

3-31-1999

Gosselin, Lucien B. oral history interview

Andrea L'Hommedieu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scarab.bates.edu/muskie_oh

Recommended Citation

L'Hommedieu, Andrea, "Gosselin, Lucien B. oral history interview" (1999). *Edmund S. Muskie Oral History Collection*. 148.
http://scarab.bates.edu/muskie_oh/148

This Oral History is brought to you for free and open access by the Muskie Archives and Special Collections Library at SCARAB. It has been accepted for inclusion in Edmund S. Muskie Oral History Collection by an authorized administrator of SCARAB. For more information, please contact batesscarab@bates.edu.

Interview with Lucien B. Gosselin by Andrea L'Hommedieu

Summary Sheet and Transcript

Interviewee

Gosselin, Lucien B.

Interviewer

L'Hommedieu, Andrea

Date

March 31, 1999

Place

Lewiston, Maine

ID Number

MOH 079

Use Restrictions

© Bates College. This transcript is provided for individual **Research Purposes Only**; for all other uses, including publication, reproduction and quotation beyond fair use, permission must be obtained in writing from: The Edmund S. Muskie Archives and Special Collections Library, Bates College, 70 Campus Avenue, Lewiston, Maine 04240-6018.

Biographical Note

Lucien B. Gosselin was born on November 13, 1941 to Delia Hamel Gosselin and Arthur J. Gosselin. His mother was a homemaker and his father worked full time at the Pepperill Mill of Lewiston. He was the second youngest of nine children in his family. They lived on Blake Street in Lewiston in a working class, French-speaking neighborhood. His father passed away when he was ten. He attended the parochial schools St. Peter's Elementary and St. Dominic's High School. During high school and after graduation, he worked for the Lewiston newspapers, at first as a delivery boy, and then in the circulation and proofing departments. He then worked at Victor News from 1961 to 1963 before taking a position in the Lewiston city government as an assistant to the City Controller. He eventually worked his way to being the City Administrator under the new Lewiston City Charter of 1980. He served in this capacity until 1989. Gosselin was instrumental in lobbying for the founding of Lewiston-Auburn College. He graduated from Lewiston-Auburn College in 1991. He later received a masters degree from the Muskie School of Public Policy, and is pursuing his Ph.D. He worked for the Maine Development Foundation in the early 1990s, and in 1997 became president of the Lewiston Auburn Economic Growth Council (LAEGC), which is the position he held at the time of the interview.

Scope and Content Note

Interview includes discussions of: the exodus of Lewiston's textile industry; difficulties attracting new industry to Lewiston/Auburn; downtown Lewiston; urban renewal grants; religion in Lewiston and Auburn; French heritage as a community asset; the "Democratic machine" of Lewiston; Lewiston getting "short changed" by Maine State government; social clubs; Lower Lisbon Street in Lewiston; the 1939 Lewiston Charter; the 1980 Lewiston Charter; Federal grants causing municipal re-organization; setting up a "Council-Administrator" form of government; Lewiston Auburn College; Gosselin's personal education experience; Ernest Malenfant; Paul Couture; Maurice Goulet; and Mario's Restaurant.

Indexed Names

Beliveau, John
Berube, Gerry
Bourgeois, Henry
Bussiere, Frank
Call, George
Caron, Lillian
Clifford, Robert
Cote, Al
Couture, Paul
Couturier, Robert
Dionne, Paul
Gauvreau, Horace
Gosselin, Lucien B.
Goulet, Maurice
Jacques, Emile "Bill"
Jalbert, Louis
Malenfant, Ernest
Malenfant, Bob
Muskie, Edmund S., 1914-1996
Orestis, Antoinette "Toni"
Orestis, John
Philippi, D. Harlan
Rancourt, Georges
Ricker, George
Rocheleau, Bill
Talarand, John
Tanguay, Norm
Woodbury, Bob

Transcript

Andrea L'Hommedieu: This is our second interview with Lucien Gosselin on March 31st, 1999. This is Andrea L'Hommedieu conducting the interview. Mr. Gosselin, I'd like to start

with a question about the Lewiston-Auburn community and what it was like when you were growing up. Why don't we start with economically?

Lucien Gosselin: When I was growing up, basically it depends how far you want to go. I was born in '41. Obviously I have little recollection of the early '40s but clearly following WWII this community was still doing quite well, particularly in light of the textile and shoe industry, there were major factories in the support of the war efforts. So things were pretty well, going on pretty well until about the early '50s. In the early '50s, and again, I was about ten years old, we started seeing an exodus of the textile industry due to foreign imports, and also significant attraction from the southern states giving textile industries and mill owners preferential breaks to relocate their mills closer to their raw material. The, and we saw a similar movement with the shoe shops. I mean, in those days, and don't hold me to the exact figure, my guesstimate is, between textile workers and shoe workers, we probably had fifty percent, fifty to sixty percent of our work force in those industries representing darn close to twenty thousand people, just in those two sectors of manufacturing.

So as those particular industries started to decline, it had an immediate, noticeable impact on the community. My recollection, particularly in the early to mid-fifties with the closing of the Continental Mill and then subsequently Androscoggin Mill and cutbacks in Bates Manufacturing, we saw a very large number of people who traditionally had seen their future as working in the mills and shoe shops start to relocate to greener pastures. And my recollection was greener pastures tended to be Hartford, Connecticut with the aircraft industry that were located there, and many found great opportunities of that industry was booming. And they would leave the community for Hartford and get a job in manufacturing of aircrafts and aircraft related parts. And every time they'd come back home, they'd entice somebody else to move to Hartford, Connecticut. So we saw a significant exodus of local people relocate to Hartford, and other places in New England, principally due to the decline in textile and shoe. And that situation compounded by national recessions at various points in time saw this community struggling for a new identity.

Surprisingly enough, the process was very slow, but Lewiston-Auburn did reasonably well at attracting new, diversified industries, particularly manufacturing-type companies like Tambrands and GE and Gates Formed Fibre and Union Camp. And the expansion of existing industrial base, the printing industry such as Geiger Brothers and others, to a point where we I don't think ever regained the total work force of manufacturing we ever had, but we have today a much better diversified industrial base than we ever had. Those were tough years, from the early '50s through the '70s, mid-'70s. It was always incremental.

And particularly for Lewiston, the battle was to try to keep our retail center in downtown Lisbon Street with the advent of the malls starting to surface back in the late '50s and early '60s. The roadside malls in those days, as each one of them got built, we saw more and more exodus from Lisbon Street. And eventually, giving our best effort, we're trying to revitalize Lisbon Street through UDAC (*sounds like*) grant. The community has spent in excess of twenty-two million of public and private funds, state and federal included, to try and hold the fabric together on Lisbon Street, unsuccessfully obviously. But we were just going against trends in the retail industry. And with the advent of the Auburn mall coming online, eventually one by one we saw the

national chain stores that were on Lisbon Street locate to the malls and then eventually the privately owned enterprises. And as much as we had tried everything we could to spruce up Lisbon Street, both the infrastructure as well as trying to leverage marginal businesses, it was a losing proposition. And even today we're still struggling to find a rebirth for the street.

