

CHARLES W. GILCHRIST

Interviewed December 30, 1986
Montgomery County Archives Project

Interviewer: Jeannine Jeffs
History Associates Incorporated
Rockville, Maryland

My name is Jeannine Jeffs. I will be talking with Charles W. Gilchrist, Montgomery County Executive, 1978 to 1986. We are meeting in the Rockville Public Library, Maryland Avenue, Rockville, Maryland. The date is December 30, 1986.

JJ: We'd like to begin with a review of your personal background, your family history.

CG: Well, I was born in Washington, D.C. My father was a lawyer, who was born in Yonkers, New York. His parents were from Scotland. He went to Cornell and then in the first World War, went into the Army half-way through college, and was in the Ambulance Corps in the first World War. And then [he] came back and went to Georgetown Law School; practiced law in New York. And during the Depression, [he] came to Washington and worked with several New Deal agencies, like the Agriculture Department. Finally, he became a partner in a law firm, Lee, Toomey & Kent, and was a corporate tax lawyer.

My mother is a Montgomery County native. Her father was Charles Waters, who was a physician in Montgomery County; also ran a school called Fairview School, and was an old-school Baptist minister, as well. As a matter of fact, it was his house that burned down up here not long ago with the ... whatever group was involved. So, she was brought up in Montgomery County, one of thirteen children, about half of whom survived to adulthood. And [she] had no profession other than being housewife and mother.

I went to [a] local public school, during grammar school years, in Washington, D.C. We lived in an apartment at 20th and Florida Avenue, and I went to John Quincy Adams Elementary School. Then I went to Longfellow for one year, which was then where the lower school for Friends School is now in Bethesda. And then I went to St. Alban's School and graduated from there in 1954, and went to Williams College; graduated from Williams in 1958. And then Harvard Law School ... I graduated from that in 1961.

And then I practiced law for two years in Baltimore with Venable, Baetjer & Howard, a large law firm over there. Then I came back to Washington as an associate with a firm called Fowler, Leva Hawes & Symington. Joe Fowler was subsequently Secretary of Treasury. It was a small, but very interesting Washington law firm. And then I went to Lee, Toomey & Kent, a federal tax firm, and became a partner there in ... well, after two years. I can't really remember the exact date ... about '67. And [I] practiced law altogether for about twelve years, the last four of which I also was a member of the Maryland State Senate. I was elected to the Maryland State Senate in 1974. And then I was elected as County Executive in 1978 and 1982.

JJ: Okay. Well, let's back-track just a little bit. What led you to the law? Was it your father's influence ... do you feel?

CG: Perhaps. I think that to some extent it was this idea of not knowing what else to do. You know, law is sort of available for someone who's interested in ... well, in reading and history. And I was never good in math, although there was a time when I wanted to be a doctor. Some of the members of my family are physicians, my cousins and so on. But I just decided that law would be interesting, and perhaps because I admired my father, I went to law school.

JJ: And at Harvard, do you feel that there was anything there that began to shape your ideas of government? Any professor that was of any particular influence?

CG: Not at law school, particularly; I would say Williams College much more. I mean, it's a smaller school and you have a much more intimate relationship with the faculty. And it was an excellent faculty. I majored in American History and Literature, and there were several professors that I liked very much, and who I think quickened my interest in public affairs. Harvard was sort of a large, very intensive trade school in many ways. I mean, you were there to learn law, and I did. And [I] didn't particularly, that I am aware of, see any real inspiration for the rest of my life there.

JJ: What decided you to leave the law practice that you were engaged in, and seek public office ... run for the Senate?

CG: Well, I think my father did have an influence on me, although I think he was amazed when I went into politics. He was a little bit horrified by it. He made me interested and helped me to develop an interest in public affairs. And I was always interested in politics and in government. And I was active in the local Democratic Party; I was on the Central Committee. And just really did a switch, because the firm in Washington is a federal tax firm, as I mentioned, and there's really no local involvement at all. The clients were all basically national corporations. But I did have this interest.

And when I had the opportunity to run for the State Senate, I did. And specifically, my predecessor in the State Senate was James McAuliffe, who is now, as you know, a member of our Circuit Court. He decided not to run again. We had just had a redistricting process, and he represented the district that includes Rockville and the area around it. And he asked me to run. And I decided to do so. I'm not sure whether I would have if I hadn't been specifically asked. And of course, I think luck and fate have a lot to do with these things; this seat did open up. So I decided to run for the Maryland State Senate.

JJ: What issues were you primarily concerned with at that time? Was your interest focused anything?

CG: I didn't have any specific overriding interest when I ran for the Maryland State Senate. My opponent was Tom Anderson, who is a very fine lawyer in Rockville. And his family had been in Rockville for many years. And he was a moderate, very capable person. So I would say that the issues between us were really not the important thing. I did a lot of knocking on doors and some grass-roots political work. But I was interested in a wide range of things. There were a lot of fiscal problems back in those days, and I've always been interested in education.

I was placed on the Finance Committee in the Maryland State Senate, which did a lot of the fiscal matters; not tax bills as such, but pension legislation and bills having to do with health and mental health. I became very interested in those aspects of government. And it was during Governor Mandel's second term, and so there was a lot discussion about the ethics of government and so on. I was on the Ethics Committee of the Joint Committee of the Maryland Legislature. And I worked on the bill that became the State Prosecutor's bill. And I did a lot of work on the effort to reform the pension law, and several committees and commissions involving mental health, and also the criminal aspects of mental impairment. And those were some of interests I had as a Senator. There was no specific issue

that caused me to run, or that was dominating the politics at that time.

JJ: Could you give us your evaluation of the Gleason government at that time?

CG: Oh, I think Jim Gleason had a good government. And I didn't follow it for the first few years terribly closely. He was the first County Executive. I think he devoted much of his first term to getting an organization set up, and sort of setting a tone. He was a sole Republican in a Democratic environment. I'm not sure that that made a great deal of difference. He did, I think, a good job of setting up the government. He established basically the principle of taking over the government as it was; in my recollection, very few changes made in the personnel of government. But he certainly was a person of tremendous integrity and he, I think, had tremendous ... well, or substantial popular support.

His public stance was sort of conservative and taciturn, and I think it served him well. That was the way people thought of him, and I think that's probably the way he was. I did not know him well; I think there are very people even of his own party that did know him well. He was not active in the Republican Party. He did not, for example, support anyone to

take his place. And he became, I think, by his own description sort of disgusted with government in general, and felt that it was impossible to govern, and the bureaucracy and so many inhibitions and regulations inhibited government. So he became a little bit disillusioned, I think, toward the end.

But he did some very good things. Among other things, he was a very strong supporter of the Metro Rail system, and stood up at times when that was threatened, particularly with respect to Montgomery County. And I think many people lately credit him for being sure that it went forward in Montgomery County. And he did an excellent job on that. He was very progressive on civil rights and the like. We had a sewer moratorium that started during his administration, and that slowed down many of the pressures for growth. So that at the time I took office, that was in effect. And I think it had somewhat stalemated or evened off. I think it had some good as well as bad aspects to it; allayed the pressure on development in the county, and things were somewhat calm in that respect.

The other major issue during the last part of his administration was the so-called TRIM Ballot Amendment idea that there should be a Charter limitation on property taxes. And so that, I think, reflected a kind of a fiscal pressure

that was at that time. And he opposed, I think, rightly. On the other hand, there was a substantial amount of growth. The school system was at its peak during his period. He used to fight with the School Board over funding for the school system. But I think any County Executive almost has to do that. And he was very much devoted to welfare and to helping people who needed help; he was good in that respect.

He was really not particularly fiscally stringent; the government grew very substantially while he was County Executive in numbers of people. So I think on the whole, he was a good County Executive. He set a bit of a quiet tone for government, and I think in some ways never really established the County Executive as a separately-elected position of political leadership as well as governmental leadership. And I think it takes a while to make that transition; I'm not sure it's been completed yet.

