Ray Moore

An Oral History

Washington State Oral History Program
Office of the Secretary of State

Ray Moore

An Oral History

Interviewed by Sharon Boswell

Washington State Oral History Program
Office of the Secretary of State
Ralph Munro, Secretary of State

First Edition 1999
ISBN 1-889320-10-2

Library of Congress Subject Headings
1. Moore, Ray 1912-present
2. Legislators—Washington—biography
3. Washington—politics and government

Washington State Oral History Program
Office of Secretary of State
Legislative Building
PO Box 40243
Olympia, WA 98504-0243
Telephone: (360) 902-4158

CONTENTS

Click here for photographs and documents included in the printed verison of this oral history.

This book recounts Washington State's political scene as I saw it during 1925 to 1994. The most fulfilling and exciting years for me were, of course, 1979 through 1994, when I served in the state Senate.

I dedicate this text to Jim Hughes and Virginia Moore, who shared the task of keeping me organized—no small feat.

I would like to thank a few special people who, over the years, helped me beyond the call of duty: Myrna Beebe, Kandy Bruesch, David Cheal, Anne Crampton, Ellie Dornan, Pat Durham, Brenda Fitzsimmons, Stanley Gallup, Blaine Gibson, Gene Gotovac, Jennifer Jaech, Scott Jarvis, Dace Johnson, Sue LaVack, Catherine Mele, Linda Mitchell, Mary Quinlan, Tracy Ratzliff, Diane Schoppert, Jonathan Seib, Shirley Wayland, Nina Weld, Vickie Winters, Nila Wood, Patrick Woods, and Marcella Young.

About the cover photo

When asked to supply a picture of himself for the cover, Senator Moore insisted on using this photo taken at his Senate desk. He stated plainly that this picture, more than the others he saw, captured "the real Ray Moore."

FOREWORD

ABOUT RAY MOORE

Senator Ray Moore and Virginia Moore are remembered by our constituents for thousands of examples of help and support they provided during his legislative service.

Ray has many other special characteristics. His resilience is extraordinary. He experienced many losses, but never defeat—always returning and then winning solid approval from our voters.

I celebrate his independent streak—searching his conscience and his personal expertise and taking tough controversial votes.

I am proud of his very early support for tolerance and equal opportunity for all.

And I especially enjoy his sense of humor—pervasive and irrepressible.

Thank you to the Oral History Program for preserving the warmth and diversity of Ray Moore's many contributions to our community.

HELEN SOMMERS
Washington State House of Representatives

FOREWORD

ABOUT RAY MOORE

I am delighted to have the opportunity to prepare a foreword to the oral history of Senator Ray Moore. Ray's political career spans five decades of Washington history and touches upon issues and people that are of amazing complexity and richness. Ray was an active participant in the public power vs. private power wars. He was present at the Goldmark trial. He was deputy chief clerk at the House of Representatives during the postwar Republican landslide. He was the Republican county chairman in King County. He broke with the Republican Party over the issue of the death penalty and the inability of the Republican Party to address the problems of basic food, shelter, and clothing for people. He was a Democratic state senator for sixteen years. He was a major player in Washington's Legislature in the decade of the 1980s and well into the 1990s. This recitation represents only a snapshot of Ray's achievements.

Ray and I were first elected to the Legislature in 1978. I sat in seat 49 in the Washington State Senate Chamber and Ray sat in seat 48. We were prepared not to like one another. I was born in April of 1952 and was all of twenty-six years old when I came to the Washington State Senate. Ray was born in April of 1912 and was a freshman legislator at the age of sixty-six. I was seen as a liberal Democrat who campaigned that year against Initiative 350, the school busing initiative. Ray was seen as a more conservative Democrat who had strongly campaigned for Initiative 350. Despite our differences in age, background, and political philosophy, we became instant friends.

Of Ray's political experiences, I am sure he has spoken at length in his oral history. There are a number of things about Ray that probably may not be revealed in his oral history.

First, Ray's extraordinary devotion to his wife, Virginia Moore. Virginia was Ray's friend and confidante throughout his years in the Senate. They were truly a team.

Second, Ray's real commitment to human services issues. Ray is deeply committed to a government that ensures basic food, clothing, and shelter for all of its citizens. It was for this reason that Ray quietly developed an organization called Food Lifeline. This organization was designed to use the best thinking and people of the private sector

to insure that food would be delivered to people in need. This was a classic Ray Moore project, bringing people together to focus on the basic needs of people.

Finally, Ray's wicked sense of humor. I trust that Ray has told the story that he has related to me so many times of his meeting with President Eisenhower in the early 1950s. President Eisenhower was not accompanied by his Chief of Staff, Sherman Adams, and was asked by one of the Republican Party leaders about his position on public power. As Ray relates it, Daddy Warbucks, the term Ray always used to refer to Eisenhower, had no idea of the controversy that was involved in the question. He responded by saying, "I believe the public should always have the power." A great story.

When discussing the possibility that certain members of the Senate might change their outlook and become more statesmanlike in their activities, Ray was fond of noting the old Serbian proverb: You can't polish a turd.

I am also particularly fond of Ray's description of the members of the Senate in activity. We would sit in our seats, 48 and 49, and watch the flurry of activity of members of the Senate discussing bills with one another and going over the issues of the day. Ray would turn to me and say, "There's a lot of low cunning in this room today."

I can still recall with some fondness the night that Ray was asked to stall for time on the floor of the Senate. Ray got up and told jokes and stories, and made the appropriate motions to confirm certain gubernatorial nominees who were introduced with a true Moore flare. It was a bravura performance and truly indicative of the Moore style.

In all, I am more than delighted to commend Ray's oral history to students of Washington State history. Ray's knowledge of the people and issues in our state is unparalleled. If his oral history gives even a small sense of the man, it will be a delight for anyone who reads it.

PHIL TALMADGE
Washington State Supreme Court Justice

FOREWORD

ABOUT RAY MOORE

It is a gray morning in Seattle's Queen Anne Hill district. Yesterday's rain has softened to a fog-enshrouded cold mist. As usual on a winter Saturday, George slept late then lingered over coffee and the morning *P-I*.

Suddenly, there is a ring at the front door. Irritated, George glances out the front window and sees an ordinary-looking, balding man in a rumpled suit, holding an envelope. The man is faintly familiar but so nondescript that George cannot remember who he is. Looks like a salesman, he thinks, determined to send him away as fast as possible.

"Hi, I'm Ray Moore, your state senator," the man says, smiling, when George opens the door. "Are you the George Bigelow who sent me a letter?"

"Yes," George stammers, having completely forgotten the incident.

"Well, daddy-o, if you've got a minute I'd like to hear more about your problem."

A little overwhelmed at first, George shakes Ray Moore's hand, invites him in, and spends the next hour talking to him. He finds that Moore is an intent listener, as interested in George personally as in his complaint. When he leaves, George is unsure whether his problem can be fixed, but he is impressed that his state senator would personally come to his house and spend a Saturday morning listening to him. Another convert for Ray Moore.

In his last senatorial campaign in 1990, Ray Moore used signs showing his picture and the slogan "Moore Than Just a Pretty Face." It was both a play on his name and a sly use of self-deprecating humor. He would jokingly tell friends that his seatmate, Helen Sommers, could doorbell once every ten years and everyone would remember that she came to their house, whereas he would doorbell twice a year and no one would remember him.

Ray Moore, with his friend, teammate, and wife, Virginia, spent sixteen years in the Washington State Senate. He was not a great lawmaker like Phil Talmadge, nor a practiced parliamentarian like

John O'Brien, nor a spirited partisan leader like Jeannette Hayner. His speeches couldn't match the smooth eloquence of Bob Charette, nor the flowery graciousness of the magnificent John Cherberg.

But plain, hardworking Ray Moore possessed a quality matched by few others in public office: his willingness to take up the causes of his constituents, no matter how small, and fight for them as though his life depended on it. Whether it was a hippie family refused drivers licenses because they believed in eternal life, and therefore had no birth dates, or a middle-class residential neighborhood opposed to the siting of a 7-Eleven store, or a jilted wife wanting to change the no-fault divorce laws to force her ex-husband to return to her, the team of Ray and Virginia Moore was tireless in advocacy and, more often than not, successful in result.

Their greatness lies not just in doing the dirty little day-to-day things that matter most in life, and which most politicians abhor, but in doing them with gusto. Ray and Virginia were genuinely outraged at lazy bureaucrats and inefficient or unjust processes. They chose to fix a thousand little problems rather than take on one or two grand schemes. Together, they provided a level of personal service and dedication to the people of the Thirty-sixth District that was unmatched, and is not likely to be seen again.

ED SEEBERGER
Former Director of Senate Committee Services

FOREWORD

ABOUT RAY MOORE

When Ray Moore first took the oath of office as a state senator in 1979, he was not your usual freshman. As he would point out, he was possibly the oldest freshman legislator—sixty-six years old when elected—in the history of the state. He probably also spent more time trying to win his first elective office—thirty-four years—than any other state elected official. And, of course, he was elected as a Democrat, having converted from Republicanism after having first-hand experience as King County GOP chair years before. So Ray came to Olympia with a great deal of practical experience and the passion of a person who knows what he believes.

Ray's legislative interests were far ranging, but no matter what the issue, he would bring to it a personal perspective and history that helped others keep things in perspective. Ray was a successful businessman and entrepreneur who could talk high finance, but in debate he'd talk about how bills would affect people's lives and livelihoods. He'd remind you of his first job during the Depression (reading meters for Puget Sound Power and Light), remembering how it was to make ends meet in those days, and keep the focus on helping those who didn't have much say in the system.

All legislators struggle with issues and deciding between doing what they personally think best and, at the same time, representing the views of their constituents. Ray told how, when first elected, he went to Lieutenant Governor John Cherberg and asked whether he had any advice for an old man arriving in the Senate. Cherberg said, "Always vote your conscience." Then, according to Ray, added, "But don't forget the district." And for years that was the advice Ray gave the rest of us in making tough decisions.

When it came to remembering the district and helping constituents, Ray, with the assistance of his wife Virginia, was one of the best. On the issues, Ray was pretty certain that he was right most of the time (some would say he was stubborn), but he was not afraid to publicly admit the occasional mistake. The Senate Journal records his admission that he had made an error in responding to a fellow senator's question during a floor debate. The exchange took place in 1984 and Ray was careful to note that this was the first error he'd made in five years in the Senate!

FOREWORD

Ray's legislative service coincided with critical years in our state's recent history. The early and late 1980s saw abrupt and contentious shifts in partisan control of the Senate that had long-term consequences for the institution. In 1981 and '82, the state was in dire fiscal straits, forcing major cuts in education and other important services that Ray cared deeply about. By the end of that decade we were enjoying economic prosperity and confronting problems created by unprecedented population growth. I am pleased that Senator Ray Moore will share his account of these important times with us through the state's oral history program.

SID SNYDER
State Senator, Nineteenth District

FOREWORD

ABOUT RAY MOORE

The state's oral history program may never have a more appropriate subject than Senator Ray Moore.

Ray Moore had a distinguished legislative career. Newspaper accounts of the final chapters of that career do not do it justice. This work is important for that reason alone. However, students of history also will learn a great deal about Ray, the Legislature and the history of our state from this oral history.

Ray's personal history began when our state was a mere twenty-three years old. As a child, he literally watched the capitol building being built. He experienced the transformation of Washington State from an agrarian outpost to a major international industrial competitor to an information and service industry giant. Ray lived during times when we had few paved highways, super highways, and the information highway.

My time in the Senate mirrored that of Senator Moore and his loving teammate and confidante, Virginia. The two of them took their legislative responsibilities very seriously, but did so with great humor. Many a time during feverish debates in the Senate Democratic Caucus on issues of great but probably passing importance, Ray would lean over to me and say, "This is just like Boys' State, with per diem."

Ray Moore, as this oral history will show, was an accomplished business person; a generous and compassionate fighter for the less fortunate; an ardent and, eventually, successful political campaigner; a pragmatic, yet irreverent, legislator; a tireless crusader on behalf of his constituents; a devoted husband; and a lovable curmudgeon.

More important than all that to me (and to many, many others), Ray Moore was a friend.

MARTY BROWN
Deputy Chief of Staff for Governor Gary Locke

PREFACE

The Washington State Oral History Program was established in 1991 by the Washington State Legislature to document the formation of public policy in Washington state. It is administered by the Office of the Secretary of State and is guided by the Oral History Advisory Committee.

Each oral history is a valuable record of an individual's contributions and convictions, their interpretation of events, and their relationships with other participants in the civic life of the state. By reading these oral histories, the complex interweaving of the personal and political processes that shape public policy is revealed.

The Oral History Advisory Committee chooses candidates for oral histories. Extensive research is then conducted about the life and activities of the prospective interviewee, using legislative journals, newspaper accounts, personal papers, and other sources. Then a series of taped interviews are conducted, focusing on the interviewee's public life and contributions, but also including personal sources of their values and beliefs. Political values, ideas about public service, interpretation of events, and reflections about relationships and the political process are explored. When the interviews have been completed, a verbatim transcript is prepared. These transcripts are edited and reviewed by the interviewer and interviewee to ensure readability and accuracy. Finally, the transcript is published and distributed to libraries, archives, and interested individuals. An electronic version of the text is also available on the Secretary of State web site (www.secstate.wa.gov).

Recollection and interpretation of events vary. It is the hope of the Oral History Program that this work will help citizens of the State of Washington better understand their political legacy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Washington State Oral History Program wishes to thank all of those who contributed to this project.

Ray and Virginia Moore demonstrated the kind of enthusiasm and thoroughness expected from such a dynamic team. They have our sincere thanks and admiration.

We appreciate the members of our Legislative Advisory Committee for their guidance, support, and unfailing interest in this work. The committee includes Senators Sid Snyder, Shirley Winsley, and Al Bauer; Representatives Patricia Lantz, Karen Keiser, Don Carlson, and Kathy Lambert; Secretary of State Ralph Munro, Secretary of the Senate Tony Cook, the Co-Chief Clerks of the House Tim Martin and Cindy Zehnder. Ex Officio members are Warren Bishop, David Nicandri, Dean Foster, and former legislators Robert Bailey, Alan Thompson, Eugene Prince, and Don Brazier.

The State Department of Printing, including State Printer George Morton, Dick Yarboro, Evonne Anderson, Steve Pfeiffer, Don Reese, Ron Mosman, Kelley Kellerman, Jade Joyce, and the efficient production planning staff, have greatly aided us in the production of this book.

Secretary of State Ralph Munro and Deputy Secretary of State Tracy Guerin have been a constant source of support. Their encouragement and dedication have sustained the program. Many others in the Office of the Secretary of State have lent their assistance to the program in innumerable ways. We thank them for their generous assistance.

All those named gave more than we asked. It is a privilege to acknowledge them.

THE WASHINGTON STATE ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

INTERVIEWING RAY MOORE

This interview with Ray Moore is unique, much like the man himself. We followed a slightly different process during both the recording and editing phases of the interview, but I believe that the procedural changes were well rewarded in the final product.

The Oral History Program normally selects narrators who are retired from the legislature or other political office, but made the decision to interview Senator Moore while he was still active as a state legislator. In addition, unlike most interviews, which often stretch over many months, my conversations with Senator Moore were compressed into a two-week period. Narrators usually benefit from the passage of time to reflect on their lives, but there can also be an advantage to recording while perceptions are still fresh. In this case, I believe Senator Moore's long career gave him the necessary perspective, but the fact that he was still directly involved in legislative decision-making added unusual immediacy and detail to the interviews. A lengthy period of editing provided a further means to shape the narrative into a rich and insightful document.

I made daily trips down to Olympia from Seattle for my interviews with Senator Moore. Despite the distance and sometimes grueling traffic problems, I looked forward to every one. Ray Moore has a remarkable combination of qualities; he is warm yet irascible, a perceptive political analyst and hard-nosed negotiator who can shock and charm you in the same breath. I particularly enjoyed his talents as a raconteur and his incisive wit. We held most of our interview sessions in a little cubbyhole of an office adjacent to the lobbyists' lounge in the state capitol building, and I'm sure many of them must have wondered about the constant peals of laughter coming from our room.

Despite the levity, the interviews came at what must have been an extraordinarily difficult period for Senator Moore. He was spending part of his year in Hawaii and the press had begun to accuse him of being an "absentee senator." The debate reached its peak during the course of our meetings and the story was front-page news throughout the state. Moore had not yet announced his long-planned retirement and met the attacks with his customary "piss and vinegar." Because of my behind-the-scenes knowledge of his plans, I was saddened

that the end of his career was marred by such a public controversy. He handled the situation with courage and aplomb, however, which only increased my admiration for both his character and abilities.

My interviews with Senator Moore were only the beginning. Dianne Bridgman, head of the Oral History Program, continued the dialogue and worked with Ray and his wife Virginia as they included additional material. An account of this collaboration is contained in another portion of this introduction. The resulting document is an effective reflection of a remarkable political career and a remarkable man. I feel quite privileged to have been part of the process.

SHARON BOSWELL
Interviewer

INTRODUCTION

EDITING RAY MOORE

Ray Moore's oral history is somewhat different from histories previously published by the Oral History Program. Senator Moore had moved to Hawaii when it was discovered that two of his interview tapes were barely audible. Rather than stall the project in hopes of someday repeating the interview, program manager Dianne Bridgman and Ray agreed he would write his recollections of the period of time covered by the lost tape. However, Ray provided us not only with a reconstruction of the lost tapes, but many more written stories from his long involvement in politics. Most of them were entertaining and well told, and some expanded on points he had already made in the interview tapes. In short, all were valuable.

My task, then, became one of integrating Ray's written words with those transcribed from the taped interview. The finished product is a fusion of his written and spoken words. In the beginning, the amount of accumulated paper and yellow Post-It notes was overwhelming. Ray has been on the Olympia scene since he was thirteen years old. He has an incredible amount of knowledge about Washington State dating from when he, and the state, were quite young.

Given that fact, I soon realized that in addition to editing for narrative flow and clarity, I was ordering not only Ray's life for the reader, but also the history of political life in Washington state. In the course of doing that, I learned an immense amount about the state of Washington and its political processes.

There is a difference between learning about government in a classroom and reading about it firsthand from someone that has lived and breathed politics for most of his life. Now entering my senior year of college, I have learned about how the political process is supposed to work. From Ray Moore's oral history, I have learned about how it *really* works. His oral history often reads like an epic—from the governors of the Prohibition Era to the politicians of today—but more importantly, his oral history is a part of our institutional memory.

For example, who knows why Seattle's Aurora Bridge was built? Officially, it was simply an act of the Legislature. According to Ray Moore, however, it was the culmination of a complicated intrigue between two key political figures. It is stories like this that provide

us with insight into the human side of politics. These stories remind us that politics, beyond theory, bureaucracies, and the governmental machine, is just about people.

It was my job as an editor to take Ray's story, in all its varied forms, understand it, learn from it, and care about it—so other readers can do the same. May they enjoy it as much as I do.

GRACE SPENCER
Editor

BIOGRAPHICAL HIGHLIGHTS

RAY MOORE

Ray Moore was born in Seattle on April 19, 1912. An only child, he and his parents lived in many towns in Washington, including Rockdale, Riparia, Starbuck, Lion's Ferry, Clarkston, Liberty Lake, Valley, and Wenatchee, before settling down in Olympia when Ray was thirteen. There he attended grade school, where he won the all-city school track meet's 50- and 100-yard dashes. At Olympia High School he discovered a talent for politics, serving on the Student Council and successfully managing the campaigns of fellow classmates for student body office.

In 1930, he began course work at the University of Washington, continuing his involvement with student politics, but eventually decided to trade in student life for a steady paycheck. He joined the work force in 1934. He worked for Puget Power, General Electric, Boeing, and several investment firms before retiring in 1979 to pursue his legislative career full time.

Ray Moore married his high school sweetheart, Honora Bouley, in 1937. They had one daughter, Lucy, who was born in 1944. After serving as assistant chief clerk of the House in 1947 and as King County Republican chairman 1948 to 1953, Ray ran unsuccessfully for various legislative offices in 1946, 1958, 1974, and 1976.

An avid civil rights supporter, Senator Moore won the B'nai B'rith Man of the Year Award in 1957. Influenced in part by his concern for civil rights and social welfare, and in part by the conflict in Vietnam, in 1964 Ray left the Republican Party and became a staunch supporter of the Democratic Party for the duration of his political career.

Ray and his first wife separated in 1967. In 1973, Ray married Virginia Lloyd Kelton. With her help and support, in 1978 Ray won the state Senate seat in the Thirty-sixth District of Seattle, beginning his sixteen-year career in the Senate.

While in office, Senator Moore established Food Lifeline, a food distribution center serving western Washington. Utilizing his knowledge of the brokerage and finance world, Senator Moore also spearheaded legislation that stabilized Washington banks, as well as

serving on several finance committees. He was twice awarded "Democratic Legislator of the Year" by the Seattle-King County Democratic Club, once in 1979 and again in 1990.

In 1994, Senator Moore retired from the Legislature. He and Virginia moved to Hawaii, where they are currently pursuing their new interest in coffee farming, and, of course Democrat politics Hawaii style.

CHAPTER 1

EARLY LIFE

Ms. Boswell: This is an interview series with Senator Ray Moore begun on March 14th, 1994. The interviews are being conducted in the oral history offices at the State Capitol in Olympia, Washington. The interviewer is Sherry Boswell. The interview is being conducted for the Washington State Oral History Program.

I'd like to begin by saying thank you for being with us.

Sen. Moore: You're welcome.

Ms. Boswell: We're very, very pleased to have you.

You've had a long and successful career in politics in a variety of areas. Let's go back to the very beginning and start with your childhood. Shall we begin with where you were born?

Sen. Moore: I was born at my Aunt Harriet's house—3038 East Laurelhurst Drive, Seattle, April 19, 1912. Since my parents, C. Rea and Elsie Agnew Moore, lived in a remote Cascade Mountain railroad siding known as Rockdale, Mother came to be with her sister, a registered nurse, for my birth.

My earliest memories? Well, I recall that on special occasions we would eat out in Clarkston's best eatery, a Chinese restaurant. In those days, it was not unusual for people to include their dog when eating out. We were no different. And my dog, Rex, took his position under the table. Of course, he ate any and all leftovers. I also remember that one day, some six- or seven-year-old boys grabbed Rex with the intent of chopping his tail off. He took a dim view of this. I ran screaming to my mother who, of course, stopped them. That set a pattern—Mother solved all problems far after she should have forced me to be an active defender. Rex and I were born in the same month and I was with him when he died of a heart attack while I was skating in Valley in the late winter of 1922. We were both ten years old. I took a pick and dug his grave in the frozen ground, crying as I dug. This was my first brush with reality of life and death.

My first brush with fear came at a small, moth-eaten zoo in Clarkston. Someone had caught a bear and her cub. Mama bear was on a chain. I was playing with the baby and got within range of her chain. She jumped on me and my father jumped on the bear. No damage, but C. Rea, I, and both bears were all scared.

Our home life was not typical in two ways. I was an only child and we had more creature comforts than most other families. After supper the fire in the kitchen range was allowed to die, and before going to bed at 10 p.m., Father crumpled newspaper, kindling, and three sticks of pine for the firebox ready to be lit when Mother and Father got up at 6 a.m. By 6:30 a.m., there was hot water in the tank and the kitchen was warm. Our breakfasts were always awful—stewed prunes followed by oatmeal and a huge glass of milk. I hated this meal until I had my own home, but I soon learned pleasing my parents was my role in life.

The period we are covering is 1912-1924. We lived on construction sites from 1912-1915. My father was a civil engineer working for contractors when the railroads relocated to improve their routes. You see, all the

railroads were racing to go west and later found they had not selected the best routes. So my father was in the second wave of railroad building. In 1915, at thirty-one, my father retired to raise grain and chickens on ten acres at Liberty Lake. In those days, people who started with nothing had a goal: acquire $50,000—today's equivalent would be a million dollars—and retire at any age.

When the United States entered World War I in 1917, he was asked to build a railroad at Valley, Washington, fifty miles north of Spokane. There was magnesite used in hardening steel there, and the supply from Austria had been cut off. My father was a born builder. Outhouses and wells were universal in rural America, and Valley was no exception. Father would have none of this for Mother and me. He built a gravity water system so we could have inside plumbing. In so doing, he diverted water from Bull Dog Creek, and I'm sure that today it would not happen. An environmental impact statement would have killed our water system!

At that time, the only reliable transportation from the Colville Valley to Spokane was the train. Our news all came from the *Spokesman Review*, which the train's engineer would throw from his cab. We would pick it up less than a block from our house. Since I was an only child, Mother had time to teach me to read. At four, I could read anything in sight. At five, I knew as much about World War I news as any adult.

With this head start I did well in the first grade. By the time I finished sixth grade, I'd read Dumas, Hugo, Dickens, Thackeray, as well as the *Saturday Evening Post* and *Ladies Home Journal*. During my first ten years I alternated between vigor and sickness, so I had time to read. Remember, there was no radio, no TV, so one's time was narrowly channeled. When I left Valley there were only seven of us left in the sixth grade out of twelve in the first grade, as I remember. One died of pneumonia, one was gored by a bull, one fell through the ice, one died of blood poisoning, and one left to work on the farm. No penicillin, no antibiotics—medicine revolved around iodine and quinine. Only the strong and lucky survived.

My father retired again, this time at forty. We moved to Wenatchee to grow apples. By the time I had finished the seventh grade and had adjusted to new situations there, we were suddenly uprooted. A Spokane lawyer, Tony Russell, had heard of my father and came to our house to tell my father that Governor Roland Hartley wanted him to become Supervisor of Public Utilities—now part of the Utilities and Transportation Commission. Since my mother was suffering from asthma, and since she never had it as a girl in Tacoma, my parents decided to move to Olympia. That was in 1925, and I was thirteen. I didn't want to go through losing friends and trying to make new ones, but I had no choice. Off to another new experience.

Ms. Boswell: I can understand your hesitation. So, because of your father's involvement with Hartley, I'm wondering if perhaps your father began your interest in politics?

Sen. Moore: Not really, because my father was almost ashamed of being considered a politician.

Ms. Boswell: Oh, is that so? Tell me more about that.

Sen. Moore: My father was a self-made civil engineer. He had walked all the way from—I think—Bismarck, North Dakota to the Dalles on engineering parties when they were relocating the railroads. At a very early age, he was admitted as a full member of the American Society of Civil Engineers. He was maybe twenty-three or twenty-four. Well, today you have to have done a lot of things to

be so recognized. But in those days if you were a good engineer and the jobs you did turned out well, you became eligible. So he had always considered himself a professional. As a matter of fact, years later when he had become a lobbyist for Washington Water Power, his card read "legislative engineer," which to me was worse.

Ms. Boswell: That's great. That's wonderful.

Sen. Moore: My father was probably reacting to—well, because Olympia was a political town and because there was, in those days, a real class structure. The natives here, the big old families like the Schmidts, the O'Learys, and a couple of others really were quite standoffish to state employees. I think the people who settled here, and the people of substance, felt superior because political people came and went after a few years. They never became rooted here. But I went one year of grade school and all through high school in Olympia. In an effort to get better acquainted with the so-called "better" classes I became acquainted with Adolph Schmidt, Jr. and a lot of other people that were my age in grade school and in high school.

In the eighth grade at Washington Grade School in Olympia, new horizons appeared. I was our one-man track team. At the all-grade school meet I won the fifty- and hundred-yard dashes in record time: 5.9 and 11.9 seconds. When I entered high school in the fall of '26, the track coach, Martin Miller (later a House member), had high hopes for me, but I soon discovered politics, ran for freshman student council, and was elected. This probably destroyed both my academic and track careers. I don't know, I just had a fascination, I guess, with the whole process. Anyway, politics has for seventy years been my chief interest.

In high school I soon realized I was deeply in love with Honora Bouley, a popular and top student. So between politics and love, studying fell to a weak third. The fellow I just mentioned, Adolph Schmidt, Jr., had some clout, partly because of his name—his family owned the Olympia Brewery—and partly because he was a personable fellow who was extremely popular. So after I was on the student council, I managed his campaign for student body president. We were running against a fellow who was also extremely popular, a big athlete, had everything going. I wasn't sure we were going to win, so I had the student council set the election for a day when the baseball team, on which our opponent starred, was playing at Centralia, so all his friends were there and not here to vote.

Ms. Boswell: All right, you were an excellent strategist.

Sen. Moore: So anyway, Adolph "Bump" Schmidt was elected.

I didn't have any confidence in myself. I couldn't dance and I couldn't sing, all the things you just had to be able to do in those days. And, although I appeared to be an extrovert, to some extent, I really was very shy. So I preferred to be somebody's manager and try to elect other people. I had a feel for campaigning and since there was always an abundance of candidates, and few with campaigning ability, I found my niche—albeit I envied the candidates!

Ms. Boswell: Which school was it then?

Sen. Moore: I went to Olympia High School. There was only one, William Winlock Miller High School. It was right across the street from the capitol, on Capitol Way.

Ms. Boswell: So if it wasn't your father, where do you think you got that interest in politics? It was with you from high school on, but where did it come from?

Sen. Moore: I suppose fascination with the capitol building and the whole spectrum. The town was so small that it was possible for even a high school student to know the governor, secretary of state, auditor, treasurer, and attorney general. You could see these people shopping, you could talk to them, you could usually go in their office when they weren't busy. I guess I was just fascinated with the building and to some extent the incumbents who were in office. There was nobody like Roland Hartley or his lieutenant governors, Johnson from Colville and Gellatly from Wenatchee. These were intriguing characters.

And there's just a time when you've put so many people who are found wanting into positions, that you think, "Gee, I could really do this better. I'd like to try it." And so, I started out in my freshman class in high school. And, as I mentioned, I was elected to the student council, or whatever they called it. I just progressed quite naturally from there on.

Ms. Boswell: Olympia was a small town, then. Were the facilities fairly good here?

Sen. Moore: I think the high school was quite good, and there were a lot of opportunities here. For example, every girl took typing and shorthand, which was one of the few fields that would be open to young women. They used to come over and sit at the desk in the outer office of the Governor's office, and they'd act as typists and receptionists for which they got credit. It was good, practical experience. You were meeting the public. It honed your personal skills. Gave you an opportunity to type and take dictation from the governor or his secretary. The overall pattern here was extremely good, I thought. And we were fortunate to have as our high school principle Leland P. Brown, who influenced all of us greatly and for the better.

Ms. Boswell: So you almost lived and breathed politics if you lived in Olympia. You couldn't get away from it.

Sen. Moore: If you were a state employee, you did. There was no civil service then, so you just served at the pleasure of the Governor, really.

Ms. Boswell: And did you say there were a lot of people in and out? I think one thing people talk about, even today, is the transient nature of a segment of Olympia's population because of the Legislature. Was that even more apparent then, or not?

Sen. Moore: People did not consider this a career. If you could get a job with the state as a secretary or an engineer or something, you considered yourself fortunate, but it was not to be a lifetime job. You hoped with engineering experience to be highly acceptable to a contractor and go to work for somebody who was building roads, and to have other opportunities. And the same with secretarial work. The state didn't pay very well. Of course, nobody paid very well, and remember, in those days if you were getting $100 a month, you got to keep the whole $100. There were no deductions—nothing. I think the first payroll deduction was Social Security in the mid-1930s. A hundred dollars a month, sixty years ago, or seventy years ago, was the equivalent of probably at least $2,500 a month now, because you have all the deductions, and most prices are between fifteen and twenty times what they were then. In 1934, eggs were ten cents a dozen, a one-pound loaf of bread was ten cents, a quart of milk was ten cents. A new Ford, Chevrolet, or Plymouth with a radio and a heater cost $600, brand new!

But the opportunities were really great here for young people. When I went to my fiftieth anniversary of my high school graduating class, which was 1980, there were

100 people out of 167 who came to the reunion. That's fifty years later. I thought it was quite interesting because all of the really lively people in high school were almost all dead. The attendees didn't stand out in high school. They were not athletes, they weren't cheerleaders, and they weren't all the things that go to make up vitality in a school. They were good kids, but not stand-outs. They got jobs with the state or just stayed in Olympia, and they bought waterfront when it was very cheap, and most were well off. I was quite surprised.

Ms. Boswell: You told me that your dad was almost embarrassed about being in politics, per se, so did your parents encourage you at all in politics, or did they just stay neutral? What was your dad's reaction?

Sen. Moore: I think that they finally came to the conclusion that I was probably not destined for greatness, which I think was a little difficult for them. My father wanted me to be an engineer. Well, after the initial disappointment passed, probably when I was thirty, they supported anything that I had a desire for.

My father died before I was elected, but my mother lived in a very upscale retirement home in San Diego. I went down to see her a week or two after I was elected. At breakfast that morning there were tables with about eight ladies sitting around, and my mother introduced me as her son the "Senator." Everything was going along fine, and all of a sudden some woman said, "And what party are you?" And my mother quickly said, "Oh, wouldn't you like some more jam?" She was ashamed I was a Democrat, but proud of the fact that I was elected!

Ms. Boswell: She wasn't going to tell what party you were elected from?

Sen. Moore: No, because they're all hard-core, right-wing Republicans!

Ms. Boswell: Would you talk politics at the dinner table? Was it that much of an issue?

Sen. Moore: No. As a matter of fact, I don't know what we talked about at dinner. I had a good relationship with my parents, but the people that really changed my thinking were the couple who became my father-in-law and mother-in-law. I was very close to them, and they lived forever. He was born in 1866 on Lincoln's birthday, a year after Lincoln was assassinated. He had been a delegate to the William Jennings Bryan "Cross of Gold" convention. He had been a treasurer and auditor in Aberdeen, South Dakota. He was one-fourth Chippewa, and he was *very* liberal, and I was *very* conservative, and finally, after many years of wrangling he influenced me. I grudgingly saw that he was probably right. And no sooner had I arrived at that point, than he turned conservative. So, we always had very hot arguments.

Ms. Boswell: But mutually respectful?

Sen. Moore: Yes. I loved both of them.

Ms. Boswell: May I ask what his name was?

Sen. Moore: Bouley. Honoré Nelson Bouley. He was of French-Canadian origin.

Ms. Boswell: And was he in government in Olympia?

Sen. Moore: Yes. That's very interesting. There used to be a department here called Business, Budget, and Finance, or something like that, and he was the person who audited all of the expenditures in the state institutions. He and a lady did this whole job, and when he retired, at about eighty, they hired four

people to do his job—a supervisor, two secretaries and a clerk. He and this woman had done the whole thing up until that time. He worked all the time. He was a remarkable, frail, little guy who probably never weighed over 120 pounds, and he used to run back and forth to the office when he was seventy-five, eighty. He was remarkable.

So was my mother-in-law, Emma Bouley. She was the treasurer for United Churches here in Olympia. Two or three years before she died, I used to come to Olympia every week to take her out for a ride. She was in a nursing home, but as a matter of fact she shouldn't have been there, because she had all her faculties and was quite ambulatory.

I learned many things of value from Emma. She tempered my tempestuous streak by example, showing me the value of patience and silence. She had many traits that reminded me of Mahatma Gandhi. Without trying, she left me a valuable heritage.

Ms. Boswell: You mentioned the other day that you were here when the Capitol building was being built, and that was impressive to you. Will you tell me a little bit about that?

Sen. Moore: It was so much fun because it was all mud and dirt, all around, clear out to Capitol Way. Here were these fairly primitive machines, block and tackle, lifting these big pillars and everything into place—these big blocks of granite and marble. So it was fun to watch. In those days they had nothing but metal rollers on roller skates, and that area where you go in that southeast door of the Capitol, if you walk on around toward—there's quite a lot of space around adjacent to the governors office—that's the best roller skating that I ever had, and we used to roller skate there all the time. The governor would scream at us, and the chief of the Highway Patrol would come out and shoo us away.

Ms. Boswell: The counterpart of the skateboarders today.

Sen. Moore: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: That's great. You were mentioning that one of the early politicians that you were fascinated with was Roland Hartley. Tell me a little bit more. Did you have a chance to observe him pretty closely?

Sen. Moore: Oh yes. He wore a swallowtail coat with white piping on it. He wore those stiff collars that had the rounded edges instead of being pointed, and he was probably five-six. He had huge, bug eyes and florid red cheeks, and he was never in doubt about anything. He was quick to anger and he got in a terrible fight with Colonel Blethen who owned the *Seattle Times*. Blethen told the Governor that he had to be made general of the National Guard. And Hartley didn't like him to begin with, and that really touched him off. "Nobody's going to tell Roland Hartley who to appoint." So, somebody else was appointed. Well, Blethen immediately took off after Hartley, hitting him with something every week. They were such minor scandals it's laughable. Like why did he sign the bill that authorized the purchase of those cuspidors at $100 apiece? Big deal. Well, Hartley took it. At this time, my uncle owned the—you know that triangle building in Seattle that's kitty corner across from the Westin Hotel?

Ms. Boswell: Yes.

Sen. Moore: Well, my uncle owned the building and the land, and the *Seattle Times* was published there. Very convenient. Right downtown, and they rolled the stuff off the presses and the newsboys were there to grab them and a few trucks hauled them out to various places. One day, the *Seattle Times* didn't renew its lease, so my uncle was stuck

with this ridiculous building. Triangle buildings are not the most utilitarian items you can find. So, my uncle then found out that the *Seattle Times* was moving out to Fairview where they are now. Well, Roland Hartley found out, too, and thought, "Here's my chance to get even with Blethen."

Because Blethen bought that property on the supposition that Fairview would go right down to the water, and there'd be a bridge, like the Aurora bridge, out over the water to what is now Gasworks Park. And so, Hartley thought, "As soon as he gets his investment solidly set there, so he can't move, then I'll build a bridge over Aurora instead." The Aurora bridge. Which he did. People got even, really got even, in those days. It wasn't subtle!

Ms. Boswell: Amazing. So, you really think that was why the Aurora bridge was built right where it is?

Sen. Moore: Oh yes. Oh, no question.

Ms. Boswell: That's a wonderful story. What was your uncle's name?

Sen. Moore: Grimshaw. William E. Grimshaw.

Ms. Boswell: What about your dad's experiences with Hartley? You said he worked pretty closely with him, as well.

Sen. Moore: In those days there weren't many departments. There was Agriculture, there was the Highway Department, there was the Department of Public Works, and then this Business, Budget, and Finance Department. I think that's about all there was in state government. So, the governor didn't really have much to do. Paid $6,000 a year? My father got $5,000, which was a horrendous salary in those days. So, yes, all the directors of departments, all met with Hartley. Dropped in, asked his opinion, told him what was going on, it was pretty informal. The place was well governed, but it wasn't over-governed.

Ms. Boswell: That's interesting. What about the role of the press? If Colonel Blethen and Hartley had this set-to, was the press fairly influential at that time?

Sen. Moore: Yes. The press had some real "oomph." Radio was just starting. Very few people had radio. There was the *Daily Olympian* and the *Seattle Times* and the *P.I.*, and then there was a thing in Seattle called the *Star*, the *Seattle Star*.