Though, you know, if one were to look at success stories, one needs to understand that had the city not spent twenty-two million dollars on Lisbon Street, what it would look like today, I mean, it would be an absolute slum. Secondly is that we have more people working in downtown Lewiston than we ever had, that, as much as we may have had a lot of activity with the retail at one time, many of the upper stories were vacant warehouses. Now most of the buildings that were rehabbed, particularly those during the UDAC program where we put elevators in multi-story buildings, those buildings are fully occupied. Every building on the street that has an elevator is fully occupied. And that's probably one of the most successful components about UDAC program was, the elevator grant programs, most innovative and most successful. Because even today, going back now almost fifteen years after the start of UDAC those buildings are still fully occupied and are fairly resilient in terms of swings in the economy.

It was a tough period, a tough period, and it was period where people were struggling not only in terms of finding a job, because they were far and few between, but in many cases required retooling, re-skilling of people, in order to find a job. We have had a continuous stream of out migrations since the fifties. I guess we probably peaked with about forty-two thousand people back in the, maybe '40 or '50 census. We are now officially around thirty-six thousand. We've never regained that exodus, as a result of loss of the shoe and textile industry.

AL: What about religiously? What were some of the predominant churches in Lewiston?

LG: Well, Lewiston-Auburn was predominantly Roman Catholic. It has a fairly strong Jewish community. At one time we had, (I think we still do, I'm not sure) at one time we had two synagogues. They may have merged, but I'm not sure yet, because we built a brand new synagogue in Auburn. But we still have a fairly significant Jewish denomination. We have a fairly strong Baptist denomination, Presbyterian and then a host now of new churches have come on the scene, generally Protestant, non-denominational type churches. I know that the area probably still assumes it has, I'm going to guess, probably sixty percent of the citizens of Lewiston-Auburn at least purport to be Roman Catholics. I don't know if that really reflects those that are actually practicing today. But the numbers in terms of those who align themselves with the Roman Catholic Church, in the ballpark. The rest of, we've seen as I said in recent years a whole variety of Protestant churches coming out on the scene.

AL: What about ethnically?

LG: Again, when I grew in the community, I came from a French-speaking neighborhood. Most of our ancestors originated from the Quebec province. The predominant language was French, as I've stated earlier. [I] did not really learn to speak English or speak English fluently until the sixth to seventh grade in elementary school, and as time went on English became significantly more important. I know even during my high school years, my mom did not speak English very well and was reluctant to do so. But the television sort of changed that because

everything on TV was in English and as she watched TV, she'd become more and more comfortable speaking English. I still have members of our family, particularly the elders, who prefer speaking French whenever they can, though they often times will listen to conversation in English and respond in French, which is not unusual still today.

The transition in the community I think to a large extent occurred with television coming on the scene. I mean, even those, just about every family that would have been predominantly French-speaking at home, once television had been introduced in the home, English just became a, a commonplace. In my own case I can remember a number of incidences where if you went somewheres and you spoke French, even though you knew that the person you were speaking to understood you, they often times made nasty remarks that you should communicate in English and not in French. There was a period of time where the French-speaking people, as well as the language, was really resisted in this community, if not admonished.

We've since in most recent years have had a renaissance whereby people start to appreciate the fact that there is a French-Canadian heritage and that people are bilingual. I mean, this country's notorious for being of a mindset that if you can't speak English then you don't belong. I've had the occasion in my professional life to travel abroad, as well as other states, and I have found the ability to communicate in French to be a real asset. Just about every place I've traveled in the U.S. as well as overseas, I've had the opportunity to communicate in French and being bilingual is worth every penny in the world. And it's unfortunate that we don't value that as much as we should.

AL: Just this morning when I was leaving to come here for this interview, at Bates College I heard two people speaking both in English and French in the building where I work. And I just, I think it's wonderful and creative. Tell me a little bit about the politics of Lewiston and Auburn, and maybe how they differed politically.

LG: When I grew up, my recollection is that Lewiston was a predominantly Democratic stronghold, a very strong Democratic machine in place with neighborhood bosses and neighborhood cliques. The Democratic machinery pretty much managed and ruled the election process in terms of who they would put up for office to run for any particular seat, as well as who they would oppose and who they would finance. There was a very strong local Democratic city committee. On the other hand, there were very few Republicans. I don't know how well they were organized; I don't know how many admitted to being Republican in Lewiston.

But in those early years my recollection, back in the '50s and '60s, Auburn was just a counterpart. Auburn was a predominantly Republican community, well-organized. In those years, I believe, there were very few Republican, I'm sorry, very few Democrats elected in public office from Auburn whether it be for city council seats, school committee seats or House or, State House or Senate. It tended to be a Republican stronghold, so there was a very, a difference of opinion in that regard. I'm not quite sure what happened over time. But as time went on, surprisingly enough, Democrats started to run for office and would win to a point where a significant number of the legislative delegation in Auburn I believe, if not all of them, most of them are now Democrats. The city council was mixed with Democrats and Republicans, our mayor is clearly Republican in Auburn and Lewiston clearly a Democrat.

I don't recall in, at least that I know of, any Republican ever holding a city council seat in Lewiston in recent years or, and historically. There may have, I just don't recall any. Well, one exception I guess, George Call who was originally Republican who ran and got elected and John Talarand (*sounds like*) who was a Republican elected. But they were far and few between, and some of those guys actually eventually changed their party. So, in Lewiston if you weren't Democratic, your chances of winning any election was pretty slim. Auburn over time changed, and there's a lot more common interest politically and socially now between Lewiston-Auburn than ever was. There's been sort of a melting of the pot so to speak, very different than it used to be when I grew up, (*unintelligible word*) perspective, at least politically.

AL: I wonder -- I've interviewed some people in other areas of the state who talk about [how they felt Republicans viewed them for being] Democrats. They didn't think they brushed their hair or their teeth or, you know, they were regarded as, as the lower end of the human scale in other parts of Maine because Maine was so strongly Republican. What was it like to live in Lewiston where it was so strongly Democratic and seeing the rest of the state go Republican all the time? Did you have a perception of that?

LG: I'm not sure it has to do with political parties, but I certainly have a perception that Lewiston in particular, vis-a-vis Auburn, particularly during my early years in public administration, Lewiston seemed to be constantly short-changed in terms of state allocation of resources. Look at the, at Auburn for example, our sister city back in the '60s and '70s where, and looking principally at issues like transportation. I mean, millions of dollars of road improvements were allocated to Auburn and little if anything allocated to Lewiston, even though Lewiston was a place the size of Auburn and the second largest city in the state. There's no question where the Republicans had a very significant stronghold in the legislature. Not to demean any of our, the Lewiston Democratic delegation; they simply did not have the clout to significantly impact allocation of resources. So that Republican communities, and given the example that we have with Lewiston-Auburn when Auburn was significantly Republican, seemed to do much better in Augusta than we ever did.

There's another perspective which, God forbid this went out to the public, I mean, looking back at the people we elected, particularly to the state legislature in those days which were part of the Democratic political machine in Lewiston, you sort of mentioned status or class. I mean, I have to at least rationalize in my own mind that we were not sending the very best people to Augusta to represent the community. They were part of a very strong political machinery. They were able to politic as a group, to campaign as a group and particularly in the days where we elected a group delegation to go to Augusta, these strong political types who were part of the machinery got elected. And in many cases one needs to question whether or not they truly had a personal agenda or whether they had a community agenda. And one of those personal agendas is the idea of lobbying legislation, particularly dealing with liquor, liquor licenses, and social clubs. I mean, that whole phenomena of social clubs I believe originated right here in Lewiston. And members of the delegation would spend an awful lot of energy fighting for getting rights for those social clubs as well as protecting their interests, particularly as it pertained to liquor laws.