JJ: During those years in the Senate, did you establish some contacts that you feel carried over into your years as Executive? Blair Lee IV ... did you become close to him at that point?

CG: Well, being in the Maryland Senate is a very good place to know and to make contacts with a large number of people. I did get to know Blair in that period, but really toward the

end of it, when he came, he was away. He was in West Virginia much of that time, and came back to run his father's campaign for governor. And that was really where I met and got to know Blair. I knew his father in connection with my service in the State Senate, and a lot of the other people around the state. It was a kind of a difficult period for state government in some ways; Governor Mandel was under a very severe cloud then. But I did I think learn, in general, that Montgomery County is part of the State of Maryland, and has to know and to work with the rest of the state.

And there were a lot of the young political figures that have since become prominent that I knew very well then: Stenny Hoyer, who was the President of the Maryland Senate when I was there ... now a member of Congress. I had been a friend and remained a very close friend of Paul Sarbanes, who was in Congress at the time. And all of those people were people that you would come into contact with: the Mayor of Baltimore, Donald Schaefer, who was Mayor for most of that period, if not all of it. And so I did, I think, form contacts mainly with people in other parts of the state other than Montgomery County, although of course you do become aware of the various aspects of your own community when you represent Montgomery County or part of it. And so,

yes, I think I did form a lot of the associations that I found valuable thereafter.

JJ: Was it helpful later on?

CG: Oh, I think it was helpful — no question — to have known and to develop some interest in the people and in the processes of the rest of government. And of course you meet prominent citizens, and you learn what the issues are. Again, we are a county dependent on the state in many ways. Of course county government flows from the state ... the power of the state; it is formed by state government. The state provides a lot of the funding, more in other parts of the state than here, which is one of the overriding issues continuing to face us ... in education and roads and certainly criminal law, all of those. Much of our law is set in Annapolis. So there is close interrelationship. And I think to serve in the State Senate is a good way to see county government in the perspective of state government, and how closely related they are.

JJ: So in 1978, the County Council race came up. What prompted you to...?

CG: County Executive race.

JJ: Yes.

CG: Well, there were several things, I think. One was I found I enjoyed the State Senate; I loved Annapolis. I liked my fellow representatives there. But I was not temperamentally, particularly a legislator ... being just sort of one vote on pieces of legislation and working on it, and not seeing the ultimate result, as to whether the law, if passed, works or not. It sort of was not my cup of tea. And I didn't particularly like the process of repetitive hearings and the like. In other words, I think I decided I wanted to be more directly active in government; that was one aspect of it.

The second was that I found it very schizophrenic in terms of my personal life. I remained a partner in the Washington tax law firm, and while there was no conflict of interest — and that was good — the two were so totally separate that I found it very difficult. My partners were very good to me; they did not make it unpleasant. But to try to be effective in both areas was a divisive impact on my life. So I also felt that I didn't want to continue that. I wanted either to be one thing or the other: either a full-time politician or in private life presumably continuing as a lawyer. So that was another factor.

And then of course, the third was that ... well, actually, it wasn't clear that Mr. Gleason wasn't going to run when I first thought of it. But as it turned out, it was a period of transition and he made it available, there was an opportunity for me then. And there was no other Democrat that I felt had an obvious shot at being County Executive. So just, again, luck and fate, if you want to call it that, have a lot to do with it. But I was interested in politics and decided to give my life to it, or a major portion of it. And I felt that the County Executive race was the kind that would be challenging to me.

Actually there was a Congressional seat came open at the same time; Mike Barnes ... the one when he was elected. I could have run for Congress; I was probably better known than Mike at that point. But I never really was interested in Congress; again, because it seems to me the opportunity to be effective is much less. Mike and others have shown that you can be very effective there, but from my own point of view I felt an Executive position, where you could be active and have an immediate effect which would be apparent and that you could see was my cup of tea. So that's why I ran for County Executive.

JJ: And you were elected in 1978. So now you're County Executive. How do you go about choosing your top aides and building your staff?

CG: Well, as I look back on it, it was a very difficult period. As I mentioned, Mr. Gleason really hadn't established the idea that a new County Executive has an opportunity to make choices, I think. And we had no contact whatever really with his administration. I mean, he was certainly cordial and provided help in transition and office space and support from the staff, and the like. But there was no real close relationship or exchange of information. And we did it on our own. And I think, overall, it came out fairly well.

One, I did think that it was necessary to have some new leadership. The fiscal issue, for example, had been such a major fact of life at the time, the TRIM amendment and the like — which was defeated, but it was close — that I wanted to do some reorganization in the county government to enable the fiscal management to work better, from my point of view. So we organized several new departments; one was the Office of Management and Budget, which had been sort of dispersed through the government before that. I also felt that economic development ought to be a separate, principal office, and the State Affairs that the lobbyists ... ought

to be a separate office and appointed by the County Executive.

We had a very controversial change in that I fired the Police Chief; that was quite something. And I think it was sort of indicative of how unprepared we were for self-government, in the sense that there was great consternation about my firing the Police Chief. And he sued me, and I spent three days in court a couple of years later. And to me, it was just utterly ridiculous throughout that a new County Executive couldn't select a Police Chief to his liking. But I think that was kind of indicative of the attitude that somehow government went on forever, and the Executive was around while he was there and then he moved on, without maybe too much impact. And it was kind of an outrage for you to think you could make any changes. But we did make that change.

We had a terrible battle over the establishment of the State Affairs Office as an appointed office. To me, again, it's ludicrous to think that a County Executive, elected to serve, should not appoint his own lobbyists in Annapolis to deal with political and with fiscal issues. But again, it caused tremendous consternation that I should do such a thing and set up a separate office and want to appoint a person to it. And of course I did select Blair Lee IV; he

did a magnificent job. The issue was not over him or his personality, but just the effrontery of a County Executive who would even think of turning away from the Civil Service for a lobbyist. Those were some of the examples.

Now, as a matter of fact, I kept most of the existing department heads. I'm not saying that there should be an automatic turnover as in state government or in the federal government, where everyone ... all the Cabinet leaves, and you start from scratch. I think in a professional environment like this, many of the people can and should stay, and do an excellent job. So I kept many of the existing department heads, and they did an excellent job.

We had a couple of very serious scrapes with the whole Merit System process then. And it was blown tremendously out of proportion, from my point of view. You may recall we had a huge investigation, the result of which was to say that we wrongly appointed the second person in charge of our Liquor Department. Given the ink that was devoted to that, and the fact that really no one ever tried to remove him or make anything stick, I felt it was kind of an astonishing situation. But in any event, again, it was indicative of, I think, a misapprehension of what an elected official in a community, really the size of a large city ... the authority and flexibility that such an official ought to have. But we

did come through it, and selected a number of excellent people; and as a matter of fact changed some of them.

One of things I discovered was, first of all, of course, that the people that you have in these important positions are what make or break a government. It's crucial to have good people. And secondly, that one has to make changes at times and be sure that you get people that are capable and who work well with me, in this case. And one of the things I'm proudest of is that over a period of time, we did do that. And I think we also have established the principle that it can be done, and that it's appropriate that changes can and should be made where the County Executive feels they're appropriate. And I think hereafter, the transition and establishment of new administrations will be much smoother than it was when we came into office. Again, I think the results were fine, but it was kind of a nerve-racking and pressure-filled period.

JJ: Did you, in effect, then create more jobs that would not be affected by the Merit Board?

CG: No, we really didn't, because we ... I've forgotten precisely the changes, but we also abolished several of the principal offices at the time we created new ones. For example, there was an Office of Capital Program and

Planning, and we merged that into the Office of Management and Budget. So the net result, I think, was maybe one additional, but maybe not; I think there were no additional Merit System positions. That has really not changed; we have not added to the appointed positions. And I think perhaps some more of that ought to be done. But I think the main thing is just to accept that at least in the areas where you do have the appointment power that it's appropriate to use it.

