only businessman I know in state government and you’ve got number two on your license plate,” I might be paraphrasing that, but he said you’re secretary of state, you’re the second guy in state government. He said, “I want them to meet you because you understand business, you’ve been active in the Chamber of Commerce in Portland,” et cetera.

I said, “What is their objection to meeting Tom McCall?”

[He] said, “Tom, they believe is unfriendly to business. That line about ‘Come to Oregon to visit but not to live’ has them upset.”

I did not bother to tell Frank that I had coined that phrase in different words and Tom had stolen it from me about a half a dozen years before in 1967, when I greeted the National Convention. I think I had discussed this on another tape here in the oral histories, so I won’t go into that. But Tom and I used to steal ideas from each other, and we thought so much alike. My quick memo thought was, well if they won’t talk to Tom because they think he’s unfriendly to business because Tom used my line, I won’t, at this point, destroy the possibility of getting another company by taking credit for the “Don’t come to Oregon to live, just come to visit.” So I said, “Okay, I’ll be very happy as a Chamber of Commerce man, former businessman to visit with them.”

So I had at least three or four visits. I believe the first was in Portland. Then I had them down to my office in Salem on another trip. Ultimately introduced them to the governor after I'd softened them up a little bit. The Intel questions - we're going back now, 1973, that's 24 years ago this fall as I visited with them. But their questions and tentative objections, or problems, all of which we overcame were, and there was more than this, but just summarizing: one, "We need an international airport. Portland's not as big as Seattle. We're looking at the Washington State area. We're looking Southeast Asia for a plant. We're looking at Central America. But in effect, we have some people in our office who think that Oregon might be worth looking at."

I said, "Let me tell you that you'll be better off in Portland. The roads won't be as congested as the Seattle roads to SEATAC. You're going to be able to buy land less expensively. Where are you looking?"

They said, "We're looking, tentatively, out in the Washington County area." I think it was around Aloha.

I said, "Well, don't take our prime agricultural land, but get some spots out there. That would be great. You'll be close to the airport."

They said, "We don't like your tax system. Your income taxes are way too high and your property taxes are pretty high."

My response there was, "The property tax is the only thing you really need to be concerned about. Washington State's will be lower, but the cost of land will be much higher in Washington State. You'll more than make up for it in the savings on the land. Why worry about the income tax?"

"Well, you know, our key executives can get hit," I think it was then 10% at least, "on the top tax."

I said, "Look, you're going to have some people who are your execs who will be happy to get out of the earthquake zone, happy to buy a house at a lower prices than in the Bay Area and would enjoy the lifestyle in Oregon. Most of your employees you're going to hire locally. Let's look at your workforce. If some of your execs who set up the plant, want to come up here and don't want to stay, they can always go back to your office in

California, but you're going to have some who'll want to live here and who will prefer to live here."

So they said, "Well, we understand everybody up here wants too much time off to go fishing and hunting."

I said, "Look, we have a very well educated workforce in Oregon. If anything, our problem is that many of our best educated people end up leaving the state to get jobs. Your opposition, your competitor, Tektronix, wants you here, because they'd like to build another [Silicon] Valley and you can feed off of each other and you can grow." So I said, "With an educated taskforce, all you have to do, for your men at least, is to give them a choice of vacation. You're going to give them at least couple weeks vacation a year. What's wrong with letting them have a week in April at the opening of fishing season and another week in October at the opening of the hunting season if that's what they want? You'll have a better, more stable workforce, less likely to move, because people who live in Oregon love Oregon."

So we discussed the taxes and we discussed the airport. I said, "Your chips are so small." They showed me what they were making at that time. I said, "You don't need a massive airport, you just need a place to quickly ship out of, and we're an international transportation one."

So we covered the taxes. We covered the land. We covered the airport. We covered the workforce. We covered their other questions. Finally, in the meantime, each time I'd see them, after the third or fourth time of meetings and, I think, the second visit to Salem, I had kind of softened them up on McCall by talking about what he was doing in preserving the livability and said, "This is the reason you want to be here, and why some of your execs will want to move here. We've got the livability. We've got the land use laws. We're going to improve the tax situation. What else do you have as things?" At that point, I finally made the pitch. I said, "Look," I might have paraphrased this differently. I said, "I've been an international officer of my fraternity and I remember going once, in 1969 to Ball State University in Indiana, and I was giving a pitch to bring a national convention here for my fraternity, Lambda Chi Alpha. I was greeted at this, with all these college students, with

about a 30 or 40 foot banner hung up in the entryway of the biggest dormitory there in Ball State, 'Discover Oregon, America's Best Kept Secret.'"

I said, "That is what McCall is talking about. You are a non-polluting industry. You're the kind of industry we want here." That was kind of a capstone on all the arguments. I said, "You really ought to meet the governor. He's not opposed to developments. Since he became governor, the rate of population growth has doubled in Oregon. We're not anti-business. We're not trying to keep you away. It was intended as a humorous statement, originally," and I knew that since I'd composed it. Tom had loved it so much he, he grabbed the idea and ran with it. I said, "Let's go up and meet the governor."

Well, I'd also pre-sold Tom to say the right things to them, and that worked out. By the end of 1973, they called me and said, "We've decided to come and locate our next plant in Oregon." I had no idea they'd ever grow to the size they now are. They said, "We want a press conference at the Hilton Hotel in January 1974, and Clay, since you are the person instrumental, along with Frank Consalvo who introduced us to you, would you chair the press conference with us, the president and other top officer of Intel, and announce that we're coming to Oregon and why we're doing it?" So we had three speakers. I kicked it off and the two of them did it, and a great press conference, and that was how Oregon's biggest employer, that's the little known background of how Intel came to Oregon.

The side bar bad news, from my point of view, was that they gave me a lovely watch. Something that I didn't know that they had made, or maybe they hadn't, but it was one of those watches that you don't wind up. It was an early one like the one I'm wearing now from Japan. It was mailed to me after the press conference with thanks. I took one look at this and said well, it isn't something, as Harry Truman said, that you could eat, drink or smoke in one day, or use up, or worth less than $50, so I returned the watch to the president, which must have insulted him, because I was never invited to the groundbreaking.

Well, I'm very pleased Intel's here. They're a fantastic company and it's nice that we've now got the Forest Valley, of the computers, here. Frank Consalvo, by the way, is

now down in Arizona where I spend my winters. But he's the guy who really started bringing Intel to Oregon and I'm the guy that helped him put it together.

EN: Okay, no segue. Just an entirely different subject, I guess. I understand you helped initiate one-stop building permits.

MYERS: Well, we never really got it, but I did chair that state commission. One-stop building permits came later, so we're jumping ahead now, I believe, to another governor. Probably Bob Straub appointed me to chair a committee on one-stop building permits, again, because of my work in the business community.

I don't know why, over the years, Mrs. Nesbitt, I have probably served 12 to 15 times as chairman of committees as a volunteer, unpaid for this extra work both when I was in private business as a vice president of a life [insurance] business, or a state manager of one, or later as secretary of state and state treasurer. Tom appointed me at least four times. Mark appointed me at least two or three times. Straub appointed me. Atiyeh appointed me. Speaker of the house, a couple of times. The president of the Senate, at least once. You know, to chair different committees.

The one-stop building permit came about because of the follow-up to land use planning and the hurdles that any builder or business had to go through. If you wanted to build a new plant for example, or building, you would have to get city approval, county approval, state approval, sometimes federal approval depending on the type of thing you were doing. Every single level of government had its own sets of forms. They all had different wording. They all required different things. It became obvious, after we did the land use planning, L.C.D.C. [Land Conservation and Development Commission] was established – oh, and sometimes you'd have to go there too! You would end up with as many as four or five different sets of building permits. This didn't make sense and people had complained about it and I guess I'd carried complaints to the governor. I believe it was Bob Straub, in a very bipartisan way, asked me.

The reason I say that is I'm sure we were still living in the home we had for over 13 years, that had been Governor Martin's home that he had rented in 1935-1939. We were up at Fir and Lincoln Street, catty-corner across from Willamette University president. So we weren't down on the Mill Creek yet. I moved there in 1978, so it had to be prior to Vic Atiyeh being elected.

I was asked to chair another state commission, as I'd done on land use, as I'd done on Youth Commission, as I'd done on other issues, and put together a committee, held hearings around the state, again as we had done on land use. The nice thing about doing this volunteer chairing of strange and unrelated state committees for governors, are: with the title of secretary of state, you have the imprimatur of state government behind you and when you're appointed by the governor, particularly of another party, why, people listen to you. You can then bring the divergent groups in. We would go out and get people to come in and talk about their headaches, and the problems that they had had in building. I had never been a builder up to that time. All that we had ever done was to remodel old homes that my wife and I liked to buy on the cheap and improve with our own labor and some contractors, but I'd had enough exposure and had enough friends with challenges and problems…

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

Tape 2, Side 1

1997 October 9

MYERS: And our goal and our recommendation. We did get some legislation, or we did get some action. But I don't think it was ever totally implemented throughout the state, but our strong recommendation was to have one form to which all levels of government would agree that their questions would be included, so people could then fill it out in more than duplicate, and submit them almost simultaneously to various levels of government, so that you didn't have yourself blindsided six months to a year later by another level of government coming in and saying something else was required.