AL: Can you tell me a little bit more about the social clubs? Some of the names of them, how

they functioned, what role did they play in the community?

LG: Well, there were a number. Some were, there were social clubs in some cases around what is known, or better known as the snowshoe clubs. But fundamentally they were year-round clubs, not just snowshoe clubs, though they participated in that snowshoe movement, particularly the relationship between Lewiston and other communities who had similar ethnic consideration in Canada where snowshoeing is a big sport. So the clubs all had a snowshoe kind of competitive environment, and very, very significant. Again, when I grew up, every year we used to have an ice castle in Kennedy Park or Main Street Square in front of the old Peck's building. And every year we used to have the snowshoe parade which was a, particularly when we were able to host the international snowshoers convention in Lewiston. This was a real big event where all the snowshoe clubs participated and we drew from all parts of New Brunswick and Quebec province and all the New England states with similar ethnic origin. It was a big, big to-do, a big feast, all-weekend affair. And they would draw three, four, five thousand snowshoers from all over, huge parade, usually at nighttime and usually, my recollection was, a real cold night. It never seemed to be on a nice calm night, but those were the days.

But the social clubs themselves continued to exist, whether it was the Montagnards, the Acme and the 3M Workmen's Club, and the, oh, the whole bunch of them; there's probably ten or twelve clubs. And these are all closed-door clubs where once you're inside the club it's considered to be a private activity and all you need to do is be a member. And once you're a member, what goes on inside the club is the club's business, they cannot be penetrated by law enforcement. So that the movement in social clubs I believe started here in Lewiston. It started with a very strong delegation protecting that interest, a very strong following, primarily blue-collar-type people. And, I mean, these clubs were reputed to have all kinds of activities behind closed doors from, well, liquor was cheap. Usually if you were a member of the club the price to buy liquor was fairly inexpensive. Many of them I think in the early years probably didn't allow women in the club; they were basically men-type organization. Never participated, but my understanding was that some gambling took place in the club. And obviously they had the occasional social event where strippers would come in and perform.

They, for Lewiston in particular back in the mid- to late '50s and '60s, early '60s, we had a whole host of them on Lisbon Street, and they tended to be real problem areas. Not so much when, I mean, occasionally you'd wind up with, you know, usual fights going in the club where they'd call the police and try to get people out. That's about the only time law enforcement was invited in the clubs, just squelching a fight of some sort. But usually the problem erupted at the end when they had to close for the night, at midnight or twelve o'clock on Eastern Standard Time. And often times these people would get out of the club and they'd obviously been drinking too much and it didn't take very much at that point to start fights. So that Lewiston Police Dept. would, on Friday and Saturday nights were quite busy at what is called the lower end where all the clubs and barrooms were located to break up fights and brawls on the street.

That also existed to a large extent back in the early '50s. You know, you used to get down by, I remember distinctly when down-town Lewiston was really the major hangout for service people from Brunswick Naval Air Station. And likewise with that environment, usually by the time clubs were, or barrooms were required to close statutorily, when people got on the street

inevitably you wound up with street fights and gang activities where the police department was spending an enormous amount of their time every Friday and Saturday night cleaning up the street after closing time. I don't know if those were good days or bad days. All I can tell you is there was a lot of activity on the street, good or bad.

But I know that during my term as city administrator there was significant effort to try to curb on social clubs and try to encroach into the area. And one of the major arguments for building a new police station and deciding to put a police station down on the lower end of Park and Spruce Street was to infiltrate, and to punch through Lisbon Street, to infiltrate the street and begin the process of cleaning up the neighborhood. The basic philosophy there was that if the police department is right in the middle of the hub of the neighborhood, with police officers coming and going and the proximity of the department, that that would curb a lot of those activities. And in fact it has.

There are still some clubs down there. I don't know that they pose a great deal of problems; I don't know what goes on behind closed doors. But as of late, and I'm saying last three, four, five years, we've seen very few complaints, very few police activity resulting from those clubs. We still have them; they're still peppered throughout town. They are not concentrated in one neighborhood like they used to be. I mean, there are some on Lincoln Street, there's some on Cedar Street, there's some on Lisbon Street, there's some on Walnut Street, there's some on Webber Avenue, there's some on West Bates Street. They're still around but they tend to be more restrictive and less troublesome. Now, again, I speak totally as a neophyte; I haven't been to one of those clubs for years.

AL: Could you tell me a little bit about the new city charter and how it developed in Lewiston? Who were some of the key players and why did the city finally change the charter?

LG: I need to ask you which charter you're talking about. The 1939 change or are you talking about the one in 1980?

AL: I believe I'm talking about the one in 1980.

LG: Nineteen eighty, the current charter?

AL: How about, go back to . . .

LG: Why don't I talk to you a little bit about each.

AL: Yeah, and we'll see what the connection is there.

LG: As I've stated earlier, the charter that predated 1939 was a mayor-council form of government; strong mayor, strong council. And as I understand it, even though I wasn't born yet, reading a little bit of history about the issue, there were a number of improprieties going on in city government which caused a citizen's group called Les Vigilants to stand up and seek a, to clean house. And they did so by having a number of public officials resign. Others were indicted and some actually served jail time and/or were fined or both. As a result, a new

transitional charter was formed called a mayor-council-commission form of government. The key element of that charter was that one, it was going to be transitional, and two, that no one body would have any real consolidation of all powers to manage the municipal affairs.

As a result of that charter the mayor became a pure ceremonial mayor, no vote on the city council, part-time office, ribbon cutting type of activity, chair the City Council, could only vote to break a tie. The members of the city council were the legislative body and basically took care of things like drafting new ordinances, granting permits, licenses, some rules and regulations, the principal function being to review the city budget upon recommendation of the Finance Committee. Their review was limited to non-personnel fringe benefit retirement bond matters, so they were left with a very small piece of the budget to resolve, if you assume that seventy percent of the budget is either personnel costs and related fringe benefits and retirement. Less than thirty percent of the rest of the budget really dealt with things like allocation for supply services and construction projects. So the city council tended to focus most of its energy on public works type activity in order to get a distribution of resources in various wards of the city, and that was always the main focus. The focus was always: where can we cut nickel and dimes off every line item in the budget so we can reallocate that in our capital budget for public works, paving, sidewalks? Things of that nature.

The, each department was headed by a five-member lay board who had the authority to hire and manage the entire staff and operation of that department, with the only restriction being that all financial transaction had to be under the purview of the Finance Committee. So that even though they could decide where they wanted to spend the money, in many cases were restricted until the Finance Committee would so approve. As a result of the structure, the Finance Committee became the power structure within city government. The Finance Committee, as a result of controlling the purse string, controlled the government because they would have final say on the number of personnel you would retain, the salary you would pay them, their level of fringe benefits, and ultimately made a recommendation on the entire budget to the City Council. And the City Council [was] restricted to change only those line items that did not fall under direct purview of the Finance Committee. So the Finance Committee was also the (*unintelligible phrase*) agent and as a result also regulated how you spent your money for capital items or projects and awarded all bids.