JJ: During that campaign for the first term, you expressed your intention to simplify county government. At that point, thirty agencies reported to the Executive. Can you tell us about your efforts in this area? How did your relations...? Tell us about your job of simplifying.

CG: Well, I think ... that's what I just said. We really didn't do that. When we tried, we thought it was a useful thing; and we did eliminate some offices. But we thought it was important to establish others. And I think what the result for better or worse was that we established the offices that we felt enabled us to simplify and manage the government, the OMB being, I think, the principal example of that. But it did not seem doable or all that desirable when we really got into office and began to operate it, to eliminate a lot

of the separate functions. Now, I think that still is an issue.

I think there is a definite problem of what one might call the "span of control." It's hard for a County Executive to have close, immediate contact with thirty different people. On the other hand, of course, you have the Chief Administrative Officer who spends full-time in the administration of the government as well, and can have much of that contact. I'm not sure, at this point, that it is a major problem. I did think it was at the time, and as I say, we never really implemented much along the lines of simplification. I do think we improved the process of management by establishing the Office of Management and Budget, which really became deeply involved in all of the aspects of the fiscal management of the county. But we did not streamline the chart.

JJ: I think we need to go into the Liquor Control Board problem just a little bit.

CG: Sure, I'll be glad to.

JJ: We don't want to stir it up.

CG: Not at all.

JJ: How do you explain that it became such a large issue? I mean, it looked for a while there as though it was tying up the government, or at least in the press ... from what we saw in the press.

CG: I'm not sure that it did tie up the operation of the government, but the press certainly spent most of its ink on it. And I don't really know how it became so out of proportion, or what we could have done to avoid it. You will see people now, when I was leaving office, who referred back to it and said if I could have ended it sooner, or could have done some things to bring it to an end.... I'm not sure. I think there was a feeling that there might be a scandal involved for a period of time. So there was a long period of time there when people were looking for that. I think hundreds of thousands of dollars and probably millions of dollars ... at least one million, maybe two million dollars were probably spent on all the investigations, including grand jury investigation and the Council had a separate investigation. So a lot of money was spent in looking at it. And of course when you gear things like that up, it takes a while to get them finished. But I would be interested to look back over it.

The fact is that there was really not a single finding that came out of that entire period — which was about two years,

as I recall — of any wrongdoing or of any fundamental problem in the Liquor Department or anything else. There was this one finding that we had improperly influenced the selection of the second person in charge there. That person is still there, and is doing an excellent job. Again, why the County Executive shouldn't have something to say about the second person in charge of one of his largest departments, which produces \$10 million in revenue a year, has always escaped me.

I think another aspect was that the Liquor ... liquor itself, of course, is a controversial area. I think it's debatable whether the county should be in the liquor business. I think it's worth it because I think we do get a certain level of control over the outlets for hard liquor that we couldn't get any other way. I think it does give some control over a very dangerous and volatile kind of a substance. And liquor and the liquor industry is one where there's always a lot of excitement. And I think the fact that the County Executive is the subject of that excitement, while not something that made me particularly happy, probably wasn't bad for the community. I mean I don't think it's a bad thing for liquor operations to be very, very public. I think that was part of it.

There was a guy named Charlie Buscher who was very helpful to me in my campaign; not a personal friend, not a crony, really, but who became very much involved and was investigated and chased all over Montgomery County by lawyers and investigators. He had been very close to Blair Lee and Brooke Lee, and was sort of a figure in Montgomery County. And so all of those connections became interesting to the press. And I think a lot of it was the kind of place Montgomery County is. In some ways, it's sort of the dark side of Montgomery County that gossip and rumor and whispering, unfortunately, seems to be a way of life here to some extent; maybe because we're affluent and have nothing better to do. But I had some political opposition that became involved in that and tried, it seems to me as I look back on it, made efforts to make it worse, and to make it appear a problem.

Again, I suppose there were things we could have done to deal with it that we didn't do quickly enough, but I'm not sure. I think it was just something that people got their teeth into and wanted to shake for two years before it got over with. The Washington Post, for example, was very deeply involved in it for a while. Oh, and then there was ... we shouldn't forget Len Kolodny — I almost forgot him — who made all sorts of claims about how awful things were, and claimed that I had offered him a job in the Merit System.

Actually, I've even sort of forgotten that. I'd be glad to talk about it, because it was really amusing, in looking back on it.

And he just was someone who loved talking with the press, and they loved talking to him. So for two years, he did a lot of talking. Again, I can't recall a single finding of any of the investigators that were looking into it that there was any finding of wrongdoing there. But he was a very, sort of a.... The press had a lot of fun with him, and he made a lot of claims and accusations that went on for a couple of years as well. And I think his personality and the fact that the press warmed up to it was part of it.

And what else...? Oh, then there was the famous ... — and I'd really sort of forgotten about this one, but — where some calls were supposed to have been made to him. Do you recall reading about that? That threats were made, and he claimed it was a young aide of mine, I think, or that he recognized him. I'm never sure he quite said that in so many words. And of course my aide, who resigned during this period, denied it. And that was very exciting for a long time, about whether these threatening calls had been made to Len Kolodny or not. It was quite a donnybrook and quite a circus.

I think it did not really affect the way things worked. I mean, I think if one looked back on it, it was very hard on me. And I felt sort of a righteous indignation that anyone should raise such questions about me. But I learned not to feel that way, because that's part of the game and perfectly appropriate, although I think the press definitely did overdo it. But we got it into perspective in the sense that it really, first of all, didn't affect an agency that was at the core, like the transportation or budget. And I think it also became clear that I was not involved in scandal. And so I think it subsided.

It was a lot of talk and politics about it, but I don't think it affected our operation of the county government. And most of the things that we'd undertaken to do, such as the condominium conversion problem at the time, and the effort to get the size of the county government stabilized, and to create these new departments and housing programs and social service programs, efforts against drunk driving, all those things proceeded.

And finally the Washington Post, you may recall, wrote a very sort of clear editorial, that said this has been much ado about nothing. There is no finding of any significance involved, and we ought to forget about it. And I think people did forget about it. So, it really was a phenomenon.

I think if someone wanted to go back and study it, might learn something about government, particularly in Montgomery County. As I say, I think there is a quality of hyperactivity in Montgomery County. The Superintendent of Schools recently said he doesn't want to get another contract. I think it's the same kind of thing. We just generate a lot of activity here, much of which is wasteful or non-productive. And I think there was a lot of that involved then.

JJ: To restore confidence in your administration, was a housecleaning sort of required? Did you bring in new staff at that point ... new people?

CG: I didn't bring in new staff for that purpose. I mentioned before that I was involved in setting up new departments and seeing how they worked and making appointments. And I did do it for that reason, and during that period of time some changes were made. One of my aides did resign in that period: a young guy named Jerry Evans, who I think really did nothing wrong in the course of it, but did resign to go to law school. And I appointed a new assistant, Ed Rovner, who was a very experienced and very forceful individual. And I think he helped a lot, in fact. But other than that, I think really it was just that the rest of the government came to the fore; not that we made a whole lot of changes,

but that when people really stopped fussing with that, they saw that things were going pretty well. And in fact we did have a good team of very good people then. So as I say, there were changes made, but not for that specific reason, but more for the operation of specific programs where the changes were made.

JJ: Well, let's go on to what else was happening. You mentioned condominium conversions, and that was a phenomenon of that period, was it?

CG: It definitely was. We had rent control, you may recall, when I came into office, which was related. Then there was a tremendous condominium conversion boom, which is extremely ... well, troublesome and nerve-wracking, and it creates terrible pressures and problems for the people who are the victims — if I could use that word — of it. I think, like many other things, perhaps the results aren't as onerous as one would expect. But particularly when an older person — and there were a lot of older people affected — are told that they have to leave their apartment, it creates tremendous pressures and anxieties. And I've forgotten the number of conversions, but it was in the thousands; several very large buildings converted.