It's still, in my estimation, it's far too complicated in Oregon, and as one who has now spent six winters in Arizona and developing homes on some lots I bought down there from the proceeds of selling some ocean view property that I've had going back to 1961 with my mother and my brother, I can say that other areas of the nation do a better job on building permits than we do in Oregon. But it was another worthwhile endeavor to try to simplify government, to try to reduce the bureaucracy and the paperwork.

EN: It definitely was a good idea.

MYERS: I hope so.

EN: Okay, next let's talk about the state hospitals and building chapels there. Give me your view on that, please.

MYERS: One of the things that, as a member of the old Board of Control, which later got abolished, with my help, and that was a mixed blessing, we had some chapels. I remember there was one up at Fairview for the mentally handicapped, or mentally challenged is now the terminology, but there was no chapel at the state hospital. This

seemed very strange, since it was one of the big institutions, and there was no attempt, obviously, to combine church and state. No attempt to raise or to use state money.

As a member of the Board of Control, when I was secretary of state, with the governor and the state treasurer, I felt it was not appropriate to head up such a drive for private funds, myself, but the hospital wanted – the head of the hospital, by the way, who starred in that movie *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest*, which they did at the state hospital, he was a fellow Episcopalian, and was interested in having a chapel there, so it seemed logical to have my wife serve as chair of a private fundraising effort to raise some money to put a chapel in the hospital of a non-denominational sort, that can be used by the patients or even the staff for private prayer or for people to come in from outside to conduct services. That was something that I was very proud of Elizabeth for doing. It followed her work prior to my going into state government, even though we lived in Multnomah County, of her chairing the Washington County Mental Retardation Fund Drives a couple of times, and her work at the Perry Center and her work with Girl Scouts and her work in other areas. Obviously had the support of the governor on that, and we achieved that.

The Board of Control, running all of the state institutions from the time of statehood up until kind of mid-my service in the secretary of state's office, when we got it abolished, was a fascinating human rights experience over and above my other activities that we've discussed with the Welfare Commission or the Youth Commission. In a totally different field than the official duties of secretary of state or, later, state treasurer, but again, it was a great, service on the Board of Control was a great complement to the kind of – and used a lot of the experiences that I had in working on Multnomah County or State Welfare, or in my other activities as chairman on the Governor's Commission of Youth when you're dealing with the state penitentiary, the state correctional institution, Fairview, MacLaren, the former Hillcrest for Girls, the state hospitals in Portland and Pendleton and The Dalles, et cetera.

EN: What about abolishing the Board of Control? Why was that…

MYERS: That – I mentioned a minute ago that I thought it was a mixed blessing, even though I was probably the person most influential in achieving that. You had the three constitutional officers, in addition to all of their other duties. The state treasurer as chief investment officer and on the Land Board and other duties that the treasurer had with the investment council. The governor supervising the whole state really couldn't give that much attention to state institutions. The secretary of state is auditor of public accounts, the only state in the nation where the auditor is also secretary of state, "leftenant," lieutenant governor now – my Canadian friends say "leftenant" governor - and running elections and handling all of the state filings and the other duties assigned to that office. It didn't seem to make much sense to have three politicians trying to visit every state institution several times a year. That it might be better left to the professionals.

You ought not to have politics involved in the management of state institutions, and sometimes the elected officials would be running against each other for the same office of governor: secretary of state opposing a state treasurer, et cetera, or one of them running against an incumbent governor. So it made sense to the three of us on the Board of Control to recommend the abolition of the politicians and to eliminate one of several layers of supervision, and to then also combine, and to try to have better financial management control of the institutions on a unified basis, rather than each of them being their own individual fiefdom with their own head. So we recommended the creation of a Department of Human Resources, in effect, to bring together all of these disparate state institutions and administer them through one group and get rid of the layers of direct leadership of each institution reporting to three elected political officials. We thought we'd get rid of two levels of administration and replace them with one.

Needless to say, my mixed emotions on the subject are because of the greater bureaucracy that was built in the new Department of Human resources. I've learned that sometimes when you cut off a couple of heads of a hydra-headed monster, there's a bigger monster grows with more tentacles, and we might have done that. We got it passed a quarter of a century ago in the Legislature, in the House with a fair margin I remember. I

think we got it passed in the Senate on a 16 to 14 vote, and I believe I was instrumental in the swing vote.

There was a moderate Republican from a reasonably conservative area of Eastern Oregon, Senator Gordon McKay, was a friend of mine and had been a supporter of Tom and of mine. Gordon really raised a lot of the reservations that I have since come to agree with, but he came in to visit with me in the secretary of state's office and, in effect, said, "Clay, these are my reservations. I know you and Tom advocate these, would you please respond as to you why you're supporting the bill." I did. He switched. Senator McKay voted – that was Gordon. There was an earlier Senator Doug McKay, who was later governor, from Salem. But this was Gordon McKay from Bend. Gordon switched, voted for it, gave us the extra vote we needed. The Board of Control was abolished. The Department of Human Resources was established.

In retrospect, I'm not sure that was one of the stars I would like to have in my state service crown to be remembered as a major contribution. I would rather talk more about land use and welfare reform and Youth Commission and election law reform and audit reform and investment improvements and a 101 other subjects. But we did it. The Board of Control no longer exists. And it really was an anachronism. I'd still like to figure out how the state of Oregon can improve both its land use planning with that bureaucracy of L.C.D.C., and its human resource services through the Department of Human Resources.

EN: Would you say simplification sometimes…

MYERS: Well, it's the same thing I'm proposing to Democrats and Republicans in Congress right now, since they screwed up the tax reform this summer, on the national level, of 1997. They did a lot of great things that I think - eliminating the tax up to a huge amount on selling your home, and reducing somewhat the capital gains tax to encourage people to turn over their investments, and why do you tax inflation 20 years ago, it ought to be indexed. I've always advocated a simpler, fairer, flatter tax, but I have yet to see one proposed that makes sense. When you try to simplify - what was it, this Forbes guy who

ran for president, wants what he calls a flat tax. Well, what he proposes wouldn't even tax him, and he's a multi-multi-multi-millionaire. It wouldn't be flatter, because people with low income pay, what, their employer and themselves pay 14% or so in Social Security tax, which gets wiped out in the $60,000-some income range. So, in effect, you have a tax reduction when you make more money if you have a flat tax. But people get catchy phrases, and I like simpler, flatter, fairer taxes and I like simpler, less bureaucratic government, but it's in the application that you run into the problems that have to be resolved.

What has impressed me in years past, are the governors and members of the Board of Control that we abolished, or the Land Board, who really worked in a bipartisan way to solve problems instead of the simplistic wrongheaded Bill Sizemores who try to tear down government without understanding it or knowing how to administer.

Sorry, I got off on two sidebars. Federal taxes…

[Tape Stops]

EN: State hospitals. What kind of changes did you see or participate in, concerning Fairview?

MYERS: Fairview, of course, was where you had people with mental handicaps, the mentally challenged. We used to say mental retardation. When I first started visiting Fairview with Tom, and then we would also go up to the state hospital in The Dalles and Pendleton, and you also had many of the people with the same challenges there, I was so impressed with the loving attentiveness that these people would pay to you. They would follow you around. They would hold your hand. They loved Tom McCall, big and imposing figure and he would hold their hands and walk with them and so forth. You would find different levels of abilities and it seemed to us that many of those people, just as we used to incarcerate many people in the state hospital for life who could live out in the community – we've probably released far too many and that's why you have so many homeless people

on the streets now with so many problems. So, again, the pendulum sometimes swings too far, but at that point it was obvious to us that many of these people did not have to be incarcerated for life in the hospital at Fairview.

I remember speaking at the chapel some years later to the first graduating class of Fairview students who were going out to get jobs in the community, and just as I had worked for halfway houses for youth and ranches for them, and worked for halfway houses for those released from the penitentiary and the correctional institutions, so that they wouldn't just come out with $50 and have to commit another crime to live, they could move into a halfway house; it seemed that we should do that with those with manual, dextral abilities, with enough knowledge and ability to care for themselves, dress themselves, clean themselves, to work at some jobs. I worked aggressively to establish such halfway houses.

I remember giving a dedication speech at the first one in Northwest Portland. One of the young [men] lived there I later ran into at the Multnomah Club and he was working in the kitchen and he was just as happy as he could be. He had a job. He was self-supporting. The state was no longer supporting him. He would never really be able to live totally on his own, but the joy and the light in their eyes when you see the opportunity to learn to work. We had other places where they would manually assemble wooden products, metal products, do other things such as that. That's really one of the great joys in my public service, is remembering the reforms that we brought about at Fairview and the people we were able to return to productive lives and much happier lives in society.