Hartley was one of a kind. If there had happened to be a band playing in the rotunda when Hartley was governor, he would have called the chief of the Highway Patrol, a guy by the name of Bill Cole, who wore puttees and a campaign hat. He'd have called him and said, "Clear this place out." So, nobody ever did.

Ms. Boswell: Not dignified enough, or what was his reason?

Sen. Moore: He didn't have any education, and he had come a long way in life. He had a reverence for this place, and for Yale, and Vassar, and that was the way he was. He wasn't going to have it defiled with a lot of silly music. He might have tolerated a string quartet, something like that, but one of these bands, no possible way.

Ms. Boswell: Forget it, huh?

Sen. Moore: No saxophones, no trumpets, no drums—he was a very tough guy. Nobody was going to push Roland Hartley around. He was here for eight years, and he would have probably been here longer if the Depression hadn't hit. I think there was one Democrat in the Legislature, in the Senate, in 1930. In

1932, they were almost all Democrats. Just a handful of holdovers. But, by 1934, the Republicans were an endangered species.

Ms. Boswell: Was that Martin's administration? Do you remember him specifically, too, from your Olympia days? You weren't really down here then.

Sen. Moore: No. I was in school in Seattle, and then I was working. I used to come back often, but I only met him twice, I guess. I had the impression of cold, marble eyes, and a quiet, not-effusive person. Robust in character and physically. I don't mean that he was heavy or stout. He was just built proportionally. He was a strong man—and tall.

The second time I met him was at a party here in Olympia, at the Mansion. I can't even remember what the occasion was. Must have been open to anybody if a Republican could get in. He was a man I don't think anybody really knew very well. He was very much unto himself, I think. But, you know, he was one of my two favorite governors. Rosellini was the other.

Ms. Boswell: What was it about Martin that you particularly appreciated?

Sen. Moore: Looking back from this vantage point, I would have a different reason for believing that he was the best governor. At that time I was ultraconservative, and he was the only conservative Democrat who was running for governor. The other two were very liberal, Pemberton and Schwellenbach. And so, in those days, as a Republican, I thought he was very good, and I also gave him a lot of credit at that time for saving the state from bankruptcy, and spreading the pain around through the sales tax. He was a tall, rather dour man with glassy eyes. They just didn't seem to see you. He was quite austere. He was probably six-two, which was immense in those days. Well built, publicly quite refined. Privately—I can't really speak to that. He had a terrifically difficult period to be governor—you have to judge people by whether there were easy times or not—and he had a Legislature with whom he did not agree a great deal of the time. So, I gave him a lot of credit for maneuvering so well for eight years with a very difficult group. The Legislature was very wild during his tenure. As I recall, Democrats had to get somebody out of jail in Seattle to serve.

Ms. Boswell: Oh, really? I hadn't heard that story before.

Sen. Moore: Some people said there were three, but I can only remember one, and I can't remember who it was. But anyway, it was a motley crew that he inherited. He just came in the same time they did, in a big landslide in 1932. They were all new, including him. He was unfamiliar with the ways of the Legislature because he'd been a grain elevator owner/operator in Cheney—very successful. He's responsible for building the highway that now connects Vantage with Spokane, and you'll notice it goes within Cheney—a half a mile of Cheney. There was a reason that road was built there. Easy access!

Ms. Boswell: I wondered about his environmental stance, because of the whole controversy over the Olympic National Park, and how big it should be, where it should be, and the interests of the timber industry. He was pretty much in opposition to a large park, which sort of surprised me a little bit.

Sen. Moore: Parks were so vague here. They were well established in the East and there were not very many national parks here. Our national forests were out here. I guess I don't know enough about that to speak to it.

Ms. Boswell: What about your academic interests? Did they have much course work in political science at Olympia High?

Sen. Moore: No. And I was a terrible student. I graduated number 100 out of 167, so I was in the lower half of the class. I would never have been able to get into the university today. But this was 1930 and the Great Depression was everywhere, which meant they would accept anyone with the tuition fee. So I was able to get into the university, but again I foundered, not knowing what I wanted. I flunked out three times and never finished. I had joined the Sigma Chi fraternity and really frittered away four years of my life, except I was still in love with Honora, and I was still interested in politics. At the university, I managed several campaigns for people with indifferent successes, sometimes winning, sometimes losing.

Ms. Boswell: What about the political tone of those campaigns? Were there some definite philosophies of the people that you managed?

Sen. Moore: Generally not. It was a popularity contest more than anything else, although I ran for A.S.U.W. vice-president. I ran on the platform of "let's have a student union building." They called me a Communist. And the fellow that had been the athletic director, Chuck Frankland, who later became a banker, came out to the university and denounced me. And about three or four years later he supported the idea of a student union building! So I was one of the first ones to have something of substance that I wanted to do.

Ms. Boswell: But the political tone of the campus at that time was still fairly conservative?

Sen. Moore: It was very conservative. I used to go to some offbeat meetings. I'd go to anything perhaps out of excitement that it was offbeat, or maybe I really wanted to see what it was about. I'm a little confused in my own mind as to why I went. If I could have found a Communist meeting I would have probably gone, although I was beyond-belief conservative. I was extreme far right. I hated unions, welfare, Social Security, WPA, I opposed anything new—a traditional Republican!

Ms. Boswell: Where do you think that came from?

Sen. Moore: Oh, I think it was partly my upbringing. My parents were very conservative. And I wanted to be a success, and you couldn't be a success in the way I wanted to be, or thought I wanted to be, if you were wildly liberal.

Ms. Boswell: How were you defining success then?

Sen. Moore: Oh, you know, money, prestige, position in the community. All the traditional things that were more a yardstick than they are today. You know today, you could be an artist and be accepted. But when I was a boy that was just too far out. But then came Mark Tobey, Graves, Fitzgerald, and Tomkins. They were all respected in the community as early as the fifties. So attitudes began to change.

Of course, Roosevelt and Truman had a big influence on what success was. Coming from a meager background and becoming a union organizer or a bank vice-president was possible. It had not been possible in the twenties and before. There was more of a class structure. That's why Horatio Alger stories sold so well, because those examples were so few and far between! There weren't many. Some people like to think the bootstrap life

was possible, but in reality it wasn't.

Anyway, I had one of the worst grade point averages anybody had at the university. I flunked out three times, and never finished, and they let me back in. I took an extension course and as soon as I finished that, I applied to come back—tuition enclosed—and they took me without any question. Academically, my grades were so bad that when I applied at Evergreen two or three years ago, thinking, "Well, after all these years, it might be fun to get a degree."

They laughed at me and said, "You know, if you'll go to a community college for four or five years, and have a 4.0, we might consider you."

I thought, "That's a long time in my life."

Ms. Boswell: That's kind of silly after a distinguished career.

Sen. Moore: I don't think so. I think they were right. I was glad they had some standards. I admire them for it.

Ms. Boswell: Well, then, tell me about that period. Were you so busy with the political campaigns that you weren't interested in studies?

Sen. Moore: Yes. It was during Prohibition. And, you know, drinking beer illegally was the thing to do. So I used to drink home brew in somebody's basement or wherever.

Ms. Boswell: So you know some Prohibition stories?

Sen. Moore: Oh, well, people know these stories pretty well, but one of the great stories is that—this is when I lived in Olympia—liquor was brought from Victoria to either Port Angeles or Port Townsend or Port Ludlow. It was always brought down in a fifty or sixty foot yacht. They'd have many hundreds of cases that they were able to bring down, and they would unload them there. Then the bootleggers would put them in regular touring cars, and one car would have a couple of pretty tough looking characters driving it. And then there'd be a second car that had a little old man and a little old lady driving like they're touring. And the third car was kind of a relief car, and it worked like this: The first car would be driving down the road looking around furtively, and the revenuers would pick them up and search them. In the meantime, the little old lady and the little old man who had the booze with them, would just continue down the road. They drove all the way from Port Angeles, or Port Ludlow or Port Townsend to Olympia, which was kind of a distribution center, and they would unload it here. Well, the third car, in case there appeared to be some question about what was happening to the second car with the elderly couple in it—whether they might be under surveillance, too—would immediately speed up and go just as fast as they could down the road. The revenuers would take after them thinking they were the ones. And so, this little old couple would tour down here with the alcohol. The bootleggers had a lot of people like that because they could only get maybe twenty cases in a car at a time, but rather than load them on a truck, which would be too obvious, they used this ruse.

Ms. Boswell: Was it fairly easy, in Olympia then, to get bootleg?

Sen. Moore: Oh, there were fifty taxies here, and all they did was pick moonshine up, up where the Westwater Hotel is, in that general area. It was brought down from the Black Hills where there were lots of stills, and they'd pick up the moonshine there for the people that couldn't afford the better stuff smuggled in from British Columbia. The taxi cab companies had, stashed around in various

places, anything that you wanted—Cutty Sark, Black and White, Red Label, Black Label. Scotch was a big drink in those days. It was kind of, I don't know, kind of snobbish to drink Scotch. So, people drank either Scotch or moonshine from the hills up here, whatever they could afford.

Ms. Boswell: So even legislators indulged, at that point?

Sen. Moore: Oh, it was a way of life! Of course.

Ms. Boswell: What about liquor, even in these days? Is a lot of business conducted over drinks? Is that culture important?

Sen. Moore: I can't really answer that. Apparently, it's a big enough item that the IRS has decided that you can only write off so many martinis at lunch. When I've had a drink, I never do any business. I don't really trust myself. So, all my business has always been conducted in an office, or sometimes at lunch, but with no drinking, because I just don't think I'm capable of totally coping. Some people seem to be able to handle it well, but I can't.

Ms. Boswell: So there was Prohibition. And were you involved in politics at all at the university, besides your A.S.U.W. campaign?

Sen. Moore: I spent a lot of time on politics. And I just wasn't interested in school. As a matter of fact, I wonder if I should have ever gone. I might have been better off at Pike Place Market just selling oranges or something, because my history has been that I'm a competitor.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think that's the quality that particularly distinguished your career as a political organizer, that competitiveness? I mean, is that what kept you going at the university?

Sen. Moore: I think so. And I was manager of our intramural sports teams at the fraternity I belonged to. I would do anything—just about anything—to have the best team on the campus. So I was pretty competitive and not very capable myself. As I said, I can't dance, I can't sing, and I never considered I had much of a personality. I always thought of myself as wanting in a lot of areas. So I guess I chose to be a manager rather than a candidate.

Ms. Boswell: What kinds of skills have made you a good manager?

Sen. Moore: I am reasonably good at seeing a few months ahead or a few years ahead, and nobody that I ever managed was damaged. I wouldn't tolerate dirty campaigns. We lost some that we could have won if we had mixed it up. But those people survived as viable candidates at a later date.

Ms. Boswell: Are you a detail person?

Sen. Moore: No. I paint with a broad brush. As a matter of fact, I wouldn't have ever been elected had it not been for my wife, Virginia.

Ms. Boswell: So you are the idea person and the vision person?

Sen. Moore: I don't think I want to make that—it sounds as if I'm some kind of seer.

Ms. Boswell: No.

Sen. Moore: But, for instance, I helped write the first civil rights act in this state, in the mid-forties. And I tried to write Indians and women into it, and those white liberals who were on the ad hoc committee all laughed at me.

I was pleased this was the fifth state to have a civil rights act. Connecticut, New York, Massachusetts, and New Jersey were the four that had civil rights acts before we did. But,

I've always tried to look ahead.

Years ago, I saw the need for trees on the Seattle streets when I ran for the city council. That—and free water to industries that didn't pollute—were the issues I ran on. That was in '58. They just laughed at me. A couple of years later they planted trees on the streets of Seattle. Eventually, they got around to agreeing that maybe we should give water away for a while, five years or something like that, to businesses. Of course, now we see we're short of water. And I saw that coming about twenty-five years ago. Long before the first drought.

When we get this population increase by fifty percent, which may happen in the next thirty, forty years, what happens then? Not only to water, but also to sewage? Nobody thinks ahead. We do have somebody in the Legislature who is thinking ahead right now, Senator Karen Fraser from Olympia. She's someone in the Senate who truly puts societal long-term solutions first. And she's interested in the water problem as I have always been.

Ms. Boswell: Did you develop that skill for seeing ahead in college? Did you have some sort of notion about the fate of the university? I mean the student union was a good example of that. You saw where things were going.

Sen. Moore: Well, there was no place for students to get together. There was a place, kind of a nonsectarian thing called Eaglson Hall, off campus. And students could get together there, but in small groups. They needed a larger arena with food and all of that. So I saw that need and others. I'd never been anyplace else but I'd heard about schools that had such things. So I thought, "Well, we should have one, too."

Ms. Boswell: Were the students very political at that time? I mean were the majority pro- or anti-Roosevelt, for example? Or was there a strong sense of national politics?

Sen. Moore: Students in general were conservative because their folks had money to get them there. And there weren't very many working their way through school, because there were no jobs in Seattle.

When I went to work in '34 there were 50,000 unemployed men in Seattle. And of course women weren't even counted. Jobs for women were mostly as a nurse, stenographer, housewife, teacher, waitress, or maybe one or two other things. But you know, as far as professionals were concerned or management jobs—no way. So it was a very terrible period, much wasted talent—and fear everywhere.

Fear can end up in revolution. So because of Roosevelt, and perhaps because of the war, the country was saved. It is a terrible thing to say, but it caused them to be motivated by fear. Everybody was so busy keeping body and soul together they forgot about being a capitalist or a communist or what not.

Ms. Boswell: You said you were fairly conservative. Were you a supporter of Roosevelt?

Sen. Moore: No, I hated him. Oh, I hated change! Oh, I just absolutely deplored him. And I am ashamed to say I passed on those terrible stories about Harry Truman. I was part and parcel of Republican gossip. When he ran in '48, I just passed the gossip along—you know, the stories that he played a piano in the whorehouse and all this stuff. I'm ashamed of myself. But that's the last time I really did anything like that without *knowing* what I was doing.

Ms. Boswell: When you were at the university, and it was the depths of the Depression, and you had some scholastic difficulties, what did your parents think about all that? Were they having any financial difficulties as well, or were they able to keep afloat?

Sen. Moore: They did all right. You see, my father was hired by Hartley, as I mentioned. In those days there were just three people in the governor's office. There was Roland Hartley, there was Amy Albright who was his secretary and perhaps something else along with it, and a guy by the name of Rochford—I think that was his name—who wrote the budget. That's all there was. One day Roland Hartley was in the East—I can't remember what the situation was, but he was out of town for a week—and Amy Albright became the Governor. The Lieutenant Governor didn't count, he was in Wenatchee. And she just called my father in and fired him. Said, "You're through, bye."

Ms. Boswell: Was there animosity there, what was the reason?

Sen. Moore: I don't know. I don't know what it was. Roland Hartley may have told her to do it—we don't know. But anyway, my father was sort of like me. He never went anyplace where he wasn't invited. I'm careful about that, too. He said, "I guess that's the way it is." The Depression was just starting, that was the summer of 1930.

Sen. Moore: So the people that put my father into this job with Hartley—the law firm in Spokane—they came to his rescue. That's the way things were done in those days. They got him a new job. They made him division manager of Washington Water Power, from Chelan to the Canadian border. And so I think he got $300 a month, which was less than he was getting here because he got $416.67, or $5,000 a year.

He then spent quite a few years in Okanogan. My parents didn't want to face the fact that I was not making it at school. Both my father and mother wanted to think I was perfect, which is not unusual. And since I was the only child they had all their chips on me. So when I dropped out of school, I think it was a disappointment, but the fact that I went to work, I got a job right away—in spite of the fact that there were 50,000 people out of work—kind of made up for everything else. I was a hard worker and never missed a day. I'd be sick and I'd still go to work. I'd go home as soon as I got through. I'd go to bed and try to get well for the next day. My parents appreciated that part of me. It was their style.

Interesting thing, a young man who had been a flyer in World War I and who had crashed, injuring his back—he lost a vertebrae or something—came to Olympia and asked for a job. My father hired him to a position as an engineer in the Department of Public Works. His name was Wellington Rupp. That was probably around 1926. Eight years later he left state employment and went to Puget Sound Power and Light.

In March of 1934, I went to see him and said, "I want to go to work, I can't make it at school." I knew it was a big burden, but he was the kind of man who thought, "His father helped me, I'm going to help him." So he got me a job reading meters for Puget Sound Power and Light, and I quit school. In those days, Puget and City Light were both competing for the same customers, using the same poles for their lines. If you didn't like one, you just cut them off and went to the other one.

So I was able to get a job when nobody else had one. I went to work on March 23, 1934, which was Honora's birthday. I was so afraid of losing that job that I never took a day off, even when I had the flu. I was there early in the morning. They gave us two car tokens every day to get out on the job to read the meters. I would use one car token to get from the University District where I was living, to downtown, get a transfer, go in and get my meter-reading book, and with this transfer I would go out to read the meters. I'd come back and use my other token—you see,

I'd get a transfer from out there—to get back to the University District.

So I had life figured out and it was very cheap living. I made eighty dollars a month and for breakfast I had two powdered sugar donuts and a glass of milk, for a dime. And I ate lunch out in little places I had discovered where you got a great meal for twenty-five cents. And then dinner I really splurged, and spent maybe fifty cents. So I ate for less than a dollar a day, probably twenty-five dollars a month. And I was saving sixteen dollars a month, with which I bought Puget Power stock.

Ms. Boswell: That's pretty amazing during that period.

Sen. Moore: I bought a share of stock in Puget Sound Power and Light every pay day for eight dollars. And that's how I got my start.

Ms. Boswell: And did Mr. Rupp note your strong commitment to the job?

Sen. Moore: Oh, yes, he didn't expect anything less. He was a tremendous worker. He was like Jimmy Andersen on the Supreme Court here. He worked eighteen hours a day. He slept a few hours every day and the rest of the time it was all work. He was especially pleased when after about eight or ten months on the job, I walked in one day with a transfer order from City Light to Puget. It was the Orpheum Building and Theatre—a really good account. It was where the Westin Hotel now stands.

The chief meter reader didn't believe it. So I said, "Well, call this fellow." So he called the guy who'd put in the order, and he said, "Yes, I just signed up a half hour ago. When are you going to make the change?" The chief meter reader shook his head because no meter reader had ever been able to sign up anybody. Once in awhile they'd stumble into a house where they were just ready to move and sign them. But nothing big. So they immediately made me a salesman and took me off meter reading. This was early 1935. I was a hero—I never told anyone the Orpheum man was my uncle in whose house I was born.

Ms. Boswell: Oh! I was just going to ask you how you did it. Well, good for you.

Sen. Moore: It isn't the cards you're dealt, it's how you play them. And that's been my philosophy always. I had no charisma, I had very little to offer, but what little I had I parlayed. I made the most of it. In the meantime, I lost every cent I had in the 1936 election.

Ms. Boswell: How did you do that?

Sen. Moore: I bet on Landon against Roosevelt. And I had wonderful bets. Like Landon will carry a state west of Mississippi. Landon will carry a state south of the Mason-Dixon line. Landon will carry a state west of the Hudson River. The Literary Digest Poll was showing Landon winning over Roosevelt. So I thought, "I've really got this thing by the tail." So I bet $300 and I lost it all, which would be like at least $6,000 now.

And I was feeling pretty beat up the next morning. By that time I had become a salesman on the floor in Puget's main office, selling ranges and water heaters. A fellow came up to me and said, "I've just talked to your boss and I'd like to talk to you." And I hadn't shaved. I was a real wreck that morning. He said, "Could you come and have a cup of coffee with me?"

And I said, "I don't drink coffee." Real friendly type, Mr. Personality!

And he said, "Well, maybe a glass of milk."

And I said, "That'd be fine." So we went to a little dive up the street and he offered me

a job with Hot Point, a division of GE, as a salesman traveling in the Northwest: Oregon, Washington, and Montana, as far east as Kalispell, and as far south as Klamath Falls. So I took the job. That was in November of '36.

Honora and I married October 6, 1937, in Olympia. Only a few relatives attended. The Depression had dragged on for seven years and no respite seemed imminent. Not only is marriage somewhat of a gamble, I did the most ridiculous thing in my life—I asked for two months leave of absence and our manager, a gentle man, said yes. We drove to San Diego, Laredo, Mexico City, and Acapulco. There was practically no road to Acapulco. We made it to one hotel and a pristine deserted beach.

By the time we returned to Seattle in December, employment had taken another dive. I was sure I was unemployed when I walked into the manager's office. He told me he had been ordered to cut expenses, which meant payroll. As the newest employee at Hot Point, I was slated to be out of a job. He asked the rest of his staff if they would take a ten percent pay cut to keep me and they said yes. Somehow I doubt that would happen today. I tried hard to succeed. Through some luck I won Hot Point's national sales effort for three of the five years I was there. Although I knew working for big companies was not my first choice, I prepared to stay, perhaps forever.

As it turned out, I was with Hot Point until December of 1941. Then out of the blue came Pearl Harbor and all-out war with Japan. Our office closed because the factory in Chicago was being converted to the war effort. I registered for the draft at age twenty-nine, and was not taken because of asthma and my age. I went to work at Boeing, which during the war was a little like the service—two or three employees for every job.

Ms. Boswell: Did Hot Point close its office because of the war, or did they just figure they wouldn't be selling a lot of appliances?

Sen. Moore: It went into total war materials.

Ms. Boswell: And at Boeing what were you doing?

Sen. Moore: I was what they now call a contract administrator. Actually, I would get a phone call from Lockheed and they would say, "You know, we have only twelve hours of supply," of some part. See, there were a lot of companies working on the same planes. Boeing and Lockheed might be building the same plane. "Well, we're out of a certain kind of grommet."

And I'd say, "Well, how many do you need?"

"Well, we need enough for a month." So my job was to scrounge around and get those and get them on a B-17 as fast as I could, and fly them down there so they didn't run out. And so that's all I really did during the war. Not much of a job.

Ms. Boswell: Well, I think it's an important job.

Sen. Moore: It didn't seem like it to me. I was grateful to have a job and be with Honora, but I was not happy. By 1945, my asthmatic attacks were daily and severe. Nothing gave relief. Finally an Austrian doctor whom I helped get into the county told me my only hope was psychoanalysis. Like everyone, I said I wasn't crazy. But in desperation I looked into it. There was only one analyst in Seattle at the time. The rest were all in the Navy. So I phoned him in February of '45 and couldn't get an appointment until July 1. I was a wreck that morning. I could just hardly breathe. So I went down to see this guy in the Cobb Building, walked out of that appointment fifty minutes later, and never had another attack. I kept on seeing him for two more years because I realized that there must be some underlying problem. Since that time I've been able to

handle anything. I just don't get sick. I just don't give up. I just keep going. I guess I have a determination to want to see what the next day is going to bring. I want to be ready for it. I'm still up at five o'clock in the morning, whether I'm farming, or whether I'm legislating. When I was a broker I was the first one there and the last one to leave—for thirty-four years.

CHAPTER 2

BUSINESS

Ms. Boswell: Before we get into your political career, I wanted to talk about your business life. They seem to have occurred simultaneously—you were handling your business ventures while you were involved in politics. So, after you see this psychoanalyst, it's 1945 and the war is about to end. Where did you go—in terms of business—once the war was over?

Sen. Moore: I left Boeing**.** I didn't want to ever go back to a big company, because I had already realized that my personality just didn't fit. And I knew I didn't want to end up anyplace with a turkey dinner and a gold watch at age sixty-five. And about that time I began to feel I wanted to have as many experiences as I could in life. So that's why I've done so many things.

But even though I just don't belong in a big organization, I ended up in some big ones anyway. In September of 1945, after leaving Boeing, I went to work as a stockbroker for a tiny firm—and I was miserable. But I stayed in brokerage, at various firms, for thirty-four years because of the money. Never had a good day.

Ms. Boswell: Oh, really?

Sen. Moore: Never. I hated it, but I was quite successful. In 1945 I was thirty-three, and I was just devastated with the asthma and hay fever. After I got relief from that as a result of analysis, I was so far behind all of the other people that I'd gone to school with it was pathetic. So, I started running, hard. Everything I did, I was trying to catch up with all the people that were my age.

Ms. Boswell: When you say, "catch up," you mean in terms of advancement in career?

Sen. Moore: Oh, yes. In politics, in business, every way. And so, I think in order to prove that I had some potential, you know, I had to do everything the hard way. I never did anything the easy way. It was as if I was going into the Kentucky Derby carrying 200 pounds extra. When I won contests, when I was a big producer in the brokerage business, I always did it the hard way. I talked people out of business. I said, "Do you have a house?"

"Well, no, I'm renting one."

"I think you should save your money for a down payment on a house." I could have had that business, you see. I could have taken their money and put it in some stock or other. But I just didn't do that. I was always looking out for what I thought was their best interest. Not that I was playing God, but it just seemed common sense to me to own a house. And that was an ambition of people back in time, almost everybody wanted to own a "piece of the rock."

Ms. Boswell: Was that a post-Depression philosophy?

Sen. Moore: I think the Depression made ownership more important. But of course, back in 1920 and before, people wanted to own something. That was security, whether it was 320 acres, or 160 acres, or 80 acres, or a house, people wanted to own. Houses were cheap to build, and they didn't have a lot of

amenities. So, if you just got a piece of land and built a house on it, that probably was going to last you for the rest of your life. People didn't live so long then.

Still, even though I did it the hard way, wherever I was, I was the biggest producer. I put in long hours.

Ms. Boswell: Was it the time? You sound like you have very good salesmanship abilities as well.

Sen. Moore: Maybe. I don't understand it. I just worked hard. I just worked. You know, I was there five-thirty or six o'clock in the morning, and I got home about six or six-thirty in the evening. I was doing twelve hours a day when I was working.

In those days, the New York Stock Exchange was open on Saturday morning. And so I was there at six o' clock until noon. Sundays I read and tried to get ahead of everybody else. I've just been a plodder, really.

Ms. Boswell: Well now, certainly during the Depression there was some suspicion cast on the brokerage business in general, because of the crash and all its problems. But after the war, the brokerage business and everything was booming. So was it really recovering, too? Or was it a tough go?

Sen. Moore: As late as 1950—I was sitting in the office—there was a day in which 240,000 shares traded on the New York Stock Exchange. Today when it runs under 600 million they think something is wrong. That's how tiny it was.

Everything in Seattle, particularly, was real estate. Heavy Scandinavian population, as you know. And they wanted a bank account and a house, and that's it. They didn't want to buy stock, they wouldn't touch it. I don't think there were ten clients in Ballard. There was nobody but Merrill in those days. Then Dean Witter came and then Walston came. I worked for Walston, but Dean Witter was Merrill's main competition. Walston was having a hard time breaking in here. There really wasn't enough business for three firms.

But I set a goal for myself every day. When I first started out my goal was to make ten dollars every day. That's $200 a month, roughly. Sometimes I was at the office until ten at night before I got that ten dollars put together. By 1979 my goal was $1,000 a day.

Ms. Boswell: And you were able to pull it off?

Sen. Moore: Yes, but only because I never give up.

Ms. Boswell: Amazing. How did you choose the brokerage business, though? I mean, if real estate was booming, why not real estate?

Sen. Moore: A fellow whom I admired at the University, he was student body president two or three years ahead of me at school. I admired him a lot; we worked together at Boeing. He said, "What are you going to do after the war?"

I said, "Well, I know I'm not going back to one of those big companies again." And I said, "Probably they don't want me anyway."

He said, "Well, come with me," to the brokerage business. I didn't have any other ideas. With my education I was not going anyplace, obviously. So that's how that started. That was '45, and we had a company called Hartley Rogers. In 1950, we sold it to Walston.

I had a great experience when I first started out in the brokerage business. I decided that I was going to call on everybody on Third Avenue in Seattle. So, I stopped in at every storefront, and I'd go up in the elevators and call on people, cold.

About the fourth or fifth place I came to was Green's Cigar Store, on Third Avenue between Union and University, on the west side of the street. Mr. Green was a tall, white-haired man, pink faced, clean shaven, dignified. I went in and I asked if I could tell him about something that I had. He said, "Certainly." And, all the time that I'm there, people are coming up to pay their checks at the counter, and they're rolling dice, and he's listening to me all at the same time. I was selling a thing called Roosevelt Oil, which were very shallow oil wells in Michigan. It was a convertible preferred stock that paid eight percent.

It sounded good, but when I got all through, he said, "Well, I'm really not interested, but I'll tell you something. I've always felt that when I get four percent, I sleep well, and when I get six percent I eat well," which is telling me that if you're too greedy, you're not going to sleep great. I've always remembered Mr. Green telling me that. It's very true. If you put it in something absolutely safe, you're going to sleep well, and if it's sort of safe, but has more income, you're going to eat well. You get beyond that, the risk is not worth the gain hoped for.

Ms. Boswell: Is that something you apply to your own strategies?

Sen. Moore: Oh, yes. Absolutely. It affected me a lot. I was never successful in business, but I got lucky. And, part of luck to me, is avoiding bad decisions, bad mistakes. And I was very good at avoiding really serious mistakes caused by greed. But, I can't hire people any better than I can fire them. I can't fire them, it's just deadly for me. I think that's why I always wanted a legislative position instead of an executive position.

It's a good thing I was lucky, because I started off borrowing money in 1934, and by the late seventies I owed a million dollars, which was ridiculous. I started out with about a fifty-dollar loan the first time, and every time I could borrow more, I did, and I bought something. I bought silver dollars when they were about a dollar-and-a-quarter a piece, and a few years later they were fifty dollars a piece. But I was never a big buyer because I didn't have the capital. My real estate ventures covered the inflation on the money I owed, but then I lost a lot of money in the restaurant business in Seattle. Didn't make any in the tavern business, and I just owed a lot of money by the time it was done.

But I've always tried to associate with people who were winners. Some people are just winners, and other people are—no matter what, they do the wrong thing. A friend of mine from the Civil Rights Council, Ken McDonald, and one of his partners, Alec Bayless, and I became acquainted about forty years ago or more. I began investing in real estate deals with them. The deals all turned out fine. They showed up one day in the mid-sixties with a deal to buy ten thousand dollars worth—a ten percent interest—in several hundred acres of cherries, apples, and nectarines, just across the river from Hanford. The taxes were low, and I thought of it as raw land and waited for it to grow in price. The idea was we were going to plant grapes. We did, and it has turned out extremely well. I was able to get out of debt. I always owed more money than I should have. I was lucky to save myself.

Ms. Boswell: There was no worry then, at all, about the effects of Hanford on the land?

Sen. Moore: No. There were a few weirdos speaking of dire consequences, but no one paid much attention.

Ms. Boswell: Before that, had your real estate interests been primarily around Seattle?

Sen. Moore: Yes. On the east side of the lake, Redmond, Carnation, Fall City, out there, raw land.

Ms. Boswell: Was the vineyard your first foray into agriculture, actually growing something?

Sen. Moore: Yes. When we went into this deal, the fellow who had started it had killed himself. His estate wanted to get rid of the investment, so a group of Bayless' friends bought it at a pretty good price, and several of us came in with him. It was a great tax write-off. And, then about the time the write-off was gone, it started producing. I was older and needed the income, so it worked out very well.

And then, of course, there was the tavern business. I had three of them.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me how you first got into those?

Sen. Moore: I read an article—in the *Wall Street Journal*—on England, where they have chains of taverns, sort of like Jack in the Box. A little different, because each one is different, but they are all owned by one entity. So, I said to my friend Sam Parks, whom I'd helped get into the mining stock business, "Why don't we have a public offering of stock? Then we'll buy a tavern, and then when that progresses, we'll buy another tavern." We bought a tavern up in Clearview, Washington, between Bothell and Snohomish. It was a disaster. We lost. With what money we had left, we went into a gold mine, and it turned out okay. But I wasn't satisfied yet, I had to buy a big tavern.

Ms. Boswell: When you say you went into a gold mine, do you mean, literally a gold mine, or into a gold mine of a tavern?

Sen. Moore: An actual gold mine that worked out fine.

Ms. Boswell: Where was that?

Sen. Moore: That was in Nevada. And then, we had Trudy's Tavern out on Highway 99 in Riverton. One of the oldest licensees in the state. A good situation, so we bought that, and, well, it's a tough business, and of course I was supporting it out of the brokerage business. It wasn't more than a year or two before I decided that it wasn't going to work, so we sold it, and we sold the two other taverns shortly thereafter. By that time, my tavern partner and I had broken up. He wanted to do some other things, so I was the sole proprietor. So, then we had a deal in Montana that showed up.

A fellow called my new partner, Mark Taverniti. He was a social worker. So, this fellow Mark knew called. They had known each other at Weber State in Utah where they'd both been jocks. He said that there was this fellow in Montana who had a hotel with a restaurant in it and a liquor license, but he didn't want to operate the liquor license because he was from Kansas, a very dry state. I said, "Well, why don't we do it?" So, the owner sent the documents over, and I signed them without ever being there.

Then, about a week later, I thought, "Well, I guess I'll go over and see what we've done." So, I went over there, and here was this really run down hotel. The restaurant looked terrible, and they were doing about $200,000 a year. So, we did some work on it and the volume kept going up, but we weren't making any money. After the third manager, we finally got a woman manager, and she managed to make it go. But, there were problems. Her father owned the building, but he was about to go bankrupt. If he went bankrupt, then we wouldn't have a lease of any consequence. So, we worked a deal out where she bought the building. Then she sold most of it as condominiums, but she owned the first and second floor and the basement. She's now

doing about $1.8 million a year. She's doing very well, and I'm happy.

Ms. Boswell: Where was that?

Sen. Moore: In Bozeman. And then we weren't satisfied doing that, we had to buy one up in the mountains at Bridger Bowl, a ski area. That was a mistake, and we got out of that but still operated the one in town.

Ms. Boswell: What was drawing you into the hotel and restaurant business?

Sen. Moore: Just a need for doing a variety of things in my life. I want to experience it all. That's why I've done everything. I even do things I can't do.

Ms. Boswell: Like what?

Sen. Moore: Well, I'm not a very good speaker, so I put myself in the position where I had to speak.

Ms. Boswell: I've read that you're complimented a lot about your great speaking ability. I think you're being too modest.

Sen. Moore: I don't know, you never know about yourself. I always feel I'm just up there wondering how to sit down.

Ms. Boswell: You were telling us some stories the other day that aren't on tape—about some experiences in the tavern business that were pretty amazing, about the real business being early in the morning or something. You want to talk about that a little bit?

Sen. Moore: At Trudy's Tavern, south of Seatac, the business starts out fast at 6 a.m., right when you open, because you have the postal workers just getting off shift, and you have the baggage smashers at the airport getting off at the same time. They come, and by 6:30 a.m. they've had a couple of beers and they are really noisy and raucous, and they're eating broasted chicken and jo-jo potatoes. It's pretty revolting. But that's the same as dinner to them. It could get a little rowdy. One morning a fellow drove right into the tavern, right into a couple of booths. Fortunately, nobody was sitting there, as he just plowed right up over the curb and into the place!

Virginia used to open it up in the morning, and then she'd stay until about noon, and she had another job putting out the *Washington Motorist* paper for the AAA. So, she'd do that, and I'd work away at my trade at the brokerage business. It went on for about two or three years, I guess. I guess it's fortunate that I never cared about making money, because if I had, it would have destroyed me.

CHAPTER 3

THE BEGINNINGS OF A POLITICAL CAREER

Ms. Boswell: Now, did you start working for the Republican Party when you left school and started working?

Sen. Moore: About then, yes. I was elected Republican precinct committeeman in 1936. That was the beginning. But I started working seriously for the party in 1940, on Wendell Willkie's presidential campaign. He was my hero. He made a great race against Roosevelt. In my view, he was vastly superior, particularly because of what has come out since. The book by McCullough on Truman, for instance, reveals a lot of things in there about Roosevelt that are less than complimentary—things that are rather bad.

Ms. Boswell: Can you give me an example?

Sen. Moore: When Roosevelt was trying to get rid of Henry Wallace as his vice president, he encouraged Wallace to hang in there. And at the same time he was dealing with several other candidates for vice president. Encouraging all of them one day, coming at them in a left-handed way the next day, to damage them. Not a very nice man.

So in a way, I was right, but I have to admit that we'd probably have a revolution on our hands right now if it weren't for social security and some of the other social programs that Roosevelt either had in mind or were put there by his staff. You can never be sure about these things.

No, I was not fond of Roosevelt and I liked Willkie. Then of course, once I made that commitment Willkie up and died. I remember picking up the paper off the front porch Sunday morning. "Wendell Willkie Dies." I cried. The last time I cried.

Ms. Boswell: What was it that you admired so much about Willkie?

Sen. Moore: I like people who are doers. And he attached no significance to worldly goods. He didn't even have a watch or an automobile. When he wanted to go from New York to Cleveland, or Washington D.C., or just anywhere, he jumped in a cab. And he was very successful in keeping private electric utilities healthy. He was with Commonwealth and Southern, which was a huge utility in Texas.

And he had ideas about getting along with people all over the world. He did not believe that people were inherently bad just because you don't understand them. Which is where mankind in general is. If you don't understand it, it has to be bad. Or at least you have to be very suspicious of it. Never giving the other person a break. I think we're a prime example of that. We don't understand a lot of things, understand different mores.

Ms. Boswell: You mean Americans generally?

Sen. Moore: Yes, I think we're among the least understanding. So I liked what Willkie wanted to try. And of course when he died, as I said, I was hurt.

Ms. Boswell: You were managing quite a few campaigns in Seattle during the thirties and into the early forties. Did you work for Arthur

Langlie? You had to.

Sen. Moore: Oh yes.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me more about Langlie and your relationship to him.

Sen. Moore: Langlie was a member of Cincinnatus. Do you know Cincinnatus?

Ms. Boswell: Yes, a little bit. Tell me more about it.

Sen. Moore: Cincinnatus was the Republican front organization. When they found out that they were overrun by the Democrats at all levels, they organized locally, and formed Cincinnatus. I was just starting to work in 1934, and nobody knew what was behind it, but they had a kind of discipline. Like when the head man would decide something, he would call two people, and they would call two people, and so on. So, within a couple of hours, they could mobilize 50,000 people. It was a little scary. It was not democracy. I went to several meetings, but I think the idea of being able to mobilize all the troops in short order appealed to me. I was so determined to preserve capitalism that it was an influencing factor. I truly believed the good outweighed the evil.

Ms. Boswell: I was reading an account of Cinncinatus, and in a lot of places, it was looked at as sort of progressive Republicans who want change and good government. But you seem to view them somewhat differently, as more reactionary. Is that fair?