So the Finance Committee really became the power structure within city government. It was chaired by a mayor with a four-member board. And the charter did call in those days for some partisan aspect, that the majority party would have the majority members on the board, and that the boards would also have a Republican representation. So every board had at least two members of the Republican Party, and sometimes those people were hard to find. Sometimes those people would go out of their way to change their party affiliation so they could get a board appointment, at least met the requirements of the law. So whether they were truly Republicans or Democrats, who knows?

The government functioned reasonably well in spite of its structure. As I said, it was intended to be a transitional government. It lasted from 1939 to 1980, almost a forty-year span; for a transitional government that wasn't bad. There were many attempts over the years to come up with a new charter. But you can understand that when you have almost sixty people running the

government in various statutory positions, given all the boards and commissions we had, elected city council, the mayors, whenever there was an attempt to do away with all that stuff, you could immediately expect a knee-jerk reaction that, "I'm not going to give them my seat, I'm important in this government and who's going to do what I do?" So you would immediately expect that members of the Fire Commission would oppose any change in the charter because, "How can you run a fire department without a fire commission?" You'd get the same knee-jerk reaction from the police department, the Board of Health and Welfare, or the Board of Education, or library trustees. So it was very, very difficult to garner the kind of political support to effect change.

The government operated in spite of itself. When you tried to develop a typical organizational charter for the old Lewiston city charter, it didn't fit. I mean, the lines didn't connect. There were all little dotted lines going from one division to another. It functioned in spite of itself because ultimately people had to make it work. And people in charge of various divisions, department heads and staff, and obviously with the support of various boards and commissions and the City Council to a large extent, made it work. It worked in spite of itself and for any intellectual looking at structures of government, when they would look at the city charter they would walk away, because from an organizational perspective it did not give any reason why it would work, but it did.

What caused the change to a large extent I think were changing times. Up through about the mid-'60s there were few federal laws and equally few state laws that impacted the affairs of local government. I mean, there was a fundamental structure in this country in terms of our democracy that state government's a sovereign government and that state governments created our union and local government were a subdivision of our sovereignty in the state government. The feds basically and fundamentally said, "We have no power to regulate the affairs of local government since they belong under the sovereignty of the state." And the feds could not regulate the affairs of state government unless state government collectively agreed to be governed by union. So that those fundamental beliefs in the way the United States Constitution, state constitutions, functioned were upheld up through about, there were very few encroachments up through about the mid-'60s.

With the advent of civil rights, the new frontier, equal employment opportunity laws, Fair Labor Standards Act, many of these things started to surface on a federal agenda. Not the state agenda, but the federal agenda, the rationale being that, "Look, we can't have one state legislating labor laws for its state but not affect another state because it would impact trade and commerce." Who would want to be in a state that's regulated versus unregulated? You can't deal with things like labor unions in one state if the other state doesn't deal with the issue. You can't have an equal rights amendment or equal employment opportunity in one state and not in another state. And there may have been some states who took a leadership role in enacting some of these things, you know. I don't have empirical evidence to the contrary, but it became clear that it became a federal (*unintelligible word*) issue.

And as a result, Congress of the United States started to encroach into these areas, first by enacting programs particularly with the advent of the federal government providing grant and aid programs to state government in a way that it had never done so before and the magnitude they'd

never done so before. With those state grants from the federal government came a whole host of strings, and those strings at least initially were in the realm of regulations. If you want to play, you pay, or if you pay you play. So that there were strings attached with state government. Well, as you would expect, if those grants passed through the state government, they eventually, if they went through there, to the local government, those strings went with the program. And then Congress started passing grant and aid programs again affecting local government. Whether it was urban renewal type programs, whether it was federal housing programs, which were the forerunners, including some transportation programs, where new federal programs brought in federal rules and regulations that, if you wanted the money, you had to play by the rules.

Eventually it went beyond that. I mean, this was the first introduction so familiarity with grant and aid programs was thing in vogue back in the '60s, late '60s and early '70s. Becoming familiar with all of the strings that were coming down were equally significant because if you didn't comply you would get sanctioned. In some cases you could have to return, repay the money. And it didn't stop there. The state started getting involved in equally passing legislation such as environmental laws. Again, we know that Ed Muskie was the father of the clean environment in this country. Not to blame him for anything, but with those laws as they were forced upon state government, state government in turn legislated their own laws that imposed those standards on local government, things like cleaning your rivers, cleaning your lakes, clean water, clean air, you know. All of those things eventually came as a result of feds to state, and all of these originally came from the feds with, if you want the grant from the feds, to this day, these laws apply. You don't want them, if local governments want to tap the state resources such as building the water pollution control authority, these rules come with them.

Then eventually those laws became written in their own rights and passed on directly to every unit of government, state and local. And then we saw more and more encroachment deal with equal employment opportunities, the civil rights movement, fair labor standards, and then plus all of these grantsmanship rules and regulations. That, to this day, if you want to play in that environment, you've got to comply with the rules and regulations; it's as simple as that. So we saw a full course of encroachments. And there were some challenges that went all the way to the Supreme Court, particularly one dealing with the fair labor standards act, where at one point there was a massive effort on the part of The National League of Cities and National Association of Counties and state governments who basically said, "You know, you're overstepping your bounds, government, you don't have any right to legislate wages at the local level." And, because the impact was very, very significant and I know in our own rights law enforcement and fire service were significantly impacted in terms of wages and hours of work.

The Supreme Court in 1976, (if I'm right, don't hold me to the date exact but I think it was '76) basically turned down the right of Congress to pass legislation, again, upholding the issue of sovereignty. It didn't last very long, eventually went through an appeals process and eventually the Supreme Court reversed its decision and said, "Yes, Congress has a right to do that and if you're not happy with it, change your congressman." And so, and at the same time that all these federal acts were impacting the operations of local government, the legislature passed along a lot of these same standards in the form of rules, laws and regulations, in many ways mimicking the federal legislation at the local level, including in 1965 passing a labor relations act, which is a

first dealing with fire fighters, and in 1967 they opened it up to other groups of employees and in 1969 it became universal, any public employee had a right to bargain and unionize. And then human rights commissions were established.

So all of these things brought in a whole new level of complexity about managing local government. So we had a commission of lay people running a public works operation. And they hired a director who was more of a construction-type guy, who knew how to run a public works operation. All of a sudden [he] now had to expand his breadth and depth of knowledge of managing the department to become an expert in all of these things, particularly if he was using federal and state resources that compliance were required. Well, by default, under the old charter they would turn to guys like me at the controller's office and say, "Well, what do you do with these things? You take care of the rules and regulations, we just want to do construction projects." So the controller's office, the personnel office, we were eventually forced to create a personnel office even though a personnel officer had no line authority. There was sufficient demand for an expert to start dealing with personnel matters so that we were not in noncompliance. So that department heads were ready to relinquish those responsibilities to a personnel director, relinquish those responsibilities for finance director to the city controller, and to staff functions that could understand these issues so that they could go on and do their day-to-day mission to run a police department or fire department, public works operation, health and welfare operation.