And we decided to put a freeze on condominium conversion, and to create a program that would deal with it. And it worked out really quite well. We got legislation through Annapolis — and looking back on it, I'm not quite sure how we did it — to give us authority to have a right of first refusal to buy buildings that are converted. And there have been a couple that we have bought since then, and also to impose a tax on condominium conversion. That was really the miracle. I don't know how that got passed in Annapolis, but we did work very hard and got it passed.

I think it's an example of the fact that really we were not weakened by "Liquorgate," because all these things kept on going. And that was effective because we plowed the proceeds, which amounted to, I think, many million dollars ... close to \$10 million, back into other housing projects using other sources as well, too. And we generated well over 500 new apartment units, and renovated a number of others, using that funding as a basic source, with other financial ways to increase it. So that, I think, was a successful program. And of course, the economy changed and the condominium conversion pressure relieved for other reasons as well. But I think, again, part of that was ending rent control.

And while that was a controversial decision, at the time, I think almost everybody now agrees that it was a good thing to do. Rents have not gone up sharply since then. They've been under the guidelines that we have set. And I think it did sort of calm down the real estate market and cause builders to stay in rental housing, and even to build some new rental housing; and with the result that we now have more apartments in the county — substantially more — than we did before the condominium conversion phenomenon occurred. And we've built something like a third of all the new rental housing in the Washington region has been built in Montgomery County. And I don't think you can point to any one aspect of it, but I think it does indicate that we came out of that in pretty solid shape. That was one whole set of things that happened.

Another was the reorganization of the county government, which was really rather thorough-going. And then we did, I think, get a grip on the fiscal aspects of things. I set sort of a principle that we wouldn't expand the size of the county government overall; that we would try to set some priorities and keep the overall size fairly steady. And so while we added very substantially to our bus system, we doubled the size of that and added a lot of people to it.... We're talking about the first term now, so this is the early stages of expanding Ride-On and getting ready for Metro.

We did increase the size of the Police Department. We had some controversies over Affirmative Action back then; I was a strong, and am a strong, supporter of Affirmative Action. And we've had an effort to increase the number of black police officers, which led to litigation again, because of claims of reverse discrimination. That was a controversial period in my first term, as I recall. We did move into fiscal restraint; and we had a freeze on the size of the county government. Looking back, I think most people would have to concede that what we referred to as fiscal restraint really was not all that horrendous; but it seemed so at the time.

For the school system, for example, I had my battles over the years with the school system. And back then was one time when that occurred. But again, I recommended reducing the school budget much less than my predecessor, Jim Gleason, had: I mean, 2 percent, and he averaged 4 or 5 percent reductions ... recommended 4 or 5 percent reductions. Mine were under 2 percent. So we really didn't limit the growth in the education budget much, but it did generate a lot of heat. So those issues were all present then.

And then you had the beginnings of the growth that we've seen in the last four years, really did not start so much in my first term. [In] my first term, we were moving to work on

roads to get ready for Metro, the arrival of Metro. And that we did. And it had very little impact from a traffic congestion point of view for the opening of Metro Rail.

We went through "sewer wars" back then with Prince George's County and with Washington. We met frequently — Larry Hogan, the County Executive of Prince George's County and Mayor Barry and people from Fairfax — over that problem, and really began to work it out; though it really wasn't resolved until the next term. But we did have a regional agreement that prevented the closing down of the Blue Plains Sewer Treatment Facility. And we were able to lift this sewer moratorium really by, I think, just being more intelligent about the application of limits than any specific expenditure of funds. We allocated sewer capacity more intelligently, and were able to end what was really a "paper moratorium." So that occurred.

We battled through the new landfill in Laytonsville, which took a lot of time. But again, I think it's indicative of how Montgomery County goes about things, maybe making a little more work for ourselves than necessary. It got to the point where the Council every week would hear from the citizens involved, and of course what they heard was they didn't want it. And you knew that, and you were sorry that people have to ... that we have to have these kinds of

facilities. But we got that opened. Drunk driving became a major issue, and we made it such. And we worked very hard to establish one of the first Drunk Driving Commissions in the country, and had a very effective program which....

END SIDE A, TAPE 1 of 1

BEGIN SIDE B, TAPE 1 of 1

CG: ... I think started some new initiatives with establishing an Office of Economic Development; not so much to "wine and dine" and to get a lot of new companies to come, but to serve the industry that we have. Because the fact is that our economy depends on the expansion of existing business; something like 85 percent of our growth in economic terms comes right in the county itself. So it was a professional effort to identify what kinds of businesses would be appropriate for Montgomery County, and to work with those businesses. And despite claims to the contrary, we really spent very little money on "wining and dining" and efforts to seek vast new economic ... new companies to move here to cause pressure on our roads and schools. I think our economic development program has been a very well-run and very good one. And then we spent some time on that in the first term.

I also have always had an interest in social needs. And we began to work on the problem of hunger, although that came along in the second term as well. But we expanded the

assistance we provide for welfare clients in Montgomery County. I want to point out that my predecessor was always concerned about those issues, too. I don't want to give the impression that I thought of these problems; he was aware of them. But we did expand those programs. So I think along a wide range of areas, we worked very hard to hold our own and to improve programs.

We dealt with the state in a number of issues; I mentioned condominium conversion, where we had to get legislation passed in Annapolis on that. We got a program passed that provided very substantial assistance — both operating and capital assistance — for our Metro. The State of Maryland does furnish about 75 percent overall of the operating and the capital funding for our Metro system. And Blair Lee, as our lobbyist in Annapolis, did an excellent job on that. And we also held our own in other funding issues: school construction being, I think, probably the main one.

And we became involved in a lawsuit; the Mayor of Baltimore, you may recall, sued in order to get a larger share of funding for the Baltimore city schools. And we defended against that, and won that suit. I think, in general, as I said, the level of funding that Montgomery County receives of state programs, since we are an affluent county, is always an issue. And we're always concerned that we're not

getting our fair share. And I think it's a legitimate concern, and it was a concern during my first term as well as the second. And as I say, I think we did pretty well in holding our own.

I think maybe we exaggerate that whole issue; I think it's appropriate, to some extent, for an affluent county to provide tax support for what has to be done for a state as a whole. After all we are an entire state, and Baltimore city is an inner city with tremendous pressures and burdens. So I think maybe we exaggerate that issue a bit, but nonetheless it is present, and we did spend a lot of time on it. And I think [we] were effective in my first term in getting programs set up, such as mass transit funding that have helped us a lot in meeting those burdens in Montgomery County.

JJ: You moved into the new Executive Office building during your first term also. Were there any particular problems there? Did you have any input in the design of that...?

CG: No, no. The new County Office building had been designed and ground was broken before I came into office. The previous administration had taken the position, and I think the Council supported it, that among the things that should happen when that new building opened was that the Planning

Commission should move from Silver Spring up to Rockville. That became very controversial, and we were never able to get that done. Again, it's sort of the example of the way we whip up things ... the real issue here. But I had no input into the design of the building. It has worked very well since. At first, the heat didn't work and it was terribly cold, I remember a couple of winters. The elevators have never worked perfectly. But I think, by and large, it was a good decision that was made by my predecessor.

We have been able to consolidate a lot of the county government offices there. We've reduced the rental space that the county has leased, although it's beginning to creep up again now, as we're in another period of growth. But it has been a good office, and run efficiently. And I moved over ... it had been programmed for me to be on the 15th floor; I decided to move to the 2nd floor instead, and I'm glad I did. So there were just really sort of minor decisions for us to make along those lines. But that building and new Courthouse have both been good additions, I think, to the county.