Sen. Moore: There were no liberal Republicans when Cincinnatus was at its peak in Seattle, which was in the mid-thirties. All the old Republicans were still around screaming about Roosevelt, and the New Deal, and all these crazy ideas like Social Security, WPA, and subsidies for farmers, and so on. I went to maybe three or four meetings, and the people I saw there were hard-core Republicans or people who hated Roosevelt. They were not necessarily synonymous. I did think Cinncinatus was reactionary. I guess I was influenced by the fact that I don't like those deals where there's a head person who calls the shots. They may have an election, and they may pass a resolution, but when it comes to activating it, it's just done by a man at the top. It always makes me nervous. I don't like secretive organizations. I don't like ones where I can't identify the goals. It almost seemed to me like it was an anti-Communist front. At the meetings they used to talk about pinkos, and so on. I was not very fascinated. But anything to beat the Democrats. That's how shallow I was in those days.

Ms. Boswell: Did people like Canwell come out of it?

Sen. Moore: No. This was a strictly local deal in Seattle.

Ms. Boswell: It was only Seattle?

Sen. Moore: Yes. Canwell was from Spokane. As I remember, there were three dominant figures in Cincinnatus. There was Langlie, Lockwood, and Hanley, who became a state Supreme Court justice. Lockwood became president of University Savings and Loan, and Langlie became Governor.

Langlie ran for mayor of Seattle, was elected, and before he finished his term he ran for governor, and was elected. Really never served as mayor very long. He was a devout, God-fearing Protestant, and had conversations with God, which he told me about. I was always puzzled that Arthur Langlie and God were so intimate that God would periodically appear to direct him. Even more amazing was that I, a nobody, knew someone who was so

important as to have such ability to talk with such an important and busy person as God.

He was not totally up front. He used to encourage Billy Graham to come here, and then they'd have these big revival meetings. Graham would always speak glowingly of Arthur Langlie for governor. When I was fronting for Eisenhower in '52, starting about February, Langlie would call me at my county chairman's office in Seattle, and he'd say, "Things going okay?"

"Yep. I think we're going to do it."

Then he'd say, "But don't involve me."

So, he wasn't the great, all-American boy Christian that you would expect. I found him to be very narrow-minded. He was prone not to live up to his promises, but always the great Christian, directed by God. He served a long time. He was elected in '40, and again in '48, and again in '52. Mon Wallgren was in between. I did not care for Langlie. He was okay, but he's just not my type. Too much praying, and when in a tight spot, he always fell back on God. I didn't find it very attractive.

Ms. Boswell: That was one of the other issues I wanted to ask you about. I wondered about the period when Langlie lost to Mon Wallgren. What's your impression of that loss, and how did that come about?

Sen. Moore: Langlie won in '40 because the Democrats had been in for eight years. Langlie was kind of a white knight, and so he came to Olympia and put in four years. And remember, they were four war years, so there was full employment, social problems were nil, teachers had good support from him and they made some progress as far as pay was concerned, but no other progress. He sounded progressive but not much happened. He really believed in the "good old days." He relied very heavily on the Gospel as he interpreted it. You know you can read anything into the King James Version that you want to, and he was very good at that. He could use the same page of the Bible to go either way on an issue. I can't remember specifically, but I've seen him do it. When he was defeated in '44 he was quite irritated, more than would be normal.

I don't think he had a great home life. Mrs. Langlie was very straight, not snobbish, but she was judgmental, as was Arthur. I think there was something missing in his life. He was a great public figure, and he could woo the constituents. But when he lost, he showed kind of a mean streak, and ever after that for the next four years, he was developing a theme to beat Wallgren.

As for Wallgren, he was definitely a good old boy. He had spent his life in Everett, preferring to play pool to doing anything else. Everybody who played pool or billiards in western Washington knew Mon Wallgren. When he was governor, they had Willie Hoppe, the great pool player of the age, world's best, come to the mansion and the common story was they'd play pool for about a week. They were drinking and playing pool. He was governor in that period right after the war, from '45 to '49, and the realities of life hadn't really sunk in yet. There was demobilization, all our young people were coming back, the Democrats had passed the GI Bill, so those that wanted to go to school could. It was a period of good feeling during that time he was governor.

Ms. Boswell: To what do you attribute his victory over Langlie? Langlie had served in the war years and people had pulled together. Why the switch?

Sen. Moore: In 1940, there was really a great hullabaloo about a third term, and although Roosevelt got the third term, as I mentioned before, Wendell Willkie put on one great campaign. If the votes had been placed right, it wouldn't have taken many votes to elect him president, although, in the electoral college,

Roosevelt won 5 to 1, I think. In '44 it was quite different, because Willkie had died, and Dewey was in the wings waiting to ascend. Once the third-term issue was put to bed, then the fourth-term was not an issue, and the Democrats came roaring back in '44. They had barely held their own in Congress in 1940. In '44 they made some more gains, they were quite strong, and I think that Wallgren rode in on the Roosevelt victory.

The interesting thing to me is, why, in '48, when Truman pulled the whole Legislature back from the GOP—I think the Democrats were down to twenty-seven members after the '46 election—they came roaring back and had sixty some in the '48 election. I attribute that largely to Truman. He did have real coattails.

Ms. Boswell: Let's go back to Langlie and Wallgren for a second. I was reading another interview that had been recorded with the former Speaker of the House, Charlie Hodde, and he made a point that he thought that one of the reasons that Wallgren was elected was because of Lady Willie Forbus campaigning for him. What do you think of that?

Sen. Moore: I didn't really see her as a major factor. I could be wrong, I had not thought of it in that way, but Charlie is more studious than I.

Lady Willie was sort of fabulous. She served in the Senate in the '40s. Raised the IQ of the Senate. She was right at the end of pure New Dealism. I knew her slightly in the 1940s, and she didn't think much of me—she was so perceptive.

Later we both lived in the Thirty-sixth District—which is, by the way, downtown, Queen Anne, Magnolia, and Ballard. When I was campaigning in '74, I doorbelled her house and we had a good talk about my being a slow learner, but finally seeing the light and realizing I was a Democrat. In spite of her warmth and courtesy, she would not give me permission to put a yard sign in her yard facing Magnolia Boulevard. She was careful. She voted liberally and only supported Democrats of like stripe. I sent assorted emissaries, and between Helen Sommers and my finance chairman, George Lane, she finally accepted me as a worthy convert. From 1974 to 1990, I had her prized location—she always took a yard sign.

She was an attorney with a terrific memory, who could best anyone in argumentation and debate. What a woman. If you think Helen Sommers is tough, you should have known Lady Willie. She died recently, at ninety-something. So, when that race between Langlie and Wallgren took place, it was fifty years ago, she was probably forty-something, then. Oh, she was wild, and wonderful, and vigorous. I would trust Charlie's impression.

Ms. Boswell: What was she like in her later years when you knew her?

Sen. Moore: Very sharp. Like most people who get old, she talked about the past quite a bit, but not as much as other people. She was thinking, "What are we going to do about water? What are we going to do about the population explosion?" Interested in not cutting the trees down. She had wide interests. She was aware. She was a deep thinker, especially for a politician!

Ms. Boswell: Especially for a politician? Shouldn't they be our deepest thinkers? What about Hodde? What was his relationship to Langlie?

Sen. Moore: Charlie was in the House when the Republicans won. I never thought about his relationship with Langlie. I don't know that I can talk about it in depth—I don't know what the emotions were between the two of them. I'll try—in some ways, they were quite

compatible. Charlie, I think, had more substance than Langlie, although Langlie's relatives would swear up and down that's not the way it was. Charlie was very courageous. He didn't care what anybody thought. If he thought it was right, he was always ready to go the distance. And Langlie was always talking about good government and all that. He talked dynamically but did not have the courage that Hodde had. But I really don't know what their relationship was. Langlie had courage but not to the extent Charlie did.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me more about your thoughts on Charlie.

Sen. Moore: I respected Charlie. He was endowed with both integrity and cunning. Charlie had a desire to help create a better government for a diverse population. He was a transplant—arrived in the north Colville Valley dirt poor, and with no great prospects. He farmed and studied the state constitution and statutes.

When he was elected in 1937 to the House from Stevens and Pend Oreille counties, his district had habitually sent Republicans to the Legislature. He was the first well-informed legislator from his district since W. Lon Johnson was elected to the Senate in 1918 and 1922, and then elected lieutenant governor in 1924. Hodde served one term and was out until 1943. Then he served until 1953, and was Speaker in '49 and '51. I talked with and observed him in the '47 session, when he was assistant chief clerk.

He treated me with more respect than I deserved. At that time I disliked and distrusted any Democrat. In fact, I am currently amused because I sounded like the Bob Dole of 1996—Social Security will be soon bankrupt, we must save the country for our children and grandchildren, etc., etc. Hodde was for public power. I was for private ownership. We agreed on nothing. In my defense, I can only say I was a slow learner. Charlie was a good and fair speaker, only resorting to foul play when forced to the wall, but when he did, he was deadly. He served as director of Revenue under Rosellini. He was liberal and exceedingly fair. Albert was fortunate to have him in his cabinet. I'm glad Charlie's still around. He's had a sixty-year political life and it's been a benefit to the state. His institutional memory is valuable. Had we had term limits in his legislative career, the state would be poorer for it.

Ms. Boswell: That's interesting. You mentioned your problems with Langlie. Was there ever a situation where you just couldn't support the person? Or were you that much of a party man that most of the people you could support?

Sen. Moore: There were some legislators that I couldn't support. Senator Harold Kimball, a name I didn't mention. He was the publisher of a Ballard newspaper.

Ms. Boswell: Oh, right.

Sen. Moore: Dangerous. Couldn't support him.

Ms. Boswell: What was your objection?

Sen. Moore: When he was elected in '46, defeating Lady Willie Forbus, he was viewed by Republicans with joy and respect. He immediately became the Al Canwell of the Senate. As a right-wing Communist hunter, Kimball was one stubborn senator. The Senate was tied 23 to 23, with Democrat Vic Meyers as the tie-breaker. Kimball raved and ranted but pinko hunting was minimized in the Senate, so his newspaper was his bully pulpit. He was smart but illogical, the type who made up his mind, then set about finding embellishing evidence to substantiate his

cause. So, I couldn't support Kimball. But he didn't care. He didn't like me—viewed me as a know-nothing—and he didn't need me, anyway.

The candidate gets the money, so who needs Ray Moore, GOP county chairman, which is what I was at the time? The party doesn't get the money, and you can't run without money. It's terrible, but it's true.

Ms. Boswell: Was there a strong network of Republican Party workers in King County?

Sen. Moore: Yes. But, you see, in a very few years they became old. They may have been forty-five to sixty-five years old in 1928, and elections were automatic. Republicans always won. Primary fight was where it would occur, if at all. These people, in a few years, were not forty-five to sixty-five. Very soon they were fifty-five to seventy-five, and they were really out of it. They were tired, and they'd been fighting for ten years to get power back. They didn't know how to get it back, because they didn't have the tools to know how to get it back, and the Democrats had figured it out. So these older Republicans just couldn't cope. Winning had been so automatic from the beginning of statehood. The state had been totally, totally Republican. So, being a precinct committeeman, or being a county chairman, carried with it a certain prestige because the job was a little tougher than it had been.

And the Democrats came along and they had some ambitious and wild people. Marion Zionchek, Warren Magnuson, Progressive Jack Taylor, who was assistant State Treasurer to Bob O'Brien, and Radio Speaker John C. Stevenson. These were dynamic people that spoke well. They sounded as if they made sense and there was always a populist feeling behind them, that they were there to do the people's business.

Ms. Boswell: But in the '40s, it was the Republican Party that drew you in?

Sen. Moore: There was a vacuum. When I came into the party in '40, I had, for four months, doorbelled every afternoon from about three until dark for Wendell Willkie and Arthur Langlie. But, when it came time to go to the county convention, they ignored me. The old-timers were totally in charge and they just kept putting the same people in as delegates to the county convention that had always gone. The old party faithful filled the delegation, with no room for newcomers.

Then in 1946, I ran for the Senate in a district that started at Roosevelt Way and 45th and ran out to the Snohomish County line, east along the county line cutting south to include Bothell, Woodinville, not Redmond, but it included Bellevue and stopped at what is now I-90. It was a huge, huge district.

At that point the GOP was so short of talent I was suddenly a young man with potential. Five of us vied for the GOP nomination. Two former House members, a fellow who was a candidate of the party, a fellow by the improbable name of Waco Texas Foster, and I. And I came in second. I beat the two House members. But I lost to the party's choice.

Ms. Boswell: Now, who was the party's choice?

Sen. Moore: A fellow by the name of Corwin Philip Shank. He was nominated. I jumped right in the race with him. I said, "I'm supporting him absolutely, I'm going to work harder for him than I worked for myself." And I did. I doorbelled every day. Phil was not a great senator, but he was certainly adequate for the job, proving his worth by winning again in 1950, not an easy year for Republicans. Phil was a status-quo type who felt America was pretty good in spite of

Roosevelt. He was not one to rock the boat.

I had just gone into the securities business and I wasn't making any money yet, but that fall I still found time to work hard for the party—not only for Phil Shank, but doing other things, too. And as a result of a lot of people's work, the Republicans had a tremendous win in 1946. That was a big year for McCarthy, Nixon, Ford. They were swept into office with a whole lot of other people on an anti-Communist tide.

So in December of 1946, the Republicans met in Spokane. There were seventy-two Republican House members out of ninety-nine. They elected Herb Hamblen, a Spokane attorney, as Speaker. I had the votes for chief clerk. I knew that I couldn't handle the job, so we decided that we would reelect Democrat Si Holcomb, who was the incumbent chief clerk, and a very good one. I was to be his assistant. The idea was to keep him there and I would learn the job.

Well, Holcomb never let me learn anything. He gave me a clipboard every morning. "Today I want you to check and see if all the cuspidors are here." The next day the hat racks, the next day the chairs, the next day the filing cabinets. So although I sat on the rostrum with him, I never knew anything about the job when the session adjourned. Of course, two years later we were thrown out in '48 when Truman won. The Democrats came back with sixty-seven members. All of a sudden they were in complete control again, so I was out.

Ms. Boswell: Was Holcomb just trying to protect his position? Is that why he wasn't very forthcoming?

Sen. Moore: Of course.

Ms. Boswell: So that was around 1947. What did you think of Albert Canwell?

Sen. Moore: Just a little Communist hunter-crusader. Canwell had the eyes and demeanor of a man with a purpose, and he did have a purpose—to cleanse education of Communist infiltration. In '47 he headed what was known as the Canwell Committee. It was a Republican majority committee, and they went after any and all non-conservative teachers, particularly University of Washington professors. They believed any higher-education type was fair game.

There ensued a two-year reign of fear, false accusations, false testimony. It was truly an era of a disgraceful waste of resources and time. At the time it seemed it would never end. With Joe McCarthy running amok nationally, most of the country was afraid to speak out, and so nationally it droned on leaving in its wake hundreds of ruined careers and lives. Canwell ruined peoples' lives with no feeling for their plight. With all the evidence in, he says he'd do it again! Like many zealots, he had little sense of humor. Luckily, his voters only gave him one term. So, locally, his crusade did wind down. And Seattle got a Pulitzer Prize winner.

Ms. Boswell: Ed Guthman.

Sen. Moore: Yes. Seattle could stand another Guthman. Fifty years is a long dry spell. See, Guthman turned to the truth. He gave it daylight, and nobody else was doing that. He found out where Professor Melvin Rader was at the time that he was alleged to be at a Communist conference in New York. He found out that Canwell's witness who said he saw Rader at the conference had already been barred from testifying nationally, and in some states, because he was a liar. He was Canwell's key witness, he was a known liar, but the committee placed *total* credence in him.

So, he never saw Rader at the Communist meeting. And Guthman proved where Rader was. Nobody else bothered. Everybody else

just picked up the hue and cry, "They're all pinkos, they're all Communists. Get 'em."

Ms. Boswell: He got hard evidence he could prove?

Sen. Moore: Oh, yes. See, the place where Rader said he was instead of the conference had burned down. The only way to prove he was there was to find the register for that hotel in Granite Falls. Guthman actually found it. Somebody had it. Now that is real reporting. Guthman just shredded the witness and after that Canwell went grudgingly into eclipse. He retreated to his Inland Empire sanctuary, never to be heard from again.

Ms. Boswell: Now, within your own Republican committee here, were there some ardent anti-Communists? Were there a lot of accusations?

Sen. Moore: Oh, yes. Canwell of course, was the ultimate. And then he had like-minded people on his committee. He had Senator Harold Kimball, who published the *Ballard News*, on the Senate side. And they started out fast, because, as I said, in '46 is when Nixon was elected, and Ford, too. They initiated their drive almost immediately. They hadn't been in office a month before they found that this was a soft spot, and they could go after the Democrats and accuse them of being soft on Communism. You see, there were three bad guys in the Congress at that time. There were Richard Nixon, Jerry Ford, and Joe McCarthy.

Ms. Boswell: Jerry Ford, too?

Sen. Moore: Yes. Absolutely. All three of them were there on the anti-Communist business from the start. But, you see, people don't remember.

Ms. Boswell: I had no idea Jerry Ford was up there, too.

Sen. Moore: Jerry Ford played it very well. He used that quote from Truman, who said, "He played too much without his helmet." So, they built this aura around Jerry Ford of just being kind of a nice, bumbling character. I've always felt he's not too bright, but he wanted this role because it made it easy for him to just be a nice fellow.

Ms. Boswell: So it was a good act to get behind.

Sen. Moore: Yes. They really had no problem at the national level. At the local level, there were egomaniacs who were trying to emulate them, and who maybe did not have the staff to do what McCarthy and company could do, but they could kind of come along in the wake and show that they, too, were anti-Communists. Canwell didn't have much of a staff. The other members on the committee were happy to be on that committee. People fought to get on that committee, but they didn't ever have the background to gather in everything that they might have been able to use. They were short-handed, and, of course, two years went by and the Democrats were back in power, and the whole thing evaporated. Except for McCarthy. He kept on going while Ford and Nixon, sensing McCarthy's extremism was running out of gas, quietly left. This suited Joe, who now had the limelight all to himself. So, finally, it was the maniac, McCarthy, who was the bad guy. But Ford and Nixon were right there at the start of the pinko hunt in 1947.

Ms. Boswell: Did you ever come under attack? You didn't follow the party line as closely as a lot of people.

Sen. Moore: No. Well, one day, one of the

people on my finance committee came to me and said, "I don't think we're going to be able to support you financially." And I said, "Well, I don't have any money, personally." I was broke, and I said, "Well, I guess I'll do the best I can." A fellow by the name of Jack Thomas, and another one by the name of Seraphino Lelli, supported me. They'd bring in about $1,000 a month in small donations from assorted sources.

Ms. Boswell: Fund-raising sources?

Sen. Moore: Yes. So I was able to stay alive. Pretty soon, the finance people figured out that I was a fact of life, and so for the next couple of years they were pretty supportive.

Ms. Boswell: Did they ever try to make any allegations against you?

Sen. Moore: No. It was just kind of a Rainier Club attitude—"This guy's pretty rambunctious, and he wants us to welcome labor, and social workers, and teachers. We can't tolerate that." But, there wasn't any move to get rid of me, except every two years somebody ran against me—at Langlie's urging—and did the best they could. But my folks stayed with me. I always won by a 3-2 margin.

Ms. Boswell: Is there anything the party could have done to head off somebody like Canwell or Nixon, to help that situation before it expanded?

Sen. Moore: Probably not. And there was no will to stop them, anyway. They were so eager to win that when this issue showed up, they all jumped on it. "Boy, we got 'em this time," was the GOP attitude.

Ms. Boswell: Did you see it as an issue? How did you feel about it?

Sen. Moore: I thought it was terrible. I don't like condemnation by innuendo. Do you remember Sacco and Venzetti?

Ms. Boswell: Yes.

Sen. Moore: Well, that's the first time that sort of thing came to my attention, and I was in grade school. There's still a question as to whether they were guilty or not. I think they probably were not guilty of murder. Of sedition, certainly, but not what they were charged with. So, I've always been very careful about accusing people. My mother was a bad one on that score. She always said, "Well, I don't approve of this. I don't approve of that." Gradually, I began to think, who is my mother to be saying, "I don't approve of that?" Who is she? Who does she think she is? In a friendly way, of course. I don't like people stepping out and seizing on something. It's mob psychology, the posse, lynch-mob policy. So, I've become careful about being judgmental.

Ms. Boswell: At any rate, Canwell only served one term.

Sen. Moore: Yes. Then in '48, I managed Herb Hamblen's campaign for lieutenant governor against Vic Meyers. We came within 5,000 votes or so of winning—very close. We were ahead most of the time. But I also knew that Clallam, Jefferson, Grays Harbor, those counties hadn't come in yet, which is where they beat us.

The next day I saw Vic on Union Street. He was behind and he said, "Well, I guess you finally got me." And I said, "Well, it isn't over yet," because I was still hoping. And Vic Meyers had such a twist on things—he was wonderful. You never knew. He had a different feel for situations than anybody else. He said, "You know, the two fellows I feel sorry for are those lieutenant governors in

New York and California," because the ticket was Dewey and Warren. Dewey from New York, and Warren from California, who were governors. And if they had won, they would have been president and vice-president. So it was the two lieutenant governors of those states that stood to benefit, by succeeding to the governorships! I don't think I would have ever thought of that. But that was the kind of mind Vic Meyers had. Original wit—never used a cliché. They were all original lines. I always admire that. Everybody says, "Oh, that's neat." Or "cool." Vic Meyers would never do that. He and John Cherberg were original types. Their manner of speech was different, and effective.

Ms. Boswell: Was John Cherberg similar to Meyers in other ways?

Sen. Moore: Not really. Meyers was a real roisterer, and Cherberg liked to drink in moderation. They both liked to play cards. Vic was informal and John was more formal. They were both magnificent on the rostrum. Different, but both fabulously good at their trade. Both good in parliamentary procedure, and both good in handling the body. I loved Cherberg.

Ms. Boswell: When did you first get to know him?

Sen. Moore: In 1930, when I came to the university.

Ms. Boswell: Oh, really?

Sen. Moore: He was a year or two ahead of me, and he was a football hero. I was fascinated. How can this homely guy have such a beautiful girlfriend? In those days, I thought that you had to be beautiful to have a beautiful wife or a beautiful girlfriend. And I was wondering how come he could do this? How did he get that woman? Of course, later he and Betty married. She was the most beautiful person on campus. He had kind of a nice manner about him, but he was not gorgeous.

I first met him in the fall of 1930, during rush week at the U of W. He was about to become the university's symbol of what pure determination could accomplish on the football field. John had talent, but not commensurate with his will to succeed.

Ms. Boswell: And then did you continue to sort of follow along with his career?

Sen. Moore: Yes. I followed his career as a high school teacher and football coach at his old school, Queen Anne High. Then he went to coach football at the University of Washington. I was very sympathetic with him when he lost his job there. There was nothing wrong with his coaching; he just was short of talented athletes. The alumni were still unwilling to finance the players necessary to win, and he was still using amateurs, kids from Garfield High School, Arlington, Bellingham, Wenatchee, and around the state, and they were the best the state had to offer. If you look at the hometowns of the players on the Husky roster now, you will find the majority is from out of state. Well, I guarantee these new arrivals do not come to Seattle for the weather or the academics. They come for the benefits! But at the time, there were a lot of semi-pros out there that were available, but they weren't using them.

Some of the players were unhappy because they were all amateurs, and other schools were subsidizing professional players. They gave him some trouble, threatening to quit, strike, and blah, blah, blah. Well, Cherberg called them together one afternoon, and said, "Anybody that wants to leave can leave. There are planes, trains, and buses leaving every hour." One of his great lines.

So, they got rid of him because he didn't have a great record. Immediately they started hiring players, and then they began to have better teams. He was dismissed without ever having the support of the alumni. During all the ensuing years, he never forgot those individuals involved. John never forgot.

Ms. Boswell: But then he found his calling in politics?

Sen. Moore: Yes. He was the biggest vote-getter the state ever had. The first one to get a million votes. He holds the American record for longevity as lieutenant governor. An uninterrupted thirty-two year reign. He could have been elected again, too, even when he was over the hill. Might have been better off if he had. When you're forced to perform every day, you do. When you don't have to, you can deteriorate—fast.

In January 1979, I paid a courtesy call on Cherberg an hour or so before I was to be sworn in. I remember the situation very clearly. His secretary, Mary Lou Bammert, told me to go right on into his office where, with all dignity, he greeted me as senator. I said half jokingly, "Do you have any advice to give an old man arriving in the Senate?" He first asked me if I would like a drink. I said, "No, but thank you very much." Then he suggested coffee, at which point he disappeared, returning soon with a silver service set, which he set on a small table in the middle of his office. I declined his formal offer of cream or sugar, and we sat down. Only then did he respond to my question, "Well, Senator, since you ask, always vote your conscience," and then leaning in my direction, touched my arm, "but don't forget the district!"

Ms. Boswell: It sounds like good advice.

Sen. Moore: Yeah. It may sound too simple to work, but I found that guided me on a good course, and a livable one. I remember, too, that when he returned from an Asian trade mission, he wrote me a letter wishing me well on my reelection bid, ending by saying, "Rots of ruck in your upcoming erection." Things like that take the tension out of wearing campaigns. I still laugh when I think of that letter. He was very good.

The governor, lieutenant governor, and the state treasurer comprised the State Investment Committee which had to approve, among other duties, the issuance of state general-obligation bonds. Well, for thirty-two years, Cherberg voted against every bond issue. Whatever his underlying feelings were is of little import. What he was doing was forcing the governor and treasurer to vote yes! This, then, protected him if anything went wrong. He could always shrug his shoulders saying, "Well, I voted no."

Ms. Boswell: Now, going back a bit, in that campaign between Herb Hamblen and Vic Meyers, you were taking Vic Meyers pretty seriously then as a candidate?

Sen. Moore: Oh, absolutely, he was a winner. Republicans even voted for him. It was amazing! People, in general, assumed Vic was politically finished when he was defeated for lieutenant governor in 1952 by Emmett Anderson. Emmett's claim to fame was as exalted ruler of the Elks—many referred to him as the "Exhausted Rooster"—but Vic staged an eight-year comeback as secretary of state in '57. He was one of the most natural and endearing personalities ever to grace the Olympia scene. And, he performed both positions—lieutenant governor and secretary of state—very well.

Ms. Boswell: Why did he engender that kind of commitment?

Sen. Moore: Because he was offbeat, and I think the voters always wanted one offbeat person in office. And he was the one. He acquired that stature. They wanted somebody that kind of flaunted vulgarity, drunkenness and still could handle the Senate, assorted governors, and citizen groups. He mastered Senate rules and was a wonderful relief, considering some of the pompous Senate members.

His humor was self-deprecating, always capturing the essence of what was happening; and he was ever courteous and hospitable. During the '47 session, my father and I were walking up the Capitol steps one morning and we heard, "C. Rea, we're out of whiskey." We looked up to our left and there was Vic in an open window. My father did an about face, headed back to his car, and soon after made a customary delivery to the lieutenant governor's office. My father had no choice, as he was the lobbyist for Washington Water Power. Meantime, I had continued on up the steps to my job as assistant chief clerk of the House.

Ms. Boswell: Is the story about Vic true, that when he first filed for office it purely depended on the filing fee of the office that he was going to run for—what was the story?

Sen. Moore: I was not a witness to his filing for office in 1932, but the generally accepted story went like this: He drove to Olympia, and arrived at the secretary of state's office. He walked up to the counter in the secretary of state's office and he said, "I want to file." And the person said, "For what?" Vic said, "What's open?" He didn't have enough money to file for governor, but lieutenant governor was the cheapest statewide office for which he had the filing fee. And that's how Vic Meyers started his political career. Now, how can you be mad at a guy like that? From band leader to a legend in his own time.

I used to go to his nightclub on Sixth Avenue. He was funny then. It was in 1932, while I was at the University. He wasn't very old, either. But he had a little mustache, you know the little thin mustache, and he looked a little like Adolph Menjou, a movie star of the time. Anyway, although we lost the election for lieutenant governor 51-49 to Vic Meyers, I was viewed by the GOP elders as a comer.

And then that accident happened in 1948, when I got to be King County Republican chairman. That year, Arthur Langlie was elected governor and he chose me to be county chairman. In a bruising fight, I won 3-2, and was reelected in '50 and '52. I brought in eleven new people—one was Joel Pritchard. In fact, lately, he's mentioned that I was his mentor—as if Joel ever needed a mentor—and that's how he got his start. I appointed him district chairman in Magnolia and Ballard. That was a district then. So, I began to pick all new people, and I couldn't get rid of the old ones in the district, so I expanded the executive committee to seventy-five. They had twenty-eight. I used this "rump" organization, and Joel was one of the ones in there.

Ms. Boswell: What was he like at that time?

Sen. Moore: Joel could have been the state cheerleader. Eager—just eager to win. Winning was what it was all about. A man for all seasons. His quick-fire personality is irresistible, and what more do you need as a candidate? There wasn't any great philosophy. This club we belonged to, this thing that I helped organize, was called the Evergreen Republican Club. The purpose of the club was to make the GOP into a party of the future, not the past. Members were generally twenty-five to thirty-five years old, strongly committed to the party. Joel and his brother, Frank—who had recently moved from

Yakima to Seattle—fit in with the group very well.

Another member of the group was Jean Latourette. She was the central committee secretary while I was county chairman and we made a great team. She went on to work for Joel for a number of years.

Among the younger Evergreeners, John W. Larson and Joe Stone stood out as a dynamic and useful pair. Both of them were gregarious, but whenever I wanted anything, they made it happen. They did a lot of the detail work, and they did it right. Some of the smallest jobs are the most important, and they had my complete trust.

Ms. Boswell: When did that start?

Sen. Moore: 1950. '49 or '50. I was elected King County Republican chairman in December of '48, and right away I realized that I was in trouble with the status quo. They didn't like me, and Langlie began to double cross them by not giving jobs. He said when he ran there were going to be Republicans who got jobs. Well, he didn't do that. So they began grumbling, and since he was my supporter, I was in trouble almost right away.

And then, I got a real break. I put on a reception for the state central committee. They were meeting in Seattle, and I thought it would be a nice thing if the King County Republicans had a reception honoring the state committee. It was at the old Washington Hotel, which had a really nice ballroom. One of my district chairmen, Jack Thomas, was a whiskey salesman. He was a salesman from hell! He was really great. When we had this reception, there were all kinds of liquor. Langlie came with his wife, and they were shocked. Within three months of my election, he turned on me. So, now I had the organization itself antagonistic to me, and I had the governor antagonistic. But, the most popular person in the party was our sheriff, Harlan Callahan, whom Langlie did not like, which was a big help! And my two friends, the two stalwarts that I had, went out in the field and turned everybody back toward me, and against the governor.

Ms. Boswell: How did they do that?

Sen. Moore: They just pointed out that he'd double-crossed all of us, and he didn't give the jobs that he said he was going to give. They wove a pretty good tapestry. So I was always reelected. The same vote every time. I ran three times, always won 3 to 2.

Ms. Boswell: You had three of the old timers who were still willing to vote for you? How did that shake out in terms of your support in the central committee?

Sen. Moore: I meant the vote was three to two. It would be 600 to 400 at the convention.

Ms. Boswell: Oh, I see. I thought you meant within the central committee.

Sen. Moore: No. They decided they didn't like Langlie, and maybe I wasn't so bad after all. Langlie never gave them anything, and I would have lunches for them when they came to the county convention or the executive committee. We'd have roses for the women, so they all got a rose and things like that. Life was pretty simple, then. They'd come from Skykomish and Black Diamond and all these places. It was a big thing when they came to Seattle.

Ms. Boswell: You must have been working pretty hard as the chairman.

Sen. Moore: Yes. And at that point, I had little or no income from the investments business. But, I was doing all right because Langlie had an early and devoted supporter named Ernest

Huntley. Under Langlie, he was director of what is now Revenue, which was a position that carried with it a special political power. Langlie believed in his version of "good government," which, more often than not, meant appointing allies/friends from his Cincinnatus days, nonpartisans, or people with a similar religious outlook. Ernest Huntley had a patronage plum in that he appointed estate appraisers to represent the interest of the State. In those days, the Superior Court appointed an appraiser, the estate appointed one, and together with the state appointee, they determined the value of the deceased person's estate. Each appraiser received a fee of 1/10 of one percent of the valuation. If an estate was valued at $100,000, each appraiser received $100.

During my entire county chairmanship, Ernest Huntley kept me supplied with appraisals. The appraisals helped keep me alive. Ernest Huntley was a live-and-let-live kind of man. He was definitely Langlie's man, but he also was an old-fashioned politician, always able to keep explosive situations from reaching the boiling point. He was soft-spoken and pleasant, and his farming background gave him, as a senator, a unique credibility with both sides of the Senate. He was slow to act, but once on course he was loyal to allies and ideas alike. He and liquor board member Clarence LaFramboise realized that, imperfect as I was in Langlie's mind, I viewed politics much as they did—that was expand the GOP base while treating old-line Republicans with respect. Huntley and LaFramboise felt Langlie's disenchantment with me was somewhat extreme, and both concluded "better the devil we know than the one we don't." They probably agreed with Langlie, but at the same time encouraged me to run for reelection in 1950 and again in 1952.

Ms. Boswell: What were the main duties of the chair of the Republican central committee?

Sen. Moore: Get out the vote, raise money, and win. Concentrate in those districts where we had a chance. We had a platform, but it was basically the national platform. We didn't deviate from that. The national platform was of such a nature that anybody could feel comfortable in the tent. There were none of those issues like abortion, ERA. Any Republican could run on the platform, which satisfied the central committee people and the county chairman, and didn't offend anybody. Actually, the real significance of being county chairman was that I was in a position of real power when Taft and Eisenhower fought to be the GOP presidential nominee.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about the Eisenhower campaign. What was your role? How did that evolve?

Sen. Moore: In the summer of 1950, I went to Boston to the Young Republican Convention. I had made arrangements before I went to stop on the way back and see Hugh Scott, a congressman from Philadelphia. I met him at the Union League Club in Philadelphia. Inside, older men were sitting around reading the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, all dark paneling and everything. It could have been a *New Yorker* cartoon. Over lunch, Hugh Scott told me that Eisenhower was going to run, and he hoped that I would pitch in. Well, I had Taft come to speak at a Lincoln Day banquet, and I found him very irritated, very thoughtless—snapping at people. Somehow or other I just couldn't visualize him as winning the presidency. I said I would help Eisenhower.

Hugh Scott called in January '52—now this is a year and a half later—to tell me Eisenhower would be a presidential hopeful. Many thought he was a Democrat. At the time of Scott's call, our state delegation appeared secure for Taft, 21-3. So, I got busy and I figured out the whole thing was going to hinge

on King County. We had 350 out of 1,000 votes at the state convention. Nearly everyone was convinced King County and the state would go for Taft.

First, I had to figure out how to get the votes at our own King County convention, which was only a few months away. At the time of Scott's call, Taft had solid control in King County. Most of the precinct committeemen were for him, so I changed the committee rules, whereby instead of precinct committeemen having to run to be a delegate, they were automatic delegates to the County convention. New rules provided for the election of another delegate from the public. Well, the Taft strategists looked at it and they thought, "Gee, we can't lose, because we're bound to pick up some of those who are going to get elected in the caucuses. We already have most of the committeemen for Taft, so we can't lose."

What the Taft managers did not take into account is that the county chairman had the power to appoint precinct committeemen to fill vacancies until the next general election. Again, I turned to my friends, William Sharples Howard and Jack Thomas. Jack felt, as did I, that Taft couldn't win with this new strategy. Bill Howard—I always called him "the Bull"—agreed with us. We were a three-man gang, pulling out all the stops. Working with others who didn't want Taft, like our teacher allies, labor, and the Eisenhower managers, we rounded up maybe 300 new committeemen who were residents of their respective precincts. They were all legitimate residents of their precincts, and I made the appointments.

The executive committee approved all of these changes, even though the majority of the committee was inclined toward Taft. My pitch to them was, "Just think of all these new enthusiastic Republican workers." They bought it!

On the night of the caucuses the Taft people were unable to control their own precincts. Since the precinct committeeman was an automatic delegate to the county convention, Taft still retained those votes but was overwhelmed by the Ike supporters we had rounded up. And, in those few precincts controlled by Eisenhower they not only sent the committeemen, but they elected an Eisenhower delegate.

At the county convention, which was 2,200 strong, the Ike delegates were almost totally ignorant of parliamentary maneuvers. To cure this, we armed Joel Pritchard with a sign on a stick. Joel stood on the floor facing the delegates. His sign read "Ike says yes," and on the other side, "Ike says no." All credit to Joel, he never made a mistake and Eisenhower prevailed. The vote was close, perhaps 1150-1050.

As the final blow, "the Bull" moved the unit rule be invoked. The unit rule binds the minority. Amid screams of anguish and foul play, the convention voted to bind all King County delegates to the state convention to vote for Ike. As it turned out, this was a fatal blow to Taft. We used the unit rule to bind our 300 plus delegates, and at the state convention, Taft lost with only 5 of 24 votes, instead of prevailing 21 to 3, as everyone expected he would.

If Taft had carried the state convention, he would have won the nomination in Chicago over Eisenhower. Had this happened, Stevenson would have been elected in 1952 with a good chance of winning again in 1956! Securing Eisenhower's win at the state convention was my greatest moment as King County Republican chairman. Eisenhower probably would never have been elected if we hadn't turned the state around. Obviously, when Taft is cut down from 21 to 4, he lost seventeen votes. That made the difference. Other states can claim the same thing, of course, but I don't think anybody had such a dramatic turnaround.

Ms. Boswell: Let's go back a moment. Explain to me how the unit rule works.

Sen. Moore: The unit rule is where the majority takes everything. Out of 350, we probably had 190, and Taft maybe had 160. So, "the Bull" made the motion to adopt the unit rule. All 350 votes at the state convention went for Daddy Warbucks. That tipped it over, because we had enough in Pierce, and Snohomish, and Kitsap, and a few others here and there. So, we got 500 votes without too much effort, and, of course, went on to win the state convention.

I'd been working with Bob Schulman of *Time Magazine* to have huge coverage of the caucuses based on the fact that the GOP in our state was opening the process to the public. He was going to feature me, "the Bull," and Jack. Well, Harry Truman did something or other that crowded our story out. My moment came and went!

It was a well-heeled campaign. Better financed than Taft's. I knew that Henry Ford—or I can't remember whether it was Edsel—anyway, whatever Ford it was, he was heavily involved in the Eisenhower campaign. Money was not collected in two or three dollar amounts to finance this sort of thing. It was just there.

Ms. Boswell: In Seattle, were they getting financing nationally, or were they getting it in Seattle?

Sen. Moore: I think they were getting some nationally, and some from Alaska. There were forces in Alaska that wanted to be part of the action. They might have been giving Eisenhower $10,000 and they might be giving Taft $3,000. They figured Eisenhower was the winner, but they wanted a little insurance. They were really giving to both sides in that campaign, which is still the order of the day!

Ms. Boswell: Tell me a little about the national convention.