EN: What would you do with those folks that we find out on the street now, that probably, when you mentioned the pendulum had probably swung too far?

MYERS: Well, it's like anything else. We too often, to solve a problem, go too far in the other extreme. What I have tried to do, is to work, primarily, with churches, for those people. I think when we – Liz and I, in recent years, lived in New York when I was working with J. P. Morgan. Our poor little parish in Ardsley, New York, St. Barnabas, we would drive

down every Friday night with coffee, and I can't say that we did it every Friday night, but our congregation did, at this poor little congregation. One our great joys was taking coffee and blankets and socks and clothing and sandwiches to distribute on the steps of the very wealthy Episcopal parish, which was not doing anything for the homeless, St. Thomas's Church in New York. We were kind of rubbing salt in the wounds of our own church.

I think of what we did at Trinity Parish, a very wealthy congregation in New York of which I was not a member, but it's the only Episcopal Church that I'm familiar with where you did not have to be a member of the congregation to serve on the vestry. I had seven elected terms on the vestry of Trinity Church Wall Street. We had homeless programs. We built a facility to house 100 people at night right next to a very fancy exclusive restaurant, which sued us and tried violently to keep us out of the neighborhood. Once we worked with them to not have people on the streets, to have them, when they came to our housing facility, to have them come into the facility and not stand out around the restaurant, the restaurant then became so impressed, after they lost their lost their lawsuit and we built our facility, that they then started giving their surplus food to us to feed. So that was an ironic, great turnaround of a New York City business.

Trinity Church also, prior to that, my son, who was at Trinity before I was elected to the vestry, when he moved back from Tokyo with the firm he was with, used to spend one weekend a month, where up in the upper reaches, you can't really call it an attic, of the oldest building in Manhattan, St. Paul's Chapel, owned by Trinity Parish. They could accommodate 14 or 50, whatever the maximum was we were permitted to have in that building. He was primarily there to make sure nobody burned the place down. Magnificent old church structure that George Washington had worshipped in.

Almost every activity I've seen that's been successful has been church or community generated. I encourage those, while I bewail the lack of governmental units, in most cases, to do what we used to the other extreme: incarcerate too many in state hospitals. I think I touched on this, maybe in a prior interview, one of my early visit to state hospitals with my then assistant, George Bell, was to find out that their own clothes were taken away from them and they were issued muslin underwear and things that were very

poor to wear. We saw one guy at the state hospital wearing two boots both for the same foot, and they weren't the right size. Just as I had worked, again with George, we worked on the Board of Control to give showers more often to the people in the state penitentiary, so we worked to get the people in the hospital to wear their own clothes, to try to restore their common humanity to them rather than making people feel they were just…

EN: They were a prisoner.

MYERS: Yeah, a prisoner. Another cog in a big machine with no rights. So almost anything you could do to encourage people to fend for themselves, and help those who cannot to at least have the minimum basics.

My biggest problem today is with panhandlers. You never know whether they're making more than you are by panhandling and using it for tobacco and liquor or whether they're really deserving. So, my approach has been, every Christmas, give some money to the clergy people at the Church to use for their discretionary funds, so that hopefully they will know where the needs are.

There are a variety of answers in effect, Mrs. Nesbitt, that people can, you know, you can do. Government's not the panacea, the answer for everything, but I think it ought to be used where it can be the most effective answer and where there is a great community need that cannot be solved by others.

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]
[Tape 2, Side 2 BLANK]

Tape 3, Side 1

1997 October 10

EN: Who introduced you to the Episcopal Church and how long ago was that?

MYERS: Back when I was changing my political affiliation and deserting my family's reactionary Southern Democratic background, as well as their fundamentalist, narrow Protestant background, I was looking at churches and I looked at, with high school classmates, I looked at the Methodist and Presbyterian Church. With neighbors next door, Seventh Day Adventist, one around the corner, Mormon. My cousins, Roman Catholic. I even went to an Orthodox Church. I was trying to find what I really believed to be the faith that I could accept and practice and follow.

I had a tall, slender gal from Washington High School, I believe, I was at Benson, named Nina [Lange?]. Nina was what she was called then. Her name, I guess, was actually Alicia. Nina Lange asked me one time, when she heard from neighbors or from me that I was visiting different churches, "Why don't you come down to St. David's Episcopal Church?" It was then down at about 12th and Belmont, I think between Belmont and Morrison. An old stone church, drafty, cold. I went to church with Alicia and met this interesting couple, the priest and his wife. He was a short, stocky, red-headed Irishman named Leslie DeVore Dunton. I think Father Dunton later died in Corvallis many years later, but this would have been about the spring 1943. By the end of that summer, early fall, I decided I wanted to be an Episcopalian.

It came about because I wanted a church that was historic, but I couldn't accept all the accretions of the Roman Catholic Church, and all the prohibitions of prohibiting priests to marry, when I knew they had married for the first thousand years or so, prohibiting any type of voluntary planned parenthood, speaking in a foreign language and I was pretty sure Christ never knew Latin. I couldn't accept the papacy. My cousins were all Roman Catholic, but it seemed to me that in their denial of women's rights in the Church, going

too far towards the adoration of the Virgin Mary. Then I looked at the Protestant churches, and they seemed to deny the historic episcopate.

Here was a church that said to me, based on the Chicago Quadrilateral, followed a couple years later by the Lambeth Quadrilateral of the late 1880s, there are only four things you have to believe: scripture containing those things necessary for salvation; two sacraments ordained by Christ, you can have more but baptism and holy communion; then you add to that the two creeds, the Apostles' and the Nicene. I've always had trouble with the Athanation but I could go along with the Apostles' and the Nicene Creed; and then the fact that Christ established a church with 12 apostles, 11 of whom accepted Paul later and picked a 12th. They and their successors were the historic episcopate, the apostolic succession, and it seemed to me that you ought to plug in to the earliest Christian church as you could.

Needless to say there were two totally irrelevant things that probably contributed. One, Father Dunton and his wife, and I was 16 at the time, had a nice youth group. Nina and others were in it. They had a cabin at Mount Hood and would take us up skiing. Then one of the brochures I was handed very early was a little one about what is the Episcopal Church and it had a quote from a person, not a relative, but for whom I'm named, a quote from Henry Clay who converted as a Protestant, been raised a Baptist, to the Episcopal Church. He said there he thought there was two things necessary for the preservation of the American government, representative republican type of government. One was the Constitution of the United States and the second was the Episcopal Church.

You put all these things together, and I probably was, at that age, still pretty green and naïve, but it just seemed to me: where else could I find a religious body that was in the Judeo-Christian tradition that was Catholic, Protestant, free-thinking and encouraged you to use your own conscience? So I became a real active, ardent Episcopalian in 1943, was within a few months president of the Episcopal Youth. At the time we had a different name, and I became president of the St. David's group, thinking I was the first Episcopalian ever in my family.

Years later, when I was senior warden and we tore down the old building and started the new one up at 28th and Harrison in Southeast [Portland], what should we do but open up the corner box, that was buried at the cornerstone, and in it was a box, and in it was a list of the vestry in around 1891 [or] 1892 when they built the earlier church, the second one. Whose name should I find in it but my great, great uncle, John Myers, who'd been the banker on the Eastside of Portland and a former sheriff in Clackamas County, and I'm told was responsible for building the first bridge across the Willamette River out in Oregon City. He had moved to Oregon some years before his half-brother, my great grandfather, Henry Clay Myers came out the year after the end of the Civil War. So the irony of thinking I was the first in the Church from my family, and then finding that, well, my side of the family had always somewhat denigrated Roman Catholics and Episcopalians and Republicans, I found out that my great aunt, Helen Myers Warren, from then Ocean Lake, now called Lincoln City, who collected family history, was very proud of the fact that back in the late 1600s, early 1700s, one of her ancestors, her mother was an Atterbury was Dean Francis Atterbury of Westminster Cathedral, and former Bishop of Rochester in England. So what goes around, comes around. But that's how I got started in the Church, and I've been active now for more than 54 years since that time.

EN: And in that activity, activeness, you've served your local parish, your diocese and the National Church. In what capacity did you serve on the national level? I understand there were some commissions upon which you served…

MYERS: Yes, there have been three commissions back from the late 1960s to the early 1980s in which I served, and then there's been a fourth one most recently. I'm trying to remember, I think I've been appointed to national commissions by at least three presiding bishops. One just died this past summer, from Texas, Bishop John Hines, who I thought was one of the great presiding bishops. Then I was later appointed to another national one by Bishop John Allen. Then following that, by the presiding bishop, who's now retiring, Ed Browning. Then I was elected in 1991 to a fourth national operation.