I might say we started also other programs of building during that first term. We expanded what is now called the Schweinhout Senior Citizens Center down in Forest Glen. We opened the Holiday Park Senior Citizens Center. Shortly

after I came into office, we opened the new Gaithersburg Library, and began at least two other libraries in my first term: Olney and ... the other one slips my mind. We opened Potomac thereafter; I guess the expansion of the Wheaton Library. So we did do a lot of building of new facilities. The recreational center up on Route 124 was completed. And, in general, I think it was ... you know, we began, in my first term, expansion that continued thereafter.

JJ: I think we can move on to the second term, '82. Again, how did you arrive at the decision to seek a second term? I mean, you had had an embattled first part of the first term. You were on a roll, though _____ at this point.

CG: Well, I think things were going well. I mean, the result was I got 60 percent of the vote in the second term, as I had in the first. I did briefly consider not running for re-election; I thought I might rather practice law or something. But I think for negative reasons and positive, I decided to run again; negative, you know, you always get a little defensive when people criticize you, and you want to prove yourself. I guess that's part of it, almost inevitably for any politician. So that was part of it. But there were a lot of things that were underway. The county by then had begun to grow very substantially. There were a lot of issues that were underway. We had, I think, in place a very good

team by then; one that I completed after my second election. But we had things underway and, I think, knew what we were doing, and I felt it would be good for the county to have that continuity. So I decided to run for re-election and really was elected quite handily.

I might mention that [in] my first election I spent, in primary and general, about \$120,000 ... not of my own money; I mean, we raised and spent that much. And in the second term, it was about \$180[000], as I recall. Now that's a significant amount of money, but for a community of over 600,000 people, it really isn't that much. And unfortunately, I think, this last election, the winner spent almost \$400,000 and the loser spent around \$300,000, or close to it. So unfortunately, I think, we're in a spiralling period of expenditures on campaigning; that's one transition I think that we have seen which is not a good one. I didn't use any television, for example ... radio and mail. Now television is being used, and that's extremely expensive. But in any event, the second term I was easily re-elected and I think we had, of course, the transition was smooth and things have gone well since.

JJ: Can you talk a little bit about the campaign and the political line-up that occurred there?

CG: Well, there has been a substantial amount of, I think, bickering is not the wrong word, and factionalism in the Democratic Party, and we certainly were part of it. Of course, my view would be that I really didn't start it. I was elected as a person who ... you know, I used to be called a "nice guy;" that was the biggest thing that people used to say about me. And I had wide support from all branches of the Party. And I was sort of elected as a unifier. But for one reason or another, and again I think I was not the one who was seeking the problems; those times will tell, if anybody's interested in really looking back over the record, we did have factions develop.

And Mr. Scull and Mrs. Gelman really were sort of the other faction. And Neal Potter, who had started out running with my opponent in the first time that I ran, came with ... he sort of supported us. And we had Council slates in the second term. And Mrs. Gelman and Mr. Scull were elected with Mike Gudis and Bill Hanna; Bill Hanna defeated Ruth Specter. So that, in a way, there was a shift of four against three.

Again, I really think when one takes a look at the specifics of decisions in the second term, there were very few cases where important programs of mine were not adopted or were prevented. The factionalism was much more on the surface, I think, than it really affected government. Again, there was

a lot of press coverage of it, and in some instances, I think, rather petty ones. For example, that the four of them prevented county employees from serving on county commissions. I thought it was sort of a petty step to take; I'm sure that they have a side of it that they would express to you. Unfortunately, one of the facts was that Ruth Specter, who had been defeated, was an applicant with the county government.

So things like that happened, which were very.... And it's been undone since, I might add, by this new Council ... has removed that restriction. Small things like that which caused a lot of press and sort of bad feeling, but which really did not affect the decisions that the county made. For example, the Council supported about 95 percent of all of my budget recommendations. We did have this program on condominium conversion, which was ongoing then. The reorganization that we had in the second term, including establishment of a new Department of Mental Health. All of the undertakings on mass transit and bus service, transportation initiatives ... everything that we did really had the support of the Council. So I think, while there was a political factionalism there ... again, it didn't directly affect the efficiency or the output of county government. It just caused a lot of surface noise, which was unpleasant and

had to be sort of hashed out in the last campaign. And that's where it got resolved, I would say.

JJ: There were occasions though when the rivalry got so bad that you both — I mean, Council and Executive — had to have their own legal persons.

CG: Yes, that's true, yes. Yes, you're right. We had a couple of ... came close to ... well, litigation. Now, I think, in part that was on the issues though. I mean, for example, where we had a big battle over cable television, that's one we haven't touched on. And finally, the Council added a lot of funds to the school budget to do things with cable that I thought were ridiculous. So they backed off of that after I threatened to sue them. And then we got into this planning issue in the second term. Now, I don't think one can attribute that so much to factions as it was a Council authority versus Executive authority. And I think it was extremely important.

One of the major things that we did in the second term was to give the Executive more authority and participation in the planning process. And we can discuss that further. But it was a shift in favor of the Executive; the Council had full appointment power to the Planning Commission, and the Executive had no authority whatever in the Master Planning

process. We thought there should be veto. We thought that the Executive should get the plan and have an opportunity, as he does with other legislation, to make recommendations about planning. And I'm confident that the future will show that that is sort of a minimal and very important step forward for the Executive branch of government. And of course the Council was bitterly opposed to that. Now, again, I don't think that was a factional issue; I think several of my sort of supporters on the Council were against that legislation.

So I think that was more ... it did involve the balance of authority and power in the county government. And I think the Council was defending what it saw as its interests, and the Executive was taking the position that we thought was important for the County as a whole. And we did get much of that done in Annapolis. Then the Council proposed a ballot amendment to undo some of it. And we felt it was illegal, so we went to court on that and had it knocked out, so that it wasn't on the ballot. Now, those were battles, but I don't think they were generated by political factionalism. I think it was more substance involved. Those are the main ones that come to my mind. Do you have others?

JJ: No, it was mostly planning. Well, let's talk a little bit about that ... sort of establishing the division of power,

and how the Executive _____. Maybe it's because you, coming as only the second Executive in the County, you were still forging that position, and that this was inevitable, this power struggle?

CG: Well, I don't know. I think probably personalities exacerbated it a bit. But, yes, I think fundamentally it was inevitable, and will probably continue to some degree. Although, now I think it is on a firmer foundation. And the current Executive and Council seem to be getting along well, and limiting their battles to substantive ones and not personalities. I think there were more personalities involved than there should have been. But much of it, I think will happen.

For example, I attended a couple of meetings of County Executives from around the country, and then one in Annapolis and there were maybe a dozen County Executives from large counties there. And we went around the table, and someone asked, "What is your biggest problem?" And almost everyone there mentioned the legislative branch ... you know, struggles with the legislative branch. So I think that tension is inevitable and probably good; I don't think it really hurts anyone. I'm not sure that any of this bickering sort of hurt anyone really.

One that you mentioned that I didn't comment on was having different lobbyists in Annapolis; that was really kind of ridiculous and silly. And I don't think it needs to happen. I think maybe that will be stopped. But again, the planning thing had a lot to do with that. We were [on] opposite sides of that. And Annapolis was where the decision was made, and we won. And I think that caused a little reaction. So, yes, there were things like that which I think were unnecessary; I'm perfectly willing to accept my share — small as it may be — [laughs] of the Planning Board. But, yes, that needn't go on. But I think there will always be a tension between us.

JJ: In 1982 you took your budget on the road. What special problems were you facing at that time?

CG: Well, I think we decided by then that we ought to make the budget process as open as we possibly could. And so we started having forums on the budget in various parts of the county. And really, I've always been kind of amazed that we survived it, in the sense that the people were concerned and did raise issues. But I think we did not get a sense of outrage or a sense of being unresponsive to what the county's needs were when we had those forums. There were people there that wanted more; basically, that's what it was: more schools, more roads, and we needed both. But in

those meetings, they were constructive and relatively calm. But we felt that it was a good way to find out what people wanted and to test whether we were accurate in what we thought was the case.