Sen. Moore: Well, nineteen of us Ike delegates went to the national convention, but before we got there, United Airlines flew us to Denver, to the Brown Palace Hotel, to meet Daddy Warbucks. He'd only been out of the service a week or two, and he came to Denver to see us and other delegations. We were all sitting there in these straight chairs, all nineteen of us.

Eisenhower came in, wearing this beautiful gray flannel suit. He was so recognizable, you identified with him, and he kind of looked like, "What am I doing here?" This was one of his first meetings with politicians. He made a statement, "I decided to be a candidate and run. Would like to have your support." He said, "Can we discuss things?"

Well, a fellow by the name of Bob Yeomans, who later became a member of the UTC, said, "General, how do you feel about public power?" That was a big issue here, PUDs versus private companies.

Eisenhower, when he didn't understand, either feigned not being able to hear, or he really didn't hear. I never was sure which. He always cocked his head to one side. He said, "What was that?"

So, Yeomans repeated the question, "How do you feel about public power?"

Although Eisenhower had been at Fort Lewis for several years during the heat of PUD fights, the military was so insulated that they didn't know what was going on. He didn't have a clue, and I began to perspire. I didn't want him destroyed, but he finally got himself together. He said, "I've always believed the public should have the power."

I thought, "What have I done?" Well, during the campaign he wowed the people. They didn't care what he knew or didn't know. He was Daddy Warbucks!

Ms. Boswell: What a great line.

Sen. Moore: His aura was so positive that it didn't matter that he didn't know much. After all, he was head of a victorious army and president of Columbia University. What more can you get in a candidate? Anyway, we departed, sort of wondering if we'd all made the right decision, but we were committed, and we went to the national convention in Chicago.

The first test of the relative strength of Eisenhower versus Taft came on the first day, when the credentials committee was faced with an important problem. There were several disputed delegations, but Alabama was the first one that came up. They had two delegations, one for Taft and one for Ike. There were the lily-whites, who were for Taft, and a "rump group," which supported Ike. The lily-whites were the regular organization, and this "rump group" had some blacks, and some trouble makers, and just general malcontents in it.

The credentials committee had to make a recommendation as to which delegation would be seated. As I recall, they recommended to the convention the lily-whites be seated, but when it was brought to the floor, the Eisenhower delegation won the seats by fewer than ten votes. When Eisenhower won that, it was all over. That was the end. The rest of those two or three days were just formality, because once we broke the ice and got that delegation for Eisenhower seated, Taft was finished. In fact, someone interviewed me on that. More of the story is in the archives of the Eisenhower Library, in Topeka or wherever it is. Of course there were other contested delegations, but, since Alabama could vote on the others, Taft's bid began its slide to defeat.

Ms. Boswell: Did you have any relationships with Eisenhower once he got into office?

Sen. Moore: I went back to see him in the spring of '53. This was six months before I resigned. It was so easy to get into the White House. I just walked up to the gate and there was a guard there, a Marine, I think, and told him what my name was, and it was on the list. Honora's name was on the list. Go right on in. No metal detectors or frisking, or anything, in those days. We went in and sat down. We got there about ten minutes early, and sat down in a little hallway. At about one minute to ten, a very nothing looking guy—looked just like an average person, you'd never pick him out of a crowd—came by. He was a Secret Service man. He said, "Mr. Moore?"

"Yes."

"Mrs. Moore?"

"Yes."

So Honora and I followed him into the Oval Office. We sat down, and Daddy Warbucks was there, and the Secret Service man sat over in a corner, as far away as he could get from us. Somebody had told Eisenhower civil rights were a big issue with me. So he started a conversation about civil rights, and what did I think, and were people going to change, and two or three other items.

And then he told a story that I thought was very interesting, and this is why I say that he's like Lincoln. The story went like this: A few days before we were there, at six o'clock in the morning, he got a phone call. Now, can you imagine today, he got a phone call, he picked up the phone. He's in bed with Mamie. He picks up the phone, *himself*. Six o'clock in the morning in the White House.

A Secret Service man is on the phone. He says, "Mr. President, those African people that are here visiting us, the president of some country over there, and his staff, went out this morning to have breakfast. Since I'd been assigned to them, I went along. We went to a restaurant and the owner refused to serve us."

As Eisenhower was telling this—I know

you've known people like this, where the vein in their neck really expands when they get mad—this vein in his neck got really large, and he began to talk fast and pretty loud for him, so I knew his heart was really in it. So, he said, "What's the number of this restaurant?" The Secret Service man gave it to him, so he dialed from his bed, he dialed the owner.

"Mr. So-and-so?"

"Yeah."

"This is Dwight Eisenhower."

The guy says, "Fuck you," and hung up. Eisenhower, I think at that point, was really exasperated, so he picked up the phone again and dialed this fellow and he said, "Now, I want you to listen closely. This is Dwight David Eisenhower, and if you doubt it, you call me right back," and he hung up.

He had given the guy the number. The guy phoned back, and Eisenhower answered, "The White House." He said, "Now, I want you to listen. If you don't let those people in right now, and serve them, just as you would serve anybody else, the same quality of service, the same quality of food, you will not be serving lunch in your restaurant today, or ever."

The President of the United States has all the power in Washington, D.C. He can lift licenses. He can do all kinds of things. Eisenhower had the number of the pay phone, so he phoned the Secret Service man back and told him, "Take them in." The incident was solved, but he was mad. Eisenhower was mad while he was talking about it. I thought, "That's the kind of personal wrong that Lincoln and Eisenhower could understand." I think on some of the deeper, more complex, and perplexing issues, neither was as good as a lot of other presidents. But they had heart, and that's so important to me. I don't want to have people in office who don't have a heart. Following the Constitution is well and good and expected, but with that I want to see heart.

Ms. Boswell: How did you happen to be there that time?

Sen. Moore: I think, partly, it was arranged by our state chairman, Mort Frayn, as a payoff to me for having turned the state around, although he really wanted Taft. But, when he realized what I was doing at the county convention and the state convention, he had a certain admiration, I think, for what I was doing. Most state chairmen I've known would have pressured me to move toward Taft. Not Mort, he left me alone, and never tried to undercut me. He did not believe in personal attacks or dirty tricks. He kept his integrity by being fair, never breaking his word. He was the best state chairman in either party in my memory. He and "the Bull" as chief clerk ran the House in 1953. Mort was no parliamentarian, but he and "the Bull"—who was better than a raw hand with the rules—were a great team on the rostrum. Mort and I were always friends. He just died last year. A gentleman's gentleman.

Ms. Boswell: Once you had talked to Eisenhower about civil rights issues, did it continue, or is that pretty much the end of the conversation?

Sen. Moore: We talked a little bit about the future of water-related resources. He had a pretty good handle on those things, whether it was Grand Coulee, or whether it was gill-netting. He understood where the problem was, and where he thought we should be going. This is before they discovered that the dams were chewing up the fish, and that there might not be any more fish. He didn't know about that. He thought we should build more dams for more hydroelectric power. The fact that it was cheap in the northwest, cheaper than anyplace else, impressed him.

On the fishing issue, he felt that you should have seasons that were flexible, not

just where, at a given moment, everybody starts to fish, and twelve hours later, they quit. He didn't favor that program, which is still in place. He thought that there should be a three month interval, where it didn't interfere with the spawning, or the little fish getting going. But, at any other time, you could go out and catch whatever fish you could catch, up to what your average had been the previous five years, or something like that. You could choose the day. You didn't have to go out in bad weather just because that was *the* day. He understood the transportation of fish by air, and that it would be nice if it was a constant flow, instead of just all of a sudden a glut. He understood, I think, more than most people thought he did.

Ms. Boswell: So you left fairly impressed, then, overall?

Sen. Moore: I was very impressed with him. Of course, I went in impressed, although I told you about the public power story. The public should have the power.

Ms. Boswell: That was an amazing incident. I read somewhere that Eisenhower was fairly close to Langlie. That he was very influential on Langlie's political decisions.

Sen. Moore: Yes, that's true. I think it stemmed from Langlie's lack of confidence. On the face of it, it appeared the man was very confident, but I think the fact that he put so much store in Christ and in Billy Graham, always led me to believe that he was looking for leadership. Looking for a father figure. And, if I ever saw a father figure in my lifetime, it was Daddy Warbucks. Eisenhower not only looked like him, he was Daddy Warbucks in a lot of ways. So, I think that Eisenhower had a big influence on Langlie. And, of course, when you had a rising star like Langlie, the party itself wanted to rally every resource to make him look better than perhaps he was.

You know—I think I mentioned—all the time during the campaign for Eisenhower's nomination, Langlie was hovering in the wings. "Don't involve me." So, I get the votes for chairman of the Eisenhower delegation at the national convention. Langlie went crazy.

Ms. Boswell: Why?

Sen. Moore: He wanted the chairmanship. So, I said, "Fine. Don't worry. You're chairman." So, he was chairman. He got to stand up and cast our delegation's votes and be recognized at the national convention. It was appropriate, anyway. Who was I? Mr. Nobody.

Ms. Boswell: You were the engineer behind the—

Sen. Moore: I know, but Langlie was the owner of the railroad.

Ms. Boswell: So Langlie was never a Taft person?

Sen. Moore: No. He was always for Eisenhower. It was a great moment at the national convention. We were all sitting around in this huge room with probably thirty-five people in it. Governors, U.S. Senators—Henry Cabot Lodge was there, Saltonstall, Thornton from Colorado, Langlie, Dewey—I can't remember who they all were. Hugh Scott was chairman. He was the floor leader, so he acted as chairman of these little meetings. The night before the convention opened we went around the room. These are the hard-core Ike people. So-and-so says, "Well, I've got nineteen out of twenty in my delegation." Hugh Scott says, "Well, you know, we've got eighty-five, and I've got seventy-eight of them." It came around to Dewey, and Dewey was Langlie's hero. He just adored Dewey.

And so, Langlie's sitting over here, Dewey's there, I'm where I can see both of them.

Ms. Boswell: Sort of a triangle?

Sen. Moore: Yes. But there were people in between. So, I watched Dewey, and he turned to Jacobi, who was speaker of the New York House, and said, "Jake, how are we tomorrow?"

Jacobi said, "Well, you know, it's the same old story, Governor. There are ninety-six delegates, and we have ninety-two."

"Huh," Dewey said, "What about the others?"

"Well," he said, "you remember, one of them was a classmate of Taft, we can't get him. The other one is a very young delegate who is a relative of Taft's, and we can't get him."

And Dewey, very irritatedly asked, "Well, what about the other two?"

And Jacobi said, "Governor, we've talked about this before, and they want to be judges." Dewey said, "I thought that had been taken care of."

I'm watching Langlie. He's just destroyed. His hero now has feet of clay. He's another rotten dealer, you know. Langlie went white, just sitting there—couldn't talk. And, of course, the next day, when we voted, it was 94 to 2. Two New York delegates became judges overnight! That's the way the whole business is. One hundred years ago or today, it's all the same.

Ms. Boswell: Was the Republican Party, nationally, appreciative of your work on the Eisenhower nomination?

Sen. Moore: No. The whole field is full of egomaniacs, and they're all so busy preening themselves that they don't ever recognize anybody else. Only I, and maybe five or ten other people, recognized it.

Ms. Boswell: What about here at home, though? Was it recognized here?

Sen. Moore: Same thing here. Nobody knew, nobody put it together. Well, a few people did. Janet Tourtelotte, who was the national committeewoman, understood. I think her brother, George Powell, who is now a regent at the University, understood. Bill Howard and Jack Thomas, my two friends. Did I mention George Kinnear and Willard Wright?

Ms. Boswell: No.

Sen. Moore: They understood. Some of the insiders. The story behind the story is always the one, and this is the story behind the story.

Ms. Boswell: Were you that committed to Eisenhower, to make it all worthwhile, or was he just that much better than Taft at that point?

Sen. Moore: Well, I thought he was a winner, and there are few prizes when you lose. And, I had also, by that time, figured out that the country was not going to come to an end, whoever was president. I just thought that Eisenhower could be elected, and I doubted that Taft could.

Do you remember H.V. Kaltenborn? That was before your time.

Ms. Boswell: No, tell me about him.

Sen. Moore: He was a big columnist, and he was on the radio a lot. This was before TV.

Ms. Boswell: And what was his last name?

Sen. Moore: Kaltenborn. At the national convention, we're riding on the el out to the Cow Palace Convention Center in Chicago. We had made up a newspaper, one of those in which one can make up the headlines to fit the occasion. Kaltenborn is sitting right behind

me on the el, and my friend, Jack Thomas, was sitting right beside me. Thomas hands me the paper and I pretend like I'm reading it. Kaltenborn sees it. The headline read, "Taft at Appomatox." Kaltenborn asked to see the paper. I refused. So, I'm always up for a few laughs. Can't take life too seriously.

Ms. Boswell: Did he ever use that line after that, I wonder?

Sen. Moore: No, I very much doubt it. Kaltenborn was very unfunny.

Ms. Boswell: Once Eisenhower was in office, how would you assess his success? He sort of gets mixed reviews.

Sen. Moore: He was the right man for the time. The country had had twenty years of social change. A lot of things had happened. There was the WPA, and the PWA, and Social Security, farm subsidies, and public power had come into being, and the country was ready for a rest. Between Roosevelt and Truman, they'd had twenty years of this. And the U.S. had enough of war—1941 to 1953. The country really wanted and needed a rest. And Daddy Warbucks gave them a rest for eight years. And it was probably appropriate. You can't just continue without a break. Every runner needs a rest, occasionally, and I think that he afforded the country that. I rate him higher than a lot of people do.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think he was the kind of person that allowed other people to speak for him or take the heat, when he was really making decisions, or not? That's been one of the arguments, that he was stronger than people recognized.

Sen. Moore: I don't think there's any question about that. But he had a lot of breaks. He had the heart attack at just the right time. Couldn't have been timed better. He was beginning to sag in the polls, and, of course, everybody that had ever had a heart attack now was with him. And their families were with him. That was one break, and he got out of the Sherman Adams fiasco easily. Sherman Adams just resigned. He was Eisenhower's chief of staff, and he had taken a vicuna coat as a gift from somebody. Ridiculous—it was $500, $1,000, or whatever it is. But Ike remained Teflon right up to the finish. They never tagged him.

The second campaign was so easy. He was the first Republican president since Hoover, so the second campaign he ran against Stevenson again. You beat them once, you beat them again. That's almost always true.

Ms. Boswell: What about Nixon's role?

Sen. Moore: Shabby. You see, when we arrived at the national convention the understanding from the Eisenhower people—Hugh Scott was the head—was that Earl Warren was going to be vice president, because Warren was liberal. But because we had just come out of the McCarthy era, it was thought too dangerous to have Earl Warren. Nixon managed to torpedo him with Daddy Warbucks, and Eisenhower picked Nixon instead. Of course it turned out it was a great break for the country, to have Earl Warren on the Supreme Court. Just an average jurist, but with a lot of common sense and heart. He turned out to be quite liberal. You can't get a court too liberal to suit me. I want them all to have heart, all the while deciding within the confines of the Bill of Rights.

I had my ups and downs with Nixon. I voted for him in 1960, against Kennedy, mostly on the Catholic issue. I was still hovering on bigotry at that time as far as Catholics and Protestants were concerned. Yet, I didn't feel badly when Kennedy won. I think out of a sense of duty, I was still thinking I was a Republican. I'd voted for Nixon. That

was my last Republican vote for president—straight Democrats for president since then.

Ms. Boswell: During that period, late forties, early fifties, who did you most admire on the state level? Were there any legislators, Republican or Democrat, that really stood out to you?

Sen. Moore: In the '40s, I had kind of a secret admiration for Bob Greive. It's an interesting thing. Virginia and I went on a trip to the Gaspé. We like to go to Eastern Canada, and on the way back we stopped at Bar Harbor, in Maine. Virginia had said, "You know my former husband and I were driving by here some years ago, and I wanted to stop, and he said, 'No, too expensive.' So we drove on." Of course, I turned in there, and we stayed at a motel right next to the ferry dock. We stayed three nights.

There was a very nice guy behind the counter, typical New Englander, he had a beautiful white shirt, tie. Immaculate. All American. When I went to pay the bill, he looked at my credit card. "Oh," he said, "from Washington, Seattle."

I said, "Yeah."

He said, "Where?"

I said, "I live on Queen Anne. I'm a state senator there." I said, "You know Seattle?"

He said, "Yes."

I said, "You go often?"

He said, "Every two or three years I go out there. I know West Seattle better than I know Queen Anne."

So, I quickly think, "How can I help Talmadge?" Maybe I can get some connection for Talmadge. So, I said, "Well, who do you know there."

"Oh," he said, "you probably wouldn't know him." And then he hesitated as if it was kind of shameful, what he was going to say, and he said, "I go and visit Bob Greive. He's married to my sister."

Things like that just always tickle me. Bob was an outstanding legislator and maneuverer. He had as many moves as Michael Jordan!

Ms. Boswell: Well, he was certainly successful, both in keeping the position and in marshaling forces when he had to.

Sen. Moore: I knew him when he was first elected. Did I tell you the kind of guy he is? About our district leader in West Seattle?

Ms. Boswell: You told me one story but I can't really recall it.

Sen. Moore: Bob was much maligned, but he was an outstanding legislator, parliamentarian and, above all, a hard worker with a heart. He was the hardest working senator in my lifetime. He knew the secret of politics—obligating people as cheaply as possible. Shortly after Langlie was elected for the second time in 1948—I was GOP King County chairman—he appointed the husband of our district chairman, Mabel Oliver, as a liquor store clerk. A few weeks later a stack of liquor cases fell on him, fatally injuring him. The Liquor Control Board chairman, Evro Beckett, decided Mabel was entitled to no benefits because her husband had worked only a few weeks before the accident.

The Olivers lived in West Seattle, as did Greive. I went with Jack Thomas to call on Greive. As we recounted our sad story, Greive picked up the phone, called Beckett, and a few minutes later Bob, Jack and I were in Beckett's office. At the time, the Senate and House were Democratic. Evro argued his position, but it was clear that accommodating Greive was important. Mabel received a small pension. Keep in mind that I, as GOP chairman, had to oppose Greive. This did not matter to Bob Greive. He wanted to right a wrong. That softened me up. I never said anything bad about Greive after that. Never. He put that

human need above partisan politics.

Ms. Boswell: That's a great story. Now, I was wondering, were you a good fund-raiser?

Sen. Moore: It's peculiar. I'm really not a very good fund-raiser, but when I run, the money just comes in. Just every day. From two hundred to a few thousand, every day. I spent nearly $300,000 last time. I never made a call for money.

Ms. Boswell: Really?

Sen. Moore: No. It just appears.

Ms. Boswell: A lot of people you don't know?

Sen. Moore: Once in a while, but most of them I know. Lobbyists, well-to-do people, it's just amazing. I think I have the record for the greatest number of contributors in any campaign. Around 1,200, and the nearly $300,000 is still the record for a legislative seat.

Ms. Boswell: And that's not by going out there and really soliciting?

Sen. Moore: No.

Ms. Boswell: It's probably something to be proud of, I would think.

Sen. Moore: My manager last time said, "Now, you've got to get on the phone and make money calls."

"Oh," I said, "I don't think so."

"Yeah. You've got to do it. I'm telling you."

So, I said, "Okay. Give me the list."

So, I would not make the calls, and he'd say to me that evening, "How far'd you get today?"

"Well, I'm almost through the A's." I went through the whole thing, and finally I'd say, "I finally got down to Paul Zeman."

That's the end of the list. And, of course, the money was pouring in, and I hadn't made a call. So, he said, "See, I told you!"

Ms. Boswell: Did you have to do campaigning to retain the chairmanship of the Republican Party organization?

Sen. Moore: No.

Ms. Boswell: That wasn't a campaign effort?

Sen. Moore: No. My two friends, Jack Thomas and Bill Howard, took care of everything. Sometimes I liken those days to being an Eastern potentate being carried by Bill and Jack in a sedan chair.

Ms. Boswell: Well, you were pretty lucky to have them. Did most people have that kind of one or two people, or a small core of people that did a lot of that organizational campaign work?

Sen. Moore: I think so. Still, it may be in some cases they'll have half a dozen, or sometimes as many as a dozen. I just had two, and I relied on them for everything. That keeps the obligations down—and neither ever asked for anything.

Ms. Boswell: What did they get out of it?

Sen. Moore: Jack Thomas continued selling whiskey to the State of Washington. That was his role. And Bill Howard, brilliant legal mind, but he hated the big firms, and so he ended up as the specialist on DWI charges in Seattle. Those big firms wouldn't touch a DWI, so they sent some rich clients of theirs to the Bull, who was a master at getting them off. He'd beat the police at every turn. He was just famous. Big firms sent their people because they didn't want to dirty their hands with that

stuff. Of course, he made a very good living. He was everybody's DWI man!

Ms. Boswell: Well, you were doing so well, was there any reason why you quit the Republican central committee?

Sen. Moore: I had just given everything, every idea, every bit of energy I had, and I thought, "I'm not going to get any place here. I don't want to die in this job," although I might have been reelected indefinitely. After all, I counted the votes.

Ms. Boswell: You wouldn't have stooped to that, though?

Sen. Moore: No, of course not. But, after Eisenhower was elected, he held the country together so well that I, frankly, lost interest in the GOP. My job as county chairman was finished and I resigned in the fall of 1953. I also quit because I was forty-one and it was time to start making a living.

CHAPTER 4

BEHIND THE POLITICAL SCENES

Sen. Moore: It was time to start concentrating on brokerage, and think about supporting our family. Our daughter Lucy was born April 17, 1944; a normal baby, a slightly advanced preschooler, and a normal teenager. And she grew into a real person. As a little one she seemed a little on the serious side, but with total balance. A funny occasion: in '52, right in the middle of the election between Eisenhower and Stevenson, I came home one day and here was a full-length, life-size picture of Stevenson on her door. Honora and I had always encouraged Lucy to think for herself, so I was surprised but not shocked. I said, "How come?" She explained that Stevenson was her choice because he was more sympathetic with the poor and had done good things as Governor of Illinois. Pretty good for an eight year old.

To show how sensitive she was—we would go grocery shopping and when she was age three or four I would say, "You pick out a can of peas." She always looked carefully and when she found one with a dent or a torn label into the cart it went. I noticed this habit and asked her why, to which she responded, "Someone has to take it."

Most of K-12 was spent at Helen Bush School. Each year, Bush teachers, students, and employees vote on their favorite senior. I believe she is still the only one to be a unanimous choice. She applied to Smith, Stanford, Swarthmore, and Radcliffe, chose Radcliff, earned her degree from Harvard, and had a modestly distinguished academic record while working as a cook and waitress.

At Radcliff she met and married Robert Hilgendorf, a dented can. After twenty years and two sons, later they divorced. She's an arbiter on water rights and other environmental disputes, one of the top ones in the country. She has lived in Arizona and New Mexico since the late '60s.

Anyway, in 1953, about the time I left as King county chairman, Aunt Harriet—in whose house I was born—died and left $25,000 each to Honora and me. Within a year we went, together with Lucy, to Europe for five months. Most of the time we lived in a pension in Paris. Lucy kept up with her school work and we spent lots of time together—museums, races, side trips, and walking the streets.

The only thing I regret about this trip is not learning French. I regret I speak only one language, and that one not as well as I wish. There is something about speaking with a person in their language that develops a relationship more quickly. From preschool on, every student should be encouraged and given the opportunity to learn a second language. Any second language is better than none, but certainly Oriental and European languages should be available.

A story in point: When Nissan leased a port facility in Seattle they had 100 apply to be their on-site port manager. After narrowing the field to ten, they finally selected someone who spoke Japanese. He told me he was the least qualified of the finalists, but he got the job because he could communicate with the Japanese captains and men who were responsible for delivering the cars to the United States.

Anyway, when we came back from France I seriously became a stockbroker, still with

Walston. I began doing things in the community, like fund-raising for the Heart Fund. I also held various offices: President of the State Mental Health Association; vice-president, Committee to Abolish Capital Punishment; chairman, Governor Rosellini's Mental Health Committee; first chairman, State of Washington Securities Committee. On all these efforts I had help from Albert Rosellini and Senator Warren Magnuson. So naturally I felt warm toward them, although still telling one and all, including myself, that I was a Republican.

Ms. Boswell: You held on as a Republican. Why did you continue on as a Republican?

Sen. Moore: I thought that I was one. I believed in the free enterprise system. I refused to see the inequities that occur in capitalism. I refused to recognize greed. I just went along trying to get the Republican Party to be more liberal. Still, business dominated, but my attitude was, "Come on, let's not be so greedy." Teachers have to live. Social workers have to live, which of course, Republicans don't believe.

Ms. Boswell: Even today?

Sen. Moore: Yes. They're all overpaid, according to Republicans. And they'd do away with social programs, and they still talk about, well, let's get rid of this program and turn it over to the churches. Well, you find me a church where the volunteers aren't already overworked, and I'll be really surprised.

In our district, fifteen years ago, church volunteers were overworked. When Reagan came in, he wanted the churches to take over everything. Well, Father Tony, who was the priest in charge at Saint Anne's, told me, "We're exhausted. We can't get any more work out of our people."

I just kept trying to reform the GOP, and if they didn't want to reform, then I guess there's no reason they should. It was just a dream I had.

Ms. Boswell: You also were very active at the time, and thereafter, in civic affairs. I wanted to ask you about, first of all, how did you choose, generally, what kinds of civic activities you became involved in? You got out of the Republican Party because it was so time consuming, and you'd sort of had enough. How did you choose what other civic responsibilities you decided to take on?

Sen. Moore: When I was assistant chief clerk of the House, the chief clerk, as I mentioned, didn't let me do much of anything. I had considerable time to meet people, and I met a fellow here who was interested—he was from Seattle, but he was down here—who was interested in mental health. Because I was just finishing analysis at that time, my interest in mental health ran high. I don't know quite how it came together, but we decided that I'd help him lobby to try and get more money for the mental institutions, in the hope that we could get accreditation back. So, I did, and the psychiatrists, especially analysts, all came out of the woodwork, and I became kind of their connection with the real world. So that's how I got into the mental health business. Nobody else wanted the job, so I became president of the Washington State Mental Health Association.

Mrs. Winthrop Rockefeller, who was from Seattle, would just send $10,000 or whatever whenever we needed money. She'd just write a check out for $10,000. So she kept the Mental Health Association going for quite a while. I finally decided that because we were spending ninety-five percent of the money we took in on overhead, and only five percent of it was going for the cause, that I'd just close the Mental Health Association down, which I

did. It was closed for several years, and then they finally became active in the state again.

Then I read in the paper one day that Ernest Skeel had volunteered at a ripe age, like sixty-five, to be state chairman of the Heart Fund. So, I wrote him a letter, and I said, "I think it's wonderful that you've taken on this job, and if there's anything I can do to help, I'd be happy to." He was a guy that got up early in the morning. Pretty good law firm he had, and he went to the post office and got the mail every morning. I was in my brokerage office, and he called me at about eight-fifteen. I had never expected to hear from him in the first place. He said, "When can we talk?"

I said, "I can come down this afternoon."

"Fine," he said. So, I went by about one o'clock and he said, "You're going to be the King County Chairman of the Heart Fund."

I said, "No, I'm not, I just want to help a little bit."

"No," he said, "you take my word for it. You become the chairman, and I'll appoint you." So, I was way over my head, I didn't know what to do, and I didn't want to do it, but he gave me a great piece of advice. He said, "Always do good works, it will serve you well."

But then in 1974, when I ran for the House in the Thirty-sixth District, I quit all the do-good projects as an active participant. I had, by that time, gradually withdrawn from Mental Health, President's Civil Rights Advisory Commission, the Urban League, the Heart Fund, and Committee to Abolish Capital Punishment, ACT Theatre, and others. This was an era of transition from "good works" to active politics. When I feel I've given all I have to give, I bow out. I don't want to be the grand old man of anything!

Ms. Boswell: Is that about the time you made your switch? When, exactly, did you switch parties?

Sen. Moore: No, it was earlier than that. I knew that I was more compatible with Rosellini and Magnuson than I was with any two Republicans. They were doing all the things that I believed in, and I always liked people who try to surround themselves with people smarter than they are. Both Rosellini and Maggie did. I was having real trouble with the right wing, and this was before the Christians tried to take over the Republican party, so that was not yet an issue. So, in 1964 I supported Johnson, openly, as opposed to Goldwater. Looking back, I wonder why I did it.

Ms. Boswell: Why do you say, looking back you wonder why? Goldwater was pretty right wing.

Sen. Moore: Yes, but, you know, I was mostly interested in the Vietnam war during that election. I wanted it stopped, and I don't know that it would have been any worse under Goldwater. Anyway, I made a clear break at that point, but not noisily. I was in touch with some real money, people who ran big money ads in the papers all over the state for Johnson, beating up on Goldwater. I guess it was just the war issue that finally tipped me over to the Democrats, although I'd been having good vibrations from Rosellini and Magnuson as well.

Magnuson had a staff that was unbelievable. I asked him one day, "Do you read all those bills?" He looked at me like, "You've got to be crazy. Of course not. I never read a bill. I don't know what they say. That's what I have the staff for." And he went out of his way to get the best. Very few people ever had a better staff than he had. You know Ancil Payne? He was one of the—

Ms. Boswell: He was one of the best?

Sen. Moore: Yes. Anyway, I was semi in the

open. I never made a declaration, "I'm now going to be a Democrat."

Ten years after the Goldwater/Johnson race, I quietly filed for the House against Eikenberry. Of course, the Democrats hated me. They didn't trust me. I was a man without a country.

Ms. Boswell: I can imagine.

Sen. Moore: With some people it's still true. As state chair, Karen Marchioro just never accepted me. I don't know how good you have to be to satisfy her.

Ms. Boswell: Now, Rosellini, you said he's one of the politicians you most admired. Tell me more about that.

Sen. Moore: He's one of the two best governors we've had. I judge them through the difficult time or easy time in which they served. He lived in a difficult period. It wasn't terribly difficult, not like Clarence Martin in the thirties, but Rosellini was striving all the time he was in the Legislature to improve prisons and mental institutions. And he did a great job. He got accreditation. Of course, as soon as he was out of office, the very next year, Evans lost the accreditation. Never been able to get them back. Rosellini did a lot. In order to give the big banks competition, he opened up more new, little banks than any other governor before or since. They were handing those charters out to anybody that could come up with the required capital and had never been indicted.

Back when he was starting out, Rosellini went to a couple of county chairmen before I was county chairman. He went to the Republican county chairman because his father had been a bootlegger and a Republican. Albert went to the county chairman—his name was Ralph Hoar—and said, "Mr. Hoar, I'm twenty-one. I want to run for the Legislature in Rainier Valley." When he got all through, Ralph said to him, "We don't need any wops in our party. Get out." So, he became a Democrat, where he was welcomed. This story may or may not be accurate, but knowing Ralph, I'm inclined to believe it.

Ms. Boswell: I didn't know that story. Interesting.

Sen. Moore: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: So, he continued to maintain some ties with Republicans. You said his district was the one that was solidly behind you?

Sen. Moore: It was a heavy Democrat district, but the Republican precinct committeemen were all with me. Albert also had the best wife that's ever been in the Governor's mansion. Wonderful woman. Albert's been in politics for sixty years. Sixty years! Nobody around here's ever been around that long, except Charlie Hodde. Mid-thirties to now. Al is still on the Transportation Commission. He's a very smart politician.

Ms. Boswell: Why do you think he hasn't gotten the positive recognition that other governors have?

Sen. Moore: Name, mostly.

Ms. Boswell: Oh, you think so?

Sen. Moore: He's not an Anglo-Saxon.

Ms. Boswell: You think that's the only reason, really?

Sen. Moore: Well, the Republicans degraded him at every turn. Accused him of selling liquor licenses, just all kinds of stuff that wasn't germane, and often times wasn't true.

So, he just got kind of a bad reputation. Just look at former Governor's names: Ferry, McGraw, Rogers, McBride, Mead, Cosgrove, Hay, Lister, Hart, Hartley, Martin, Langlie, Wallgren, and then the Anglo-Saxon rule was broken by an Italian-American, Rosellini—whose father served time! A voting pattern of nearly seventy years is not easily overcome.

And then he made a bad mistake when he ran against Evans. He had it won, and they had a meeting up in Edmonds, and he referred to Evans as "Danny Boy." That seemed to just touch people the wrong way. His campaign just went downhill from then on. It would have been Al's third term.

Ms. Boswell: What do you think about the press's treatment of Rosellini?

Sen. Moore: Unfair. Biased. They downgraded him to such an extent that he had trouble filling his cabinet. Nobody wanted to serve with him. But when he finally got it together with Garrett Heyns, Charlie Hodde, and all the others, it was a very good cabinet.

This is a pretty good cabinet. I just hope that Lowry will pay attention to them, and not move out in front too fast before he knows what he's talking about. Those people that he's put on the Liquor Board are no better than average. Lottery is a little weak. Agriculture is very strong with Jesernig. Ecology with Mary Riveland, very strong. Chase Riveland in Corrections. Labor and Industries with Mark Brown. Licensing is so-so, but better than it usually is. It's a good cabinet.

I judge governors by whom they appoint, too. If they appoint people that are strong and smart, I give them extra points.

Ms. Boswell: So you think Rosellini did a good job, too?

Sen. Moore: Yes. Very outstanding.

Ms. Boswell: Are those appointments primarily engineered by governor's underlings, right-hand men, whatever?

Sen. Moore: It depends on who's governor. I believe that when Evans was governor Jim Dolliver made a lot of appointments. I can't get a handle on the governor's office now. I can't understand what's going on. An awful lot of second-raters. I thought Gardner's staff was pretty weak, but Lowry has an even weaker group. And I don't like to think that because I want Lowry to gather people that are sharp around him. He may want "yes people." Some people want "yes people," that's just the way they are.

Ms. Boswell: What were your feelings about Dan Evans as a governor? You mentioned he lost accreditation for mental institutions and prisons. Did you see him as successful in any other ways?

Sen. Moore: Dan was always popular. He became the state's Teflon man—nothing stuck to him. Ed Donohoe of the *Washington Teamster* called Dan "straight arrow," and it stuck because that was the way people perceived him. Personally, Dan is dignified, yet warm and approachable, and I was a booster for a long time, reinforced by the fact that I knew and admired his father.

But when Dan became governor he went counter to my favorite programs, failing to continue the work of Rosellini, as I mentioned. When we lost accreditation, what happened was that mental patients suffered from cuts in rehabilitation programs and adequate staff, and the prisons underwent quite a change. The prison system nearly became governed by the prisoners—inmates never had it so good! One positive was that Evans continued the Rosellini policy of commuting the death penalty to life imprisonment, if the condemned asked for clemency.

Ms. Boswell: So you saw his ability to bounce back as one of his strengths?

Sen. Moore: Dan Evans was so popular he could probably be politically resurrected successfully. He was "Durable Dan." But as the public saw more Teflon, I saw more tarnish. Admittedly, I was irked by his lack of feeling for mental institutions and wrong-headedness regarding prisons, so I became soured on him.

As a matter of truth, he was a strong force for the Washington Public Power Supply System, which, because of no cost controls, cost us perhaps as much as $20 billion in waste in the building of nuclear plants. Not only was this costly to the investors, but it weakened our state's bond rating, which cost the taxpayers. Nobody blamed Dan.

Then some Liquor Board members were indicted for accepting free liquor from liquor representatives. A violation of the law. Nothing happened because then Attorney General, Slade Gorton—"Slippery Slade," as Ed Donahoe dubbed him—said there was inadequate evidence, although these illegal gifts were in custody! Again, nobody blamed Dan!

Dan used a new gimmick to hide his malfeasance or misfeasance when he discovered he'd overspent the budget. He just withheld the bills from the state treasurer until a new biennial budget was enacted. This, ever after, was known as the twenty-fifth month in a biennium. Definitely a constitutional violation. Nobody blamed Dan.

In my last campaign in 1990, my opponent, Andy McLauchlan, was always bragging that Dan Evans had endorsed him. Finally, one evening at the Coe School, I'd had enough, so I pointed out all of the aforementioned, and a few more, ending with, "If this is my opponent's role model, I rest my case." Well, understandably, Dan's and Ray's relationship has been somewhat strained the past few years. I simply can't resist this fulfillment of human frailty. I thought a lot more of Rosellini.

The situation with the Liquor Board indictments soured me on Slade Gorton, as well. I began to wonder if perhaps he wasn't just another political animal after all. Despite the fact that Gorton was an austere, Eastern elitist, I had felt he was a good legislator, spending all but his last two years in the minority. In spite of his coldness, I always thought the party benefited from his input. At the time he was in the House, he occasionally came by my desk in the investment business. I found him very bright and equally cold.

I admire Slade's audacity in opposing President Reagan's budget, but I've grown weary of people arriving from elsewhere insisting their mores, ideas, and dogma should be imposed on the locals. Slade was new to the Senate, and although he may have had a better budget, his action was offensive to the President, but, more importantly, senior senators did not take this as a good start for Slade. To his credit, he nominated and fought hard and well to put Bill Dwyer on the Federal Court, but after sixteen years in and out of the U.S. Senate, he certainly is no Warren Magnuson or Henry Jackson.

Ms. Boswell: What about your relationship with Maggie? We talked a little bit about him, but not a lot.

Sen. Moore: I was not close. He knew me and he liked me, and I liked and admired him. He was a wonderful guy, just truly one of a kind.

Ms. Boswell: Did you know him early on when you were first in politics?

Sen. Moore: No. I never saw him. Oh, no, actually I saw him in 1944. He came with Harry Truman and I can't remember who else.

They came to the old ice arena in Seattle and they had a big crowd there. Truman was running for vice president, and Vic Meyers was there and he'd probably had several drinks. It was seven-thirty or eight o'clock, and he introduced Magnuson who was going to introduce Truman, and, in the course of introducing Magnuson, he got all wound up. He said, "This young man's responsible for opening up the gateway to Alaska." And he raved on and on. Then, he said, "I give you," and he couldn't think of Magnuson's name. So, he starts out again, and says, "Speaking of opening up gateways, he's the man that has bridged the gap between us and the Orient." All baloney, but he turned around and said, "And now I give you," and he still couldn't do it, couldn't think of the name. Finally, the county chairman, moved up alongside him and whispered in his ear. Of course in the audience, you could tell what was happening. So, he gives it one more try, and this time he carries it off. "I give you Warren Magnuson."

Ms. Boswell: That's a great story. So, when you left and concentrated on stock brokering, did you lose your interest in politics?

Sen. Moore: No. I think I may have mentioned in 1958 I ran for the nonpartisan city council. In those days, ten were nominated and I was sixth in the primary. I was sixth in the final five to be elected. I just lost by a few hundred votes. The fellow who beat me had the same kind of support I did, David Levine, a Jew. So, he got the Jewish vote, and so did I. We both got labor, but I just didn't have quite the name familiarity as he did. By then I knew that I was all through. I had lost at the university, I lost for state Senate in 1946, I lost for city council. I lost a close election and felt sure, with two defeats and no victories, I was not much of a candidate.