So by default, the structure sort of started to gel and even though there were no line authority, and even though it was all advisory and at any time people could walk away from deliberations, out of necessity people began to respect the need for that discipline. That sort of set the stage for a new charter that basically said, "Look, you know, this charter has in fact outlived its usefulness. We can't continue to manage departments with five lay-people sitting on boards and commissions, with department heads who are really subjected to enforcing all those state and federal laws and regulations within their operation when they don't have the expertise or discipline." I mean, that's not what they were trained to do. I mean, you're a police chief, what do you know about equal employment opportunities and civil rights laws?

And, you know, so the momentum had built at that point. And even though there had been a number of attempts dating back to the '50s for a new charter, the effort in 1979, headed by Chief, not Chief Justice but Supreme Court Justice Bob Clifford who was a former mayor and counselor, who chaired the commission, was successful in developing a charter. That was a classic city manager form of government, and brought about true line functions and reconcentrated the responsibility in a mayor and city council, even though the mayor remains a ceremonial mayor. Mayor and council basically have the full authority to manage the affairs of city government, hiring a city manager, overseeing some checks and balances for key staff people so that the finance director, for example, is protected by the city council, the manager can't fire him without consent of the city council, can't hire without consent of the city council. Checks and balances in those areas are critical to city government. So the stage was set through all of these evolutionary changes in both federal and state encroachment into the affairs of local government. So what, as I look back in the early '60s, my God, it must have been easy to manage government in those days. When I retired it was a very, very complex business to manage with lots of rules and regulations, federal, state and local.

So we went from the old city charter to the new charter in 1980. It had a fairly strong support from . . .

AL: I'd better stop you right there. We'll turn over and continue.

*End of Side One, Tape Two
Side Two, Tape Two*

AL: We are now on side B of the second sessional interview with Lucien Gosselin.

LG: Getting back to the new charter -- of course the impetus to change was really changing times with federal and state encroachment on the affairs of local government. Running local government in those days had gotten considerably more complex. And the charter commission, with the assistance of a faculty member from the University of Maine in Augusta, not Augusta, University of Maine in Orono, worked with the commission and staff to design a new city charter. That, for all practical purposes, [was] a classic city charter consistent with the Municipal League Charter with one minor variance, being that the mayor is elected at large as opposed to the mayor being an elected member from the city council. We chose not to have city councilors running at large as opposed to Municipal League Charter. But for all practical purposes it was fundamentally a city manager type form of government.

I, there was a search committee appointed by the mayor and council following the election of the new city charter. I applied for the position. My understanding was about eighty people nationally applied for the position, win, lose or draw. I guess I wound up with the short straw and I got appointed city manager, or city administrator. And it was a very difficult period because we virtually had to start from scratch in organizing all of the internal rules and regulations of running a city from a centralized point of view. And so we had no administrative manual in the old charter, we had no personnel policies in the old charter because there was no mechanism to enforce those things. The personnel manager had no authority; the controller had no authority over administration. So we virtually had to draft from scratch and get council approval on a whole host of policies that reflected the new form of government. So the first six months of the new charter was really devoted to structural issues such as that.

In the first election, we had some great new faces come on the city council. Historically under the old charter, many of the councillors tended to be of blue collar origin, capable people in their own rights but generally speaking people who had worked in the shoe shops and the mills, owned small businesses. Occasionally we had a professional type coming in, i.e., a lawyer or, they tended to be mostly lawyers but occasionally other disciplines as well, but far and few in between. Mayors also tended to be of blue collar origin for the greater part, with the exception I guess starting back with the mid- to late '60s we started having mostly lawyers run for mayors.

And there was a whole series of lawyers that followed from, Bob Couturier was not a lawyer when he ran for office, but he eventually became a lawyer. But he was a college graduate from Bates College, followed by Bill Rocheleau who was an attorney, followed by I think John Beliveau, followed by, who was a municipal court judge, followed by the Cliffords, followed by

Orestis, who tended to be all lawyers. So there was a streak there of almost all lawyers running for, at least the better part of a decade and a half I guess. Lill Caron then became mayor in the late '70s, who was not, was of blue collar rank, if you want. At the time she ran she was an unemployed homemaker and served for a three-year term. John Orestis, by the way, was the first mayor to serve a three-year term, followed by Lill Caron for a four-year term.

The new charter was a new beast and everybody wanted to sort of see how it would work. Many in Lewiston in the early years had the opinion that the last thing in the world we want in Lewiston was city manager form of government, because Auburn had one and Auburn was one of the first municipal-, the first municipality in Maine to introduce city manager form of government. And many saw them as operating a very efficient governmental administration. But for whatever reason, many of the old guards in Lewiston, the last thing in the world they wanted was a form of government like Auburn with its autocratic approach to doing everything, as opposed to fifty or sixty lay people running the government. And every time that a discussion of a new charter came up, the opposition always said, "We don't want a form like Auburn."

One of the things we persuaded the charter commission to do was: do not label this as city manager form of government, do not market it as a city manager form of government because you will be opposed. I mean, nobody wants a government like Auburn. So they were very, very tactful in calling the chief executive officer the city administrator, and they labeled this as a city administrative form of government, a CAO, chief administrative officer, not a city manager, a chief administrative officer. And the community bought it. And they overwhelmingly adopted the new charter because it was a chief administrative officer form of government, not a city manager form like Auburn. The fact of the matter is, the CAO in Lewiston has more authority than the city manager of Auburn, and is far more classic city manager form than Auburn is. But the community was persuaded that this was in fact a chief administrative officer form and not a city manager. What can I tell you, that's fact.

The charter evolved. The first city council was a super group of people who ran, new faces, really functioned like a board of directors. [They] took their responsibilities serious, assumed the responsibility of running the affairs of city government and working through its city manager, city administrator, and respected, respected the new structure. It was really an optimistic time in Lewiston where finally you've got an elected board of councillors that really saw their role as directors of a multi-million dollar corporation and functioned as such. Unfortunately, that didn't last very long. Subsequent elections, we saw some of the same old guards who may have been reluctant to even run for office under the new form when the transition was taking place in '79 and '80, for whatever reason chose not to run, the old guards, the Paul Coutures of this world, for example, and the Al Cotes and so on. But the fact of the matter is that within two years, on the following subsequent election, many of these same people who served under the old city charter as city councilors decided to throw their hat in the ring and guess what, they won.

So that the city council started to look more and more like the old city council and started to function less and less like a bona fide board of directors and more like the old political arm of government they used to be. And I suspect that, it's changed a little bit in the last couple of years, but not by much. It's an incremental change; it's been a slow process. But, you know, we've been under the new charter now for almost eighteen years so it's seeing its own evolution.

Another element of the new charter that was critical for its passage, one was that there be no city councilors at large, though that was proposed by the charter commission. That met with a lot of resistance in the public hearings and eventually that provision was stricken out. The other was a need to have a Finance Committee. Under the old charter, the perceived balance of the old charter, as imperfect as it was, was vested in the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee were always, had picked appointees. And they tended to be professionals, lawyers, professional business people, people who really could take the responsibility of managing a multi-million dollar corporation seriously, bankers and otherwise. And they were looked as the powerhouse. And under the new charter there was, as much as there was some optimism to create a new form, they sort of wanted to bring back the Finance Committee into a new charter.

So, for window dressing, a Finance Committee was in fact created under the new charter, still exists. And, but their role was given mostly to regulate the affairs of purchasing. And even though they review the budget, their review is purely a perfunctory function, they only advise the city council. Since the inception of the new charter, the Finance Committee has played virtually no role in day-to-day affairs of budgeting; it's been pretty much relegated to the city council has final authority.