And of course, we have a big county geographically; I don't think people realize sometimes how big it is, and how disparate it is. You have a part of the county really that is still leveling off, if not slightly declining in enrollment in the schools, whereas in the upper part of the county, we're feverishly building new schools. And so there is a difference in parts of the county, and I think you have to keep those things in mind. And I'm sure we can come back to the whole growth issue, but that is definitely a problem. There is congestion there, and it's different in different parts of the county. So that was one reason why I had those forums. And I think they worked extremely well, and that by and large we found that while people were concerned, that they weren't desperate and that we were being responsive to their needs.

JJ: You frequently referred to the county's AAA bond rating. Why did you see that as being so important? And how was it preserved?

CG: I think the AAA bond rating is extremely important; it's important, in part, fiscally. You have a lower interest rate on your bonds and that saves the taxpayers millions of dollars over a long period of time. But in a budget that now is over a billion dollars, you know, maybe a million or so a year in savings on interest costs, isn't the crucial thing. I think the importance of a triple-A bond rating is what it says about the whole fiscal management of the county, and the health of the county from an economic point of view. And whether, as judged by the rating agencies, which after all are not the final say about government, but do have a lot of experience in assessing whether a community is meeting its needs, and whether it's doing so with a fiscally responsible and effective point of view. I think to have the judgement that we are among the best — if not the best in the country in that respect — is extremely important in terms of how we perceive and are perceived in doing our job in the county. So I think, for all those reasons, the AAA bond rating is extremely important.

And I think we had one big battle over that, because we felt that the School Board was making claims on our fiscal structure that were really unwarranted. And I want to point out that there has been no school space, that the School Board has asked, that we have not supported. All we did was to say that we don't need to build two brand new high

schools, starting at the same time at the cost of \$40 million. And I don't think there is any question we're right about that. There's no need to build two high schools immediately. One is being built now, and the other will be coming along shortly. We have built all of the new elementary school capacity that the School Board has asked for.

There are some temporary classrooms, but not because we didn't provide the funds to build the school. I think it's somewhat inevitable that with the growth we've had, there would be some temporary classrooms, fewer by the way than occurred back in the '60s, when you had double enrollment, morning and afternoon. We haven't gotten into that, but we have been able to pretty much keep up with school capacity. So we never took the position that we couldn't do what really needs to be done, from a capital point of view, including a huge road program. I mean, our road program is much bigger than any other local government that I know, including Fairfax County. They're just beginning to catch up with us.

So we never took the position that we can't do what needs to be done, but we did take the position that we don't need to do everything immediately. And we can stage and manage the growth of the capital budget. And we had something of a

battle over that. And we were cautioned by advisors that we had that our AAA rating was an issue. I mean, no one ever said, "You're going to lose your AAA rating," nor did we ever slash, as I say, needed projects because of that. And one will never know whether we would have lost it or not. But I think what we were really saying — and I think it ought to continue to be said — is that fiscal restraint is still an issue. It wouldn't take much to get back into a taxpayers' revolt. The national economy may not be as good as it is forever. And there's always, I think, a reason to be restrained from the fiscal point of view, and to be concerned about analyses that are made by Standard and Poor, or other rating agencies, of how our fiscal management is going.

For example, the concept that your budget should not exceed 2 percent of your tax base; things like that which are not magic ... there's no magic limit. But they are important to be aware of how the whole fiscal picture is set up. And we did have some debates with the Council over those issues. I don't think they really ... again, we turned out to get just about 98 percent of what we asked for. And also the Council agreed with us on most of the ways in which we suggested holding back or cutting. But, I think those were.... After all, fiscal management is what really a County Executive is elected to provide. I mean, County Executives ... probably

the Executive everywhere, but certainly in Montgomery County, is the only person who is inclined to say "no;" and it's part of your job. I mean, we didn't say "no" that much.

If you look at the budget — I haven't really even looked at it — I'm sure it grew tremendously while I was in office; less than inflation. That was the difference. We stayed below inflation and managed to hold the size of the government steady. But we certainly grew. But if the County Executive doesn't say "no" to spending money in Montgomery County, no one will. So I think that really is what the press sees as sort of battles over fiscal issues, and the County Executive saying "no," and everyone else wanting more. And most of it, that people wanted, got done, but not quite all of it. That's how some of these AAA bond issues arose, I think.

JJ: Well, let's come to the big topic of economic growth. Tell us about the evolution of the policy to attract hi-tech development.

CG: Well, I think that started before my term. There was a study done many years ago called "Boise-Cascade Studies," the basic finding of which was quite logical that not all growth is good. And that there's a difference, and that fundamentally Montgomery County's base should be a high

technology base. We have here major federal research institutions; NIH is the best example, but the other is David Taylor Naval Research Facility, and others. And we have here the most highly educated work force in the world, in the Washington region in general, and Montgomery County in particular has a tremendous hi-tech work base in its work force.

We are not a place where smoke-stack industry is appropriate, and therefore that isn't something we should be pushing. See, it is also pretty well established by that study — which has been debated, how valid it was — but I think, in general, it's common sense that residential growth costs relatively more than commercial and hi-tech growth. Of course, one depends on the other; you can't keep building your employment base without needing housing to support it. But that, basically, the extent to which we are not a "bedroom community," but have an economic base that is going along with the residential base, the better off we are in terms of the balance of the economic picture.

And sometime during my period in office, we crossed the line so that now almost 60 percent of the work force that lives in the county, works in the county as well. And I think the main thing to keep in mind about economic development and growth is that it's not that it's a quality of life issue. I

mean, that's what we should ask ourselves: what is good for the quality of life? And I think most people will say that it's good that we have a large number of jobs near where people live; that we're no longer a "bedroom community," where people mostly go in and out of the District everyday. But most people live here and work here, and that that's a good thing. It is a good thing that we're on the cutting edge of high technology, from a world-wide point of view. I mean, it makes us a more interesting place to be. And I think that, again, because of the federal research facilities, that is logical that we do that.

One of the major economic steps that we've taken — I think, probably, the major economic step — is the establishment of two major university campuses here. Now, I think that's more quality of life than it is economic. I think, in the long run, it will contribute to the kind of place where we are and make it a more exciting, interesting place to live. So we believed in balance in economic growth. I am not a believer in economic growth purely for the sake of the tax base. And that is an oversimplified argument that is used by the development community, and it's not accurate. I mean, probably development costs at least as much as it produces. So I don't believe in this sort of blind economic growth just in order to increase tax base.

Now, remember a couple of other things: one is that the sewer moratorium ended and the national recession ended during my term. And the pent-up demand really was enormous, for those two reasons. So we have had very, very substantial pressure in growth, and I think we need to do some catch-up. There's no doubt about that; we fell behind. Now, I also am not prepared to concede what some people say was that we didn't spend enough on roads and schools. I really think we had just about as large a program as we could have produced, not only afford. I mean, as I say, I don't think it's so much losing your AAA bond rating, if you use any sense at all. But, you know, how many roads can you build at one time?

We built \$30 million in new roads to serve Metro. Probably the biggest single impact on life, individual life, while I was in office was the opening of Metro Rail. I mean, I don't think there's much question about that. And it's been a phenomenal success. You have something like 80,000 rides per day of Montgomery County residents on Metro Rail. And we're beginning to expand parking and the like ... to provide for that.

So there were these sort of unleashed pressures on growth from the national economy and the end of the sewer moratorium, and we are in a catch-up mode. I don't think

that our economic development program contributed to the congestion. I think it, if anything, did more to kind of rationalize it, and analyze what it is we're doing and what our interest is and where our future lies. And I'd say the result of recognizing that to retain and to serve our existing work force, you need a university presence for continuing education and post-graduate education. Those kinds of decisions were really what we decided from the point of view of economic development.