Ms. Boswell: Was that particular campaign unique? Were there different strategies because it was a city campaign as opposed to a legislative campaign? Are there big differences?

Sen. Moore: Yes. When you are running for the U.S. Senate, or Congress, you're running statewide, or from a 500,000 person constituency. When you're running for city council, you just lean on people whom you can see. They are part of your life. They get inside you. They have a lot of influence, whereas take Jim McDermott in Washington. He probably knows fewer people today than he did when he was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in our state Senate, fewer people in the state, especially in Seattle, I'm sure. So, the main thing, I think, is that you're dealing just with local issues. The street light is out, chuckholes, garbage, and these are things you can do something about.

There are two city council people who will never be beaten because they do constituent work. They take care of these little but important problems. I'd call them when I'd hear about something, and they are happy that I called them. They take care of the problem. They'd then write a letter to the person that asked for help, saying, "If it hadn't been for Senator Moore, I never would have known about this." Well, you know, how do I feel? I feel warm and fuzzy toward that person because he or she mentioned my name. And yet, they did the work. They know, as a result of that "back scratching," I'm going to be there to scratch theirs, in all likelihood.

Ms. Boswell: Are you speaking of two people specifically?

Sen. Moore: Yes, two. Tom Weeks is one, and the other one is Jan Drago. Neither are destined for greatness, but they're good journeymen council-people, and they're interested in taking care of people's problems,

rather than trying to mastermind some city ordinance that may cause more harm than good.

Ms. Boswell: What did you feel like when you came so close, but didn't win? How'd it make you feel?

Sen. Moore: Well, I hadn't expected to win anyway, so I was not surprised. I guess I was surprised that I came so close. I was a gracious loser the first time that I ran, and this was the second time. It had worked so well before, being a good loser, that I was a good loser one more time. So, ever after that, the next two times that I ran and I lost, I had mastered the art of being a good loser. People began to remember me as the fellow that doesn't get personal, doesn't blast out, doesn't accuse anybody, doesn't blame the loss on a dirty campaign, or "the press was against me." I just admitted I just didn't *have it*.

Ms. Boswell: Did you see that as helping to build a reputation where you would eventually get elected?

Sen. Moore: No, I think I mentioned before, this is a disease. There is no inoculation for it. Only death or the voters can cure you, so periodically, I'd have to run. I ran in '46, '58, '74, '76, '78, and every four years after that.

A year after the campaign for city council, I had become disenchanted at Walston. Bache wanted a Seattle office and offered me $45,000 to come with them. This was still quite a sum in 1959, so I went with Bache. Since 1955 my business kept increasing—partly because I cut commissions, which no firm liked. In fact, the firms around town had an active dislike for me, but I kept increasing my business year by year. So they didn't want to lose me, although I was an aggravation.

Ms. Boswell: Brokering was somewhat of a political connection. Did the political connections and your interest in politics continue to help you in that business?

Sen. Moore: No. Every manager I worked for always wanted me to poach on people that I knew politically and socially. And I wouldn't do it. I just went out and acquired people I never heard of before. Just walked the streets and called on people. I wanted to keep my political life and social life separate.

I was kind of the darling of Washington Park, that big social enclave there. You know, they used to say, "You really believe Negroes are supposed to be equal?" You know, things like that. And I said, "Damn right!" and they'd all laugh. I was kind of a toy for that group. You see, I was included because I was so offbeat and they liked Honora.

Ms. Boswell: Now, where did you get that strong sense of civil rights and equal opportunity?

Sen. Moore: Well, in 1939 Hitler marched into Poland, over the Labor Day weekend. On Wednesday we had our drill night in Seattle, and I went to drill because I got a dollar for going to that drill, and I needed every penny of it. On that day, our commanding officer read this proclamation from the War Department—they used to call it the War Department before the Defense Department. It said, "As a result of what is happening in Europe we may be at war." Now, this is twenty-seven months before Pearl Harbor. "Anyone who wishes an honorable discharge may step forward." Out of three hundred of us, myself and one other guy stepped forward. The others went to Bataan, and I believe one guy came back. *One guy*.

Ms. Boswell: Out of the whole group? Oh, my goodness.

Sen. Moore: So you ask about civil rights. I turned my attention at that point to what I had. Honora had talked about how hard it must be to be Jewish in just about anyplace, particularly Europe. We belonged to the Plymouth Congregational Church and I went to the then minister, wonderful guy, Wendel Fifield. And I said, "Dr. Fifield, I have five dollars," which was a lot of money. "I want to start a fund. I want you ministers who belong to the Council of Churches—and if you can get the Catholics in, too, that's fine—I want you to go to Europe and tell Hitler to stop killing the Jews." And I continued, "You know, I keep hearing when I go to church that we're in the army of the Lord, and I said to myself 'Dr. Fifield has got to be pretty far up in that army of the Lord,' and I think there's a time when you have to really put up." He was a strong man—wonderful fellow.

He said, "You know, two months ago I brought this same thing up, or something comparable, before the Council of Churches, and they all sat there wringing their hands and saying, 'We must stay with our flocks.'" So, I said, "Dr. Fifield, I'm going to leave the five dollars here. If anything materializes, use it for that, otherwise put it in the Boys Club." That was before they had Girls Clubs. Every church had a Boys Club. So, it eventually went into the Boys Club. So, I went home and told Honora what happened. Next week we signed a letter resigning from the church. I've never been back. I'll never go back. I have total disrespect for this type of Christian. Finally, long after the need to support civil rights, they began to surface, they're always a mile behind, and a generation late.

Ms. Boswell: Why do you think that is?

Sen. Moore: They're conservative.

Ms. Boswell: They're too conservative?

Sen. Moore: Yes. Of course.

Ms. Boswell: You were conservative. How did you—

Sen. Moore: I have become more liberal as I grow older. As I mentioned, I had tried to influence the GOP in our state so they would become attractive to labor, teachers, and the disadvantaged, but the majority of Republicans could only see dollar signs, equate money with success, and flag waving ad nauseam. And, of course, the underlying theme was a return to the good old days that never were. Hark to the fates of my first grade class. Well do I remember the horrors of county poor farms. No thank you.

I began to see the injustices that were wrought upon women and minorities. Think of this: When I went to work the whole spectrum in commerce was almost the sole property of white men. No nonwhite could get any good job at all. They could maybe get service jobs with almost zero upward mobility. They couldn't be in banks. They couldn't be in brokerage firms. They couldn't be at Weyerhaeuser, Boeing—anyplace else. And I began to see this as a bad thing, and then I interpreted, in my own way, to mean that if this continued there'd be a revolution in this country.

This system, this economy, is not bad, but in 1980, I think, one percent of the people owned five percent of the wealth. Not bad. It seems there always has to be kind of an aristocrat class. Ten years later, one percent of the people own ten percent of the wealth. Now, what that means is, that a whole lot of people who were just barely making it have now been crowded into poverty, and when enough of them get down there, there'll be trouble. So, that's why I became a strong advocate of equal opportunity, way back, a long time ago. I started in '39 and it has become very dominant in my thinking ever

since then.

I think I mentioned my friend Mort Frayn—he was state chairman, and arranged after the 1952 election for me to meet with Eisenhower. Well, everything about Mort was friendly, including body language. He was one of the all-time greats in my political life. Mort Frayn would have made Will Rogers look like a curmudgeon. He liked everybody and almost everybody liked him.

When I joined the Washington Athletic Club, Mort spent time in the bar. I never knew him then, but I grew accustomed to his gravelly and warm voice. When the club opened in the late '20s, only white Gentiles were members. Then the Depression came and the club soon became insolvent, at which time the board decided to ask Darwin Meisnest, who was quite capable with money, to take over the management. Because the board was in a weak bargaining position, Darwin made an unreal deal. He was to get a less than nominal salary, but he was to get a percentage from the slot machines. Since Darwin counted the money, who was to argue about whether he took more or less than his share? Original financing of the club was a community affair with people subscribing to a bond issue. By the mid-1930s the bonds were considered of little or no value. As people needed money or estates needed liquidating, there was only one buyer, Darwin Meisnest, with his cash cow, the slot machines. It wasn't long before brother Meisnest controlled the club by virtue of owning the bonds. Meanwhile he had convinced the board to build membership by admitting Jews, to increase the income. That's how it happened.

Meanwhile, Mort was becoming a minor power in the club, and eventually became president. By the late 1930s, the club was so solvent the board didn't approve new Jewish applications. I was furious and resigned. I think I resigned in 1939. Mort suggested he wished I'd stayed because it is often better to fight from within than without. He was right, but I've always had a tendency to want to right every wrong right now.

In 1957, eighteen years after I'd taken up the cudgel for Jews, the B'nai B'rith Lodge in Seattle gave their Man of the Year award to me, only the second or third non-Jew who had ever had it up to that point. I had made a trip to Israel at my expense, and they made arrangements for me to talk to all kinds of people, from retired Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion on down. I was there a couple of weeks.

Ms. Boswell: This was before the award, or after?

Sen. Moore: Before.

Ms. Boswell: And that interest was generated primarily by the situation during the war? You recognized that?

Sen. Moore: Yes. My father was a Quaker and my mother was a Presbyterian. My father told me about his father, who was a doctor in the Civil War. After the war, on the way back from somewhere, he slept in a barn. In the morning he got up when it was just getting light, and he saw something moving under some straw. With his gun drawn, he went over and kicked the straw, and it was a little black kid hiding, scared to death, didn't know where he was. My grandfather took him back to Philadelphia. He wanted the boy to live with him and my grandmother, but the little boy wouldn't come in even to sleep. My grandfather finally got him so that he would come in and eat meals with them. Then, my grandfather built a little house out in the back of the big house, and that's where this person lived all his life. I don't know what finally happened to him. But this, and other things my father told me, impressed me about a certain goodness in his Quaker family.

My mother had prejudices against Catholics and anybody with a dark skin, whether it was Mexican or Spanish, or whatever. In fact, she didn't like brunettes, so, of course, I married one, Honora.

Ms. Boswell: You got the other side of the family's strong sense of justice?

Sen. Moore: Yes. In all fairness, my mother was kind, but she made the rules! So my parents were very conservative, but they were not mean. Before the Depression, my father had loaned money on two houses. People lost jobs and couldn't handle their payments. They came to him and said, "You know, I guess you'll have to throw us out, we can't pay." He said, "No, forget it." He didn't take any interest for the time that they were unemployed. Eventually, after continuing to live in the houses, both parties got jobs and paid off. He thought that anything above six percent interest was too much, whether you got it, or whether you paid it. And I hold to that. When interest rates were twenty percent, I thought it was a criminal act.

Ms. Boswell: It was pretty bad.

Sen. Moore: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: So B'nai B'rith then recognized you for that long history of support for equal rights?

Sen. Moore: Yes. I've been there, on every vote for women, for minorities, even when some of them seemed a little overdone. I've been there because there were few enough of us who had that much of a commitment.

Ms. Boswell: And it was particularly true, of the Republicans at least, that tradition would not be disturbed. Very few would have had that strong commitment to social issues.

Sen. Moore: Very few. Very few. For the most part, Joel Pritchard met the test. I totally underestimated his political potential. I felt that, over the years, he had a good voting record, one of which I would have been proud. As a liberal Republican, he spent his years as congressman in the minority. Of course, we will never know how he would have voted had he been tested by being in the majority—either he would have voted hard-line Republican or would he have stayed his Olympia course.

The reason I dwell on this is that his ally and friend, Dan Evans, as U.S. Senator, changed stripes and left his liberal Republican views to vote the Reagan program, with which I did not see eye to eye. The thing about Joel was, he was part of a tight little group—Dan "Straight Arrow" Evans, "Slippery" Slade Gorton, and Chuck Moriarty. I regard Senator Moriarty with esteem and warmth—he was conservative, but not self-serving. Evans' and Gorton's records are clearly not up to Moriarty's standards, but Joel, I feel, was greatly influenced by these two. In no way do I demean all four of their political abilities, but except for Moriarty, I'm quite satisfied the other three and I are basically not on the same frequency.

You see, my family has a creed. My mother and father would never do anything to hurt anybody. Even if they could take advantage of a situation, they wouldn't do it. I won't do it. My daughter won't do it. We've built our own lives and our own businesses without hurting anybody.

Ms. Boswell: I was wondering about all the hard work and the long hours that you kept. That must have taken a toll on family life.

Sen. Moore: Well, in 1967 Honora and I separated. I moved out of our home at 1400 39th East, and six months later she left for a new life in San Francisco. I moved back,

subsequently selling in 1971 to buy a house on Queen Anne at 1722 Bigelow North. We were actually married thirty-six years. We were divorced in 1973.

Ms. Boswell: And she is someone that you had met here in Olympia.

Sen. Moore: Yes. She was a precocious student. She was two years younger, but only a year behind me in school. I had a great love for her and I'm sorry to have hurt her so much. We're now good friends. I talked to her yesterday. I asked her if I could buy her lunch on her birthday, and she said, no, she was busy, but some other time sounds good.

Ms. Boswell: Was your working so hard, and being gone, part of the divorce, or was that a result of not such a good relationship?

Sen. Moore: I think it was probably a better than average marriage for those days, although we did grow apart. But I thought, "There's got to be something better, different. I can't go to my grave without having another look." So, I don't think it was the long hours. She had trouble getting up every morning and I had trouble not going to bed at night. I have great admiration for her. She has degrees till you won't believe it, I mean ranging from nursery school to law. She's a great student and a wonderful person.

Ms. Boswell: Did she have an interest in politics too, or not?

Sen. Moore: When I ran for ASUW vice-president, I lost by ten votes or something like that, and she didn't help me with her sorority. That could have made the difference.

Ms. Boswell: Just because she didn't want to get involved? She wasn't interested?

Sen. Moore: Yes. She thought it was a terrible waste of time.

Ms. Boswell: And so it was after your separation with Honora that you became involved with Jim McDermott's campaign for governor?

Sen. Moore: Well, we separated in 1967, and it was '71 when Jim McDermott asked me to be part of his campaign for the Democratic nomination for governor. He was a freshman House member at the time. Actually, I've felt badly that I supported Jim for governor in '72. Not that I've grown away from Jim, but he split enough of Martin Durkan's vote so that Rosellini was the Democratic nominee.

Now, this was probably as exceptional and talented trio as ever squared off in a Democrat gubernatorial primary since Martin, Schwellenbach, and Pemberton squared off in 1932. I had always been a Rosellini supporter, but Durkan was Ways and Means Committee chairman, and I thought, "No chairman of Ways and Means has ever been governor." Albert had been beaten by Evans in 1968, so I left two good men to help the "new white hope," Jim McDermott. Al Rosellini was nominated and beaten by Evans again. I feel Durkan would have beaten Evans. I certainly didn't make the difference, but I didn't do the best thing for Martin or the party. Amazingly, I am on good terms with Governor Al, Senator Durkan and Congressman McDermott. Maybe time does heal all!

Ms. Boswell: Tell me a little about Martin Durkan.

Sen. Moore: He was the ultimate politician—served the state well. As a senator, Durkan served sixteen years in the Senate under two governors, Rosellini and Evans. It seemed to me that whoever was governor, Martin always

had access. After he left the Legislature, he became a lobbyist whose effectiveness was a legend by the time I arrived in 1979. He was loyal and helped ex-legislators who, when defeated, often had a campaign deficit. Martin not only helped—he solved their problems. After the nomination, I was really bothered that I had helped kill Martin's future. He was a comer, smart enough to be a good governor.

Ms. Boswell: How did you become involved in Jim McDermott's campaign?

Sen. Moore: I can't really remember. There I was supporting the man who truly had little or no chance. Martin was well-organized and well-financed. Albert had his faithful followers. All Jim had was a new, untarnished image with no money.

Ms. Boswell: He was coming from the Legislature?

Sen. Moore: Yes. Jim came to my door in Washington Park in 1970 not once, but twice that summer and fall. We had never seen or heard of each other, but Jim obviously was looking for votes, and although I did not commit myself, I quietly voted for him for state Representative. He had something called "It." Otherwise how could he have broken tradition by being the first ever Democrat elected to the Legislature from the Forty-third District?

His only session in the House was spent in the minority, but his wiliness showed quickly. After his unsuccessful bid for governor in '74, he surfaced as a Senatorial candidate in his same district, the Forty-third. He won and eventually ended up as Ways and Means Committee chairman. As chairman he was slightly less secretive than his predecessors, but you still couldn't be sure which walnut shell your pork was under, if any.

Jim went on to Congress. He is, I feel, even better in Congress than in the state Senate. Possibly he's matured, but more likely because he always played better to a large audience. Jim is always on the side of the angels, and not afraid of any issue. As state senator, no one was more liberal. I've had very few bad moments with Jim, although we've had some severe disagreements. I always stopped to consider his pluses and minuses, and the pluses were always overwhelming. Now, who do you know who so consistently saw the merit of single-payer health insurance? This is just one of McDermott's liberal views. I'm with him on that one. He's an important voice for the general welfare.

Ms. Boswell: So it sounds like you two had a good relationship. You just came away from that particular campaign with some mixed feelings.

Sen. Moore: Yeah, but there was a bright side: Virginia Lloyd Kelton, who later became my second wife, seeing my name in the paper as a McDermott supporter, gave me a call.

Ms. Boswell: Oh, how did you two meet? I don't think I know that story.

Sen. Moore: Well, we had met once a long time ago. At the time, she was unmarried, and she was seeing a fellow who had been an all-coast quarterback for the University of Washington, and looked like Dick Tracy. When I was King County chairman, he was my assistant. Then he went to Korea and got shot up. When he came back, he and Virginia met somewhere. Then I met her in '56 at an Eisenhower party, and I thought, "Wow, that looks to me like the real thing." And I envied my friend, this fellow who had been my assistant. Then in '58, Virginia sent me five dollars when I ran for city council. Well, I

made it a point—that everybody who had supported me—I would call them or do something, and I called her and said, "Could we have coffee?" She said, "Yes."

She worked at the YWCA, and I worked in the Skinner Building, so I met her and we had coffee for a half hour or so, and I was very fascinated. She said later, "You know, I really wanted to make a move, but you were married." Things have changed! So she subsequently got married. First she had been married right out of school to a lieutenant in the army, but that was a dud, so then she worked for the Yakima newspaper, and she worked for the *Seattle Times.* Then, she met this colonel in the army and she married him. He and his family were very domineering. His father before him had been a colonel. They had a daughter, but thirteen years later, Virginia left him. That was the summer of 1971.

And then, in January of '72, she called me and said, "Do you remember me?" Wow, how could I forget her? She said, "I saw your name in the paper. You're on the committee with four or five people that are supporting McDermott for Governor. When did you become a Democrat?" I told her I'd really decided in 1964 when I chose to support Johnson in preference to Goldwater. She didn't say anything. Talked a little bit. I said, "Can I call you sometime?" She said, "Sure." So, two or three days later I called her, and we began keeping company. She was in the throes of a nasty divorce. I found her to be strong, attractive, humorous, determined to succeed, and suddenly I was in love or whatever happens to a sixty-year-old. We were in touch daily sharing our ups and downs. A year later I was divorced, as was she. A few months later we were married. She, her daughter Eileen, and their big gray cat, Casey, moved in. That's how the political team of Virginia and Ray was born, and we have been constant companions. I have a daughter, fifty, and Virginia has a daughter, thirty.

Ms. Boswell: That's great. When you were running for office in the seventies, by that time did being divorced have any effect on being elected? I know that early on it did make a difference.

Sen. Moore: In the twenties it would have killed you, but now it has no relevance. In fact, before I met Virginia, I had been "living in sin" with a young woman who later left me. My opponent never brought it up, because many, many people in Queen Anne were living in sin. Either that or they were gay. So, that's not an issue anymore. Neither is religion. They don't want to know, and that's good, because you're going to offend more people than you get, if you get into that.

Ms. Boswell: You had run for the Legislature in the forties, run for the city council in the fifties. Then you helped with McDermott's campaign. And then in '74 you ran against Eikenberry. What made you decide to get back into the legislative race again?

Sen. Moore: After nearly a year of marriage, we were returning from the ocean in the spring of '74 when Virginia asked what I really wanted to do with my life. I mentioned several things and she asked, "What really?" I blurted, "I want to run for the Legislature." She, in customary style, said, "Let's go home and look in the yellow pages to see what we can do." And so we did.

Ms. Boswell: You looked in the yellow pages?

Sen. Moore: It was just a figure of speech.

Ms. Boswell: You just got busy, in other words?

Sen. Moore: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: Okay. You hadn't been in it for a long time. How did you get the organization? You hadn't been a Democrat before when you ran.

Sen. Moore: It was difficult. I went to the Democratic Club's Thirty-sixth District meeting. Karen Marchioro was there and the district chairman was there, and they're sniffing like I'm a new dog on the block. They're not happy with me because, having been a Republican, how could I possibly try to be a Democrat? They were antagonistic to me. But, unknown to me, it turned out I had one ally that was worth all of them, and that was Helen Sommers. After a rocky start, we got to be on the same frequency.

Ms. Boswell: Why a rocky start? What had happened there?

Sen. Moore: Virginia and I came down to Olympia to a meeting that the House Democrats held to brief candidates on how to get elected. We broke for coffee about ten-thirty or so. I went out to get Virginia a coffee and get one for myself. I saw Helen Sommers. I walked over, and I said, "Ms. Sommers, I'm Ray Moore."

She said, "Yeah, I know."

Real friendly! So I said, "Sometime, I'd like to get together with you and talk about the issues, so we're on the same frequency."

She said, "Find your own issues," and walked off.

So, a few days later I got this little scrap of paper with half a dozen names on it with telephone numbers. It was signed, "Call these—Helen." So, I called them, and she'd already primed them. "Yeah, we're with you, yeah, we'll take a yard sign, yeah, we'll have a coffee hour." Every few days came another list.

Ms. Boswell: So she was sending you all these sort of terse notes. Why did she decide she'd go with you?

Sen. Moore: Well, she didn't like the other guy. In fact, when she ran against Eikenberry, her billboard said, "She's better than the other guy." So, I think that was kind of a process of elimination there—least worst probably! And, gradually, we got to be on very good terms. And now, I think that I am as close to Helen as nearly anyone. At a certain level, I really love her, which sounds strange, because Helen is not considered lovable—to me she is!

Ms. Boswell: Why do you suppose you're close?

Sen. Moore: I'm a sucker for brains. Talmadge, Adam Smith, Marty Brown, some others. I mean, if they've got brains, I want to know them. I want to be with them. I don't want to be with people that are even dumber than I am.

Ms. Boswell: What did she see in you? Why did she reciprocate?

Sen. Moore: I think that it may be the same relationship that Talmadge and I have. Talmadge thinks I'm his grandfather. She may have a feeling I'm her father. I think it's sort of like that. And, she likes Virginia.

One time I said, "Helen, I wish I had your vote-getting ability." And she said, "That's okay, but I'd trade places with you. People love you." Well, the ones that love me, love me. The ones that don't, they hate me. I think there's a certain straight forwardness and a sharp tongue that I have. But I'll go to the wall for Helen, as she knows. Every once in a while, she slips a little present to me in the budget. Never comes by and says, "Did you see what I did for you?" It's up to me to find it.

Ms. Boswell: What kind of things would that be?

Sen. Moore: Oh, I started Food Lifeline. We got so big that we needed a warehouse. Raising $800,000 for a warehouse is pretty difficult. Helen knew that I wanted that, so she helped to find money in the budget. She wanted to do something another time, and she put a million dollars in the budget for ACT Theatre because their request seemed logical and reasonable. As one of five founders of ACT, I like to think she helped a worthy cause—and me.

Ms. Boswell: How has she built and maintained her popularity in such a strong way?

Sen. Moore: It's unexplainable. I do not understand it. Sometimes she doesn't campaign. Doesn't have any folders printed up; goes years without anything to hand out. She's now become just a solid tradition. I can't really explain how. Some people have it, some people don't. She's Teflon. Nothing sticks to her, even when she does something that's halfway bad, it's always overlooked. The press loves her. I can't explain it. She has the championship stuff.

Ms. Boswell: Are there a number of people like that, or is that really rare? How frequently do you see something like that?

Sen. Moore: It's rare. Reagan had it. Helen has it. Karen Fraser has it. FDR, Dan Evans, Joel Pritchard, and Bill Clinton have it. Just a very few people. Helen's unassailable. She goes on these month-long trips right in the middle of the campaign, while everybody else is knocking themselves out. She's everybody's darling. The Municipal League wishes they could think up something better than "outstanding" to give her.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think she'll have a fall some day? Be that cavalier, and then all of a sudden trip up?

Sen. Moore: No, she'll go on. I think she'll quit at the top of her game, and that will be it!

Ms. Boswell: If she had that following, why hasn't she gone to a different office, or a higher office?

Sen. Moore: She didn't want to. If she'd gone for U.S. Senate, they'd never have heard of Patty Murray. She could have gone for governor any time from 1980 on. She could be congressman in her district. She could be county executive. She has her choice. Anything. Helen knows all the offices she could have had. We have one commonality: we need privacy.

She has a certain life that she likes. Being with people all the time is too much. She likes her little house in Magnolia. She likes to travel to faraway, exotic places. Can you imagine somebody who is writing the county budget putting a lesser amount in for her salary? She took a pay cut. And her theory was, "I can do all the work that's necessary in four hours. That's all I deserve to be paid. Why should I get eight hours?"

Ms. Boswell: That's a rare person.

Sen. Moore: Oh, she's almost as rare as the Dodo Bird. I'm flattered that she likes both Virginia and me.

Ms. Boswell: So, she was helpful in getting you back into the legislative races?

Sen. Moore: Yes, with Helen's help, I ran for the House against Ken Eikenberry. He beat me by 2,500 votes—pretty bad beating. Now, I'd lost so many times nobody can remember

how many, but the important fallout of that election was that I acquired Helen's support. As a freshman House member elected in 1972, she showed promise as a legislative great and continued to grow. And then an explosive thing happened. As the 1976 election time approached, Eikenberry decided he was going to replace her in the election. He said, "There isn't room for Helen Sommers and me in the House. I'm going to run and take her out."

Well, a fact of life in Senate history is that four Kinnears have served in the Legislature—J.R in the late 1800s, Ritchey in the early 1900s, Roy in the '40s and, of course, George, who served in the House from 1939 to 1943 and again from 1947 to 1951. All were conservative in the best sense, and highly regarded. George lived in the original Kinnear mansion on Queen Anne Avenue on the property now occupied by Bay View Manor. I'm sure Eikenberry figured Republican publisher and Senator John Murray would support him to get rid of the newly elected Representative Sommers. And I'm sure he left George Kinnear out of his thinking because George had moved to Mercer Island.

Near the end of a vicious campaign by Eikenberry, with little response from Sommers, there appeared a double page ad in Murray's *Queen Anne-Magnolia News* giving Ken one of the great coups de grâce in my political span of sixty years. Signed by George Kinnear! Come election day, the voters turned Eikenberry out by about the same vote as Eikenberry beat me just two years earlier. It was a rough fight, but she retired Eikenberry from the legislative scene.

Even with Eikenberry on her hands she gave me a lot of support. Of course, after three defeats—Senate 1946, City Council 1958, and House 1974—I was sure I was finished, but when Eikenberry vacated his seat to take on Sommers the Democrats had no candidate, except Emmett McCormick, whom I had defeated in 1974. So with a little nudge from Helen, and knowing the political virus was alive and well within me, I filed.

The Republicans came up with Joe Taller, a Boeing supervisor. He was a very nice guy. Very proper, every hair in place, perfect collar, perfect tie, perfect suit, said all the right things. I, on the other hand, was just a rumpled old man, still ambitious beyond his talent and sort of flip. Even so, my resume was filled with thirty years of good works and community involvement. Joe's brochure was slick, professional, but had little substance. Among his accomplishments he highlighted "Winner, Golden Acorn Award." Nobody I knew had ever heard of it. I worked very hard, doorbelling eight hours every day for six months, and in spite of my previous losses I thought I would win. Well, I guess more people were impressed with "Golden Acorn" than me. I lost by seven hundred votes, in spite of Helen's support. I knew then, for sure, that there was no hope. Here I had a cinch seat and I blew it.

Ms. Boswell: Is the Golden Acorn Award really the reason you think he won, ultimately?

Sen. Moore: No. I think I blew it. I don't know how I blew it, but I did something wrong. I just don't think I spent the money right. I can't really say. I think I screwed it up, but I like to joke about the Golden Acorn Award.

After I lost that election, I was absolutely convinced I could never be elected and my life should revolve around home and business. Virginia had just come into the brokerage business and life was good. Back in 1969, I left Bache and went with another New York firm that wanted a Seattle branch: Shearson, Hammill. Strangely they gave me a $45,000 bonus to go with them, the same amount Bache paid for me ten years earlier. I used to joke that I was a $45,000 man and could prove it.

Virginia and I also owned that restaurant in Bozeman, Montana and had decided to move there to fully enjoy a new experience. In addition, we were planning to go to Europe in the fall of ’78. So, what with our plans for the future, 1977 was a good and peaceful year—too good to last.

CHAPTER 5

AN ELECTED OFFICIAL

Ms. Boswell: Now, in 1978, things are about to change for you.

Sen. Moore: Yes. In January 1978, Helen Sommers asked if I would run for the Senate seat occupied by John Murray, a longtime acquaintance and, as I mentioned, publisher of the *Queen Anne and Magnolia News*. She came to me and said, "If we can't find a candidate"—she'd become the unoffical maharani of the Thirty-sixth District—"if I can't find anybody else, would you run against John Murray?" I laughed and said this was one of the more ridiculous ideas I'd ever heard. She pressed her case, tantalizing me with the suggestion she'd try to find someone else, but if she couldn't, would I do it? I asked why. She said, "You're credible."

I laughed, "I always thought of myself as 'incredible.'" We all laughed and, maybe I'd had a second Manhattan, I said, "I don't want to, but if that's the way it works out, I'll run."

I gave it little or no further thought until she said in June, "I can't find anyone."

I said, "I can't beat Murray," to which she responded, "You can at least keep him busy." I really wanted to try one more time so, despite our plans, Virginia and I easily succumbed and I filed.

Helen obviously knew John Murray's and my strengths and weaknesses better than I. He had the paper, name familiarity, was nearly a generation younger, and certainly better looking. His negatives were high: he didn't answer calls or letters; the business community did not like his excessively high advertising rates; and he was generally considered arrogant. But I had always liked him, and I did not assess his negatives properly.

My strengths were from labor, teachers, social workers, seniors, and liberals in general. My weaknesses were numerous: I was age sixty-six; had neither a memorable face nor personality; had a sharp tongue; an inability to speak publicly; and, in common with Murray, I was not a lover of people or crowds. Nonetheless, on the last day of filing, I filed. Then Virginia and I jumped in our car, and headed for Bozeman, Montana for a visit.

We stopped at Vantage to phone the office and were told John Murray had called and had to talk. So I called him. He was very upset that I'd filed for his Senate seat. He pointed out we'd known each other a long time and we both had the same ideas, etc., etc. After quite a harangue I suggested he had no need to worry about me. After all, I was overage, had a reputation as a four-time loser, no campaign, no money, no charisma, etc. He was unconvinced and asked that I withdraw. I told him he was lucky to have me as an opponent.

A few days later we returned from Montana and started a tremendous campaign. We just gave it everything we had. Politically, it was do or die. There were two huge issues: a city election on a gay rights issue, and a state initiative on mandatory school busing. John was very active on behalf of both issues. It was assumed by interested proponents of the gay measure that I was with them because of my forty-year civil rights record. For whatever reason I was not asked to participate. As it turned out, this issue became ugly and Senator Murray was identified as a prime mover. Plus, it was rumored his marriage was coming

unglued and maybe he was gay. It was rotten. And it damaged him with nominally GOP rednecks.

But, the real issue was mandatory school busing and his public endorsement really hurt him. As it turned out, the hotbed of anti-busers was Magnolia, a major part of our district. They asked me to participate. The hard-core-liberal Democrats who controlled the party machinery in our district were pro-busing. This dilemma was easily solved. I was, in fact, anti-busing. I told the anti-busers (mostly GOP) that I was in a tight race and I needed to keep the liberal Democrats mollified by not making it an issue, but that if elected I would support anti-busing in the Legislature. By this time they would do anything to derail Murray.

Throughout the race we were advertising in John's newspaper, running cartoons of John and me with such captions as "Why worry with Murray?" That seemed to catch on. And then we had a cartoon that we ran in his paper. It showed two kids on a teeter-totter. The caption didn't make any sense, but people seemed to think it was funny. It said, "Move over John, it's Ray's turn." I think sometimes the ridiculous catches on. Somehow or other it tickled people.

Ms. Boswell: And he let that run in his paper? Was that ever an issue about media access in the region?

Sen. Moore: No. He liked the money, and he was sure he was going to win. He told his caucus he didn't have any problem at all a week before the election. Some of them were beginning to wonder. A lot of them knew me from the old days, you see. They knew I was one tenacious scrambler. Republican Senate leader Jim Matson and others felt, "Watch out for this old bastard, he's wily enough and nobody works as hard." That was what they were all saying. "If hard work counts, you're in trouble, John."

Ms. Boswell: How do you translate hard work in a campaign? Is it the number of doorbells you ring?

Sen. Moore: Well, that's part of it. And the post office. Somehow or other, we'd get an anonymous phone call as soon as Murray drove up with another mailing. We had connections everywhere. All the little people, you see. The little people can hurt or help. Never underestimate their effectiveness. They knew I was one of them.

I also used to have my finance chairman, George Lane, drive me up to the end of the bus line, in Magnolia, where I'd get on. You're not supposed to campaign on a bus. I would start down the aisle handing out my folders and the driver would say, "You can't do that." So, I'd stop, and wouldn't do it any more. And people are reaching out, "Give me one." It was interesting. If it was a white driver, very often I had a problem, but all the black drivers would pull the shade down behind them so they couldn't see what was going on, and let me go because I was a civil rights-er, and they knew it.

And then I'd get off the bus. The bus driver would demand that I get off, so I'd get off as soon as we'd cross the Garfield Street bridge, and George Lane was right behind the bus in his car. He'd pick me up, U-turn, and we'd go back and do it again. We worked at that for about an hour and a half every morning. I made some friends—people I still hear from. They laugh, "Remember when we met on the bus?" One of these was a Filipino man who looked at my folder and made it clear he didn't believe my civil rights record. That was about 7:30 a.m. After this routine, I went to the brokerage office as usual. The phone rang. It was the man on the bus. I guess he had checked me out. He said, "I didn't believe you. Could we talk?" It turned out he was a leader in the Filipino community in Magnolia and he helped me a lot.

Ms. Boswell: And so that made the difference? Some of those strategies?

Sen. Moore: Yeah. Anyway, one day near the end of the campaign I saw Murray doorbelling, and the next day I covered where he'd been. In the words of one woman who answered the door, "Oh, I know who you are, but yesterday that SOB Murray came by—first time in twelve years and I told him to get off my porch or I'd call the cops." I had a suspicion Murray was in trouble. Our campaign was managed magnificently, and I had good support, although based on thirty-four years of losing, I'm sure none of us thought we'd win.

Murray was the father of mandatory school busing. Our district voted by a three-to-one ratio against busing, and I still was only able to squeak through, even with that. As a big plus, the fact that he was way out in front on the gay rights issue certainly helped. I was totally with him, but the issue never came up about me. They were just after him. So, the rest is history. After thirty-two years of defeat, I slid in with a six hundred vote win. The next time I won by 10,000, the next time I won by 5,000, last time by perhaps 4,000.

Ms. Boswell: It was just that one break through and then—

Sen. Moore: I knew they'd never beat me because I saw a vacuum. Nobody was taking care of the constituents. Helen Sommers is so bright, and so good, that it would be a total waste of her time to be spending time worrying about whether somebody lost their food stamps. What I did was good for both of us. It freed her up because Virginia soon became the district problem solver, and I knew that I had no upward mobility. I couldn't go anyplace from here, and I was just intent on getting a .500 batting average. I had lost four times, and I wanted to win four times, and so I did. Of all the opponents I faced over a forty-four year period, I liked John Murray the best, and I'm not sure the best man won.

We had planned a party at the Washington Athletic Club for election night. My plan was to thank people and announce they'd never have to support me again. Instead I thanked them and promised to keep office hours 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. every day of the year and that promise was never broken. Virginia and I were available. A longtime friend, Gil Houghton, asked me at the election party, "Why did you keep running all those years?"

I said, "I just wanted to beat somebody." I suspect my motive was not an isolated, rare case.

Ms. Boswell: Reading some of the newspaper articles, I noticed labor claimed a role in your victory in 1978, I guess because of their campaign donations, in particular. Was labor really a big factor in that year?

Sen. Moore: Labor was a big factor, and Mark Brown, who is now director of Labor and Industries, was our advisor. He was then with the state employees organization. Their contribution in effort and time made a tremendous difference because, having been defeated four times in my life, I didn't attract a lot of volunteers. And so they sprung to and really did a whale of a job for me. The AFL-CIO in Seattle, particularly the Central Labor Council, were a big help, too. Very big help with yard signs. The firefighters built my yard signs, and that's a job in itself, getting hundreds and hundreds of those built so they'll stand the rain and wind. They had a technique that was very good, probably the best in the state at the time. I had really tremendous help. I always felt that if I had lived in England, I would have been a Laborite. They knew that way back when I ran for city council. They supported me then, although I've never been a union member.

Ms. Boswell: Why this year, in particular, did you get help, and maybe not so much in previous years?

Sen. Moore: They did not like John Murray for a variety of reasons. One was that they alleged that he didn't answer phone calls and he didn't answer mail. Second, they wanted a Democrat, and they knew from past performance, that when I was dedicated to something, I stayed put. I wasn't going to waffle. So, it was a natural alliance between me and labor.

Ms. Boswell: During that same year, labor also conducted what I guess you would call a negative campaign against Augie Mardesich. Wasn't that that year? 1978?

Sen. Moore: That's right.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me a little bit about that. Were you privy to that? What was the thought on that?

Sen. Moore: Well, I don't really know what went on there. I really did not know Mardesich until after he was defeated, and then he used to come to Olympia. He's a tremendous personality. It's almost impossible not to like him. He did a little lobbying, and I can't remember for whom, but I liked him.

Augie must have been a joy to serve with. You know, he may have invented speed-reading, making him dangerous. In addition, he knew what he read and remembered! He read almost every bill. He also knew the Senate rules. And, to top it off, he was aggressive, ambitious to rule the Senate. He had only one serious hurdle—to be undisputed king of the caucus. But Bob Greive, in his own non-confrontive way, held the power. I sometimes likened Augie to California's Jesse Unruh who made legislating into a full-time profession. Mardesich was intent on improving legislators' pay—and particularly retirement. He was tough, had an unreal knowledge of legislative rules and protocol—equaled only by Vic Meyers, John Cherberg, Sid Snyder, and Marty Brown—in addition to which he could read people. Augie eventually prevailed over Greive and became a dynamic leader.