So that again, as a matter of selling the new charter the Finance Committee was an integral part. Many may perceive the Finance Committee to have the same power structure as it had in the previous charter, though that was far from the truth. The Finance Committee had a very, very limited role under the new charter. But [it] was an element that we all thought would save the day to create a new charter, that people were looking for that Finance Committee to be in place. Another big debate was the question of whether you have an appointed school board or an elected school board. There was a lot of support for an elected school board and that was a significant change and also garnered a lot of support. But that was the new charter. Be got it up and running, it's been functioning relatively well since.

I served in the capacity of city administrator for ten years, retired in '89. My successor has been in office since 1990, he's going on ten years as well, so there's been very little tinkering with the CAO. Many of the department heads that were there when I was there are still in office. Lewiston has by far the best administrative staff in the entire state. To this day I would still put the administrative staff in Lewiston against any other municipality in the state, or maybe New England for that matter. They're very, very competent, very capable, very professional individuals and the Lewiston government is functioning quite well from the administrative level. Politically, it's had its ups and downs the last eighteen years. But overall it's not bad; it's no worse than other communities. And it's sort of finding its place in the realm of public policy and public administration.

AL: Now, you said that you were CAO until 1989. I understand after leaving that post, or during, you started attending LA College?

LG: Oh yeah, my career has been sort of unique. As I indicated, I went to work at Lewiston city government in '63, leaving Victor News; basically high school education at that time.

While working in the controller's office I enrolled in correspondence courses through LaSalle University and got a diploma in business management from them. Unfortunately, those credentials in many cases are not fully recognized, but nonetheless it was a learning experience. I was strongly persuaded to start taking college courses at the University. In those days there were very few courses being offered locally, but nonetheless I enrolled in programs and took a bunch of disjointed courses at the old EL High School in Auburn and eventually the new EL High School in Auburn. And I took a few courses up at Farmington, not Farmington, at Gorham, which is part of USM.

But then I was, in those days I was assistant to the controller, an assistant controller, and then I was appointed controller and chief executive officer. And given the demands for that office and staffing the Finance Committee and the city council, particularly during the budget process which started in September and ran into March, that straddled the two semesters in school and we were tied up a minimum of two, sometimes three nights a week in meetings, it was virtually impossible to continue with taking regular courses. So I basically had to stop; there was just no way of my doing it. But I had made a personal commitment during those years that I would spend at least two academic weeks per year in time spent in some form of academic learning experience, whether it was a day here, a day there, a three-day seminar, and I did that for the better part of twenty-five years.

I was a very strong advocate of the university, along with Paul Dionne, who was mayor at the time. The two of us basically fabricated that idea in his office one morning, and Paul and I led the charge. It took the better part of six years to get the university to commit to do that, but we finally did. After the college was up and running, in 1988 was the first class. I was a very good friend of Bob Woodbury, who was president of USM and had just been moved on to chancellor. I had met most of senior staff at USM as a result of our advocacy for the LA College. One day I got a call from Harlan Philippi who was the first acting dean of LA College during the construction period. And he came to see me and he said, "Look," he said, "I got a call from Bob Woodbury and Bob indicated that you always wanted to get your bachelor's degree. Well now it's your turn to step up to the plate, to walk the talk. I mean, you've always said that the reason we needed a university here was to have a university that's accessible and affordable and provide quality educational opportunities. Well, we now have all that in place. Now you have an obligation to follow through."

With a great deal of resistance at now my mid-forties, I decided to go back to school in an academic environment competing with kids that are virtually right out of high school and in other cases individuals who already had some college training. It was a little bit intimidating, to say the least. But he insisted and, I says, "Jeez, it's going to take me forever to do it." "Well," he says, "no, the university has a portfolio assessment program, you get prior learning credits and etcetera. Why don't we get everything together and see where you stand?" So I went about doing that and prepared a ring binder about five inches thick, trying to identify all my academic learnings and experiences, not life experiences but academic experiences and submitted that to USM through Dr. Philippi. And he turned it in for evaluation by staff who do portfolio assessment and came back and lined up a program and said, "If you follow this program, we'll award you a baccalaureate degree, but you've got to do your part, and there's no other way." So with that said and done, I reluctantly enrolled and matter of fact the first two classes I took were

still over at EL because the university wasn't quite ready yet, and then transferred to LA College when they opened up the door. And after three years, three and a half years of taking two courses per semester including summer and fall and few self-learning, self, what do you call it, self-study courses . . .

AL: Independent study?

LG: . . . independent study courses. Finally one day I got a call from the dean to go in the office. And when I got there they said, "Well, we reviewed your academic program and we think you now have met and exceeded your requirement for a baccalaureate degree." So, finally got my B.S. in '91. And the same dean twisted my arm until I said, "Mommy", insisted I enroll into the Muskie School of Public Policy and continue with graduate work. That was intimidating to beat hell, to be honest with you. But I did, and wrapped up that program in '94 and got my master's . . .

AL: Master's in public policy?

LG: . . . public policy and management with a GPA of about 3.89 or something like that. And they twisted my arm to continue with the executive certificate in community economic development and planning, which is another fifteen credit hours beyond masters. I said, "Why am I doing this?" But I did, and I wrapped up that program as well. So the only thing left for me now is to pursue a Ph.D. which is, I've not said "No", but I've not said yes either. I'm fifty-seven years old; I don't know if I want to pursue that, but I might, who knows? Again, when I retired I had three basic goals. I mean, I had worked in local government for twenty-seven years. Local government is a fish bowl, everybody's looking in. I have seen plenty of my colleagues who have been very proficient, very capable policy makers, public administrators, who have seen their reputation damaged for one minuscule *faux pas*, whether it was caused by themselves or another department head that they were held responsible for, overseeing or what have you. You know, I'd had a good career, it was time for me to move along. The city needed new ideas, new blood. I wanted to do something different, I wanted to have a family life. My kids were still in high school at the time. I had not paid much attention to their growing years, you know, shame on me for that, from that point of view.

But fact of the matter is, not having credentials, I probably worked harder than I probably should have in many ways because I was competing with people that had credentials. By the time I retired, almost every department head had either a master's degree or at least a bachelor's degree, there were very few who didn't. And many of the staff people had a master's degree. My assistant had a master's degree, and I still had a high school education. So it was intimidating in many ways and having credentials is important for me. Working hard and staying on top of the game was important to me. I like to think that those years were successful, and eventually got recognition as Manager of the Year by the Maine Association of City Town Managers, so there were some good years. And I wanted to go do something different before I was too old. As you approach fifty it starts getting more and more difficult to get a change of career.

So for all those reasons, I was being recruited for another job. I said, "Well, if I'm ever going to

make the change, now's the time." I'd already enrolled in the university. Finishing my baccalaureate degree was a high priority for me. Being able to be in a position where I didn't spend three or four nights a week at city hall and spend some time with the family was important for me. It turned out to be a wrinkle for them because I don't know how many nights I'd get home at five o'clock and they'd say, "What are you doing here? Are you staying home tonight? What are we going to do?" I said, "I don't know, do what you've always done." "But we've never done it with you, you've never been here." My wife might have gone out quilting with a friend, and said, "Well, am I going to stay home tonight?" "Well of course not, go quilt." "But then you'll be home alone." "Don't worry about it", you know. I mean, it was, adjustment at home was difficult both for my wife and kids.