I also think that we have to recognize that the Washington region is a very desirable place for people to live, and that they want to be here; really our congestion problems are the problems of success. We wanted that people like our schools and like our roads. We took a survey in which there was overwhelming favorable findings about life in Montgomery County, and the government and services that are provided. So I think really people are pleased about things in general, and that that's, again, why you have congestion, because it's a good thing and people want to be here.

I also believe — I don't think I'm being Pollyanna; time will tell — that we have the programs underway that are going to adjust to that growth. I mentioned the huge program of building schools and roads that we had, including our building something like a hundred million dollars worth of

state roads with county funds. We opposed an arbitrary cap on growth in Montgomery County. I think that would have been a terrible mistake, and may have been illegal. It certainly was inequitable, and would have ruined, I think, the attitude with which people regard Montgomery County as a place to develop. And that would hurt us in bad times, I think, very substantially, and would have harmed our reputation.

On the other hand, we did impose impact fees, and that will generate, I've forgotten, many, many millions of dollars over the next 15 or 20 years to build needed roads. We have expanded our bus system; we've inaugurated some sort of programs of free bus transportation and car pooling and van pooling. All those things, I think, are beginning to have their say. And I also must say — and this isn't my achievement — Montgomery County does have a land use planning process that is not all that bad. I mean, I think that the Executive needed to be more of a part of it.

But we do have a land use plan, with wedges and corridors, and a very substantial level of open green space, which I think will remain that way; much better than other jurisdictions around here. So I think we have a lot going for us in terms of the land use situation. And that while we are catching up and there is congestion, and it will remain

bad, and maybe in some places get worse for a period of time, that the solutions are understood and are underway, and that we'll be able to deal with them.

JJ: What persuaded Johns Hopkins to come into that Center for Advanced Research? Were there arrangements that had to be made or any sort of deals?

CG: Well, we talked with them a great deal, and with the University of Maryland, which was establishing a research facility for biotechnology here. But Johns Hopkins ... we talked with them, but they were very business-like about it. They took a survey of a large number of ... I mean thousands of business people in [the] high technology community, and found a tremendous demand for increased educational opportunities: continuing and post-graduate education. And so they simply responded to what they felt was an excellent market. And we are fortunate to have that area up there.

And Jim Gleason, of course, I think, foresaw, maybe not the specific way in which it would work out, but he did see that area of Shady Grove as a large tract of land, which the county owned a substantial portion, that should be used for medical purposes. I think it's been developed now to include education and not only hospitals and the like, but also biotechnology and other firms. But basically that county

property has given us an opportunity for these new developments, both for the University of Maryland and Johns Hopkins, which I think will have a very favorable impact on the future of the county.

JJ: So that was lacking at the time, wasn't it? I mean, higher education...?

CG: It's the one thing that was missing. We have, as I mentioned, the highest education level in the country. We have more Ph.D.s in Montgomery County, for example — for better or worse — than you can find anywhere in the world. And people, I think, don't realize what a phenomenal educational facility a place like NIH is. I think NIH produces forty Ph.D.s a year or something like that. But we did not have the major research institution, like MIT in the Boston area, or Stanford, or Research Triangle in North Carolina. And it was the inhibitor.

The big problem that we hear from business people that we did talk to, who are considering moving here, is not roads or schools and taxes; it's not having opportunities for continuing education. Because the useful life of a technical education, apparently, today is very short. You have to learn or perish. So to respond with these programs, I think, yes, was the crucial missing link in our economic structure.

And one that will not just enable us to grow, but will prevent us from dying on the vine, and will permit us to be current and to have opportunities here, the kinds that people want for their families and themselves.

JJ: Let's talk a bit also about the arts and humanities. How supportive of the arts and humanities was your administration?

CG: Well, I think very. And I think most of the humanities and arts groups that had been active have felt that we supported them substantially. We set up Strathmore program, again that ... Jim Gleason foresaw the need for a place like that. And the final decision wasn't made, but it was foreseen that that area where Strathmore Hall is, in the Grosvenor area, should be preserved. And we did preserve it and set up a foundation, and have given it substantial support. And I think it's doing very well. The Arts Council has been established and is expanding.

We have felt that the private sector has the fundamental responsibility to continue those undertakings. And I think they are responding to that. We are furnishing substantial matching support, and will continue to do so for fine arts programs at Strathmore Hall, and that's basically music and visual arts, more than otherwise. We also have a very strong

theater program, in general, in Montgomery County. But our Recreation Department, as you know, does operate the Roundhouse Theater. And it produces excellent plays, and also, I think, equally important, provides training and opportunities for young people to learn theater. And that is an excellent program.

We have passed a 1 percent expenditure for the arts for capital programs. That was Bill Hanna's bill; I strongly supported it, and I think it will have a favorable impact in having public art. And those things can be controversial; people have a way of disliking what juries pick. But in the long run, I don't think there is any doubt that to have a program of public expenditure for the arts is a good thing, and I'm glad that started during our administration. I think, therefore, that overall we have done a lot for the development and encouragement of the fine arts — theater, painting, music — in Montgomery County, and that it has done well and will continue to do well.

JJ: What sort of problems did historic preservation present to you in this period?

CG: Well, I'm a strong supporter of historic preservation. The historic preservation ordinance was passed during my administration. And I've appointed commissions to implement

it. I think it's been good; I think the disputes over it are well worth it. There is a major issue now in Silver Spring about the extent to which Art Nouveau should be preserved, and to what extent and what really are valuable monuments there, and whether or not.... And I'm glad I don't have to be involved in making those decisions. But in general, I think that most of the preservation decisions have not been ones that required turning things down. I mean, I think we have preserved a lot of art and historical heritage at a time when it wasn't controversial, but just could have been lost inadvertently. So that really it hasn't been a matter of that much controversy, and I think it's been a very good process.

END OF INTERVIEW

of government. And they're not unrelated. I think you've got to be able to deal with both. So, yes, all those people are ones that I turned to.

And then the public ... there was just any number of people. Again, Montgomery County ... there's something like 2000 people that participate in committees and commissions for the Montgomery County government. And every commission we have is personned by experts in the field, and really it's just incredible how capable and effective they are. The volunteer -- that's another area that we emphasized was volunteerism. And we set up a new process for volunteers. We had several programs, for example, for retired federal employees, who were very helpful to the county government on a volunteer basis.

The Blue Ribbon Commission on Planning, Harvey Krushner is the chairman of it. I think you'd have to mention him as a person who provided tremendous leadership on that; on the Higher Education Commission that identified the need for campuses and places for continuing education, [Krushner] had a lot to do with the moving ahead with the Johns Hopkins and University of Maryland. And just in general, a number of people like that I turned to, as well: Jim Culp, who has been the Head of the Chamber of Commerce, and a number of others are the sort of people you turn to.

I believe in listening, and I think you have to in Montgomery County, because there's so many people who want to tell you what they think -- but rightly so. And I think that I did a pretty good job of knowing what people in the community as a whole were thinking and getting their advice. And so I turned to a lot of, probably hundreds if not thousands of people in the period that I was in office.

JJ: Well, then in 1984 you decided to leave government. Would you like to elaborate at all on that decision?

CG: Well, sure. I've talked a lot about it; I mean, it's been written about a lot. And I find that the more I talk about it the less I'm really sure exactly what was involved. There's no doubt in my mind that the positive aspects of it are the basic ones. Just to state what it is, as you know, I've decided to go into the Episcopal ministry, and I'm now in seminary pursuing that. And there are a number of aspects to it. Maybe somewhere involved is underlying frustration with government, but I really don't think so. I think, when all is said and done, I feel government works very, very well.

And I think most of the things worked well when I was in government. I like politics; I like 95 percent of the people

in it. I think they are very talented; I think the political process is an exciting one. I think politicians, as a group, are more imaginative and honorable and effective than most other groups of people. So I'm a great supporter of politics. I believe in [the] party system and so on. So I'm not, I think, discouraged or sort of "burned out" in terms of the political process or government. There are frustrations and we've talked about some of them, and I guess conceivably that has some part in it -- but a very small part.