But then, of course, the fellow that defeated him, Larry Vognild, was elected the same time I was, so we had a particular kinship. Talmadge, Vognild, and I came here at the same time as new people that had never been in the Legislature. Tub Hansen was elected to the Senate the same time, but he'd been in the House.

Ms. Boswell: Is there something to the notion that when you come in to the Senate, or the Legislature in general, that you're a class? That there are some of those ties? What is the nature of those ties?

Sen. Moore: Well, it's natural, because you're sitting in the back row. Talmadge had seat forty-nine, I had forty-eight, and Vognild had forty-seven, and Hansen forty-six, as far back as you can get. And so, the people who are senior to you are sitting up front, and I suppose there's a little natural jealousy—"I want to be up there, too." And so, as a result of that, and maybe other factors, you begin to feel that you're a unit. Although Vognild, Talmadge and I are quite different in some ways, we have always able to support each other in, I suppose, nine-out-of-ten cases. We were all compatible, but I must admit I was so overwhelmed, living vicariously through Phil, that I did not realize Larry was a man of considerable talent. Different from Phil, but just as important.

Ms. Boswell: How about when Vognild was running against Mardesich—are there ways that other candidates can help? Do you help each other in the campaigns, or not particularly?

Sen. Moore: When I ran, for example, I was encouraged to run by Helen. I said, "I can't win. I've been defeated four times. I'm a joke of a candidate." And she said, "No, just file, you'll at least keep Murray busy," which meant, in the vernacular, that he would be kept busy in his own district, and not able to siphon money off from his coffers to somebody else. He'd also be pinned down in the district as far as going out and helping anybody else. I've gone out and helped other people who needed help. I was perhaps not running the same year that they did, so I had the opportunity of freedom of choice.

Ms. Boswell: So there is something to that, then, that you could in fact influence another race somewhere else?

Sen. Moore: More then than now. Now, you can't give any money out of your campaign fund to any other candidate, so that makes it more difficult. There's a dilution factor that takes place there, because you have to give your money to the central committee or the caucus. And, of course, who knows after you once make that donation, what they will decide to do with it. You kind of have to trust them.

Ms. Boswell: You were talking about your back-row experiences when you got to the Senate. What was it like? Can you remember back to that first session after you were elected?

Sen. Moore: I remember the first day because I had only met Talmadge once before. It was during the campaign. I had gone to a lunch at the Catholic Seaman's Club. There were two seats left, and the place was so crowded that a huge young man and I sat at the head table, but with our backs to the audience. And so, there was nobody that we could look out there and see, or make conversation about, and within thirty seconds, we hated each other. His name was Phil Talmadge, about to be elected senator at age twenty-six from adjoining West Seattle. Turns out that he was pro-mandatory school busing, and I thought it was a terrible idea. We made our positions perfectly clear, and I really froze. I thought, "I really don't like this guy." I went home and told Virginia that I sat next to this guy who I swore was a fugitive from an "Our Gang" comedy. I just didn't like him. So, the first day I arrived in the Legislature, there I am seated next to him.

Right away, Talmadge is on his feet, and he's making his first speech within an hour or two of the session opening. Vognild didn't say anything for quite a while, and I didn't want to say anything, didn't feel I had anything to say. So, my dislike for Talmadge was accentuated.

After the opening day swearing-in was done, we adjourned to our offices. Phil's office was next to mine. His wife, Darlene, came by holding their second baby, Matthew. The baby looked exactly like Phil Talmadge! Exactly! So, I got to laughing so hard, and she said, "He does look like Phil, doesn't he?" And then she said to me, "Are you as crude as Phil?"

And I said, "I hope so," not really knowing what I was admitting to. Remember, in 1979 senators drank spirits, smoked cigars, and behaved like people. Anyway, she laughed, and an hour later Phil came in and sat down. We had a beer together and things started going very well.

As I listened to him, I knew I was in the presence of an unusually bright person. I've always been a sucker for brains, so all of a sudden, my dislike dissipated and I forever after respected and loved him. I don't care about personalities as much as I do brains. We've had some other unique minds here. Kent Pullen. We'd never be best friends, but I recognized I was in the presence of a thoughtful person with whom I didn't agree.

Ms. Boswell: In Talmadge's case, what is it particularly, that you find intriguing about his mind?

Sen. Moore: Sometimes we used to drive back and forth to Olympia together. He'd be sitting there, this huge man sitting in this little seat next to me, and he'd have a yellow pad, and he'd be talking about baseball or something, and he'd be writing a bill at the same time. I thought, "This guy is really something else." And then I found out that the bills he wrote were so perfect, that even his references to RCWs were so accurate, that when they went to the code reviser, they rarely made a change. That never happens to anybody.

Later on I would say to him, "Phil, remember five years ago when you wrote the dog bite bill?" This legislation set penalties for people who allowed dogs to attack and injure people.

He said, "Yeah."

I said, "Phil, what was the number of that bill?" He gave me the number. What a talent. That kind of memory fascinates me, and it isn't just the vignettes that tantalize me, it's that ability to have four or five balls in the air at one time and keep them going. He could have half a dozen pieces of legislation, major pieces, and could speak with authority on all of them accurately. Always factual, didn't embellish the truth hoping it would be more dynamic.

Phil has a liability that has cost him dearly—he doesn't suffer fools lightly. I've noticed some great politicians can listen to drivel, actually appearing interested, all the while thinking, "How can I use this time-waster to my advantage?" I've actually seen Richard Nixon and Warren Magnuson use these types, often to mutual advantage. Manipulation never crosses Phil's mind. He feels the facts, as he marshals them, can, should, will speak for themselves, and will prevail. He's a unique person. My hope for him is happiness, which may mean governor or U.S. Senate—better yet, baseball commissioner. Like I've said since we are forty years and four days apart, subliminally he may very well see me as a grandfather.

Ms. Boswell: How much advantage, or is there an advantage, to being a lawyer and a legislator?

Sen. Moore: It helps because an attorney can bluff his or her way through, as opposed to the rest of us. We're kind of in awe, but if a person really has it, you find out in a week or two. If they're just flannel mouthing and carrying on, you begin to discount them, whether they have a law degree or not.

Ms. Boswell: So, their role in the Legislature is more than just presence and polish?

Sen. Moore: I can think of some lawyers who have been in the Legislature, and some are here now, that I wouldn't take a case to. On the other hand, there are some here that I would really relish the opportunity, if I needed one, to have them as my attorney.

Ms. Boswell: So it's more of an individual thing.

You said when you were there in the back row, you didn't speak for a while. You were an accomplished politician, though—is there really an awe about starting out in the Legislature?

Sen. Moore: I was here when the building was built, and I do have a reverence for the Legislature, the building, the institution itself. So, I was really in awe. I listened to other people speaking with authority on the floor, and I quickly realized that I really didn't have anything to say. I'm not sure, but I think that maybe one of the first times I spoke was on the dog bite bill. Of course, everybody understands dog bites, so I felt as comfortable

as anybody else speaking on it. I always feel that I'm at a loss for words. Often times, when I think back, I think I could have done this better, I could have said such and such. I'm not at ease speaking. Some people think that I am, but I'm really quite shy.

Ms. Boswell: What kind of preparation did the Legislature provide to you as a freshman senator? Did they have any kind of training, or other kinds of help, in the beginning?

Sen. Moore: Well, the assistant secretary of the Senate, Bill Gleason, came around to us and said, "What can I do? What do you need to know?" Well, you didn't know what to ask. Since that time they've had some training classes on things—where is the code reviser, physically? Where do you go to find things? They have it for secretaries, administrative assistants, and so on. However, a change took place. Training classes had less to do with the legislative process and more to do with diversity, sexual harassment, and political correctness, whatever that is!

Ms. Boswell: Is that enough? How long does it take to really get comfortable in terms of proposing legislation and getting it through?

Sen. Moore: In the case of Talmadge, it was about one day. With me, it was maybe two or three years. Vognild, on anything pertaining to labor—he'd been through hundreds of labor negotiations as a fireman—felt very comfortable in that arena. He probably needed the first couple of months, but it was a very long session that year. It went 160 days or something like that. I was very slow to develop. I recall I was scared of how Slim Rasmussen would impale me as I was explaining a bill on the floor. He would reach for his microphone, stand and wait for Lieutenant Governor Cherberg to recognize him, and then he would face me. Then he would ask the words I grew to dread, "Would Senator Moore yield to a question?" Now, no matter how well you knew the bill being debated, he *always* hit you with something pertinent but for which you were totally unprepared. He *always* listened attentively, acting as if he were unaware of your suffering. When you finished your answer, he would thank you—but that was if he liked you! If not, he had follow up questions that made you think how pleasant an IRS audit is.

Ms. Boswell: On the other hand, you had a lot of previous political experience. Did that set you apart at all from some of the other freshmen?

Sen. Moore: I think it occurred to some of them that I had a lot of experience, and the fact that I'd been a Republican made me more unique. People asked me, "How come you changed?" And as I told them, it seemed to be okay. Republicans were not as ornery as they could have been to me, I think, because so many years had passed since I was county chairman. I think probably the fact that I was already sixty-six made a difference, too. I think they realized I probably had no upward mobility. At first, I think they were sure that I could never be reelected again, because the district had been sending Republicans for a long time, except for Helen Sommers. She broke the ice, and she became kind of the darling of the district, so everybody voted for her. She was kind of everybody's conscience. So, the Republicans said, "Well, we're going to be fair, we'll vote for Helen, and then we'll vote straight Republican." So, other people had trouble winning.

Ms. Boswell: At least thinking back to the very beginning sessions, was it what you expected? You had run several times, you finally get there, is it what you had hoped?

Sen. Moore: Yes. I had that part well in mind, because I had lobbied for mental health and against capital punishment many years before, and as a boy, I was over in the gallery a lot of the time, and even in the governor's office occasionally. Physically, I kind of knew my way around. But, there were parliamentary maneuvers that I didn't understand, didn't know about, because the Senate has its own rules as opposed to Reed's or Roberts'. So, you can know a lot and still not know much.

That first session was long, at least five months. Virginia took over our office as a volunteer, and although we had a secretary she really took charge, and at no pay. We, of course, noticed a big change in our income, a drop from $75,000 to $9,600. But we adjusted, and for the first time, we were doing something we enjoyed. Toward the end of our first year, Phil and I had lunch with a reporter—off the record, I thought. A foundation had offered to fund a "legislative humanist." I said that was sort of like an "ethical big businessman." The reporter managed to get it on the front page of the *Seattle Times.* I never spoke with him again. Shearson's management feigned outrage, suggesting I resign. Since we didn't like each other I said, "Sounds good to me." So I left and continued as a full-time senator on part-time pay. We moved our licenses to a smaller firm, but we were too busy to do any business, so we were brokers in name only.

Ms. Boswell: You've spoken highly of Talmadge, but did you have any other people who you really respected?

Sen. Moore: Oh, Jim Matson was the best of the best. Phil Talmadge first saw him at close range in January, 1979, and we both laughed. Here was Humphrey Bogart's double, even to the cigarette. We loved him and thought he was a perfect minority leader. When he was ousted, I thought, "This is the dumbest move the GOP could make," but the hard-liners in their caucus couldn't wait to push their "money comes first" philosophy. Anyway, I was never in a cooperative mood from that moment forward and that was okay with them, because they couldn't and wouldn't compromise on anything. Jim Matson was a big orchardist, an outstanding woodworker, and a brilliant legislator. No matter how heated the debate, I don't think anyone ever left thinking, "Matson didn't give me a chance." I've been enraged by Hayner, Metcalf, von Reichbauer, West, Linda Smith, Eleanor Lee, to name a few, but never by Jim Matson. A truly lovable character.

Ms. Boswell: Did you have any other mentors, people who helped you learn the ropes?

Sen. Moore: Senator Bill Day. "Big Daddy" Day was a very kind man, and an unusually gifted politician. He phoned me after I was elected, maybe a couple of weeks later, and said, "I'd like to have you be vice chairman of the committee," which was Social and Health Services. It had a huge staff, and, in those days, was a very important committee. So, I thought about that and made a few phone calls. Big Daddy had previously put a coalition together in the House, and I had heard that I might not want to be that closely allied with him. But, I checked around, and people said, "Take it," so I was vice chairman of his big committee.

Well, he ran it, and he was a good mentor. He had me sit next to him, and he would say, "Watch this person," when they'd come up to testify. And then, he'd impale them with some question that pretty much proved that they didn't know what they were talking about.

He was also very kind to people who were nervous. One day in a Social and Health Services Committee meeting hearing the first person to testify had come from the Colville Valley, a 350 mile trip. She was obviously

scared. Typically, Senator Day looked at the list of people to testify, and seeing her name said, "Is it okay with you if I call you Mildred?"

Feeling a little more at ease she said, "Most people call me Millie."

He said to one of the staff, "Move that microphone over so it's convenient for Millie." He then said to Millie, "Do you ever fish in Waits Lake," which was close to her Chewelah address.

"Oh, yes, Senator, but I liked it better when the lake was full of perch."

"Now Millie you've come a long way—please tell us your ideas." Well, she was now relaxed and talked right along. As she got going she was calling him Bill, because he was very gentle. Now that is the sign of a real chairman. I learned so much, which helped later on, just by watching and listening to him. He was very kind. He had a terrible reputation, which in my view, was undeserved.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me a little bit more about his reputation.

Sen. Moore: Well, he was a chiropractor. Having a chiropractor in charge of Social and Health Services was, in the view of doctors and dentists, absolutely an outrage. Just an outrage against society in general, and them in particular. So, they were out after him. Several things happened.

He was sort of a swashbuckler in a way. He was strong, and he was a huge man, very imposing, and very at ease on his feet. So, they set about to try to destroy him. The largest donation that had ever been made, I believe, in the state's history, was made against him when he ran the last time in 1980. I think it was something like $20,000 from the dentists. The chiropractors had been having a field day for quite a few years. The doctors would have bills in trying to say that you could only go to a chiropractor if you were referred by an M.D., and things like that. So, it got very tense.

But, Bill Day knew everybody. He was just everywhere, and had been in Spokane for a long, long time. As an example, he was driving down the street one day, and he saw a prostitute that he had known from way back as a chiropractic patient, and she said, "Hi Bill." He stopped his car, didn't get out, but stopped and talked to her for a few minutes, the next thing you knew, it's all over the *Spokesman Review*, that he'd approached a prostitute. Things like that. The M.D.s finally just destroyed him in 1980. Bob McCaslin defeated him in a nasty election that year. In all fairness to Bob, he did not personally attack Bill. He didn't have to. His allies in the medical dental profession did it for him.

When Bob arrived in 1981, I took a dim view of him, feeling he was a lightweight and a buffoon. As time passed, I had to revise my attitude. Bob is a kind man who would always help when someone had a problem. I guess the clincher was when Cherberg told me he was okay! Bob's an independent thinker, and he's still around. But that was the end of Bill Day as a public figure.

Ms. Boswell: Why did he choose you as vice chairman?

Sen. Moore: He had checked me out pretty thoroughly, I found out later, so I have a feeling that he was looking for respectability. The fact that I had been a Republican gave me some credentials in his eyes. All the years I had been in politics I was always fair to the opposition. Looking at the rest of the people, he could have asked Talmadge and been better off probably, but he chose me.

Ms. Boswell: You had a long record of working in health-related issues, as well.

Sen. Moore: Yes. He knew all about that, and he used that as a reason when he approached

me. He said, "You know, you've been working in mental health, in the penal institutions, and all these things that we have something to do with. You'll be a help." I wasn't a help, but at least I learned a lot listening to him. To this day, when I'm chairman, I operate somewhat like Bill Day. I always take the person who lives the farthest away first. If they live in Colville, they come before the ones who live in Wenatchee. And the last ones that get called are ones that are here in Olympia, mostly lobbyists. And he did that. I learned quite a bit.

Ms. Boswell: Anyone else that you particularly admired?

Sen. Moore: I loved Al Henry. He was a dynamic figure. First elected in 1941, he'd been in the Legislature forever, at least so it seemed. Governors came and went—Langlie, Wallgren, Langlie again, Rosellini, Evans, and Ray. Al was there all along and everyone knew him. He was chairman of the Transportation Committee, a powerful person, so powerful that he rarely bothered to come to caucus. People came to Al Henry. He was even larger than Bill Day. This was an era of huge men, physically, in the Senate. Al Henry had to weigh over 300 pounds. He was a prodigious eater. Breakfast was horrendous: five plate-sized hotcakes, ten strips of bacon, four eggs, all of which swam in maple syrup. He started with fruit and finished with cups of coffee. The exciting part of breakfast in the Senate dining room was watching Senator Henry's routine: an empty platter was set in front of him, then a platter of hotcakes, another with strips of bacon, and a another housing four fried eggs. He carefully began building his breakfast. A hotcake was placed on the empty platter; next, two bacon strips followed by an egg. He was meticulous in building his breakfast, following the same pattern until all food was carefully in place and swimming in maple syrup. Then, with knife and fork, he ripped it asunder! After five minutes or so he finished his first meal of the day and was ready for all comers.

When I was in Olympia High School, Al was the terror of Southwest Washington high school football. He was a lineman for Centralia, and, although they didn't have much of a team, he was so fierce he kept them in contention. There was no grass in those days, and he'd pick up handfuls of mud. He was a huge person, even then. He was probably a 180 or 200 when he was in high school. He'd have these hands full of mud, and he'd just throw them in your face. Then he'd just charge forward, just knocking everybody down. Very colorful. And, to top it off, his personality was very kind. He and Lieutenant Governor Cherberg had much in common: both had played football, had long memories, could handle any occasion, and were loyal to a fault. There was one significant difference—they both could hate, but Cherberg did it silently, Henry volubly.

Al Henry had almost forty years in the Legislature. He was strong-willed, and blessed with unsurpassed wit. He did not waste time deciding whether or not he liked someone. He was uncanny in how he decided whether someone was worth wasting time on. He was almost always right. I had a modest but good relationship with Al, so when Talmadge needed money for the West Seattle bridge, he came to me. Talmadge was a little reluctant because Al Henry was such a beast when it came to approaching him—he could kick you around just to find out how tough you were—so I arranged for Phil to meet Al Henry. Well, when these two met, 700 pounds stood pressing the flesh. I felt like a midget. They fell in love right away. I don't know if it was because they were both large men or what, but anything Phil wanted, Al was always there to help him get it. Phil was the one that really got the money for the West Seattle bridge.

Other people have taken credit, but it was Phil and Al. Take my word for it—I was there! Al was generous. One of the last of nature's noblemen.

Ms. Boswell: So both Day and Henry you see as a different kind of style politician, then?

Sen. Moore: Oh yes. That was the old style. They were on their way out by the time I arrived. I could see that. Public disclosure, I believe, was the start of the end.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me why that would be.

Sen. Moore: There are certain personalities that don't want to put up with a whole lot of filling out useless forms, complying with what they view as useless regulations. They are truly out of the Old West. They are good people, but they're nonconformists—and now, there's no room for a nonconformist in the Legislature. I'm about as nonconformist as you can be here, anymore.

Ms. Boswell: Why has that changed, typically?

Sen. Moore: The Public Disclosure Commission has you in a straight jacket. And every time there's a new one of these initiatives, like 134 that passed, it puts a tighter restriction on you. You can't give money to a friend who's running for office out of your campaign fund, you can't do this, you can't do that. It's all open to public scrutiny. You're vulnerable all the time, and there's no credit given for good deeds. I voted against 276, the initiative that started the public disclosure, and I haven't changed my mind. There is a direct correlation between the birth of the PDC and the astronomical increase in campaign spending. The proliferation of political action committees gave those with money undue power, thereby doing a huge disservice to the public. The first director of the PDC, Graham Johnson, was superb. He had judgment. Since his departure, objectivity has disappeared

Ms. Boswell: Some people would argue to you that it's cleaning up politics, that it's exposing corruption that existed. What's your response?

Sen. Moore: You can pass all the laws that you want to, but the human mind is so constructed that it will find a way around. When I came here, there was a little pamphlet of public service contracts—PDC had only been in effect five or six years when I arrived. That book now has grown, infinitely faster than government, or faster than inflation, or any other gauge that you might want to use, because now, people are getting public service contracts, and that's supposed to be okay.

You see, before the Public Disclosure Initiative, contracting for state services was within the authority of the various departments of state government. They were awarded based on price and/or ability to perform. "Public service contracts" are now the custom, and how are these awarded? Anyone may bid provided they can meet the specifications. Sounds reasonable, right? Here's the catch: it is still easy to give the contract to the right person by writing the "specs" so that only the right person can qualify. Thus bids become moot. The public is no better protected than before.

I'm not even sure there was that much corruption to begin with. I've always felt that ninety-nine percent of all public employees, including legislators, are absolutely careful with the public trust. Some of them may have some prejudices, but they can support those prejudices with, at least to them, and others maybe, legitimate arguments. So, I don't think you ever clean it up. I don't think it was ever that bad. It's just like everything else. Why is it, on the cover of *Fortune 500 Magazine* or

Time, they show somebody who is a fabulous businessman, for example? Well, that's because there are so few fabulous businessmen, and the same thing pertains here. There are so few people that are trying to beat the game in government that going after them, in my view, should not be a major item, because you're helping destroy the whole institution when you do that. You're degrading it in the eyes of the public.

Ms. Boswell: It seems in the late seventies period, when you came in, there was a lot of that going on. Mardesich later. Walgren. The public eye was on what they had done. Greive was gone by the time you got here, wasn't he?

Sen. Moore: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: There have been a number of fairly public situations.

Sen. Moore: I think the only one in question that you've mentioned—first of all, let me back up a minute. Walgren, in my view, was framed. Bagnariol, probably, unquestionably guilty. Mardesich, guilty. Greive just did what he could to further the interests of the Democratic caucus, and did not violate any law. So, there are so few of them, really. It's interesting you mentioned Walgren, because there's no proof of guilt. None, to this day. But the perception, you see, is there. You picked up on that, just like everybody else would.*

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about Walgren's situation in particular. Why do you think he was framed?

Sen. Moore: This is my own personal opinion. I think that it was a vendetta between him and the district attorney at the time, going back thirty years, or twenty, or some such. There is a story, which I never inquired into, that Walgren succeeded in getting the woman that the district attorney was seeing away from him, and the guy had been waiting for Walgren for years. I don't know the district attorney, but my impression was that he was a guy capable of getting even. Walgren never did

*In 1972, Sen. Mardesich challenged Sen. Bob Greive's nearly 20-year run as Senate floor leader. Sen. Mardesich drew public attention to what became known as the "Greive Fund," a fund to finance the campaigns of Democratic candidates. Sen. Mardesich alleged that Sen. Greive only gave contributions from the fund to Democratic candidates that supported his continued position as floor leader. Sen. Greive denied the allegation. No formal investigation or charge was ever brought against Sen. Greive, but the rumors were enough to turn public sentiment against him, and he was ousted as floor leader. He left the Senate in 1975, and continues to maintain his innocence.

Sen. Mardesich was investigated in 1975 by a Senate Committee for allegedly accepting a bribe, as well as transferring funds meant for Democratic Senate campaigns into his personal account. Though he broke no laws, the committee found him to be in violation of Senate Ethics. He resigned of his own will shortly before he was charged. The Senate never tried to censure him. After his resignation, Sen. Mardesich was charged in a civil case, investigated by Attorney General Slade Gorton, for being retained on a monthly fee by Seafirst and Household Finance. This charge was settled out of civil court for $165,000. Sen. Mardesich continued to maintain his innocence.

In 1980, Sen. Walgren and House Speaker Bagnariol were each charged by the Federal Bureau of Investigation with three felony counts of racketeering in the state of Washington. Both men were subsequently convicted and sentenced to five years each in prison.

anything. Baggie did. Baggie took some money. Walgren did not take any money. Walgren was the kind of guy—not unlike me in this regard—who will see anybody. I go to every deal once. I told you, I think, that I went to Reverend Moon's convention in California.

Ms. Boswell: I don't think you did.

Sen. Moore: I wanted to see what it was all about. I found it was an Oliver North rally. But, in order to be well-rounded, you have to do these things. I've never been to a Klan meeting, and I guess that's one I wouldn't go to, because my mind's so rigid on that subject that I couldn't accept anything I heard.

I understand that FBI agents posing as businessmen approached Walgren and claimed they had a corporation, and said they wanted to get a foothold in gambling in the state. It required legislation, not dissimilar to what we're probably going to do when we open up gambling in this state. I think it is inevitable. Indian gaming is the opening wedge. Soon private enterprise in this state will say, "Why not us?" And there'll be enough pressure, and there'll be the need for money. Maybe they dedicate all the money to education, I don't know.

But, anyway, that's how Walgren got started. And, of course, he went to a couple of meetings. I think Gordon was in sympathy with what they wanted to do, as I would have been. I think he went to some meetings, they discussed things, and of course the guys were wired, and Walgren probably said, as he always did, "Sounds good to me," one of his trademark expressions, and that was all used against him. Again, nothing illegal. He's a fine man, and I consider him a friend.

Virginia and I visited Gordon at Lompoc Federal Prison. During our visit, he told us in a half-humorous vein about prisoners from abroad who, at this minimum security facility, would go for a walk, be picked up by a car, whisked to a waiting plane and flown back to their country of origin. As Gordon said, "I can't do that because I have nowhere to go."

He should not have been convicted. To me the evidence was inconclusive, and there was more than reasonable doubt. When he began lobbying after his release, we both did all we could to help him rebuild his life in Olympia.

Ms. Boswell: So, overall then, these kinds of incidents you see as being really minor, in the bigger scheme of things?

Sen. Moore: Yeah. They are not at all important. They become important though. For example, shortly after the Mardesich situation came to light, I served with a fellow named Bruce Wilson. I liked him. He was the last of the Senate chain-smokers. He was an idealist with a pixieish sense of humor, and a solid sense of where he stood on any issue. He was an asset to the Senate and a force for liberal, new concepts. But of course, he wanted to improve the image of the Senate after the Mardesich scandal, and in doing so, he so hamstrung the Senate Democratic majority that they were actually unmanageable.

His idea was to rewrite Senate rules to split authority between the majority leader and the caucus chairman, thereby eliminating the possibility of concentration of power as occurred under Mardesich and Grieve. So, I never served under a leader, but rather under a tug-of-war between the two. There was perpetual tension between the leader and the chairman. Not a good idea. Much more important to spend time trying to explore how many homeless, how many hungry, how many people could be helped a little bit and get them back into the mainstream. Just a peripheral amount of ink goes into that compared to when you come up with something that might smell. That gets ink 'till hell won't have it.

Ms. Boswell: I wasn't going to go in this direction, but that sort of brings us to the role of the press, though. You have not been shy about your feelings about the press. Tell me about it in your earlier years in the Senate. Tell me about your reaction, or your interaction, with the press.

Sen. Moore: Well, everything was going along fine. Generally speaking, the Municipal League in Seattle, and, I think, the press downgraded me a notch when I became a Democrat. The media gives undue coverage to the Municipal League of Seattle.

When I came to Olympia, I was treated well. I have no complaints. However, somewhere along the line, I made an unfortunate attempt at what I thought was the right thing to do, and that was when I tried to amend the "truth in advertising" law, to read "truth in advertising and reporting." The press really came unglued, shouting "First Amendment rights." Of course it's been accelerated now by the Sullivan decision, which gives them the right to print anything with immunity. I think they're taking advantage of their position. You notice that the people who get good ink, good press, are the ones that come up with good one-liners. McDermott's a master of the one-liner. Talmadge is very good. I think the media's very subjective. I think they're more interested in scandal than they are in substance.

Is anything ever really done on the income tax as an issue? You never hear about that in the press. And yet, if you want to be fair in society, those that make it should pay. In my view they have the most to lose if there's a revolution, and therefore, they should pay more than somebody who doesn't have anything, because they're protecting the status quo under which they've prospered. So, there are all kinds of things that you could do in the income tax arena. But they're more interested in somebody who gets off a glib one-liner. That's the news for the day!

Ms. Boswell: Were there any reporters that you particularly respected during your time in the Senate?

Sen. Moore: I thought John White was good. Lyle Burt was no Pulitzer Prize winner, but he was fair. He didn't pick up on little snide remarks or scandals of any kind, he just reported the news, what was happening in the Legislature, and left alone what I consider abuses of the profession, he wouldn't touch them. Those are the two that come to mind. Among the newer players, one I like and respect is Hal Spencer. And in TV, there is one standout, Larry Cali of KING TV.

Ms. Boswell: What kind of stock do legislators put in columns that some of these political writers produce? Are they important? Are they influential?

Sen. Moore: With legislators?

Ms. Boswell: Uh-huh.

Sen. Moore: I think maybe a third of the legislators might be influenced. There are people like Talmadge who will always tell it as he sees it, without worrying about what the press is going to say. There are other people who are very aware and don't want to say anything that could be misinterpreted, or skewed somehow.

Ms. Boswell: The lack of depth that you're describing in the reporting—how much is that an individual reporter, and how much is the tone or the publisher, or the direction of the newspaper itself?

Sen. Moore: Sometimes I get the feeling that the owner-publisher-editor are in one box over there, and over here you have the reporters.

The publishers are saying to the reporting staff, "Go get 'em, but don't get caught." While the publishers remain pure, the reporters are encouraged to do wild and wonderful things to sell newspapers. And, of course, newspapers are losing out. Many newspapers now are just a combination of the *National Enquirer* and a shopping guide. The *Seattle Times* is a scandal-driven shopping news, for example. There isn't much substance.

Ms. Boswell: Has that always been true?

Sen. Moore: No, the *Wenatchee World*, for example, when the Woods family was at their peak, they were dynamic. They favored a lot of things that I didn't like, but they were right out front and accurate.

There was a time when the two families that controlled the *Seattle Times* were at loggerheads, and each gave Elmer Todd, a Seattle attorney, one percent of their ownership. So, he really ran the paper, and it was a very objective paper—no nonsense. They were very careful. Every story that might possibly be attacked was always run by their lawyer, who did a very first-class job keeping them out of trouble. And of course today, with the Sullivan decision, it's open season on public figures. Judge Sullivan ruled, in essence, that public personalities, including politicians, cannot sue the media. This has led to skewering of politicians with wild abandon.

Ms. Boswell: You think the press has too much freedom these days?

Sen. Moore: Yes, and I just wonder what's being taught in journalism school. I catch a whole lot of things in the stories that they write that are grammatically incorrect. If *I* can pick them up, think what a *real* student could do. I just wonder what's being taught. And, of course, the papers are in a terrible position because they're losing out to television and radio. Television makes an impression. You see people. It's much more dynamic. The only thing that television doesn't have is coupons for grocery shopping.

Ms. Boswell: Are there times when you were able to use the newspapers though, newspaper reporting, to your advantage?

Sen. Moore: No.

Ms. Boswell: No? Did you try?

Sen. Moore: Never tried.

Ms. Boswell: Why not?

Sen. Moore: I didn't think it was appropriate. I've never had a press conference. Our caucus staff, once in a while, will issue a press release, and I laugh because nobody pays any attention to press releases. They get a million of them a week. The only way you get any coverage is to have some startling facts to present, or a way in which you can present them. No, I'm pleased to say, I never, never, have approached the press. Never had anybody approach the press on my behalf, that I know of. They can find me if they want to. And I'm not very keen on being in the paper. I've always tried to keep out, knowing they have control of what they print. The *interviewee* is at the mercy of the *interviewer*.

Ms. Boswell: Now, why do you suppose that is?

Sen. Moore: I'm sure that if you think about it, everything you know about that you've seen in print, you've found was inaccurate in some way. In every story that I see, that I know about, they've missed the point, or they didn't pursue it. They just kind of went over it once, lightly, and another deadline is met.

Ms. Boswell: You were talking about other people with one-liners, but you were telling us earlier, a good—what I might consider a one-liner—about the press and a rating thing that you were familiar with. How did you characterize that?

Sen. Moore: Well, those reporters and TV personalities, radio types, that I knew, I rated. They asked for remarks, and I said something to the effect that: "Journalism in the Northwest had about as much depth as a mud puddle." And, I think that sums it up, for me. I don't see any real depth in any of this reporting. It's once over lightly, and let's make the deadline. Where is Ed Guthman when we need him?

Ms. Boswell: You've also, in the past, said during your campaigns, and even after you were elected, that people never really asked you what you were doing. Do you think that lack of depth is a result of public interest? That the public doesn't want, or can't handle the depth?

Sen. Moore: We'll never know because they've never tried. They just don't try, so how can you, except subjectively, guess?

Ms. Boswell: Are there certain legislators who are, in your mind, skillful? You mentioned the one-liners, but I mean others who have tried to get more substance into the news?

Sen. Moore: How often do you see Karen Fraser quoted? Almost never. Karen Fraser is one of the heavies in the Senate. If you want to know about a piece of legislation that is in her committee, or another committee on which she sits, she knows, and can discuss it in depth. She could give them a story that wouldn't stop if they were to ask her about civil service reform. She's on top of the section of regulatory reform that pertains to the environment. She knows more than anybody in the Senate on those two things. Do they ever approach her? No. Maybe it's too dull, but they'll never know because they never tried.

And you don't hit people with just one story. Most ad agencies maintain you have to hit them seven times before they get the idea, whether it's soap, or a politician. When you just write a double page spread on the income tax once every three or four years, who's going to pay any attention? Why don't they have charts showing that people making $35,000 are better off with an income tax than they are with a sales tax? Or, if you cut the sales tax in half, how much would you be paying?

You can't discuss things like the B&O tax because they say, "What's B&O?" "That's Business and Occupation." "Oh! Let's tax business." In the *Seattle Times*, this last Sunday, Warren Aakervik, who owns Ballard Oil, was quoted as saying, "Regulatory reform doesn't do anything for me. I just pass the cost on." Pretty up-front statement. Well, I think things like that need to be aired. The public is paying if you raise the B&O tax. The income tax, I think, has a lot going for it, plus you can deduct it from your federal tax. You can't deduct the sales tax from your federal tax. Why not start showing people?

My question is, what is it they are trying to hide? I think the management of these papers are all in the upper income brackets, plus, all their friends that they have dinner and lunch with at the Rainier Club, and the Columbia Tower, don't want an income tax because they will be paying more. But the average person, like you and me, will be better off.

Ms. Boswell: If you can't get the depth of news to the people through the papers, how can you get that information to them?

Sen. Moore: You can't, because on television, time is paid for by the advertisers, and when you figure that some of those prime-time spots

will run hundreds of thousands of dollars, who can afford that? So, we just continue to wallow.

Ms. Boswell: You don't see the television news broadcasters, for example, as doing any better job in terms of reporting than the newspapers?

Sen. Moore: No, but it's harder for them to distort, because when they show what's happening and then they try to say something quite contrary, people say, "Well, we must be listening to two different programs at the same time." Whereas, with the print press, we only get their subjective view.

Ms. Boswell: What about the notion that you're just getting these little, tiny, so-called sound bites, that you're getting so little of the story, say on TV or in the media?

Sen. Moore: Serious shortcoming. No question. Those little sound bites can be devastating, or they can be useful. They don't tell the story. They just titillate you, that's all.

Ms. Boswell: In terms of your own career, have you ever had any situations where you felt unfairly represented in the press?

Sen. Moore: Yes, but only recently.

Ms. Boswell: You mean the residency issue?

Sen. Moore: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: Let's take a minute to discuss that.

Sen. Moore: It's very simple. A fellow named Steve Kendall has attacked my residency. He filed a Voter Registration Challenge with the King County Records and Election Division. That's one of his rights as a registered voter of Washington state. He claimed I spent most of my time in Hawaii, and was no longer permanently residing in Seattle. You see, I can't serve in the Senate if I'm not a registered voter in Washington, and I can't be a registered voter if I'm not a permanent resident of the state.

I would say I spend about eighty percent of my time between Olympia and Seattle. The other twenty percent I spend in Hawaii. Anyway, the claim went before a King County Canvassing Board. It's their job to decide if I'm a resident of the state. They voted in favor of me. They said Kendall didn't provide suitable evidence that I'm not a resident of the state.

But now he's challenged my residency a second time, and because the press and various legislative members are badgering them, the board is going to hold another hearing. It's set for today or tomorrow, and the decision by the election department will be made—again—as to whether they'll honor his claim, or whether they'll throw it out. It doesn't make any difference what they do, because if he loses, he'll take it to Superior Court, and if he wins—he wants me de-frocked instantly.

Ms. Boswell: Why does he have such a vendetta?

Sen. Moore: He's a fellow who was sent to us by Dr. Hugh Bone, at the University of Washington, to observe our '74 House campaign and write a paper on it, as a student at the university. He came, and after a week or so, our manager began to think he was a little different, a little strange. So, she didn't let him near anything. We let him sit in on some meetings so he could get the flavor of it and write his paper.

After I was elected to the Senate in 1978, he began to ask me to do some really wild things. I can't remember what they all were, but they were impossible. "I want you to do this constitutional amendment for me." I was

unwilling to do it. Senator Al Williams had the same experience with Kendall, because he lived in Williams' district at the time.

Kendall had the same problem with his district organization. They wouldn't let him be close to anything. Going back, while he was at the university, I believe, he ran for school board in Auburn and was elected. Twenty-one years old and on the school board! And I thought, "Boy, this guy probably does have promise. I may have misjudged him."

A year later, all of a sudden, he resigned. He was out, and it's been downhill for him ever since. He's never been able to live up to those early expectations.

Ms. Boswell: So, are you going to fight it? What will you do?

Sen. Moore: No, I won't fight it. If they throw me out, I'm just going to Hawaii. It would cost us more money than I could afford to fight it in court. I'll just let it go. If he wins in court—the attorneys don't think the court has the right, the ability, to throw me out, it's only the Senate. If that's the case, why I'll just serve out my term. I'll be here to fulfill my Senate duties, two, three, four times for the investment board, and pension policy committee. Those are the two important things that I have. When I'm in Hawaii, the rest of it will be done with conference calls, and that will be it. A year from now, I'll be history. People will say, "Ray who?"

Ms. Boswell: So you feel you were treated unfairly by the press?

Sen. Moore: Just this recent furor I think has been unfair. It's true that I live away part time, but they're ignoring the fact that court case after court case has indicated that you live where you say you live, and that is the last word from the Supreme Court. Is that ever mentioned? No. And, the first headline about it was, "May Lose Job." Well, not right. Either the headline writer was ignorant, or there was malice. But that excites people. Our senator may be thrown out! If I didn't have a pretty good reputation, that could be damaging. I've always said that nobody can ruin anybody's reputation. If they can, you didn't have one to begin with. I think that's a truth.

Ms. Boswell: Why do you think that? Is it just to sell newspapers? Why would somebody with a good reputation—why would the newspapers go after somebody? Certainly you're not the only one that this has happened to.