And going out and doing something different -- at that time I went to work for Sisters of Charity Health System for about eighteen months; that was fun. Then I went to work at Libby with their transition from here to Lewiston Falls, South Carolina. And then was recruited to go work with Henry [Bourgeois] over at the Maine Development Foundation for five years in public policy area; [that] gave me the opportunity to continue and finish my master's. And then I was recruited to come back here and here I am. Nice career, enjoyed it, challenging, but, leaving the city was tough. It was my home for twenty-seven years, but the three aspirations I had were very significant: to complete my baccalaureate, spend time with family, and start a new career was very important. And it's worked out.

AL: Sounds like it's been a success.

LG: Let other people decide that. It's been fun for me anyway.

AL: Let me switch gears a little bit. I'd like to ask you about a few more people who historically have had significance in this city, the first being Ernest Malenfant, a former, would you describe him?

LG: I did not know Ernest when he was mayor, he predates me just a little bit. But I worked, when I started working in city hall, Ernie was still on the scene. Ernie's background was very Franco-American; did not speak English very well. He had a very, very strong reputation in his district. He came from the so-called little Canada area of Lewiston, had had a very, very strong following politically over the years as mayor, and I believe served on the city council. His profession was a gate tender when the, at Middle and Bates, when, before they had automated signals, his job was to be in the little booth there. And when the train came he had to lower the gate and when the train had gone he'd raise the gate, and that was his job for Maine Central. I understand he did that for years until he retired. Ernest is probably as honest as the day is long; had, did not have a good command of the English language. By the time I started to work in government people were making fun of him as well as many other Franco-Americans. He had a very unique reputation in terms of his inability to understand people who spoke in English, and misinterpreting things. And people made jokes of that.

But Ernest, surprising enough, even the last time he ran for office just before I started in government, he ran against a Dr., I think, Bert [*sic*] [Horace] Gauvreau, who was a well-known physician in the community. And he had Ernest running against him with probably at best a

third grade education at best. And surprisingly, a lot of people used to joke about it,¹⁹ but Ernest won. And when you'd ask people after the fact, "Who in the hell voted for Ernest against Dr. Beliveau, (*name*)?" And nobody would admit to voting for Ernest but he won. He still won against an M.D. And to some people that was a death knell to Lewiston, that, you know, I mean, here you have a chance to elect a professional to be mayor and you elect Ernest Malenfant. What a contrast.

But again, based on what I know of Ernest, he was honest, he cared about his, the people he served, he cared about the community, represented the community well. Again, in those days running government was a lot less complex than it is today. I mean, you had no federal intervention, no state intervention; it was purely local affair. City councils did not have a great deal of power and authority over the affairs of local government, mayor was a ceremonial mayor, Ernest did a respectable job, that I know of. A fine gentleman, and my recollection, even when I was appointed city controller, he was still around. And occasionally he'd come in and chat about, you know, things he didn't like going on in city government.

And, but Ernest is a unique individual that, to this day, people still make jokes about, and, you know. The most famous joke was, two of them I guess, one had to do with an anecdote about sanding sidewalks and his cliché was that "We'll put *gravel* on the sidewalk," you know, using half French and half English; people still joke about that. And the other was, and again, these are all hearsay, there was an incident in the city council where the finance, or the controller reported that the city had incurred a deficit. And he advised his colleague on the council that we ought to, you know, think about how we're going to spend it. And so, I mean, those are two anecdotes of Ernest that I recall that still float around today. But was he an honest individual? Absolutely. Well respected and win, lose or draw, I think he, when he did run for mayor at least twice, and ran twice, and won twice. And that was Ernest.

AL: How about telling me a little bit about Paul Couture?

LG: Yeah, Paul Couture is a different animal altogether. I knew, I got to know Paul when I started working in local government. Paul had been a long-standing member of city council and when he wasn't in the city council he was county commissioner. And when he wasn't county commissioner, and even while on the city council he was a long-standing member of the state legislature. Paul was quite an individual. He was representative of what we now know as ward six, but the Little Canada area. [He] spoke French very well, and equally had, in the early years in my recollection had some difficulty in English, but did okay.

He was a union boss, he was a business agent for the carpenter's union from the older days. He was a, in many ways he could be a bully. He spoke a lot, spoke very loud, was very vocal, was very offensive at times, and did not give up on any issue very easily. He was a, he was very, very streetwise. Very, very strong support from his district; he and his wife lived right across the street from St. Mary's church, owned and operated the social club called the 3M. [He] was a member of the legislature for many, many years during that period, was part of that clique of Norm Tanguay and Frank Bussiere and George Ricker and Bill, well, Bill Jacques to some extent, and Louis Jalbert. These guys held office together as a group. And Paul was probably the most forceful city councillor I've worked with in terms of looking for the interest of his

district, almost to a fault. He was a royal pain in you kn-, the neck. He had no problems telling you that he didn't agree with you and really did it in a civil way. I've had a number of conversations with him on the phone when he was city councilor where no one would want to print. I've had those discussions face-to-face with him. But there's one thing with Paul Couture: he was probably as dedicated a public servant as I've ever worked with. Honest as the day is long, you couldn't have bribed him for any amount of money. Not that anybody else would, but you couldn't; I mean, he was very honest. And as hard as he fought for the cause of the day, the time, whatever issue it was, when it was done, it was done. He had no grudges. We can scream at each other while we're debating the issue, it's done, it's done. Let's go down to the club and have a beer.

That was the kind of guy he was, a gentleman and a half, really. Very, very dedicated to his church, he was a Roman Catholic, very, very supportive of St. Mary's church. He had very, very strong union ties, union support. You know, he was the neighborhood boss in many ways. Paul served almost his entire life in city government, state government, county government. Wherever he went, he brought integrity. You could disagree with Paul, you may sometimes have a hard time getting him to see your point of view. But his point of view was always well-grounded, well-founded, and he would go out of his way, literally out of his way, to make sure he understood the issue.

Now, I don't know if I should say this, but for what it's worth, in some of his later years in the city council, I know he could look at written material. And we'd always send a lot of written material (*unintelligible word*), but Paul was the kind of guy that would, the minute you set out the agenda to all this supporting material, that he'd be on the phone calling you and asking you about this and asking you about that. Then you'd walk across the hall and you'd run into the city clerk. He'd say, "I just got off the phone with Paul," you know, went through the same series of questions. And you'd run into a public works director and, you know . . . I mean the guy was really, like, "Wow, how many councillors spend all their time and energy doing this?" And then one day, there was something involving a proclamation we wanted to have resolved for his district. And as city manager I felt it was appropriate to have Paul introduce the resolution, which he reluctantly agreed to do. He basically said, "Oh, you do it or have the mayor do it", or whatever. So I sort of press on and he finally agreed to do it. And it became evident to me after the meeting that, I went to the city clerk and I said, "You know Gerry, is it possible, is it really possible that Paul can't read?" All of these years we've worked with him on the city council, on committees, never would assume that he can't, but he has extreme difficulty in reading. The probability is that he did not read very well. And then Gerry said, "That's probably why all these years, he gets on the phone and talks to people about the issues." That the supporting material we've sent him is just, you know, difficult for him to understand and carry the thought with the written words, that he does his communication best with oral communication. And that's why he spends all his time coming to city hall, talking to people face-to-face, pointing to things on the agenda, and/or call you on the phone as friends and colleagues saying, "What's this?"