Those have included the National Church's Commission on Social Responsibility and Investing, because of my deep interest in South Africa, I was appointed by that many years ago. This would certainly go back into the early 1970s, I think. I served there in helping to vote Church owned stock on issues of South Africa divestment and tobacco, and other social issues. How do you try to be responsible in your investment and not encourage, what do you want to call it? Works of war, land mines, et cetera, or whether you want to discourage things that contribute to the death of over 400,000 Americans a year, such as the use of tobacco, or whether you're talking about South Africa divestment, on which I have been wearing different hats on every side, just about, that I can think of, of the issue.

As a longtime person interested in the southern hemisphere and particularly Southern Africa, and in one of my first interviews on this oral history, I went into great deal detail, so there's no need to do it now, about my having lived at age 11 in Southern Rhodesia, now Zimbabwe, when we left Oregon and went down there and came back. That was really the first epiphany for me, over and above my conversion to the Church when I decided - when we came back to the States in the spring of 1939, with that boatload of German Jewish refugees and talking to the young democratic Americans who had fought against Franco in Spain and had been released from his prison. I started looking the next year or two for a new church and some political activities that would best be found, in my estimation, in the progressive or liberal wing of the Republican Party.

I, later, when I became state chairman in Oregon, was able to use my experience on that Social Responsibility and Investing Committee of the National Church, as far as South Africa divestment was concerned. A minute ago mentioned that I'd been on almost every side of the issue. My heart said follow Desmond Tutu's request, and get American companies to divest, get out of doing business with a fascist government. The White Boer, or Nationalist Party, a quasi-dictatorship in South Africa. As state treasurer, which we can discuss next year, I obviously felt a fiscal responsibility to get maximum return for minimum risk, so my business head said it might not be prudent to divest. But as a member of the Social Responsibility and Investment Committee for the National Church, I advocated such

divestment for Church funds, because those were not public funds. I helped write the resolution for that committee, on a number of issues, but with primary emphasis on South African divestment in those days.

Another group I served on in the National Church was this one of 200 on Venture and Mission, when a presiding bishop wanted to raise a couple of hundred million dollars for the National Church for social outreach and other programs.

The third one that had, probably, the most lasting impact on the Church, was to serve as one of 9 people on the Church Standing Committee – Commission. The Social Responsibility and Investing was a committee and Venture and Mission was a group that really never met, but the presiding bishop put together. But the Standing Commission of the Church in Metropolitan Areas had three bishops: a fairly moderately conservative bachelor with reservations about women priests, I believe, from Chicago, James Montgomery; a fairly progressive bishop from Arizona, and I'm trying to remember which of my two friends down there, starting with an "h" it was, whether it was Bishop [Histad?] – no, I think it was another bishop starting with an "h" there, from Arizona, who represented both the metro area of Phoenix plus the rural areas in the deserts of Arizona; and the third one was a very left-wing, wealthy Democrat from New York, Paul Moore. It was fascinating to find that as, from the little community of Salem, Oregon, serving on this National Church commission with those three bishops and with three priests, mostly from metropolitan areas, with two other laypersons, one, a wonderful woman, a white, from Wisconsin, who'd married a black later, from Mississippi, and she moved from Wisconsin down to a farm in Mississippi, and Clay Myers from Oregon and one other layman. The nine of us were dealing with all kinds of outreach problems in metropolitan areas and how could the Church be more effective there.

When I mentioned Paul Moore as being probably the most interesting of the other eight members that I worked with, he and I both looked at each other, of course, initially somewhat askance. I was a state elected official Republican from Oregon, and his brother was president of the Bankers' Trust in New York, and he has a big trust fund that he helps to administer from his father, probably Moore Trust. We just didn't think we were going to

resonate, but we did. We ended up deciding, contrary, I think, to his initial beliefs, thinking that we could go to Washington and get the federal government to help in a lot of these social issues of the homeless and feeding the hungry and other things that we were concerned about, that he finally came to the conclusion, and I was an ardent supporter of this concept, that we should encourage social outreach through the local congregations. The two of us were really the mover and seconder – and I'm now trying to remember the name of this program. Let's see, there's one where you forgive all debts every…

EN: The Jubilee Ministry?

MYERS: The Jubilee Ministry. Bishop Paul Moore and I were really the godparents of the Jubilee Ministry, along with a priest, then from Connecticut, who's now an arch deacon in New York City. Paul moved him to New York from Connecticut, first to be rector of a church in Westchester County, where I later lived, St. James the Less in Scarsdale. This priest went then from St. James the Less to be an archdeacon in the Diocese in New York. But years before that, when he was from Connecticut, and I just served with him this past summer, July of 1997, on the Social and Urban Affairs Committee at the National Church Convention. I guess the three of us were the ones who kind of put this together. I would give the priest most of the credit for having the idea, and Moore and I for getting it through the committee, because this gave us a bishop, a priest and a layman. We decided the way to handle these problems is getting the Church to establish a Jubilee Ministry. So, if you leave a few good works behind you, I hope that's one of the ones that I've contributed to that will have the greatest impact in the United States in many areas. But those were my three National Church committees and commissions since my first general convention in Seattle in 1967.

Most recently, I retired just last month. Had my retirement dinner in New York. For six years of volunteer work, they gave me a little piece of glass, but it does have a nice name on it from Upstate New York, Steuben. So I have a little piece of Steuben glass with my name and the Church seal on it and my years of service on the Church Pension Fund,

and that is what I've been doing as a volunteer from the summer of 1991 at the Phoenix Convention of the National Church, 'til I retired mid-September, the 16th was the night they had the dinner for me and some others retiring from that group. Needless to say that's been another exciting experience, the volunteer contribution. We had been running the six major corporations of the Church, affiliated with but not dominated by, not run by the National Church Headquarters at 815 2nd Ave.

The Church Pension Group is a separate group of corporations, so I'd been one of 25, the president plus 24 elected. We hire the president. The Church Pension Fund administers – when I went on it wasn't half this size, but it's now about $3.3 billion of pension funds for clergy and widows, or spouses and children. We run the Church Hymnal Corporation, which changed its name this last summer to the Church Publishing Company. We have, what, 160, 180, maybe more titles that we publish, the prayer book, the hymnal and a lot of other religious publications. We have the Church Life Insurance Company, of which I've been a director for six years. The Church Insurance Company, which is the fire, casualty, liability end of the business and was one of our earliest insurance companies. There, of course, we have to deal with hurricanes and fires and floods and other catastrophes, and in recent years, the liability of bishops or priests accused of sexual misadventures. We paid out $1,000,000 in the case of one former bishop in Denver who then became head of a conservative seminary in Pennsylvania. We also have the Church Major Medical Company and the Church Real Estate Corporation.

Three or four years ago we relocated our offices from 800 2nd Ave. to 445 5th Ave. Bought most of a downtown office building at 39th and 5th and we're saving the Church hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in cost, because we got away from renting, bought a building from Connecticut Mutual Life that they had taken in on a foreclosure. Got a great deal there and the properties are now appreciating nicely. One of the little side advantages there was we got out of a building where there had always been security threats. The Israeli Consulate to the United Nations wanted to take over our floors of offices for their expansion, and you couldn't get in or out of that building, practically, without being frisked. One of my fellow trustees, a wonderful Lebanese retired judge in New Hampshire, of

course, looked Arab and he has served for at least 15 years on the Church Pension Fund Board, and always had trouble trying to get into meetings in that building.

There are 1,001 stories about that group, including one of my predecessors, Margaret Truman Daniels, who had retired just, I think, three years, or six years, before I was elected to the board. And some of the other great people we've had on that board. For me, the Church has been, really, my anchor to windward for 54 years. Really, it means more to me than the state of Oregon or the Republican Party or my fraternity or a lot of other activities.

EN: You've seen many changes, especially, probably, in the last two decades, in the Church, issues concerning gays and divorce and marriage and termination of pregnancy issues. Would you comment on one or…

MYERS: I would add women priests to that as well, and some others.

The greatest changes, for me, have not been those that you've listed. They're the important ones in the last generation or so. But for me, the great change has been to see the Church move away from its old reputation. When I say the Church, I'm referring here, of course, to my branch of it, the Anglican/Episcopal part of the Catholic faith, Universal faith.

When I first became an Episcopalian I did not understand all the ritual. I came into the Church as a rather militant low churchman. I ended up serving for seven elected terms on the vestry of the wealthiest parish in the world, Trinity Church Wall Street, with all of its incense and stained glass and wonderful organ and fancy robes. So, I've watched the Church move from what we used to refer to in my youth, as being split three ways: high and crazy, low and lazy, or broad and hazy. I kind of went from a low and lazy to a broad and hazy, and finally recognized the value even of the ritual and high churchmanship without ever, I hope, becoming crazy. So, I belonged to five out of the six groups in Church practice or ritual.