Sen. Moore: Oh, sometimes you get crosswise with them. For example, I mentioned my attempt to add truth in reporting as well as advertising. That could have been simmering back there on the back burner someplace for a long time. It is pretty sensational. If I had a place in the Idaho panhandle, or in Bozeman, Montana, where I once bought a house when I was thinking about operating our restaurant over there, it wouldn't raise the specter of me lying on the beach in Hawaii drinking Mai Tais, while all the minorities are up working their hands to the bone on my "plantation." The use of those words conjures up a whole lot of things, and so, it naturally creates a little jealousy. In actuality, Virginia and I have a one-half interest in three acres—scarcely qualifies as a plantation.

Ms. Boswell: In terms of this whole issue, is it the press that's really to blame for blowing it out of proportion?

Sen. Moore: Well, what is there to blow? What is such a big deal? And, why keep it up for fifty days? I'm not Bill Clinton, I'm little Mr. Nobody from Queen Anne Hill. I had no future when I came here, I have less of

a future now. I was not a big name. I am now. I went into a restaurant yesterday, on Queen Anne. Never been there before—new restaurant. Waitress said, "Oh, you're Senator Moore." So, all of a sudden, I'm famous. Actually, I think that if I were to run again, I think I'd win. Head to head, or with several opponents. That may sound a little arrogant, but I've found no deterioration. I've had a couple of Republican precinct committeemen write to me saying, "You've got a bum rap. We'll support you next time." Surprising.

Ms. Boswell: You mentioned to me that you also laid some blame on the Democratic Party.

Sen. Moore: Well, the county chairman is somebody that helped me on my first campaign. We supported him when he wanted to be district chairman. There were other people that were very adequate, but we supported him when he wanted to be county chairman.

We were right there to support him. And now, when he could have maybe stemmed the tide, he stood by and watched the flames. He didn't come forth. Didn't come forward to help, or to ask those people who were attacking me to ease up. And his excuse is, "Well, what could I do?" Well, George, you could try.

By the way, today is the end of my sixtieth year in the work force.

Ms. Boswell: Today?

Sen. Moore: I started March 23, 1934, and March 23, 1994—that's tomorrow.

Ms. Boswell: Amazing.

Sen. Moore: Yeah, amazing to still be alive.

Ms. Boswell: That's quite an impressive career.

Sen. Moore: Yeah. I worked a long time with no vacation, never took a day off. Just basically a worker. Not too bright, but a hard worker.

CHAPTER 6

THE FIRST YEARS IN OFFICE

Ms. Boswell: Going back a bit, right about the same time you came to the Senate, Governor Dixy Lee Ray was coming in, too. Tell me what you thought about her.

Sen. Moore: Oh, she was fun. I liked her.

Ms. Boswell: You did? You were in the minority.

Sen. Moore: I guess so. That's not unusual. Dixy was perhaps the least understood of all our governors. Although I often did not vote her way, we liked each other. We were both forthright, and she liked that. Her lobbyist was Jerry Hanna, who had been in the Legislature and knew the process.

He was a big, robust, good old boy. So, he'd call and say, "What have you got on your mind?"

I'd say, "Someday I think I better talk to the governor about something."

"When do you want to do it?"

I'd say, "I don't care."

He'd say, "Well, I'll call you right back."

He'd call back, and say, "How about right after lunch?"

"Fine." So I'd go down. Jerry would open the door. Governor Ray would be sitting at her desk, the two poodles right along side of her, sitting at attention, their little bowls right down there. She'd see me in the door frame, and with a big, broad, smile, she'd say, "Senator Moore, cometh."

Now, you know, how are you going to be mad? It's so ludicrous and funny, and out of the twelfth century, you could think you were reading *Ivanhoe* or something. I don't know why, but we always just got along fine. We didn't agree on much of anything, and I just made it clear that I'm extremely liberal, and she was extremely conservative, and we went on from there. I liked her a lot. I'd have rated her right up there if she'd had the ability to get along, but you can't give her points when she really failed.

Ms. Boswell: Just a personality that was just not right for the office? She'd sure been a lot of different things, too. She'd been successful in a variety of fields.

Sen. Moore: She just couldn't resist. Talmadge is the same way. He can't pass up a microphone. In all fairness, they are both worth listening to. The media got on her almost from the start. She took their barbs, but when she acquired a litter of piglets she named the pigs after those in the media who had been most vicious. We all thought, "Good for her." Some governors could have done it, and maybe made it stick, but she was already on such bad terms with them that that just tipped it over and they never gave her the benefit of the doubt.

She was a good thinker. She was right on the atomic energy business, I think.

Ms. Boswell: In what respect?

Sen. Moore: She favored using known, proven plans for nuclear plants. She did not believe that it was necessary to go out and invent a whole new concept, which is what we were doing. She favored just picking up time-tested plans and using them, those that

had worked very well. She also was a believer in looking abroad, looking elsewhere to see what other people are doing, whether it was on sewer treatment or a new concept for the elderly, like an in-between step from home to a nursing home. There's another step that you can put in there—very inexpensive. She favored that kind of thought. She had a fertile thought process. Of course, she insisted that starvation was one way to keep the population down. And so, she'd be flying along very well, and all of a sudden she'd come up with one of those, and everybody would be mad at her again. I like people who are smart. They fascinate me. She was very bright.

Ms. Boswell: What about political aptitude?

Sen. Moore: She had the aptitude to woo the public, holding them. She liked that. She was not like anybody else who has held that office. Nobody else who has ever held that office had the education that she had. I think there was a certain amount of resentment by a lot of legislators who were not so endowed. I don't know. To me, she filled all of the bill. She was in touch with the Legislature. I was nobody. She used to see me. She was very friendly, and you could joust and joke with her. It was all the same to her, she didn't care.

Ms. Boswell: Was she vindictive?

Sen. Moore: Yeah. Bad. Really bad.

Ms. Boswell: Can you give me an example?

Sen. Moore: Well, it appears to me, without any proof, that her pawprints are all over the Walgren-Bagnariol scene. Hard to prove. Yeah, I may have been a little too enthusiastic in saying that. I don't mean to say that she loved being vindictive, but she could be. She was very nice with me. I was new here, and I may have appreciated that over much. I had a lot of good thoughts about her.

I, too, believe that the United States is way off base. Our psyche, which was always this way, but accentuated by Reagan and John Wayne, is that if we didn't think of it first, it isn't any good. She was not that way. Vindictive, yeah, but her assets far outweighed her liabilities, I thought. I was sorry to see her leave.

Unfortunately, then we got Governor John Spellman. Very under-confident. Spellman was an average governor with a slightly above-average staff. He is a likable fellow, particularly if you like people who use a pipe as a prop. He came into the governorship at a time when Reagan was encouraging the religious right to have a heyday. As a Catholic and a moderate man, he had a very real problem in not telling them to ease up while trying to keep the liberals at bay. Frankly, I never was sure where he stood on much of anything.

Ms. Boswell: One of the first years you served with Spellman, I guess it was '80 or '81, was the year that von Reichbauer made his big switch, and you were very vocal in condemning that. Tell me how, from your perspective, all that came about and why?

Sen. Moore: When I came to the Senate, Democrats controlled 30-19. But the 1980 election cut us down to 25-24. Reagan swept a lot of us out and Republicans in. Five weeks into the 1981 session, one of our members, Peter von Reichbauer, announced his defection to the GOP, giving them control with 25-24 margin. Peter is a fellow who was raised in the lap of luxury. Has never had any position except in the Legislature. He's a brilliant campaigner. Began to show signs, as early as that short session in '80, of not liking the caucus, and deciding that he was going to be independent. He just made a decision. He walked out of the caucus one day and the

majority leader asked, "How are you going to vote on this package?" And Peter said, "I'm going out on the floor to listen to the debate." I knew then something was wrong, but I had no idea that it would be drastic.

I was outraged because when I changed parties, I did it quietly. I didn't surface for ten years after I had done it. I had nothing to hide, and his was, in my view, such a grandstand play. His timing was perfect, and the way he carried on after that, like "They're after me! I have to have surveillance in my office because somebody will come in with a machine gun." Or, "I have to be driven home by the state patrol." They had to drive him to Vashon Island every night and pick him up every morning. Like, "I'm so special, I'm so powerful that somebody's going to want my head."

I would never do that. I would go to the majority leader and say, "I am not satisfied with the liberal views of the Senate Democrats, and I'm not going to come to the caucus anymore." I'd say, "I'm declaring myself a free agent. We can still talk, and I may vote with you, but don't count on me." I think that's the gentlemanly way to do it. And then, in the next election, run as a Republican, if that's what you've decided to do.

But, von Reichbauer caused an awful lot of anguish, and from the winter of '81 to the fall of '92, there was a ten-year period of bad feeling in the Senate. His own caucus chair, John Jones, came to me and asked me—a couple of months after he had defected—if we would take him back. So, he was a pain to them, too.

His demands were always immense. He's very skillful at timing. He's a skillful politician. Never take him lightly. And when he decides to get somebody, that person might as well shoot himself, rather than let him do it, because he will get people. He's a tough and wily customer, and he loves to keep the pot stirred all the time—people gossiping about other people. He's a cross between Shakespeare's Iago and Machiavelli. That's who he is. From the standpoint of one politician to another, I have admiration for him, because he is tough and he gets his way. He doesn't have friends. He doesn't care because he's smarter than most people, and he doesn't need them. He's a maneuverer—very skillful. His stock in trade is cultivating the rich and famous.

Ms. Boswell: What were the issues that, at least ostensibly, he was so at odds with, with the Democrats at that time?

Sen. Moore: I think, basically, he had decided that he was not a Democrat—I don't know that there was any one specific issue. He told me a year before he defected that his hero, politically, was Edgar Eisenhower. Edgar Eisenhower is a far-right Republican. I mean, he and his brother, Dwight, had nothing in common politically. When von Reichbauer told me Edgar was his hero, I thought, "I can't believe this." An awful lot of Republicans wouldn't say that. Unlike Ike, Edgar had little feeling for the rank and file. He was, in my view, a bad guy, and von Reichbauer chose him as his hero.

Ms. Boswell: So there was nothing that sent him over the edge at any one time, you think?

Sen. Moore: No, he was waiting for an opportunity to use something as an excuse, and I can't remember what the bill was. It was too early for it to be the budget. It was something else.

He was careful to keep the teachers with him, careful to keep the Teamsters with him. He's very adroit. I have admiration for his ability, but I would not trade my life for his.

Ms. Boswell: What could he have gained, though, from making that switch in mid-

session? I don't see what the gain for him would be.

Sen. Moore: Well, because he was now the center of power.

Ms. Boswell: He's the power broker?

Sen. Moore: Yeah. He can go back. If he doesn't like what the Republicans are doing, he could start voting with the Democrats again, so he has everybody over the barrel. Wonderful position.

Ms. Boswell: What about his constituency?

Sen. Moore: We did everything we could to recall him, and we lost. We did everything we could to beat him, and we lost. We came awfully close last time in '90. Five hundred, seven hundred votes out of forty thousand, I guess. Big vote. And we had a good candidate. Von Reichbauer managed to survive.

Of course, Kreidler took him out of the congressional race. Now he's in the King County Council and he's flexing his muscles there. He's chairman of the Finance Committee, I think. It's a position of power.

Ms. Boswell: More so than the Legislature?

Sen. Moore: Yes. See, he's one of forty-nine here. There he's one of thirteen. With a one-vote lead, you see, it's seven to six, I think in the vote on the county council, he has the Republicans where he wants them, too.

Ms. Boswell: When he made that switch over in the Legislature, tell me what ensued. That meant the Democrats lost their majority?

Sen. Moore: We lost our chairmanships, we lost our offices, and the Republicans were vicious. I was outraged. They wanted to censor our mail. They were doing a whole lot of bad things. It happened on a Friday, and Saturday and Sunday we were to move out of our offices.

Ms. Boswell: They didn't waste any time.

Sen. Moore: In order to make a grandstand play of not costing the state any money, they had the employees of the Senate moving furniture. I came down, and I saw a woman who was probably seven or eight months pregnant, together with a woman who was about sixty-five, wrestling with a big desk, trying to get it on a dolly.

Alan Bluechel was in charge of the move. He behaved like a southern plantation owner 200 years ago. He had everything but a whip. "Got to get this job done. Move! Move!" And so we all moved over to the Institutions Building. It was almost uninhabitable at the time, because the heating system had broken down, and the air conditioning had broken the previous summer. Just a lot of things were wrong. There were leaks.

After the 1982 election we took back the majority, 26-23. The GOP spent a lot of money refurbishing the Institutions Building and getting it up to standard. They had so improved the building, they decided to stay there whether they were in the majority or not. So, they've never left there. That has become the Republican office building. They like those offices now. Democrats are all in the Cherberg Building.

Ms. Boswell: At that time of the upset weren't you head of the Social and Health Services Committee.

Sen. Moore: Yes, after Day had lost, I became chairman of that committee. I had been there five weeks.

Ms. Boswell: And how was that transition? What happened?

Sen. Moore: The switch put me out as chairman and in as ranking minority member, a position which has no meaning and no power, and everyone knows it! So from Mr. Chairman I was Mr. Nobody. Oh, it was brutal. When I was chairman, I had picked a guy out of nowhere on the staff to be staff director. His name was Gene Green. He'd been here a while, seemed to be the right one, so I picked him out and kicked out the guy that Big Daddy had, who I didn't think was right for me. Five weeks later, Alex Deccio, was named Chairman of Social and Health Services. And Gene Green was still staff director. The fellow that I had picked out all of a sudden couldn't remember who I was. So, I was badly treated by Green, and Deccio ran over me like I didn't exist. Alex is decent when in the minority. Personally I like him, but...

The chairman of the committee always used to get "title onlys" from the bill drafting department, which means there would be a title that said something about developmentally disabled, or mental health or anything. You would have about fifty of these in your desk all with different titles so in case you, at the last minute, all of a sudden need a bill with an appropriate title on it, you can pull that out and use it. Well, all of these had my name on them. Next thing I know, Alex put a bill out there on mental health, I think, and it's designed to destroy the mental health system in the state. I'm the sponsor! Deccio pulled a bill with my name on it to discredit me. He pulled a blank bill out, put all his language on it, and it was on its way, with me as prime sponsor! So I had to speak against my own bill.

Ms. Boswell: Does that happen very often?

Sen. Moore: No. In general, people realize that it can come back to bite you. But, it was Deccio's one moment of power. He was eager, he acted as if it was going to last forever.

Ms. Boswell: How were you able, ultimately, as a group, to recoup from that experience, or to even get anything passed during that session?

Sen. Moore: Well, we didn't. Hayner blocked everything. She got rid of Matson, who would have been a conciliator. We would have had the same relationship, only they'd have been in power and not us. Historically, I think in general, the Senate tries to give the minority maybe a fourth to a third of what it wants, and the majority takes the rest. I think that's civilized. There's no use just abusing the hell out of the minority, because they can get mean, and worse, get even. It's much better to have everybody get along. Most of the time, there's no problem in getting along. But in this 1981 session, Republican senators who had been very agreeable turned unpleasant and rode roughshod over our Democratic minority. It was the end of the era of goodwill in the Senate and the beginning of mean-spiritedness.

For example, I remember that Slim Rasmussen didn't think much of von Reichbauer, who couldn't resist jabbing Slim. One day Slim had had enough. He rose, was recognized, asked permission to speak on a matter of personal privilege. After a few minutes of rambling, he hit von Reichbauer where it had to hurt, declaring that in the Legislature, only Senator von Reichbauer had no visible means of support. Von Reichbauer, as I mentioned, had inherited wealth and had spent his life playing at politics. Slim, on the other hand, made his living in the railroad roundhouse working with his hands. He had made his point and there was no more flak from Senator von Reichbauer.

But that was the sort of thing that went on. And worst of all, when we regained the majority we were unforgiving. Anyway, the Senate was never the same.

Ms. Boswell: Did the Republicans feel abused from before? Is that why they were so tough?

Sen. Moore: They were in the minority most of the time since 1930. Fifty years they're in the minority of this Legislature a good part of the time. They were waiting to pounce. So, then they had it in their grasp. They even had some members who were very unhappy about everything that was happening, but Hayner insisted, "You'll be out if you don't stay with me on everything." So, she forced them to stay. Like when we had the bill on castrating rapists. She had twenty-five votes for it. A whole lot of people didn't want to vote for that. You could hardly hear them say "aye." But she had twenty-five votes any time she wanted them. She threatened political death, and they came through for her.

Ms. Boswell: When you say "threaten death," how did she do that?

Sen. Moore: Oh, just tell them that you won't be chairman of Education. Cliff Bailey, from Snohomish, was one that didn't want to do a lot of these things, but he did.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me more about Hayner. What's your perspective on her?

Sen. Moore: Margaret Thatcher of the State of Washington. Strong. A little more—can't think of the right word—isn't vicious, or violent, but a little—she's going to have her way, only her way, and you get nothing. Stand back or you'll get spattered. Had I been endowed with Hayner's confidence I might have been king. Her heart is quite secondary to her brain. Fortunately for Jeannette, she lives late in the twentieth century in the U.S. A royalist to the core, had she lived 200 years earlier in France, she could have been in jeopardy. Regardless of my personal feelings, she was the toughest leader on either side of the aisle in my memory. I have admiration for her ability, just as I do for von Reichbauer's ability, but I don't want to be in that mode myself, nor in a lifeboat with either of them.

The other day I was on the floor, and I went over to see Ann Anderson because we were working on regulatory reform, and I had some news to give her. I noticed she was on the phone with her head right under the desk, way down. Talking. So, I went back to my desk. A few minutes later I looked over and she was still there. She came over to see me as soon as she hung up, and she said, "I was just talking with Hayner. She called me from Palm Springs to tell me how to do it." And Ann Anderson did not appreciate that. I could tell from her tone of voice. Ann is very talented. She doesn't need a whole lot of direction.

Ms. Boswell: So Hayner still wants to keep her fingers in?

Sen. Moore: Yeah, up to the elbow!

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about getting a bill passed. I've talked to some people who say, "I wanted to get on as many bills as possible." Other people say, "No, I only went for just a few that I really wanted." What was your philosophy about developing a bill and getting what you want?

Sen. Moore: I go on as few bills as possible. I want it known, when I'm on a bill, that I'm serious, and that I'm not on there just for the ride. I think some people get on too many bills. It dilutes their credibility. How can you be on everything? We have a House member who is on 430-some bills! People ask her about one, "I don't know. I don't remember that one."

"What do you mean? You're on it."

"I know, but I'm on a lot of bills."

Well, that doesn't wash. I want to be able to discuss, in modest depth at least, why I'm there.

Ms. Boswell: What about bills you sponsored? Did you start right away, even when you first came to the Legislature?

Sen. Moore: No, I was reluctant. I waited until I saw a need. Talmadge passed, I don't know how many bills, the first session. He got the governor, Dixy, to sign several of his bills. He was amazing. He set a record that probably will never be broken. I don't think I had one bill, I might have had two bills. One was that dog bite bill, and I can't remember what the other was—and he wrote them both! He said, "I've got too many. These would be good for you. They'll like these in your district." So he gave them to me.

Ms. Boswell: Now when did you start, yourself, deciding that there were certain things you wanted to do?

Sen. Moore: I guess about 1983. I'd been here, maybe, four years. I knew the business in which I'd been involved for thirty-four years—securities—from top to bottom. I knew that although there were many ethical brokers, there were far too many who put their self-interest above the client's. I knew what motivated the firms, I knew what motivated the salesmen. I saw what I could do in terms of legislation with the securities business. I began to think, "How can we straighten out these firms and help the clients?"

For example, if you have an account with a member of the National Association of Security Dealers, known as NASD, you sign a four-page statement. In the fine print it says, "If I have a problem with my account I will first go to arbitration." Sounds good, but who picks the arbiters? The firm or the NASD. *You* don't get to pick an arbiter. I tried to change that. Things like that.

Or churning an account, which means that the broker makes more than the customer does, or the customer loses while the broker is making a ton. We now have some penalties on that.

Inappropriate placement. Now, we're asking that the firms get in writing what the customer's goals are—speculation, high income, safety. The firm is now expected to supervise the salesman to be sure that he follows the customer's wishes. So, I made some changes that I think will help. There's a lot more that I'd like to have done, but somebody else can do that.

Ms. Boswell: When you had an idea of what you wanted in a bill, would you, like Senator Talmadge, draft it out, or would you go to the bill drafters?

Sen. Moore: I just went to the staff and said, "This is what I want," and they'd put it together. They'd show it to me, and then they'd go to the bill drafter, who'd put the final touches on it to be sure that the RCWs mesh, and so on. You know, I worked on an interesting piece of legislation with Senator Vognild. The outcome of it was that it overturned a state Supreme Court decision retroactively.

Ms. Boswell: Oh, tell me about that.

Sen. Moore: Well, it came to the attention of a law firm in Wenatchee that Maytag had their own finance company, and that they financed their own contracts with the public. Some members of the law firm thought the finance company's charges bordered on usury, so they took Maytag to court on a class action suit. Eventually it wound up in the state Supreme Court, which ruled in favor of the plaintiff, the law firm. I can't recall the name right now. Maytag would have to refund millions in the state of Washington—very small refunds, like five dollars here and ten dollars there, which just wasn't worth it—for at least the last five years, maybe as far back as thirty to forty

years. I didn't agree with the Supreme Court's ruling. I didn't think they really thought it through.

Ms. Boswell: You didn't feel Maytag had done anything wrong?

Sen. Moore: Well, I'll tell you, I think in a situation like this, there is no right or wrong answer. It was easy for that law firm to make a case. There was reasonable premise. But many companies, like GE and GM, also had their own financing, and no one had ever complained. Maybe if it had been an individual going after Maytag, I would have felt differently, but instead it was a law firm bringing a class action.

What would have happened if the court's decision had stood? For every dollar amount Maytag would have owed a past buyer, it would have cost maybe that much to process the refund. We're talking about a lot of money spent by Maytag so that individuals can get back five, maybe ten dollars. It could have destroyed Maytag's pension plan, and whom does that hurt? Not the executives, but the employees. It didn't seem worth it to me. And if it had happened in Washington, it might have made it possible to happen in other states.

So Representative Ron Meyers and I decided to try to pass legislation nullifying the Supreme Court decision. Well, you can imagine, no one wanted to touch it. After all, who wants to legislatively reverse a seven-to-two Supreme Court decision, and *retroactively*? Our only hope was to get the bill into conference. I looked around the caucus for support, and when I came to Senator Vognild, I looked no further. I told Larry he would feel some heat if he joined me on the conference committee. He looked straight at me, shook hands, and it was a done deal. We were able to pass the legislation and overturn the ruling. Larry made the difference.

Ms. Boswell: That's amazing you were able to pull it off. Now, you had some other important pieces of legislation, but I want to talk about those a little later**.** Let me switch subjects for a minute—I want to go back to your thoughts on the governors you've served with. After Spellman came Booth Gardner. What did you think of him as a governor?

Sen. Moore: Booth Gardner's great regret was that there were only twenty-four hours in a day in which to be adored. Anybody—people, kids, dogs—they were all the same to him. He was another governor who was likable, but not a heavy. Richard Nixon would have called him a candy-assed, touchy-feely type. His humor had a self-deprecating slant. One of his favorite vignettes went like this: "I run down to the 'Y' as soon as I get up to work out. Then I run back to the Mansion to shower. One day I stepped out of the shower and Jean was sitting in the bedroom reading *The Olympian*. As I'm drying myself, I asked her, "What would the voters think if they could see me now?" Her response, "They'd think I married you for your money."

On one occasion CEOs from nursing home chains called on Governor Gardner. Since I'd set up the appointment, and the pertinent legislation was before our committee, I was introduced to the group. I was playing host while we waited in the outer office for him when, suddenly, a smallish man came up and goosed me. He was, as usual, in shirtsleeves and they could hardly believe this was the governor. As I introduced these men, Booth shook hands and said to one, about his size, "And where are you from?"

"Fresno, California," was the reply.

Booth said, "You can't be from California. You don't have an earring."

He wowed them with his goodwill, and when we departed they told me how lucky we were to have such a smart governor. He had told them nothing, but they happily left in their

Lear jets. Here was another governor who truly needed a good staff, but couldn't put it together.

How Booth became rich is a story told almost as many times as Cooper's Leather Stocking Tales. You can find it elsewhere. Gardner was just a very nice guy and loved to banter with people, but what the hard-core Democrats wanted—after Ray and Spellman—was a combination of FDR, Truman, and Kennedy with a dash of Johnson.

Ms. Boswell: Would you call Lowry a hard-core Democrat?

Sen. Moore: Yes. Hard-core, old-fashioned, liberal Democrat. A good-natured prophet, really. I think the public wants to like him, but Governor Lowry is too often the textbook case of how not to operate. Highlighting his personal problems is just an excuse to get rid of an unsuccessful governor. He was an unusually good legislator miscast as governor.

Legislators, more often than not, make poor executives. Rosellini was an exception. Evans was an exception, but Lowry is no exception. He had a great opportunity. As I told Patty Murray when I was doorbelling in her first race, "You have two assets. You're not beautiful, and you have crooked teeth—count your blessings because no women voters will be jealous or afraid you might steal their spouse. They'll vote for you." She's never been beaten. The same holds for Mike, although he hasn't always won. On a good day he looks like Arafat, and on a bad day people feel they just want to help that ugly critter.

But for all his staff experience in Olympia, his legislative experience on the King County Council, and as a congressman, he failed to recognize the ego factor in the Legislature. I've always known I was not equipped to be an executive and remained quite content to always run for a legislative seat. These positions suit the person who seeks compromise as opposed to leadership. Personally, I've always tested my ideas in a group, often taking extreme positions in order to force discussion, which often leads to reasonable compromise.

Lowry has never been in doubt, which in a way fits my own "extreme positions" technique, but an executive can only do this if he has public and legislative sympathy. Instead of asking legislators what they think, philosophically or politically, he has chosen to let his third-rate staff tell him how great he is. His major problem is that he's just had a terrible staff, and if he loses, it will be due to that staff. Talk about on-the-job training. This group is slow to learn. They're into it a year now, and I don't see much progress being made to handle the process. Maybe they are afraid of their positions, so they sit on things until they literally go away without ever having made a decision.

Ms. Boswell: Why do you think that he's chosen such a staff?

Sen. Moore: I have no idea. In general, I think that people who choose a weak staff do it on purpose. They want "yes" people around them. I don't think that's true of Lowry. I don't think it ever occurs to him. He is so into himself that I don't think he can tell whether they're buttering him up or arguing with him. It's about all the same to him.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about choosing a staff. How did that process evolve?

Sen. Moore: It is very helpful to have staff who are better schooled, smarter, and more disciplined than is the legislator. It is equally important the staff understand where the legislator wants to go. I had an advantage—I was on the five-person Employment Committee, so I had the advance knowledge

of who had unusual potential. A funny thing happened: when I was chairman of the Employment Committee, we interviewed three people for a position in a committee of which I was also chairman. As we listened to them, I wrote down how I rated each one. When we voted, my last choice was the unanimous selection of the other four members. After we informed the winner, she came by the office to thank me for her selection. Being up front, I told her that I did not vote for her. I do not know what response I expected, but she handled it so well, saying, "I'll be good, you'll see." And she proved the committee right. We laughed about it many times and I think it actually made for a very honest relationship.

I have to have people that are infinitely smarter than I. I won't tolerate anybody that's my equal or less. So, I got the best. They just carry me around on a satin pillow. It's wonderful. They're wonderful. They follow through on everything. Just on the remote chance that something will come up, they'll stay 'till 4 a.m., bored out of their minds in the wings, just in case I might need them. They know there's nothing coming that can possibly involve them, but just to be safe, they stay. Great staff.

Ms. Boswell: Where are these people coming from?

Sen. Moore: You have no idea how good people are, nowadays, that you get a crack at. I'm chairman of the Employment Committee in the Senate, and we just interviewed seven people for four jobs, and I couldn't believe the qualifications, the background, the law firms that they have been with, the areas of expertise. All of them had samples of first-class writing. I don't know, the market is just out there, and it's full of good people. There are a lot of slobs coming out of the universities, but the ones that are good are really good.

Ms. Boswell: So, they are attracted, still, to government? That's another argument that you hear being made, that people aren't being attracted to public service, to government. Good people. But that's not what you're finding?

Sen. Moore: I think that's true of those seeking elective office, but not of professional staff. These are not bad jobs. A good analyst will make—just a very young one, without much background—will start out at probably $35,000. And, it isn't too long before they can be at $55,000. This is a good job, stimulating, with variety, and you get to see consumers. They don't just sit at a desk. I have one of our stars going up to Ballard Oil. This man has something to say about regulatory reform, and I want the staff to be on top of that—as in real life.

Plus, the retirement—not bad. You put in twenty years here, you get forty percent of what your five highest years were, and if it averages out at $50,000, you get $20,000 for retirement at age forty-five or fifty. Not bad. You can start another career. This opens up all kinds of possibilities. Businesses want you. Lobbying, that's a big and lucrative field for them. They have a lot of possibilities. These are good jobs, and they're sought after. These people are professional.

Interesting sidelight. I never inquire about their politics, but I can tell when looking at their résumés, I'd say that three out of four are Democrats. I think there is probably more money in the private sector so Republicans are probably going there.

Ms. Boswell: It would seem that the universities, too, over the last couple of decades, would generally have more students who are Democrats. I may be stepping way out to say that.

Sen. Moore: I think that may be true. I can't say. But I know the ones that are coming to me, when asked questions like, "How do you feel about welfare cheaters?" If they're Republican, they say, "They should be shot," and if they're Democrat they probably say, "Policing it is more expensive than letting it go as it is." Things like that, you can detect pretty quickly.

Ms. Boswell: So you could, fairly comfortably, rely on your staff to develop the bills as you envisioned?

Sen. Moore: Oh, yes. If it turns out that it's a Republican chairman, the staff people are like chameleons. They may not be in agreement, but the guy will never know, and they'll give him a bill that he wants, just the way he wants it. They're professionals. That's the biggest improvement in this whole scene, is the staff in the Senate. The House always had pretty good staff. Now, we're equal, at least, to the House.

Ms. Boswell: How many staff members, over all, does the Senate have? Do you know?

Sen. Moore: Well, we have about forty-five on the staff for the committees, then there are about twenty-five in the Democratic Caucus staff and about twenty-five in the Republican Caucus staff. So, there's probably ninety, or something like that.

Ms. Boswell: Are most of them year 'round positions?

Sen. Moore: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: They are? It's an interesting contrast to some of the older legislators that I've talked to, where there was one secretary for ten people and that was it. There was no staff. There was no staff at all.

CHAPTER 7

COMMITTEES AND BOARDS

Ms. Boswell: Going back to 1981, you were appointed to a board that you served on for a long time, the State Investment Board. Tell me how that works, and what you were able to contribute.

Sen. Moore: It started out with a tiny amount of money, and it was pretty loosely run. People came from investment houses and called on the director, Roy Pitt. I did a little business with Roy when I was in the investment business. Very tiny amount, but still, I understood how it worked.

Well, the fund grew because both the state and the employees were making donations. When you get that many people making donations, it grows pretty fast. It was a very loose operation. Nothing illegal, but it was pretty much up to the director to decide what was going to be bought, what was going to be sold, and where we should be. He did not do a bad job, but he was very friendly, very cozy, with some of the investment houses, and a couple of investments didn't work out perfectly.

And so in '81, Bud Shinpoch, a brilliant senator from Renton, drew up a bill with the help of Dan McDonald in the House, that would set up a new board. Its purpose was to oversee the state employees retirement funds—nine voting members, and five nonvoting members. The nine voting members were to be the state treasurer, one member from the House, one from the Senate, one from the retirees, one from the WEA, one from the public employees, one each from the firefighters and police, the director of Retirement Systems, and the Director of Labor and Industries. The advisory group of five were chosen based on their expertise: real estate, securities, mortgages, insurance, etc. It took effect in the summer of '81. I wanted to be the Senate member, but I couldn't be appointed because I had voted for it.

Then in '82 I faced my first reelection bid, which generally is thought to decide your future. Having lost so many times, I was apprehensive. Our Republican opponent was a "Barbie doll" named Linda Kay Porlier. She announced that if I and the other legislators would just communicate and cooperate we could do the people's business in three to four days and go home. She was quite attractive, aggressive, and articulate. I let her rave on. We won with sixty-five percent, so I was safe for four more years. And we kept on with office hours from 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. *every* day of the year.

So, after my reelection in '82, I was appointed to the Investment Board by the Senate in January of '83. I was the first Senate member.

Ms. Boswell: Who chooses the members to go on it?

Sen. Moore: Our caucus chose me. When the Republicans were there, they chose Hayner, and she didn't like serving, so they put—I don't know, there were two or three on it—finally, she put von Reichbauer on it. Anyway, that's how the legislators get there. The rest of them are picked by their organizations. One of the members from the police and firefighters is now chairman of the board.

Early on in my tenure on the board, the

Democratic Caucus appointed me to a foundering Pension Policy Committee. There were members from both Houses, but almost no one came to the meetings. It really lacked status, so we offered a bill creating a committee of four from each caucus to study and suggest to the Legislature possible improvements to the retirement system. With this clear mission, some real heavies from both Houses came onto the committee. It came to have prestige. And for the first time, there came to be a link between the Legislature and the Investment Board. Since I was the only member of both committees, I sort of became—at least on the Senate side—the authority on policy and investments. I also had a further advantage: out of the unwieldy sixteen-member Pension Policy Committee, we created an executive committee of four, and I was always the Democratic Senate member. As to my role on the Investment Board, my high point came in February of '87, when I urged the board to decrease its sixty-two percent position in common equities to half that amount. They agreed. By October '87, when the market lost one-fourth of its value in one day, we were at our goal. This may have saved $500 million in value and many sleepless nights.

I was on the board for several years, and during that time, we were making fabulous amounts of money. One way of calculating it, we were making nineteen percent on our money for five years. Another way, it might have been twelve or thirteen percent. But, anyway, we were doing well, and it was in a period when the market was not doing particularly well, didn't have that big explosion that it's had in recent years.

But we did it by branching out and doing other things. We went into leveraged buy-outs, and we were very lucky. We were dealing with the firm of Kohlberg, Kravis, and Roberts, the one that turned out to be the king of leverage. When they were tiny we started doing business with them, and made a lot of money, and still are. And they've had some disasters, but even so, the disasters were tiny compared to the victories.

So, we've now grown a lot. The staff used to be comprised of half a dozen people. I don't know how many are on the staff now. We hired a new director three years ago, I think it was, and he came from the California teachers' retirement system. I'm not sure what his background is because I wasn't on the board at that time. We were out of power, and I didn't come back on until a little over a year ago.

The whole structure has changed so much, it's now almost impossible for them to make a major mistake. But it's also almost impossible for them to have a major win. They've hamstrung themselves with so many rules, and so much red tape, that sometimes an opportunity is there and needs to be seized, but it's evaporated by the time we get around to doing it. I don't like the present structure very well.

Things changed a lot last January, a year ago. When Lowry came in, he got rid of the head of the retirement system, and the new retirement system person is Sheryl Wilson. She was head of Oregon's system before she came here, and was very familiar with their board actions. She had been assistant director of retirement systems before that in the State of Washington. Very well known here, and very smart. Also, the governor put a new director of Labor and Industries in, Mark Brown, very smart. Brought back George Masten, who had represented the public employees years ago, but now represents the retirees on the board. I came back. So, the power, since there are only nine voting members, the power began to shift a little bit.

Dan Grimm had instituted some very good systems. I think that Basil Schwan, the new director, had gone a little bit too far in expanding some of these things. Too many committees, too many people to look over

other people's shoulders, to be sure that they're doing it right. But Dan Grimm really was the power there for two or three or four years. Most of the time I was off the board when he really began to be the dominant figure. He did, overall, a very good job. He was hard for the staff and director to fool. His questions had a canny way of ferreting out what *wasn't* being said. He was an outstanding board member.

However, things have changed now, and these last fifteen months I've seen some dissatisfaction arising. There seem to be some conflicts of interest. I think that some of the board members agree with me that there are too many people supervising too many people. We used to have four or five managers, now we have fifteen or twenty managers. We have several other people that are watching those managers, to be sure that they're doing it right, and sometimes I wonder what the staff is for. The staff is big now. They have specialists in real estate, specialists in leverage buyouts, stock specialists, bond specialists, and I'm not sure that we need all of this.

We also manage the Labor and Industries fund. That's five billion or so. But, when you're looking out there at twenty billion dollars, you know that a whole lot of soft-shoe artists are going to come before you with great programs. We don't see most of these people, because they have to be filtered throughout the staff first. On the other hand, there's a manager out there who is superb, but whom they won't give the time of day to. He never gets as far as the board because the staff doesn't believe that he is competent enough. He had a brain tumor, and he recovered fully, but it took him two years. I would hire him, but they don't ever let him get to the board. I'm referring to Jerry Kohlberg, the senior founder of KKR.

Ms. Boswell: So the board's role is to be the final decision maker in specific investments or just in overall policy direction?

Sen. Moore: We don't decide whether we're going to buy IBM or not, but we decide what percentage of the money is going to be in stock, what percent is going to go in foreign investments—which I oppose. I don't want any money going abroad. I don't care how well these markets have done, everything comes to an end.

The Japanese market went from nothing to 36,000, or some such number, just unreal. Well, everybody was getting into the Japanese market when it was at 36,000. At that time I wasn't on the board, but I thought to myself, "This is no time to be getting in that market." It went to 14,000 right after that. Now, nobody wants to touch the Japanese market. They want to go to Hong Kong and Thailand where there are just roaring markets, but when they're roaring is not the time to buy. So, I'm at odds with the decision of the board, and with the decision of the staff. It's only five percent of the total funds that they want to put abroad, but I wouldn't put any money there. Unproven, emerging markets are not prudent places for retirement money.

Ms. Boswell: In terms of partisan issues, you said there's some shift now in the board. How does that alter, generally, how the board goes? Is there anything, besides maybe the idea of trimming staff, that the Democratic philosophy would change?

Sen. Moore: I think it revolves, right now, around the director. We're evaluating the director, the nine of us. I'll be doing that the next day or so. I've not talked to other board members about it, but I have a feeling that he may not come out with a very high rating. So, I think that's where the aggravation may be.

Ms. Boswell: Is that kind of position

appointed by—

Sen. Moore: By the board. The board picks them. When the director, Schwan, was hired, it was a toss-up between him and Joe Dear, who was then director of Labor and Industries, and now is head of OSHA in Washington D.C. Had I been there, I would have voted for Dear. Von Reichbauer, whom I replaced, voted for Schwan because he hated Dear, not because he loved Schwan. I'm sorry that Dear is not there. He would have been, I guess I could say, more my type. You can talk with him and know that you're getting through.

Ms. Boswell: How frequently does the State Investment Board meet?