I think the ministry, in many ways, is an opportunity to continue service to people. And you're dealing with many of the same issues, probably more on a one-to-one basis than in large groups, although I think leadership in the church can involve talking to the community as a whole. But, in general, it's more one-on-one; but the same problems of hunger and isolation, loneliness, aging ... but I think maybe with an emphasis more on the spiritual aspects of it. And I'm interested in, I think, more on a broader scope than just Montgomery County; you know, where the world has been and where it's going and some of those things. To have a little time to think about that, I think, has been very appealing.

So I consider it, more or less, progress along the path that I've been following, which is to try to be involved in the community and to help people and to work on issues that affect people and their lives, now when there's so much greater emphasis on the spiritual aspect of our lives. Now part of it, I think, was just maturing as a person, growing older, and maybe giving more thought to where we've been and where we're going as a society and a culture and as human beings.

Part of it also is personal. And we had a son who was very ill and who is fine now; he had a brain tumor and was successfully treated. And he's graduated from college and working and doing very well. And it wasn't a direct relationship, you know ... sort of a bargain that if he gets better, I'll go into the ministry. But I think it just helped in this maturing process, or at least expanded my horizons, you might say, or from my point of view, raised issues about what's important and what isn't, that changed my direction a bit. So I think that personal experience was part of it. But I regard it as a fairly natural evolution of my own career and what's important to me.

JJ: There are some who feel that you enjoyed campaigning and politics, and they can't imagine that you will stay out of it. Would you be able to live without it?

CG: Well, I have enjoyed campaigning and politics. But I have no doubt that I will not run again. Let me put it ... I'm sure I will not run for office again, or be involved directly in partisan political activity. Again, though, as many of the people in the clergy, who have read some of these articles, say to me, and I'm well aware of it, that, it is not a retiring, isolated profession where you're not dealing with people or don't have to speak about issues or can't ... not campaign, but certainly talk with people or be part of the public and be a public figure to some extent.

So I don't expect to be locked up in a monastery. And the ministry is a very active and public kind of profession, so I don't think that whatever interests I retain in public life will be frustrated at all by being in the ministry. But I will not be involved in partisan politics, and that's ... I just think people.... I think that's inappropriate in general; I mean, you can't overgeneralize. But for me, who have been a partisan elected official, to continue as an active partisan Democrat at the same time that I'm in a ministry for a denomination, I don't think would be appropriate. So I intend to stay out of partisan politics. But I will undoubtedly be interested in many of the issues: homelessness or nuclear armament, for example, some of these issues which I think are issues for society, not just for

government, and for the church as well, I will undoubtedly take an interest in, but not on a partisan political basis, I hope.

JJ: The timing of the announcement was sort of unplanned, I guess....

CG: Well, it was. Although I knew it was almost inevitable that it would have come out. I mean, once I decided to do it, I certainly had to move ahead with it because it takes a while. I mean, there's almost a year that you're dealing with your own church, your own parish committee there, and then there's a process where the diocese ... you go through an interview process there. And then there's another year of internship where you work in a church -- which I did down at Epiphany downtown, just on weekends. There's been some misunderstanding of what that was all about. I really worked twelve hours a week, mainly on Sundays and early mornings and late nights. But anyway, that's a year.

So I had to get going with it. But once I did, and the decision was made that I was going to go ahead with it, I think it was really -- and with a number of people from my own parish and the diocese involved -- inevitable that it would become public. And really, looking back on it, I think some people thought I was going to be a "lame duck" for two

years and sort of go off in a corner somewhere. That didn't happen. And in many ways, it was the most active period of the entire eight, although they were all pretty active, that I was office. So I don't think it hurt anything. And while I would have preferred that it not be public, as soon as it was, I really think I expected that it probably would be. And I don't think it was bad news.

JJ: Well, as a matter of fact, did it really help you get some of the things through that you...?

CG: I think it may have. I think, for example, the planning initiatives; I was able to make it clear that I would not be the beneficiary of the changes, and sort of removed.... Some people made the argument that it was a power grab anyway, but it didn't have much steam behind it when I wasn't going to be running again. So I think, yes, that helped. And I think there was a certain ... we are so cynical as a society about politicians, that you gain something when people think you're not going to be staying in politics. I think that's too bad because, as I said, to me politicians are among the most honorable effective people there are. But the fact is that to some extent, you gain something by turning your back on politics. And [when] people don't think of you as a politician, they give you credit for that. And I think that helped.

So while there was probably some aspect of being a "lame duck," not really, I think I was probably stronger. And then of course, I also was deeply involved in the campaign for my successor. I was a strong supporter of Sid Kramer. And so I think, even from that point of view, I didn't lose ... whatever clout being an active politician provides, because I was involved in that campaign, in particular, and some others as well.

JJ: Let's talk a little about your campaigning for Sid Kramer. Why was that? Why did you decide to go so strongly?

CG: Well, again, it was mainly positive. I find campaigning much easier, in fact, it's possible only from the point of view of being for someone. And I've been an admirer of Sid Kramer for a long time; I've known him well, I've seen him in action, as the chairman of our Senate delegation. And I thought he would make an excellent County Executive. I think it's already clear that he will be. He had served on the Council. He'd been in our community a long time; his family has been very active. His wife, Betty Mae, [is] a very effective citizen, as well as supporter of Sid. So I thought he would be an excellent County Executive. I think he had the kind of judgment and balance, the ability to listen, the sort of steadiness that you need in a job like County

Executive. So for all those reasons, I was very strongly supportive of him, and I encouraged him to run, and supported him very strongly.

I've had a couple of people raise the question of whether it's proper or not. To me, that's kind of ludicrous. I mean, I think people involved in party politics have an obligation, if they feel strongly about it, to support others. Voters know who they're going to vote for; you certainly, in Montgomery County, don't tell people who to vote for. But to me, it was entirely appropriate -- and I think that most people agree -- for me to be involved in the selection of my successor.

I think that's one problem with the Republican Party, as a whole, in Montgomery County is that there's not enough of that mutual support of one for the others. So you get an occasional exception to the rule, such as Connie Morella, but basically you don't have people working for others to improve the quality of candidates for office and the like. My predecessor, I think we mentioned before, supported no one to succeed him, of any party. I don't know, I think part of the effectiveness of my years in office will be the fact that I worked for my successor, and that he was elected, and I hope will be very effective. And whatever judgments people bother to make of my period in office, I think, will be

colored to some extent by his effectiveness, and the fact that I was supporting him. So I think you've got to have the continuity in public office. And so, for all those reasons, I was for him.

I, of course, was very much opposed to the person running against him, Dave Scull. I don't think we need to rehash all those things, but we didn't see eye-to-eye in any way. I think the campaign that he ran was not an appropriate campaign, but of course there are complaints on both sides, I suppose, about that. But my feeling was that it was a bad campaign, and that the effort to blame Sid Kramer for our congestion problem, when Sid had had nothing whatever to do with it, and the Council was the entity that made all the land use decisions, I thought was kind of a ridiculous posture to strike. So I was against Dave, but really, mainly I was for Sid Kramer and supported him for that reason. And I'm glad he won and glad I had some part in his victory.

JJ: Are there any areas that we haven't touched on that you feel that we should?

CG: I can't think of any. [interruption] Yes, there are a couple things I'd like to mention. First, in connection with housing and rent control, I ought to point out the leadership that Rick Ferrara, as the Head of our Housing

Department, exercised. Without him, I think we would not have had the success we did in our condominium conversion program or in housing or in the end of rent control. And then, with respect to cable and many other issues, Alex Greene, on my staff, really carried the burden extremely well, and it was, I think, in large measure because of his efforts that we were able to turn around the cable situation. And those two people were among the ones that I relied on for advice and counsel, and I want to emphasize that.

END OF INTERVIEW