But the great progress has been made, and I go back to my days at St. David's, where I served at least three terms on the vestry, at least a dozen years, and twice senior warden, I believe. I was senior warden at the point we were building the new church. We used to argue over the most stupid things. If you're building a new church, are you going to have gold carpet or red carpet? Are you going to split the choir on either side as you go up to altar, put the choir behind the altar where you have to look at them, or stick the choir up over by the north exit, the entry and having them sing over your from behind, which I think, sound-wise, is probably the best? None of this has anything to do with the faith of compassion, serving your fellow men and women, trying to do the things that Christ taught us to do. These are the peripheral things.

Now, when I take, as I did last Sunday, take a young 26 year old Democratic state representative to the Episcopal Church for the first time in his life, he'd never visited one before, a Roman Catholic, that I helped elect to the legislature last year against a friend of mine of over 50 years, standing Bill Moshofky, because I thought Moshofky was a little too reactionary on land use. So I'm out helping Ryan Deckert get elected, first Democrat ever in that district, Washington County.

Before we got there, I said, "What is your interest in going, because, over my life, I probably helped to bring 50 or 100 people into the Church, but I don't want to do it just to convert them to the Episcopal Church, I'd rather have them be happy Unitarians, Roman Catholics, Mormons, or Baptists, than be unhappy Episcopalians. But, if they are going to be happy Episcopalians, that makes me happiest." I said, "Well, now, really, let me ask you why you're doing this."

He said, "Well, Clay, I got terribly upset this past spring when I got a call from the cardinal in Chicago telling me how to vote on an issue in the Oregon Legislature." He said, "My conscience has made me believe in right to choice. I'm against abortion, but I'm for women's right to choice. My conscience," and I'm paraphrasing a little, "tells me to support Death with Dignity, and when the former archbishop of Oregon, who was promoted to cardinal in Chicago calls me and tells me how to vote, that's not my concept of a faith." He said, "Your church seems to be a Catholic church, et cetera, but with more of a free

thinking, being able to use my conscience approach." And I am paraphrasing. Those are not his precise words.

I said, "Do you have any questions before we go to church on Sunday?" That was last Sunday, the fifth of October, 1997.

He said, "Well, I only want you to assure me of two things. I'm not going to see a bunch of people wildly waving their arms in the air and talking in tongues."

I said, "No. I don't think you'll get that. At least, not at St. John the Baptist." That's not my parish here, I go to St. Andrews in North Portland, which is closest to our home. But my prior parish, when we lived on the near end Westside, had been St. John the Baptist out by Portland Country Club.

Young Ryan said, "Oh, that's wonderful. I live next door. I walk there in three to five minutes." So I was pleased to introduce him to the Church. Well, that's getting off the question of what changes I've seen, but what impressed him was we had, not only the wonderful dean, Roy Coulter, doing the preaching, but we had a wonderful woman priest at the altar. He wanted to know if he could receive, and I told him he certainly could receive the Eucharist. He was so excited to see a woman priest there and being able to receive from her, and the openness of the Episcopal Church.

So, going back to your question of three or four minutes ago, changes, yes. In my estimation, they've all been for the better with one or two exceptions. I voted for the new prayer book in 1976, but I loved the language of the old 1928 prayer book. On the other hand, if you're open-minded, and if you're trying to find and discover the basic faith – when I talk to people who leave the Church or want to found a new church because the prayer book of 1928 was a gift from God, I become a little facetious and say, "Oh, you're absolutely right. I was one year old at the time, and I remember when Christ wrote it." You know, some people take the minutia of the Church so seriously. I try…

[End of Tape 3, Side 1]

Tape 3, Side 2

1997 October 10

MYERS: When you have someone, such as Ryan, joining you at church, as scores of others have done with me, I really try to not be vulgar when I use some examples, or some analogies, or some stories, at least not too often. I try to understand what it is people are looking for. Having introduced to the Church a former Presbyterian who left his church, is now a retired chief justice of Oregon, probably my best friend, my former lawyer. I think of next door neighbors, one of whom was Mormon and one of whom was Jewish. Dozens of other people from different backgrounds. Yet, I've sent many more people back to their own church or tried to help them find another one other than the Episcopal Church if they don't care for the ritual or some of the things that they find in the Episcopal Church.

Your basic question was: what changes have I seen? We've gotten rid of the minutia, largely. We still have some disagreements on the ritual, but I love belonging to a bridge church, the old via media, the middle ground between Catholicism and Protestantism, where you try to embrace the best of both.

Then, I guess, side bar, I am one of those who does not slam the door in the face of a Mormon or a Jehovah's Witness who rings the doorbell. I much prefer to welcome them, talk to them, try to convince them that I already have a faith of mine, and without trying to be as converting as they are I started asking little questions to see how much they really understand their faith. You know, what bible do you use? They usually say King James, and I say, "Oh yes, that's the one my church produced at the beginning of the 17th century. If you accept the King James Bible, why don't you accept the trinity?" If they say there's only one god, I say, "Absolutely, I'm in total agreement with you. Are you, sir," in the case of the Mormons, or ma'am, usually in the case of the Jehovah's Witnesses, "Are you the son or daughter of your parents? Are you the husband or wife of your spouse? Are you the mother or father of your children? Oh? So you're three people. You're not one person." I use these kinds of examples, and when they get so literal about a god that they think is in human form, I haven't yet gotten vulgar enough to say to them, "If men and women are

created in the image of God, and therefore God looks like us, how long is his penis and how big are his breasts?" People just get to be so damnably, narrowly literal.

I got so upset this past summer at the National Episcopal Church Convention with some of our extreme right wing Bible bigots who were talking about forming another church because we have women priests and we have a new prayer book and we're trying to be loving of all of God's children, including gays and lesbians, I said, "You know, you're perverting the scriptures of the New Testament and you're perverting the words of Jesus. You've become a textual deviant. Don't just take a narrow text and try to change all the rest of scripture to fit into it."

So, I guess at age of a little past 70, I'm getting to the point in life where I believe more firmly than ever what I do believe. I'm more accepting of other people's differences, as long as they don't try to force it on me or others, such as the Roman Catholic Church is, again, trying to do in Oregon on Ballot Measure 51 this next month. And, if people are really looking, then I try to introduce them to what I think is the one true Holy Catholic Apostolic Church with an Episcopal label, but without claiming all right for us, the changes that you asked me about.

Marriage, I remember writing my father a letter a couple years after my wife and I were married and he was going to divorce my mother and I said, "Well the Church doesn't accept divorce and remarriage." I've become a little broader since then. In 1973 I voted for the remarriage of divorced people at the General Convention of the National Church in Louisville.

I used to question the role of women in the Church and wondered if my support of women priests early on in the 1950s and 1960s was more politically motivated because of my activity on behalf of women's rights. Studied that issue for about six years and started working for it. First, in my first General Convention in 1967 in Seattle. My, forgive the, maybe it's an intentional pun, my maiden speech at the National Convention of the Church was for women's rights to serve on vestries and attend general conventions, to be deputies to general conventions. I gave a one minute talk and I was one of only three speakers in favor

of it. I was so pleased when it passed. In retrospect, I was probably pleased for the wrong reasons, political included, as well as the right ones.

A priest in Oregon kind of rubbed my nose in my joy of some of the measures in Philadelphia in 1997 when, about the fourth time that I sat down after giving a speeches on the floor of the convention and I was being very happy that we had carried another measure, another resolution, he says, “Clay, we’re here to serve God and do his work and you ought to rejoice for the spirit moving you, not for winning a ballot measure.” I’m probably misquoting Father Jim Boston from Grants Pass a little on that, but in substance, that was what he intended.

My activity on behalf of women clergy continued. First you get women have the right to vote in the Church. It took a century too long, but we got that in 1967. In 1970, I believe it was, in Houston, I remember voting for women deacons, not just a perpetual diaconate, but women deacons as the first order of the three orders of the priesthood: deacons, priests and bishops. In 1973, I thought we were going to get women priests and lost a maneuver on the floor of that convention when I challenged a wonderful presiding officer, later bishop of Massachusetts, he was then the rector of St. James Church on the Upper Eastside in Manhattan and he was the president of the House of Deputies. He ruled - and this is an arcane subject too detailed to go into on a tape like this, but for anybody who wants to study it they can get Episcopal Church’s Constitution on how you vote by orders.

In a vote by orders you have four priests and four laymen, or laypersons, on the floor of the House of Deputies and a divided vote is when you split two and two. Divided votes in a diocese, in either order, are considered a negative vote. So you really need to get a 60 to 70% vote in order to get anything passed if they have a vote by orders instead of a voice vote or standing vote. He ruled that you could require a two thirds majority on a vote by orders. So we had a good majority for women priests, but it got defeated when they called for a vote by orders. I challenged it, asked to overrule to chair, probably was not dramatic or explanatory enough in my arguments to prevail, and you very seldom can

overrule the vote of a chair when he's as popular as that clergyman was. We lost it in 1973, but we prevailed three years later in 1976.