And what, and it wasn't until, I mean, just, maybe his last term in office that I realized that I may have inadvertently embarrassed him to do this thing, at the same time divulge to me that the guy couldn't read, and that's why he never read any proclamation or resolutions. Articulated

extremely well, his ability to communicate was very good, but he did it entirely through oral communications. You know, Paul is a great guy, and I can tell you over the years as city manager and city controller, we've had plenty of arguments where we disagreed, but always a gentleman. I mean, at the heat of the moment, maybe you wanted to punch him in the nose, but he was bigger than I was. But after it's done, it's done. There was never any grudges whatsoever. Nice guy; he was a great colleague.

AL: One other person I wanted . . .

LG: And I would say he was a good friend of Ed Muskie, I assure you.

AL: Yeah. Would you tell me a little bit about, could you tell me a little about Maurice Goulet?

LG: Yeah, Maurice has been around for a number of years, still is. Maurice is, has been in the real estate, real estate development field I think all of his life, at least as far back as I can remember. He's developed some housing locally and developed some businesses and, both locally as well as out of town and out of state. Maurice is a character in his own right, asserts to know Ed Muskie very well. And Maurice has always been on the fringe of sort of the power structure. I don't know that he ever played a direct role, but he seems to be always around the power structure in one way or another.

Maurice is more renowned locally here for being a dreamer. A dreamer in the sense that as a developer he's always done a lot of research about what it could be rather than what we have. And certainly years and years ago [he] was an advocate of merging the twin cities into one community, and as you well know, that is yet to take place. We've come a long ways from the administrative level to do that, but not at the political level. He was also the individual when communities were struggling to develop their downtown, and that's even before malls coming on the scene, he had, and again, this is before my time, but he had articulated a vision to put a bubble on top of Lisbon Street, which is a main retail area, and make that into an air conditioned environment where you could shop on Lisbon Street day or night, summer or winter, in an enclosed environment by literally putting some form of canopy or bubble on top of Lisbon Street and closing it to traffic. In effect, the first concept of a mall. And this goes back I understand at least to the '50s, so he was way ahead of his time. And to this day, people still, you mention Maurice Goulet and they think of the bubble on Lisbon Street. Had he done that, Lisbon Street might be an entirely different community today, I mean, neighborhood today, I mean, I don't know.

But he was clearly way ahead of his time. And Maurice has always been sort of on the scene with these new ideas and new ways of doing things. Very, very nice gentleman, works a lot behind the scene with his colleagues and friends, has a good grasp of the development game, and has been very successful in his own right. We still see him around; matter of fact he was here at a meeting yesterday because we talked about a new project. He was here, again, to support that project. The guy's just a good visionary and good thinker. And, but I think his problem is that he's got the vision but has difficulty selling it and getting people to buy into it. Sometimes his visioning is so far ahead, he still hasn't been able to put the support structure to carry that vision forward. And when people look at it they throw all kinds of road blocks and the thing just

evaporates. But looking back, I mean, I think Maurice Goulet certainly is a visionary and was a visionary, and I think continues to be. Just wish he could find a way to get more support.

AL: My last question is about the Marois Restaurant that you mentioned on Monday. I understand it was a gathering place for some business and political leaders? Could you tell me a little bit about that? Were you involved at all, did you know some of the people?

LG: Sure. Yeah, Marois' an institution, it's a local restaurant, still managed by Antoinette Marois Orestis. She's in her seventies now and her sister's still there. The actual establishment's gone through several major renovations and retrofitting. I remember when I first started in city government it was a typical -- you walk in, you had a, sort of a bar with stools and, so you had a counter bar-type thing where you'd sit up on a stool and you ordered. And they had a few booths in the restaurant. And all that was ripped out and then it's, it looks more like a traditional restaurant now with sort of a Mexican-type motif in there; very well kept, great restaurant. But even dating back from the days I started in city government, once we had, particularly when we did budget meetings, these tended to go late into the evening, probably nine, ten o'clock. And whenever we had to go to the city council as well, it was critically important that one of the ground rules in public policy is if the majority of the council or the group convenes after the meeting, that's where the meeting takes place. And God forbid if you're not there to defend your cause.

So I learned that very early on when I started in city government that following the regular meeting, if the group, or a group went out and, to their favorite watering hole, you know, to have a nightcap, it was important that you followed. Because if you didn't you never knew what the results would be the next day. Marois' was, *Marois*, Marois' was one of the places where, there used to be a big booth in the corner there with a big round table and following finance committee meetings or following city council meetings, if appropriate, that the power structure always gravitated to Mario's for a cocktail. And that's where you regurgitate everything that goes on and then you hear all the complaints and everything else. And it was critically important as staff, and particularly when I moved from staff to city controller, chief executive officer, you be there. Because if you're not there you're probably going to be a subject of conversation. And in the days of Paul Couture, often times it was down to the 3M, and if not the 3M, there was a, the Derby Club, and if it wasn't the Derby Club it was another local establishment.

And even during my years as city administrator, after every city council meeting the majority of the council would go out and have a nightcap. And again, I have seen individuals get in trouble just for not being there, whether it's a councilor who's not present or a department that was on the hot seat or what have you. I mean, that's where the real discussion takes place. And sometimes where the real rationalization takes place because now you can be a little bit less formal and try to defend your position. And sometimes you win, sometimes you don't. As you know, under today's Right to Know Law, gatherings of that type with the majority of the council present would be inappropriate, so I don't know what they're doing now. But I know in my latter years as city administrator we used to make it a ground rule that, fine, we're going but we're not going to discuss city business. You can talk about anything you want. You can talk about the ball game, talk about hockey games, you can talk about anything you want, but you can't talk about, you know, the affairs of city government. You know, we tried to uphold that.

But it's still going on today, to the best of my knowledge.

AL: Is there anything that I've missed that you feel is important from your experience that you wanted us to know?

LG: No. I'm still perplexed. I mean I, from my point of view I realize this whole conversation started around Ed Muskie. I know Ed Muskie was a very, very big figure in this community during his tenure in public life. I know this community was, (I suspect; he was really a bit before my time) but I suspect this community was significantly instrumental in helping Ed Muskie get elected governor, particularly with some of the many people we've talked about here: the Paul Coutures of this world, the Louis Jalberts, and Bob Malenfant, the Rickers, Bussieres. These are all people who, Bill Jacques, George Rancourt, people who were very active in the political arena in those days, including I'm sure many I've not mentioned. I'm sort of reminiscing here from things that people have said, and what I surmise was going on. Ed Muskie is a big figure here and was really looked upon . . . I mean, I know he's not from Lewiston, I know his ties to Lewiston is Bates College. But I think his ties to Lewiston is far bigger than Bates College. It really has to do with his Democratic alignment and Democratic support that he got from this city in a time in his career that he most needed it. And I think that's the legacy Lewiston brings to Ed Muskie. In return, Ed Muskie brings an excellence in public policy, both as governor, as a senator and secretary of state, to this state, to this community, that's unparalleled.

AL: Thank you very much.

End of Interview