As an Oregon Episcopalian, one of my great disappointments following the 1973 convention in Louisville, Kentucky was meeting a man who later became bishop of Oregon and who told me in Louisville that he favored women priests, but when he was elected bishop of Oregon he apparently - I don't think he sold his soul but he certainly sold out on his promise to me, when Matthew Bigliardi then opposed women priests. He was then the rector of a church on an island up in the diocese of Olympia. By the next convention he was bishop of Oregon.

At that time, I was so ardent in my support of women clergy, that I became one of 20 sponsors in the National Church, clergy and laity in the House of Deputies. We prevailed at the Minneapolis Convention overwhelmingly in the House of Bishops, very narrowly in the House of Deputies, but again, we had to get a two thirds vote. We had to get a vote by vote by orders, which required, even on a majority vote, with a divided vote counting "no," it really required a two thirds or more vote to prevail. I think we only had a couple or three votes extra. I, again, opposed, this time, the Oregon clergy, all three bishops voted "no" in the House of Bishops, but they were greatly outvoted and we prevailed in the House of Deputies.

I remember afterwards stepping back outside and having my student chaplain at the University of Oregon, my suffragan bishop of Oregon, Hal Gross, who had given an impassioned speech against women priests in the House of Bishops which I had rebutted, because I watched him on the television on the hall, I rebutted, in the House of Deputies, his argument, and we had the then dean of Oregon, Bob Greenfield, who's gone to a monastery in recent years in Massachusetts. Bob Greenfield, who had helped to draft the new prayer book but was against women priests. Bob came up and put an arm around Hal and Clay. Hal and Clay – I, at least, had tears in my eyes and he might have too. Bob Greenfield said, really more to Hal than to Clay, "Well, we lost. Clay won. We're all in the same church. If it's wrong it'll, like other heresies, wither and die on the vine. If it's right, it will prevail and we'll ultimately accept it."

So, you know, in the Church, it's just been a great, great experience for me. I've attended nine general conventions, eight of them as a deputy for the Diocese of Oregon, one, in Phoenix, as an observer, in 1991, when I was elected to the Church Pension Fund Board of Trustees. Probably the other issue that most attracted me a generation ago, was how to resolve the question of abortion. What should be the Church's stance when everybody is so polarized? You know, it's right to choice or it's right to life and never the twain shall meet. Well, Elizabeth and Clay Myers have been on every side of that issue. In our lifetime, it's much like the South Africa divestment question.

With divestment, it was which hat was I wearing? Was it my church hat and my heart? Was it my state treasurer's hat and the funds of public employees? Or was it as a member of the staff and officer of J. P. Morgan trying to help public funds get legislation passed that could express our outreach against a fascist government in South Africa without having to hurt their pocketbook on their investments?

So, just as I wore three hats, depending on my responsibilities, but without every changing my beliefs on divestment of South African investments, so on the question of termination of pregnancies, or prevention of it. Elizabeth and I have been on every side of that issue. We met in 1954, were married in 1955, and we were both very successful at that time. I was running a program for Connecticut General Life, nationally. My wife was an editor of *My Weekly Reader*. But both of us had been travelling and spending money, hadn't saved much. Even had to sell most of my stamp collection, at least my mint stamps, to help pay for our honeymoon, and she sold some things of hers. So, we didn't want a child in the first year. So we go to our doctor in Connecticut and say, "Would you please tell us the best methods of voluntary birth control?"

He said, "I can't."

"Why not?"

"Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, all have had laws that prohibit the dissemination of birth control information."

My statement was, "How stupid can this government be? Why?"

"Well, the Roman Catholic Church is opposed to any form of birth control and they've gotten these laws passed in these heavily Roman Catholic states."

I said, "Well, how do we get the information? We don't want a child in nine, 10 or 11 months! We do want children, but not that fast."

He said, "Invite me to a cocktail party, and we'll have a philosophical conversation."

We moved to Oregon the next year, having utilized a recommended form of birth control, and decided, since I'd been promoted and was back in home territory, that it was time to start a family, because we had a combined age of almost 62 years when we were married and Elizabeth, the next year, was in her mid-30s. It was time to start a family, and we didn't get pregnant. So at this point, we have a wonderful doctor who is a Roman Catholic, and a dear friend of ours, we go to him and say, "How come we're not having children, now we're trying?" He gave us all kinds of tests. My sperm count was, I think, triple the normal so there shouldn't have been any problem, but there turned out to be a little plumbing problem. He just suggested we keep trying.

The following year we still weren't pregnant, so we went out and adopted two children. Had to wait about 18 months. Found out it was because the adoption agency, Boys and Girls Aid, had siblings, natural brother and sister, that they'd had in mind for us from the day we walked in and had to get them released by the natural parents before they could put them up for adoption. So we waited a year and half, I think, from the time we applied 'til we adopted and got a five and half and a four and quarter year old, simultaneously. Of course, you know what happens then, you get pregnant and you have a child.

So, having been on the side of wanting voluntary planned parenthood information, wanting next to get pregnant and having it be delayed in the family, then going through the adoption and picking up unwanted children, and then having one of our own. So, three children in 17 months, with the oldest one starting kindergarten five weeks after we got him, was quite an experience. That would have been about 1958, August of 1958. Our baby was born in January of 1960.

At this point, Mark Hatfield asked me to on the Welfare Commission of Oregon. I know I'm getting off the track of the Church, but it's leading up to this termination of pregnancy resolution. I've told this part of the story before on my Welfare Commission service. My first meeting of the Welfare Commission, I proposed – and this would have been the summer of – I served a year on the Multnomah County Commission. Hatfield appointed me there, but it was my first year on the state commission a year later, probably the summer of 1961. I proposed the first voluntary planned parenthood information being furnished to welfare women, welfare mothers. I've mentioned before this wonderful Roman Catholic doctor who was chairman of the commission, who felt he couldn't vote for it, but knew it was right, so he abstained. I got it through with no negative votes. The next year, we started, by 1963, furnishing materials and supplies and by the next year we were paying for abortions for welfare mothers, and without the storm that you have today. I can't believe a third of a century later there's so much controversy over something that we knew how to handle in Oregon in the early 1960s.

So, by the time I became a deputy, 1967, 1969, 1970, 1973, 1976, my fifth general convention in Minneapolis in 1976, I had already served a couple of times before on the Social and Urban Affairs Committee, that handles all those non-controversial subjects such as gun control and abortion and gay sex and so forth, you begin to learn there's nothing foreign to what you end up discussing in the Church. I ended up chairing the committee at that convention and we had at least eight or 10 resolutions on abortion, we had at least 12 or 15 on gays, we had them on all these other subjects. But at that point, the really hot issue was going to be termination of pregnancy. The Church had faced the question once before in 1967, or had a resolution passed once before in 1967 in Seattle, which, in effect said that only in cases of rape, incest or saving the mother's life was the termination of pregnancy permissible.

I had, I believe, 37 members of my committee almost equally divided between people who thought they were right to life and others who thought they were right to choice, and about a third of us who were saying we really should see what the Church's

position ought to be. You know, will the spirit move us in a direction that can resolve this question with people so polarized?

So, as chair, I made the following announcements – and I'm probably not giving all of them and I'm probably, again, using a term I use too often, paraphrasing, because when 30 years later you're trying to remember what you said, it's a little difficult to have the precise words. But, in effect, I said, "Ladies and gentlemen, this convention will run another 10 days after we organize. We have to get the resolution out within eight or nine days. We can't put it out the last day, so we probably have to finish within about eight days. We have to listen to everybody who wants to testify. These will be the rules unless this committee overrules me. As chair, I will not express an opinion." I certainly had them, but I felt I should not. "We will listen to testimony. Nobody will be permitted to speak more than two or three minutes apiece. Maybe three minutes to start and towards the end it'll be shorter. Nobody may speak a second time. No one may, until anyone who wants to speak has spoken a first time. We will not have two people from the same side speak one following the other. We will alternate speakers, pro and con, on the subject of termination of pregnancy. We will listen kindly to each other. We will hope the spirit moves us. We will not attack anyone. If anyone gets too obstreperous, they will be expelled from the meeting and not permitted to speak again. And, we will try to arrive at a committee conclusion that will represent what ought to be the Church's position, not our personal prejudices or predilections. Let's go."

We had to handle some other committees, so we didn't do all day, every day on the abortion question. We never used the word abortion. By about the seventh day, we had reached an almost unanimous conclusion, which to my knowledge has never happened before on that subject anywhere with people of diverse backgrounds and opinions. We then voted unanimously for a resolution, after further discussion.

We then had a somewhat similar resolution passed by the House of Bishops, but not exactly on point, so the two houses got together and appointed three people to work out the differences. A "cognate committee," so to speak. One bishop, one priest and one layman, Clay Myers. The bishop wouldn't vote for the priest for chairman, the priest wouldn't vote for the bishop for chairman, so Clay became the chairman of this three

member committee. So, in a sense, I'm the godfather of the Church's national position on termination of pregnancy, which, in effect, and I'm not quoting it because I don't have a copy in front of me, but in effect it said, "Life is sacred. It's a gift from our Creator. It's not to be taken lightly. The question of termination of pregnancy has arisen. In 1967, in Seattle we said it was only permissible in cases of rape, incest or saving the mother's life. Now we're faced with the problem of the parties involved." We included the male. "The parties involved wanting to terminate pregnancies in other instances, or wanting to consider it. In all cases, anyone should get medical advice. If they're members of our church," I think we used maybe a different terminology: "if they're members of our communion, then they should also seek spiritual advice from their pastor. Should they decide to proceed with a procedure of terminating pregnancy, we would hope that it would be cause for repentance, and, God willing, maybe forgiveness, but in no event should the government interfere in personal choice and decisions."

That had the unanimous committee's vote. An overwhelming vote, my recollection was it was at least 80% on the floor of the House of Deputies, overwhelming in the House of Bishops, and that position has been reaffirmed at every succeeding national convention, held every three years, tri-annual conventions, of 1979, 1982, 1985, 1988, 1991, 1994, 1997, with two modest amendments since then. One says you do not use termination of pregnancy, or abortion, for sex selection. We just voted this past summer, that you do not do late-term abortions unless it is necessary to save the mother's life.

So that's kind of a long-winded answer on the question of where the Episcopal Church stands and my participation on the abortion question. And I think we covered the marriage question and the women priest question. I neglected...

EN: And the gay and lesbian question.

MYERS: I neglected the gay and lesbian question.

EN: [inaudible]

MYERS: This is one where, again, I've been involved since the 1976 convention. In 1976, my wife and I drove to Minneapolis. She hasn't gone with me to all the general conventions, but to several of them. Took our son with us to Minneapolis and put him on to a plane to St. Paul's Prep School in New Hampshire, and stayed at a hotel. The same committee, that faced the question of termination of pregnancy that we just discussed, had the gay questions. A number of resolutions, everything from what the gays and lesbians wanted, gay clergy and blessings of gay associations, to the other extreme, almost hang 'em, castrate 'em or otherwise reject them in the church, and everything in between.

We had testimony again and, while I had chaired the committee at most of the convention, I neglected to point out that a wonderful churchman from Arizona, an attorney, Mr. Rocha, had been appointed chair at that convention. He had chaired it before when I had served at prior conventions in Louisville and others, but he had had a quadruple bypass a few months before, following a heart attack in, I think, the L.A. airport. Paul Rocha was not able to preside at the meeting. So, he'd call the meeting to order, and then he would gavel over to me as the vice chair. Paul was presiding when we first faced the gay questions and resolutions. So, while Paul was calling one of the early meetings to order and the gay question was coming up, I was sitting next to a priest from New York who had been in Oregon, had been assistant clergyman at a Portland parish where I'd known him. He was a wearing a pin that I didn't recognize at the time, with a kind of a lavender or pink triangle on it, but some queen comes in, a male in drag, carrying a whole slug of thick publications to hand out to all the committee members, using vulgar language, and the priest turns to me and says, "Clay…"

[End of Tape 3, Side 2]

Tape 4, Side 1

1997 October 10

MYERS: During the next few days and during our trip home to Oregon, I realized, more fully than I ever had, how diverse the gay and lesbian community is, because we had a number of people coming in to testify on every side of the question. We had people damning homosexuals and citing the scripture at great length, some of whom must have been bisexual because they said they were former gays who had been converted, some of whom really didn't want any homosexuals recognized and didn't even really want to discuss the subjects, others of whom came in and talked about their lifetime, loving, committed relationships.

The [pink triangle] pins, I recognized later in the week, were a group called Integrity, which was the gay and lesbian Episcopal group, and they had a booth at that convention. At an Oregon dinner, there was a young man wearing one of those pins, who I recognized as having been in the booth when I had walked by it as I walked through auditorium of the display booths.

We had all of these resolutions, and the fairly conservative Democratic former attorney, suffragan bishop of Oregon, Hal Gross, had been one of the committee members that had studied the issue in some depth. Here, unlike with the women priest issue, I agreed with Hal and their recommendations: lesbians and gays are children of God. They should have no legal discrimination, but in the Church we don't need to ordain them, or necessarily bless unions, et cetera. I guess that probably pretty well reflects my 1976 attitude at Minneapolis, as I, for the first time, rather dispassionately, listened to arguments from people with all viewpoints and again tried to work out: what should be the Church's position? Not what should be Clay Myers's position, or some text that could be taken from scripture for or against.

I began to wonder, for the first time, why the people who were so homophobic didn't get as upset about things that were damned in the New Testament even more, which many of them engaged in: adultery or fornication or bad language, taking the name of the Lord in vain, or all the other sins. But, I began to study the issue and I guess this started a

metamorphosis in a number of ways of thinking about deciding that it's the Creator who has to judge people, not Clay Myers. Now, I'm not very good in living up to that belief, because when I'm on the highway and some road hog or somebody else with road rage does some stupid thing, I become rather judgmental.

But going back to the gay and lesbian question and the Church's couple of generations of studying and discussing and still not having totally resolved it. In our own minds, most of us have resolved it, but not Church resolutions. We came out with a number of resolutions that passed that were really middle of the road: get rid of discrimination, recognize everyone as a child of God regardless of sexual orientation. Didn't really get into the practice of sexual behavior. I've always believed, in that respect, with a fellow Episcopalian, Barry Goldwater, who says, "Keep government off my back, out of my pocketbook and out of my bedroom."

We concluded the convention, and the last Oregon dinner just shortly before we came home, a priest from Eugene, Duane Alvord, an old friend of mine, he and his wife had driven to Minneapolis also and were going on to Kentucky, I believe, to perform a wedding ceremony. He said, "Clay, you and Elizabeth and your son came to Minneapolis, three of you in the car with your luggage and so forth. Your son's gone on to New Hampshire. Would you have room to drive one of our people back to Oregon?" I think it had been a former student at the University of Oregon who probably had belonged to Canterbury Club at the University of Oregon, and that was a group I had been high on, because I was a past president of the Canterbury Club when I was at the University. This young man was at a chapel here in Portland. His name shall not be used because, one, I'm not sure I remember it and two, he spoke to my wife and me in confidence, later, about his lifestyle. But Duane said, "My wife and I are going on to Kentucky and we have this young man with no money, except enough to buy his food on the way home, and maybe pay for his room. Would you and Elizabeth be willing to take an Episcopalian home with you?"

I said, "Well, I'll ask Liz, but I'm sure."

He said, "Well now, I should tell you, he's gay."

I said, "Well, I've never discussed that subject with my wife other than telling her about what our committee's been doing this week."

So I ask Elizabeth and she said, "Oh! Was that that fine young man that I sat across from at dinner one night in the Oregon delegation?"

I said, "Yes." She said, well, I won't go into all of her quotes, but in effect, because Elizabeth can speak for herself, but she said, well, she'd be willing to drive him home.

So, for the next three days of driving and two nights, including sharing a motel suite one time with him, why, we discussed in great detail what gays think they are and how they think they're born that way. It was probably the first conversation either Elizabeth or Clay ever had in any depth with a person that we knew was gay. A week after we got back to Oregon, we got home after being away and our house was locked up, but our garage door had been left open as we'd been gone just a brief time and by the back door was this half gallon of our favorite, nice gin, Tanqueray, I think it was, at that time, which this young man had driven down from Portland to leave as a thank you for the drive from Minneapolis to Portland, as well as for our kindness to him.

From that day on, we found just how many of our acquaintances were gay. It's apparently, there are some in every family. When I listen to the real homophobes – who's that terrible woman from Illinois? Phyllis Schlafly, who has totally screwed up the Republican Party in my lifetime and yours, has a gay son. Who's another anti-gay? Newt Gingrich, and his half-sister is gay, you know. It's just – I find out one of my cousins has a gay son.

The old expression, as I once said to my daughter, "Some of our best friends are gay, I just hope you don't marry one." Having all my life, fought prejudice against blacks and other groups, I want to fight prejudice against gays, but I think gays should have gay partners, not heterosexual and homosexual in the same household and the same bed. Maybe I can't even address that, because I'm not really familiar with bisexuality. I keep getting off on tangents, don't I, Ellen?

So, we then found that one of our good campaign supporters, with a lovely home on the Westside, who had a wonderful business, was very close to one of the most famous

chefs in America, who died here a few years ago. In fact, Richard later got this chef to autograph my wife's four or five cookbooks by the guy from Agate Beach and Portland, Oregon in New York. I said to Elizabeth, "You know, Richard and Charles have to be gay."

"Oh! No, No," you know, Elizabeth [said].

I said, "No, I'm just sure of it." Well, it wasn't until a few years later when they were travelling with us five years ago last week in Nice and Villefranche for the 25th anniversary of our neighbors, Sylvia and Jebbie Davidson, by that time, Elizabeth had accepted for several years, since we'd gone to dinner in their home and visited with them at other places, that, yes, Charles and Richard were gay.

We buy a house in New York, two wonderful women, one French, one Irish, and a lovely, handsome five year old boy that the French girl had adopted and in effect, the Irish girl who was taking care of the house was serving as the mother of. Always had home surrounded by lots of trees and bushes for their privacy. We bought a wonderful home from them. I looked at the house, Elizabeth only looked at the Chagall over the grand piano and the Monets going up the stairs. They became friends of ours, and I could name another 100 or 200 of our acquaintances and friends and neighbors.

So, I then, before getting to this last church convention, which was the most definitive one on this subject of gay and lesbian legislation by the National Episcopal Church, when I was state treasurer, had a young man who shared a two bedroom apartment in Salem with my son, when my son had momentarily dropped out of Wesleyan University when he was considering changing majors and worked for a state representative and I had his fraternity brother on my staff. I just thought Grey Lambert was one the finest young men I had ever met.

Grey, doing a fantastic job for me, admired by all the members of my staff, was seeing a psychiatrist. Well, I knew that he wasn't active in his Methodist church, I thought it was because his mother was dying of osteoporosis and that he was having troubles there, and I suggested I could save him a lot of money by introducing him to an Episcopal priest and that he might give some money to the Church or whatever the priest recommended, but, why are you spending all this money? Well, he never told me. Left my

office, moved up to the Portland area, got a job here, moved back up to Seattle, went to work for Boeing where his father was an officer, and it wasn't until years later, after we went to New York with J. P. Morgan, came back to Oregon, got reacquainted with Grey, his mother had died, that he invited all of us, my wife and me, our son David and his wife, Heather, our daughter-in-law, Carolyn, all five of us were invited one Christmas to Grey's home for a Christmas party, and we ended up being the only five straight people there, our of about 35 or 40. Grey and his partner were there. Grey's father showed up with his new male friend. I later asked Gray if his uncle I had met in New York wasn't also gay, who had never married and was an outstanding attorney. "Oh, yes. He is too."

Well, at this point, I finally learned from Grey that the reason he was seeing a psychiatrist was he was trying to deny his gay orientation. He was double-dating with my son. He was doing everything he could to be different, I mean, to try to adopt a straight lifestyle. It just didn't work. Elizabeth and I used to go to Seattle and hold him in the hospital when he was dying of AIDS.

You get a few situations like that, and you then say, what should be the Church's approach? Well, I get a little worried about having any priest, who has an avowedly gay lifestyle. But, I get equally disturbed by any heterosexual priest who leaves his wife and starts sleeping with a gal in the choir or the secretary. To me, the scriptures teach me that you want a monogamous, loving, lifetime committed relationship. If that is heterosexual, then I can very upset with my second priest, I think his name Father Ernest Bartlum, St. Mary's, Eugene, who when I was president of Canterbury Club and Hal Gross was the assistant clergyman there and the student chaplain, when Father Bartlum, an Englishman, leaves his wife and runs off with one of the other women in the congregation. Likewise, I don't like a priest in the Diocese of Long Island having rather blatant gay activities in a congregation.

To me, it's not the hetero or the homo, it's what kind of a life do you lead? Are you trying to be better? Are you being faithful to your partner, hopefully for life? That is a realization that didn't come to me, probably, until my late 50s [or] early 60s, and it was helped by a move to New York when I no sooner got into New York, my first day of work

at [J. P.] Morgan was the first of April, 1984, and I hadn't been in town two or three weeks when Bishop Paul Moore called and said, "Clay, I want you to be on the Venture Fund." I said, "I've already done the National Church's Venture Mission."

He said, "Oh, no. I'm talking about the Diocese of New York's Venture Fund. Having worked with you on the Church in Metropolitan Areas, will you help me?"

I said, "I'm not a fundraiser."

He said, "Well, help me spend the money that we raise, as well as help me with some ideas, possibly, as to where to raise it. I won't hit too you for too many thousand for your own personal contribution."

Again, my first meeting - it was like going on the Welfare Commission. My first meeting I get this big stack of issues to discuss, and I think this was about July of 1984. I moved there first of April, he called me in May, I agreed to serve on the committee in June, I went to a meeting, I believe, in July of 1984. What is one of about eight or 10 resolutions, is to appropriate $10,000 to start an AIDS ministry in the South Bronx where an Episcopal priest would devote one third of his time. $10,000, I thought, was a pittance for a third of the time of a bright, community involved priest. It was in a poor parish in a poor neighborhood, and I read the material in detail.

Sitting across from me was the head of the Education Department of the Diocese of New York, a former Oregonian – I guess I'd better not mention where he came from because he's still living. The story that I'm going to tell I believe is accurate, based on the information that was furnished me from what I believe are reliable sources. But this priest was a Republican, who had campaigned for me in Oregon, who had been in New York for a few years, and he was very upset when I made the motion to approve this $10,000 AIDS ministry grant from the Venture Fund of the Diocese of New York. It was obvious it was going to pass, but I wanted to make sure that the good father both understood what the resolution provided and if he had objections, to try to understand those or see if I could answer it.

So I said to him, "Well now, have you read this in detail?"

He said, "Oh no, I haven't. I didn't have time."

I said, "Well, when you read it, you'll find here on page such-and-such-a-number that the primary efforts of this AIDS ministry are the children of black and Hispanic mothers who have inherited AIDS because their mothers are shooting up drugs with dirty needles." I said, "How can we deny ministry to dying children in the hospital in that community? And it also says not one of those kids belongs to this congregation, that this is outreach to the un-churched or those who belong to other faiths."

Well, he hadn't even seen that because he just had had this emotional reaction about AIDS being associated only with gays and so forth. He had tried to block my motion, first by tabling it but that was defeated; second by cutting the $10,000 to $5,000, which obviously we couldn't do anything with. How could you ask somebody to give a third of their time a year for that amount? And he had some other attempt to side-rail it. Once he then – we took some time and let him read that, he then seconded the motion.

As the meeting broke up an hour or so later, the archdeacon, who had been the priest at St. James the Less in 1984, when we moved to New York, but by this time he was on the bishop's staff, pulled me aside after the priest had left, the former Oregonian, and said, "Clay, you have to understand where he's coming from." He said, "Your friend, and mine, Paul Moore, who's appointed you to this fund and who is my bishop and who hired me as archdeacon, Paul ordained the first avowedly lesbian woman to the priesthood. And, this former priest who left Oregon, [his] wife left him to move in with this lesbian priest."

So, you learn in the Church, that we have everything that goes on anywhere else in any community. I think the only difference between the saints in the Church who are sinners, and the people outside the Church who are sinners also, some of whom, I hope, want to be saints, is that, at least, the sinners in the Church are kneeling together, trying to get better and trying to understand and help each other.

I've given you far too much on the gay and lesbian questions, but that is the type of background, and I could give scores more examples of personal conversations, including former clergy of the Missouri [Sinai?] Church, college professors and others whom I know who discuss their lifestyles and their challenges and their desires, et cetera. But, I guess

we ought to cap this conversation, maybe with what happened at the National Church Convention in Philadelphia, this past last half of July of 1997.

At that convention we, again, had these issues coming up, only in even stronger terms. Desires to bless same-sex unions. Violent testimony against it, from people who equated the blessings with marriages. A gay priest, coming in with his lifetime partner, expressing his desire to be recognized and accepted. People who had said they had led gay lifestyles who claimed they have been converted to a straight lifestyle and there is no such thing as an innate or genetic disposition to be gay and lesbian. Once more in 1997, I went through all of the agonies of those people's life and listening to those discussions and one of 51 members of a cognate committee on social and urban affairs. We also had gun control and abortion and all the other quiet little issues, but we had more resolutions on this subject of gay blessings or rejections of it, than on any other subject. Obviously, from the Diocese of Fort Worth and Lexington and so forth we had opposition. From the Diocese of Newark and El Camino Real and others we had strong support. We then, as a committee, had to try to reconcile all of these conflicts and arguments to see where we were going to stand as a committee on the issue.

Once again, with the spirit in his or her or its wisdom, move us to some conclusion which we felt the Church might ultimately be able to accept. That probably made this 1997 convention, for me, one of the three most exciting I've ever attended, along with Seattle and Minneapolis, as far as major actions were taken. I guess I'd have to add a fourth one, the special convention in 1969 at Notre Dame University, for just sheer excitement and almost confusion at times, when we did our outreach to our black brothers and sisters.

EN: Thank You.

[End of Tape 4, Side 1]
[End of Interview]