Sen. Moore: They meet every month, but there are committees. For instance, Monday I'll be at the Audit Committee. At that meeting we will be deciding on a vacancy that has occurred in its advisory committee. They sit with us. There are nine of us and five of them, so there are fourteen, but of us, only nine have the vote. These people that we pick out to be on the advisory group are experts in real estate, experts in markets, or maybe they just have good business judgment. It's not all it should be right now, but I think it's improving.

The voting members, in my view, are more dynamic now than they were two years ago. You've got Sheryl Wilson—strong—succeeding George Northcroft, who was very busy with busy work., and Mark Brown, probably just as good as Joe Dear, on the board. Actually, I think I'm an improvement over von Reichbauer. It's getting to be a better board again. It was very good when I came on originally, then I think it went into a slump, and I think it's coming back again.

Ms. Boswell: In terms of the caucus, the caucus would select you. Is there a lot of lobbying and jockeying that goes on? Do most people want to be on different boards, as well?

Sen. Moore: Yes. But I had investment background, wasn't bankrupt, and have never been indicted, so I became kind of the natural choice. And Shinpoch's design of this board fit me. I didn't know about it. He designed it so that Ray Moore could be on it. He always saw some talent in me that I couldn't see, and nobody else could. But, anyway, the board was designed so that I'd fit on it.

Ms. Boswell: Did he tell you that later? How did that all come about?

Sen. Moore: No. We just both knew. Wonderful guy. He was one of the legislative heavies, in the time that I've been here. I think that during his twelve legislative years he had more impact per year than anyone who comes to mind. Logical to a fault, straightforward. He was hyper-friendly to those he respected, but he could bite when disturbed by phoniness. His decision to leave the Senate in '85 was an unexpected blow which I had trouble handling. In a word, outstanding describes him. I am grateful to him, because of all my varied experiences, the Investment Board was my real love. It was a board of very sharp people endowed with a rarity—judgment. We outperformed nearly every private or public pension fund in the nation.

Ms. Boswell: As long as we're talking about commissions and committees that you've served on, another one was the Tax Advisory Council. Do you want to tell me a little bit more about the workings of that Council?

Sen. Moore: In 1982, I was appointed to the Governor's Tax Advisory Council which was comprised of one member from each caucus and eleven selected by then Governor Spellman. After much research, staff time, and the council's meetings, we finally voted on a

revenue-neutral tax plan to cut the B&O tax, the sales tax, the property tax and to institute an income tax. This was in 1982, and projections indicated the state would have a more stable tax structure, and anyone making less than $35,000 annually would be better off. It was to be a constitutional amendment which required a two-thirds vote of both Houses and then an affirmative vote by the voters. The council voted thirteen to two for the plan. As I recall, Doc Hastings and George Sellar voted "No." At least those two indicated they like the present regressive system which unduly taxes those with lower incomes! Doc is certainly not mean-spirited. He just happened to vote that way both in Olympia and now as a Congressman. Not a bad guy, and I'm sure the salary has appeal. And as for George, he is extremely likeable. Without demeaning him, he's among the best in a slow field.

Anyway, their votes didn't matter because we still voted in favor of the income tax being presented to the Legislature in the '83 session. Although all the governor's appointees voted for the measure, Spellman, who was not famous for courage, would not make it an executive request bill. So, I asked to be the sole sponsor in the Senate. Because it was to be a constitutional amendment, it required thirty-three Senate votes. After much wrangling we could only muster thirty-two votes. Although the Democrats furnished most of the votes, GOP Senator Patterson was tremendous. He brought us up to thirty-two with several Republicans joining him. On our side, Senator Rinehart led the charge—outstanding performance.

To me it was an amazing experience. The amendment could only become law by a vote of the people, and it had so many attractive features, but no matter how hard I tried to sell this idea, resistance was universal. I told voters again and again that it could only become law if they voted for it, and it could *only* be altered if they voted for a change. The response became almost predictable, "I don't believe it—you politicians will somehow change it." My own conclusion is that the abuses of the federal income tax, with so many loopholes, has given the mere words "income tax" a bad name. As soon as voters hear income tax they become rigid opponents. No amount of logic or proof can change their minds. Even the fact that a state income tax is deductible from the federal tax had no effect. I tried for several more sessions. Although a majority of the Legislature favored putting it on the ballot, we could never get the two-thirds vote necessary, even though two-thirds of Washingtonians would have been better off financially. When Dwight Pelz arrived in the Senate he grabbed the income tax as an issue. I figure his involvement—sponsorship—set the cause back at least a generation.

All in all, I've served on a number of committees. People fight hard for chairmanships of committees, but those are standing committees. On these committees, you kind of get there by your field of expertise. I'm known as a risk-taker, and, of course, I'm pro-gambling. There aren't many of us around. Some members are skittish about being associated with the word "gambling" in any way.

Ms. Boswell: I was reading some of the motions or remarks made by senators on the floor, and Senator Wojahn began by praising you also for your accomplishments, particularly as chair of different committees, and I wanted to ask you about that. What makes a good chair? How did you run your committees?

Sen. Moore: I want everybody to know that I'm the chairman. But, I want it to end there. From that point on, I think it's important to be, first of all, courteous to all of the people that testify. Never argue with them, do not

berate them because your personal views differ from what they're presenting. I think I mentioned that I learned that from watching Senator Bill Day and Lt. Governor Cherberg. *Always* treat members, staff, and the public with the ultimate courtesy.

I think the second thing is to try to establish that the members of the committee are to ask permission to say something, or to question. So, there's a certain Cherberg quality standard there that I like to have observed and try to enforce. Now, some very senior members of the Legislature—Slim Rasmussen was one—would just start talking whenever he felt like it, and you have to accept that. After all, he's been around forever—not really, it only seems like it. You can't, all of a sudden, turn around and say, "You're out of line, Senator. So-and-so is next." So, you put up with that. Irv Newhouse is another one, although this time I noticed that he's always asking, "Mr. Chairman." I say, "Senator Newhouse."

I think it's important, the smaller the person that is testifying, in the scale of success or life, the nicer you are to them. If you're going to have any discussion that maybe is a little antagonistic to the speaker, only do it when you're talking to somebody that is more important than you are. In other words, when I'm chairman and I see the executive vice president of Boeing sitting there, I'm not afraid to challenge him, which I would never do to some person from Usk or Forks or Peshastin.

I think the fourth thing that's really equally important is to try to work with the minority members, and to include the ranking minority member in meetings before hearings, scheduling, etc. It was very easy this time, easier than anytime in my life, because, first of all, I was compatible with their ranking minority member, Neil Amondson. Neil and I both wanted the same thing. We wanted regulatory reform with some teeth in it and some specifics. So, it was easy to work with him. We tried to have meetings every week or so, to clue him in as to what we're thinking, ask whether he would like to alter it a little bit. I think that is important, in the long run. That carries over into your relationship on the floor by extending that courtesy. Not only is it a courtesy, but it's oftentimes beneficial, because if you have a smart ranking minority member, he'll actually throw something in the pot that is very constructive, and Neil did. So, things on that score went very well. I feel the same way about Ann Anderson.

I also think that it is very impolite to start the meeting late. Some people get there on time. They've driven a long distance, and they want to be there. They get there at eight o'clock, they're in their seat. I see chairmen walk in, and twenty minutes afterwards, they're still gossiping with people, other members, or they're drinking coffee, or they're talking to the staff, or something. That's not very polite or businesslike. It doesn't give a good impression. It further substantiates the voters view that legislators are arrogant, unfeeling, indifferent, lazy louts. So, I start—even if I'm the only one there—on time, at eight o'clock. As soon as the clock is straight up at 8:00 a.m., down goes the gavel, and I ask the staff to present the first bill. And, believe me, pretty soon the members are getting there on time, too. They used to straggle in a half hour late. Irv Newhouse, boom, he's there every day on time. Neil Amondson. Prentice. They get there right on time. So, I think those are the things that make for a good chairman.

One morning at 8:00 a.m., no one was at a Labor and Commerce hearing except for Senator Prentice and me. As soon as I opened the meeting, I announced we were in executive session. This means we will start voting bills out of committee. Senator Prentice moved a bill in which we both had an interest. As is the custom, I seconded her motion, asked for

discussion—and hearing none—I asked the clerk to call the roll, all in one breath! By 8:05 a.m., we had moved six bills out and into the Rules Committee. A member of our committee arrived and asked where we were on the scheduled agenda. To which I answered, "We have had executive session. We will now go to the agenda for the day!" After that, members arrived close to on time.

Additionally, I think that when you have a large committee, you have to encourage the lobbyists to deal with the staff, and most of them get the news fast. There are some of them that still think they have to see the chairman. Some of them have been here twenty years. Often times, I don't even know what they're talking about. I need to be briefed on an issue that I don't know anything about. I need the staff to tell me about it, and then I can talk with the lobbyist. But, some lobbyists have a tendency to just rattle off their side of the story, and you aren't in a position to make a decision, so I send them to the staff, and the staff then tells me what their feeling is about that issue, and what this person wants. I'm then able to make some kind of decision. I try hard to hear every bill.

I think that there are too many committees in the Senate. There should be one education committee. As it is now, Higher Ed and K-12 are competing. If you have one chairman, everything has to funnel through the chairman. I think that would be more productive. I think Trade and Economic Development should be put in the Labor and Commerce Committee. Then, I think that every committee should have a subcommittee of three people, two from the majority and one from the minority, who sit in judgment on whether a bill shall be heard or not. Then they could make a recommendation to the committee—"We will have an informal study of this bill by the staff during the interim." "This bill we'll hear, but probably doesn't need action." "That probably will end up in a formal study." A third group of bills, they'll come and say, "These bills need a hearing, and they need executive action."

So, that's the way I would like to go. I wanted to do that this time, but I was discouraged from doing it by the management, who said, "Let's get set a little bit firmer around here. Find out how we do in the next election and then we'll start some more revolutionary, structured ways of doing business."

Ms. Boswell: Why were they being so conservative there? They were just afraid they hadn't solidified or consolidated their power?

Sen. Moore: I think so. And, the fact that the management had already agreed to let me combine Commerce and Labor and Financial Institutions. Probably they felt that was enough trouble for one session, and maybe they shouldn't let me do much more.

Ms. Boswell: Was that your idea, to combine the committees?

Sen. Moore: Yes. I'd wanted to do it for years.

Ms. Boswell: What were your main reasons?

Sen. Moore: Banking is now being taken over by other areas of commerce, you know, all kinds of businesses now have their own credit cards. Businesses now own banks. The whole thing has changed. Brokerage firms now have checking accounts for people. So, they're all intertwined. I wanted to get them all in one tent, and we were successful in creating Labor and Commerce, which included the traditional Financial Institutions Committee.

I think I mentioned before that securities were buried over in the Department of Licenses. In order to get anything done, you had to go through the administrator for the securities division, to a supervisor, then to the

director, then to the chief of staff in the governor's office, or OFM, and then to the governor. Well, the brokerage business is gigantic. It can't be handled that way. It has to have the same status as banks, savings and loans, and credit unions. So we put them all in one department with John Bley as the new director. Superb choice. And they'll now have cabinet status, which they didn't have before. None of them had cabinet status before. I think since money is such a driving force in our society, it needs to have more direct feed to and from the governor.

Ms. Boswell: Since we're talking about this, you did some important legislation while you were chairman of Financial Institutions. Do you want to talk about that?

Sen. Moore: You're referring to the legislation with Seafirst and Old National?

Ms. Boswell: Yes.

Sen. Moore: In March of 1983, it finally dawned on Seattle First National Bank that it was in trouble, because of speculative lending to slick oil drillers in Oklahoma and Texas. At the same time, Old National Bank realized that its holding company was in trouble because of real estate mortgages.

Interstate bank acquisitions are prohibited unless authorized by the state, and at that time Washington had given no statutory authorization. We were approached separately by Seafirst and Old National Bank requesting legislation to permit interstate banking. Seafirst, at first, claimed they were not going to fail, but needed the legislation as a safety valve to prevent damaging market speculation and a possible run on the bank.

With his usual clairvoyance, one of our staffers, Blaine Gibson, had alerted me to this issue way back in the fall of 1982, before I even became chairman. He told me that Seafirst had made some very bad loans with Penn Square Bank in Oklahoma that would probably lead to failure as oil prices dropped because of the recession. I requested that Blaine independently verify what the lobbyists were saying and determine what the situation of these banks was, and what the effects of failure would be. He concluded that Seafirst was headed for failure, a fact that Seafirst recognized in April. Throughout this ordeal, Blaine provided me with detailed and accurate information concerning the conditions of both banks, and the effects of failure on the state's economy and on public deposits, as well as on their employees.

My philosophy was that if the private sector had a solution for this problem, the state should get out of the way and let it happen, so long as no taxpayer money would be spent. I also believed that if we saved one bank, we should save them all, not pick and choose. I did not like the law at that time, under which a bank from Japan could buy a Washington bank, but a bank from Oregon could not. The law as it stood was the creature of SeaFirst which feared expansion by out-of-state banks—Bank of California and BankAmerica—which might give them competition. Good for customers, bad for Seafirst. Suddenly, when Seafirst found itself foundering, they reversed their fifty-year stance against the entry of foreign banks into the Washington market.

Seafirst's Olympia mouthpiece, Joe Brennan, began lobbying for the entry since the only salvation for the bank was to be bought out, or using a more genteel term, to merge. Joe was moderately popular with Republicans (in the minority with twenty-three of forty-nine votes in the Senate) but he had been for years obliquely insulting to Democrats and habitually talked down to me. Not an endearing quality in anyone, and particularly a lobbyist. Well, Senate Democrats remembered how, only two years

previously, Joe had reveled when von Reichbauer defected, giving the Republicans Senate control. Powerful Democrats lined up against Seafirst in general, and Joe Brennan in particular, people like Lieutenant Governor Cherberg, Slim Rasmussen, Jim McDermott, and Phil Talmadge.

Ms. Boswell: But you supported Seafirst's efforts to change the law.

Sen. Moore: Yes. As chairman of Financial Institutions, I felt quite lonely because all these people and I were normally natural allies. But, early in the session, two new, very young and ultimately well-mannered and pleasant young people appeared. Their names were Sandra Burgess and Randy Robinson, and I came to know, respect, and love them. They represented Old National Bank. Because their bank had also fallen on bad times, these two neophytes to Olympia lobbying and Joe Brennan had the same problem—trying to keep their respective banks alive.

Joe, from the first day on the job, treated them as if they were liabilities. It was as if he patted them on their heads, and said, "Run along and play. I'll take care of the lobbying." Well, there were 147 members and, with great politeness, Sandra and Randy asked for appointments with each one. They lobbied with great sensitivity, and were almost painfully polite. These two young people were so charming that people began referring to them as Hansel and Gretel. Everyday one of them would come by our office with a progress report, which was, of course, flattering to the chairman!

Ms. Boswell: What do you think prompted you to go against Democratic conventional wisdom on this issue, when your allies were opposed?

Sen. Moore: Well, when I was born my parents opened a savings account with one dollar at the Old National Bank. Old National's current president, David Clack, was part of a family who owned cut-rate gas stations in the Northern Tier states. I bought gas there because I was able to save a penny or two a gallon in the 1930s and 1940s. David Clack married the daughter of a couple I admired, Dr. Clyde and Mari Jensen. From the first time I saw Mari Jensen, there was vitality and good will. So, I must admit, when Sandra and Randy showed up I was already favorably disposed to their employer. And then, as I said, I wanted to save all the banks, not just one. Plus, to let the banks close would have been disastrous.

So while Randy and Sandra lobbied, I worked to help them out. Although control of a seven-member committee can be tenuous, I had no problem moving at will in committee because with the three Republicans going along, it made little difference how our Democrats voted.

The Washington Bankers Association convinced its members to put all lobbying on hold until it developed an industry consensus position. They produced a bill authorizing interstate banking if the Supervisor of Banking made a determination that a bank was in danger of failing. The bill was craftily written to save Seafirst but leave Old National Bank to fail, because Seafirst's problems were in the bank, and Old National's were in the holding company. While the WBA tried to convince us the bill was drafted to reflect public interest and philosophy, it was clear to me that the WBA was willing to save Seafirst, but would allow Rainier Bank to pick up the pieces of Old National Bank after it failed. Joe Brennan was satisfied. Randy and Sandra were not. But, most important, I didn't like it. Like I said, save 'em all, or save none.

It was too late to introduce new bills, so the only thing the banks could do was amend their bill onto a Senate bill that was now in

the House Financial Institutions Committee. This obscure bill was a Ted Bottiger special, to eliminate the dedicated fund—part of the fee banks pay to help support the banking industry—for the Supervisor of Banking. But it had a very conveniently broad title: "An Act relating to Financial Institutions." So the WBA and all the array of bank lobbyists trooped down into House Financial Institutions Chairman Gene Lux's committee to hang their industry consensus onto this insignificant bill. I walked over to the House committee where I saw Keith Hopper, the WBA lobbyist. I informed him that I would try to amend it to save Old National Bank as well. He said, "You can't do that. This is a WBA consensus bill!" That was all the inspiration I needed. Just try to tell a senator he can't amend a bill!

Randy and Sandra started lobbying in the House committee to include the necessary holding company language in the amendment to save both banks. The president of ONB, Pat Fahey, joined them, and was sensational. To everyone's surprise, the underdogs won, and the amendment hung. This meant that Rainier Bank now actively opposed the bill, and it became a bank free-for-all. Rainier hoped for disaster so they could pick up the pieces.

With all this maneuvering, Joe Brennan decided he didn't want to carry Old National Bank and its problems, so he told Randy and Sandra to remove their hard-earned amendment from the bill. This was not a good move, because Randy and Sandra were his best chance of passage. Fortunately for Joe, they refused. As the legislation progressed the Republicans went with Joe, and the Democrats went with Randy and Sandra. In their attempts to separate the two banks in the legislation, the WBA and Rainier had turned the two young ONB lobbyists into sympathetic characters. Rainier Bank fought the bill because they wanted to see Seafirst fail, and they wanted to gobble up ONB for nothing. Joe Brennan convinced himself the Legislature was acting to save him. The truth is they were acting to save ONB, and in spite of their hatred for Seafirst, simply wanted to save the state from economic disaster. Joe Brennan and Seafirst actually were an obstacle to passage as far as most Democrats were concerned.

Ms. Boswell: What was the mood in the Legislature at the time? I imagine this issue was pretty volatile.

Sen. Moore: Yes. By now the infighting was intense. When the bill came to the Senate, its opponents tried to kill it by declaring that the House amendment was beyond the scope and object of the original bill. It obviously was, and Cherberg correctly so ruled. This sent us through a series of parliamentary maneuvers, conference reports and free conference to finally bring the bill, at the last minute, to the Senate floor.

The main question the conferees and all Senators had was whether Seafirst actually was going to fail, or if the lobbyists were just trying to put one over on us. Blaine Gibson's research had already determined that the situation was real and failure was imminent. I arranged for the Controller of the Currency, C. Todd Connover, to call the conference committee members to state expressly what Seafirst's situation was. He did, and quite frankly told us that if the bill did not pass the bank would fail and he would have to close it the next morning. Then Seafirst would be merged with an out-of-state bank anyhow.

We knew from our research that if this happened, the Seafirst employees would be unemployed; the stockholders' investment would be gone; the employee retirement plan would disappear and the California retired teachers, as the largest shareholders in Seafirst, would be hurt badly. The pension

funds holding Seafirst stock would take a bath, and the State of Washington would lose about $150 million in unprotected deposits, resulting in a loss of taxpayers' money. Additionally, through the public funds collateral pool, Seafirst would take a few other banks with it as it sank. At this point, the bill gathered more supporters. Few Democrats, I among them, had any warm, fuzzy feelings toward banks in general, and Seafirst in particular. But, just to see Seafirst executives ruined, wasn't worth the trauma to employees, customers, and stockholders. That became the dominant driver in my decision to go all out to save Old National Bank and Seafirst.

I recall that when union organizer, state Representative Ken Jacobsen, tried to give Seafirst employees a choice to be unionized or remain disorganized, Seafirst made his life more than miserable. Ken would have been a Democrat House member with some understandable emotion favoring a Seafirst collapse. But not Ken Jacobsen. He came out four square to *save* Seafirst—another legislative hero overlooked.

On the night of the session, Slim led the attack to kill the bill. I was hourly updated by Sandra and Randy as to how the votes were lining up. They had the votes, but how to keep Slim from stalling 'till midnight, when the Legislature would adjourn without bank legislation, became a real worry. With intermittent caucus meetings, the evening dragged on slowly. By eleven o'clock, time was wasting. I felt I'd done all I could but was haunted by a feeling I could have done something additional.

Slim kept asking the Lieutenant Governor, "Mr. President, could you tell us what time it is?" Cherberg would methodically check all visible clocks and a few that weren't, before announcing, "Senator Rasmussen, it now appears to be 11:47."

Finally, after several more such exchanges, Cherberg said, "Senator Rasmussen, it is now twelve o'clock." There erupted an argument pertaining to finishing a bill in progress. Finally we were able to call for the previous question—which is not debatable—and the roll was called. Anticlimactically, the bill passed and was rushed to Governor Spellman for his signature.

Ms. Boswell: That's quite a story.

Sen. Moore: Yeah. Then in 1985 I sponsored, and we passed, legislation authorizing interstate banking on a reciprocal basis regardless of the bank's condition. Rainier Bank had one good point in 1983. Why reward failing banks by letting them sell out-of-state, but deny the opportunity to healthy banks? While I understood that, the situation in 1983 made such legislation impossible, and the need to solve a serious banking crisis was great, so we had limited the bill to failing banks. In 1985, we did what the banks always called "leveling the playing field." The failing bank bill of 1983 was the leak in the dam, and now it had burst. Fortunately, as I had foreseen, there has been a boom in community banks to meet the needs of customers who do not want to deal with big bank bureaucracies in faraway places. So, I feel I may have helped save Seafirst and Old National Bank from going bankrupt eleven years ago.

Ms. Boswell: Are there other committees that you felt were particularly influential, or that you really—I don't know if enjoyed is the right word—but that you really had some power in?

Sen. Moore: I think it would be a waste of my time to have wanted to be on some committees. I would have spent too much time learning to be of any value. I would like to have been on a higher education committee. Perfect for a guy who flunked out of the

university three times and never finished. They need to get a little real life experience in teaching, and I'd like to have been there to help that idea. But, in order for me to understand their budget and how they all worked, it would have taken several years. I think it was better, since I never thought I was going to be here more than four years at a time, that I was utilized in those areas where I knew something. I'm fairly good at numbers. I never wanted the responsibility of being Ways and Means chairman. I wouldn't have been as good, politically, or as good at the job, as the people that have had it—Donohue, McDermott, Rinehart. It was just not appropriate for me to try that. So, I did things that I knew something about, and I think I understand the psychology of gambling probably as well, or better, than anybody here. I knew what I wanted to do, so the Gambling Commission fit me.

But, I was on other committees. Social and Health Services—I spent four or six years there, I can't remember. I've heard every horror story imaginable. Finally, you just get worn out with that. I was on Local Government. I'm not very pro-local government to begin with, and that didn't improve my feeling about them any, and I wasn't particularly a fact of life there. I've been on some other committees, but I like the Labor and Commerce end of it, and I liked Financial Institutions.

If I were younger, I would have been happy to spend my whole career doing just that kind of work. As I said before, I never aspired to a position of leadership. Partly because I don't think I'd have been particularly good at it, and second, I don't want it intruding on my time. I'm willing to give it everything for twelve hours a day, but at seven o'clock I want to be having a Manhattan and have dinner with Virginia—this is my first choice.

CHAPTER 8

CAUCUSES, PARTISANSHIP, AND THE ART OF LEGISLATION

Ms. Boswell: In terms of the leadership of the party, are there different characteristics that, say, the chair of the caucus has, that possibly are different than those of the president pro tem of the Senate, or the majority leader? Are there different people that are suited for those different things?

Sen. Moore: You have to be everybody's confidant to be a caucus chairman. People will come and cry to the caucus chairman, asking him or her to intercede for you with the majority leader, particularly when you're fairly new here. So, the caucus chairman serves a real function in that way, in addition to hopefully running a stand-up meeting.

The presiding officer needs to exhibit dignity appropriate to the institution, which Cherberg furnished. He never had to ask members to shape up—most of us recognized we were lucky to have him as a standard. When he departed, so did the dignity of the Senate. Now, we have a new president, Pritchard. Joel and I have known each other for forty-five years, and I regard him very highly. His standards and mine are somewhat different, but he runs a successful Senate. It's more informal, and he's able to get away with it, I think, partly because of his age. When you're older, you can do some things that when you're younger, are not considered funny. It's just a fact of life.

Ms. Boswell: Can you give me an example?

Sen. Moore: Well, he has everybody's name pretty well down now, but he used to take his gavel and just point at you when recognizing you because he didn't know your name, and Cherberg would never have done that.

Cherberg would say, "Senator Moore," and you'd stand up, and his tone of voice was such that it was intended that you were honored by being recognized by the president, and you were to speak in a reasonable way. Hopefully nothing inflammatory, don't insult anybody, and behave yourself. Pritchard is good, and I like him, but I also yearn for Cherberg's days. Maybe that's because he was here when I arrived in 1979. I like a little more formality, but Joel does a really good job, and I'm pleased that he's there. He's very fair. Very fair. The presiding officer has to be very fair. Only be a son-of-a-bitch when you absolutely have to. Once in a while you just have to step forward and be a dignified authority, but you will settle all disputes finally. That sort of attitude—both of them do that well. But there will never be another Cherberg—imagine thirty-two years of perfection as lieutenant governor!

The majority leader has to be somebody who understands every issue. It is a trying job. I can't believe, when I go to our majority leader, Gaspard, and I say something, he immediately raises three questions or two questions that show me that he understands maybe more than I do, and I like that feeling. I want him to be something more than just a title. And, of course, he doesn't preside. He is the majority leader out on the floor. He has a floor leader who looks after all the details, like you go to the floor leader or assistant floor leader when you want to get a bill moved down on the calendar, or you want it moved up. So there's quite a bit of authority in the

floor leader, and the floor leader has to be fair—well, sort of!

I supported the present floor leader when she wanted the job because she's liberal. There are enough conservatives in that caucus, so I wanted somebody with some authority, in that prestigious position.

Ms. Boswell: And she is?

Sen. Moore: That's Harriet Spanel. Now, I know that when I go to her, there's a mechanism in her mind that says, "Friend." When it says friend, it's like, "What do you want? What can I do for you?" If it was somebody that has been antagonistic to her, either before she was elected, during her election, or is just too wildly conservative, or is bolting the caucus and such things, I'm sure that something in her mechanism says, "Be careful." She may not give the person what they ask for. She'll try, if it doesn't cost anything, but if it's going to preempt something I want, she's probably going to give me the preferential treatment. It's just the way it works.

Gaspard, as majority leader, mostly is in his office during sessions. He's not on the floor a whole lot. He's meeting with people who have some case to plead. You'll notice that he leaves his office to come out and vote, and goes right back in the office. Terrible strain, really. He comes out on the floor on critical issues, like he knows, but he doesn't need to come out to support Talmadge. Talmadge needs no support, but he'll come out just to be sure that Ray Moore doesn't flub it, or maybe needs a little help. I've always felt rather inadequate on the floor, and he knows that, because I've told him.

So, Gaspard always comes out on a big issue that I'm on, or I'm the chairman, and maybe I'm the prime sponsor, he comes out to let the caucus know, once and for all, the majority leader expects support for this. He wouldn't do that for other people because they don't need it. He wouldn't do it for Vognild, Vognild's so capable, as is Phil. But, for people who aren't quite so confident, aren't quite so eloquent, and maybe aren't quite so well-informed, he'll come out and pick up the cudgel for you. Well, you know, that welds you to him once and for all. You don't forget those things. This is a business of loyalty. Gaspard is very ethical, good choice for now, though I wish he was a little stronger, maybe. It would be nice if he kept the caucus together a little better. Vognild was good on that score. He always acted on behalf of his members, but he was a strong leader, totally dedicated to his job.

The president pro tem is a ceremonial position. However, if the lieutenant governor, as Senate president, feels the president pro tem can fill in for him, he will probably ask the pro tem to take over on the rostrum. President pro tem is always given to a senior senator. It will look good in their obituary.

Ms. Boswell: You mentioned caucuses. How do they really work? Behind closed doors you said they could get pretty vicious, but how does the format of a caucus really work on an issue?

Sen. Moore: The chairman and the leader sit at the head table. Also there are the caucus vice chairman, the floor leader, and the president pro tem. The rest of us all sit in a big square around the head table. The chairman brings things to order and says, "Our leader has something to say." So, he gets up and tells us what the program is going to be for that day—"We're going out and we're going to run a few bills. But first, we're going to have to go through the calendar." So we go through the calendar, and the committee chairman or the prime sponsor or the ranking member describes the bill and tells people whether it's controversial or not, warning

them that there are amendments coming and how they should vote—be careful of amendment 204, I hope you won't vote for it. I hope you'll vote for all the others, and then they go on to the next bill. They probably go through twenty bills, and then they go out on the floor and start running these bills.

When we get in really tight spots in caucus where there's great argument about, for example, the health plan, someone like Talmadge will explain the health plan, and then the critics begin whining. "It'll never work. Can't do that. Can't tax this group. Not fair to tax pop to pay for health—got to tax booze, got to tax beer." And they get into terrible fights. Guys and dolls jumping up and screaming, and everybody talking at the same time. It gets really out of hand. And, since I've been there, there's never been a chairman who could control it. I keep thinking that if I were chairman, I could, and would.

Ms. Boswell: How would you?

Sen. Moore: I'd tell them to shut up, and if they kept right on, I'd adjourn the meeting. "We're going out on the floor, not going to have any more of this. We're adjourned." Boom! "Let's go. You people know everything." That's what I'd do.

"No, no," they'd shout. "Oh, no. We don't understand this."

"Well, you had your chance. Let's go out. Every man for himself, that's apparently what you guys want. Every man for himself. To hell with the caucus, who needs it? You don't want to listen anyway, so shut up and get out there."

Next time, we'll see how it goes. New caucus, new day, we'll see how they behave. Of course, they'd soon rebel and I'd be out. Democrats don't like organization or much structure. Free spirits. I'm happy to be a part of the bedlam, but it's exasperating. You see, on a good day, on a controversial issue, we have twenty-five votes. We need twenty-five. That's a good day on a controversial issue.

On a bad day, on a controversial issue, we may have twenty-one. Seven in our caucus depart and start voting with the opposition. That's where the leader has to come in. Sometimes the leader has to ask the governor to come up. And the governor tells us, "Got to have this." Well, three of them, lamely, come back, so there's twenty-four. How do you get the twenty-fifth? Well, the leader, the caucus chairman, and the governor, call in two or three Republicans whom they think they could get, and they finally will get one of them. Now, we go out and vote—twenty five for this bill—three of our people still vote "no," but we get the bill. That's how it's done.

I'm a team player. They know that I'm always there. But they don't take me for granted, because I can be pretty biting. The management doesn't like to hear me when I'm on a tear, because I can be as violent as the rest of them. When they have a "good old boy" who is upset, it upsets them. They don't like it either, so they keep me informed, and they keep me abreast of what's down the road.

Most members have two faces: the caucus face of naked emotion, conniving, greedy ambition, and the Senate-floor face of veiling these emotions—all sweetness and light. On the floor, most legislators are trying to present a united front, all the while dancing around the issues. In general, the shrewdest say little. But, the fact that in a caucus there are often several side conversations only proves my point. There is zero silence and not much attention even paid to the leader or chairman. During my sixteen years we had a few brilliant minds: Bud Shinpoch, Adam Smith, and Phil Talmadge; a few zealots: King Lysen, Bob Oke, and Margaret Hurley; and a few workaholics: Karen Fraser and Nita Rinehart. The people with whom I felt rapport were good old boys, a term I use to describe people loaded with common sense and good judgment: Gordon Walgren, Don Talley,

Lowell Peterson, Al Bauer, Margarita Prentice, Lorraine Wojahn, Bill Day, Al Henry, Sid Snyder, John Cherberg, and Tub Hansen. Without these people there is no ballast to the caucus ship, and it could capsize with an overload of goofy ideas. There are too many with ambition beyond their talent. I won't mention them by name.

Ms. Boswell: You say you respected Don Talley. Do you want to say a little more about him?

Sen. Moore: The ultimate old pro. He loved and respected the Senate, the members, and the staff. In his later years, when offended, he could lose control and occasionally use language unbecoming his surroundings. In my first session, Don and I were on the Local Government Committee. We were listening to the cities, counties, and ports and other local governments, asking the Legislature to raise the amount of work they could do in-house. At the time, they were limited to $5,000. Anything above that had to be put out to bid. Local government wanted to raise the in-house limit to $20,000, as I recall. It sounded good to me and I was ready to vote for the raise. Our chairman, Bruce Wilson, brought the bill up for a vote at which point Senator Talley whispered that I vote "no," which flabbergasted me until he explained, "If we give them what they ask for, they won't feel the need to show up at our fund-raisers." Well, what a predicament. I hated, as a freshman senator, to go against our most senior member. At the same time, I felt my original intent was valid. At this point another member moved to amend the bill to $10,000. Senator Talley voted for the amendment, as did I, and the bill as amended.

Don was right in his prediction, and the next session local government was back again asking for the raise to $20,000. It was a ticklish issue because the Association of General Contractors wanted this as low as possible. By giving neither side what they wanted, both sides had to play the game. There are many issues like this in which there is no logical, right or wrong decision. As is often the case, what I call the "greed-o-meter" is the driving force, like that case with Maytag I told you about.

There was another issue in which Senator Talley played a key role. Several mishaps had occurred while ships were being piloted in from Port Angeles to the Puget Sound ports by pilots from the Puget Sound Pilots Association—now Port Angeles Pilots. Since one active pilot was over eighty, and several were in their seventies, the ship owners clamored for an age limit of sixty-five. The president of the pilots association, Captain Phil Luther, a friend since the 1930s, lived in my district, and was very voluble. I enlisted the help of Senator Talley, whose district was near the Columbia River and who therefore had knowledge of pilotage problems. He was ready to pass the owners bill, which made sense, but I needed a compromise, which he agreed to. I suspect he wanted to help me, which he did, but saw that I got the credit. It was fair, and both pilots and owners knew it.

Ms. Boswell: What about as a leader? You mentioned earlier, that in terms of caucus leaders, that there really haven't been many strong ones since you've been here.

Sen. Moore: I may have not described it quite right. Having been Republican county chairman, I believe it is easier to be a Republican leader than a Democrat counterpart. As Will Rogers said, "I don't belong to any organized political party. I'm a Democrat." And seventy years later, it is still true. I think strong is still right, the right term, but most of the caucus leaders either weren't totally dedicated, or their minds wandered—I mentioned Bottiger, he'd go right down the

hall and not even see you. Well, you're walking with a constituent who knows that that's the majority leader, and the guy doesn't speak to you, the guy that you're walking with thinks, "Geez, Senator Moore must be in bad with the majority leader." That kind of thing hurt Bottiger. He was an average leader who was fair but unimaginative. I think he parlayed a modest talent into a good thing. I liked him, but he could be maddening. I would reproach him sometimes for not telling me the truth, and his response was, "You didn't ask the right questions." He had a very sly streak.

Walgren inherited the job from Mardesich, who was king. You went to Mardesich, and he told you, "Yes, you will get this lollipop, but you won't get the box of Frango mints this time, and that's all there is to it. Good-bye." And you'd get the lollipop. He wouldn't double cross you, but you wouldn't get the Frango mints that time. Next time, maybe you get the Frango mints. So, Gordon had a difficult role to fill. Plus the fact that we were beginning to slip, although we held thirty seats. We held on during the '78 election when the Republicans were beginning to make inroads. Talmadge and I made the difference. We lost a couple of seats, but we came in and took two Republican seats.

Also, Gordon had to deal with what might be called an "assorted" caucus. There were shrewd good old boys—Al Henry, Don Talley, Bill Day, George Fleming, Hubert Donohue, Ted Bottiger and Lowell Peterson. Then there were troublesome types, like Phil, King Lysen and Jim McDermott. Into this mix you also had tough customers—Wojahn, Slim Rasmussen, Bud Shinpoch. And, just to round out his covey of strange birds there were Barney Goltz, Dianne Woody, Bruce Wilson, Ray Van Hollebeke and Dan Marsh. All Democrats, but with diverse issues, they posed daily problems and provoked and participated in occasional skirmishes within our ranks. So, Walgren had a tough time, and then, of course, the scandal broke, and he was very distracted during that period. I became his friend and ally when he was getting hit so hard. I'd been critical of him in the beginning, as had Phil, but as soon as he was getting beaten to death, we rallied.

Ms. Boswell: Why were you initially critical of him?

Sen. Moore: When I ran for the Senate in 1978, I was already a four-time loser so Walgren had little evidence I'd ever be elected to anything, and he made no overture toward me. My finance chairman, George Lane, called Gordon and we finally met at Victor Rosellini's 410 restaurant. The meeting was perfunctory. I was then chairman of a paint company in Seattle, and the president, Bob Lent, wanted to give $1,000 of company money, but he did not want to embarrass either of us, so I asked Walgren if he could handle the contribution. He suggested a donation be made to a Kitsap County fund and he would take care of it, and take care of it he did. The $1,000 went in, but only $300 came back to me! At the time, this seemed as if it were kind of a steep handling fee. So, from my standpoint, Gordon and I were off to a rocky start. But, as I said, I came to respect him in the end.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think, over all, that he was a worthy and competent legislator?

Sen. Moore: Yes. You have to use the word "great" sparingly, so I would not say that any of them were great, but Gordon was a good representative of the caucus. He was very adroit, politically. He was good.

Ms. Boswell: How did he get himself into the leadership position that he had?

Sen. Moore: I think that he was a younger

star coming on, who was extremely affable, did not get crosswise with Mardesich, had enough respect from the older members like Al Henry, Bill Day, and Don Talley, some of the others, so he was the natural choice. Henry didn't want it. Big Daddy didn't want it. Don Talley didn't want it, but Gordon was in the appropriate age bracket, an attorney, and pretty skilled, and well-liked, so he succeeded to it after Mardesich left. I've never had any real problems with Walgren, except I was a little aggravated that he wasn't stronger, but like I said, I didn't realize at the time how loose Democratic organization is compared to Republican counterparts.

Ms. Boswell: So the Republicans were much more "toe the mark" in terms of leadership?

Sen. Moore: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think it's the nature of their philosophical grounding, or what? Why is that?

Sen. Moore: No, I think they're in power so little of the time that it's "we better hang together or we'll hang separately." I think that's the basic thing. "We only will be here a short time, so let's get it done fast, and we need to stay cohesive." They can't tolerate anybody getting off the reservation. And that's the way it almost always works. In Congress, and here in the last sixty years, Democrats have had control of the legislative process almost all the time. So, when the GOP is in, they're going to push hard to get what they want—now!

Ms. Boswell: Some people that I've talked to in these interviews have told me that when it gets right down to it, they're not partisan. What they vote on, and what they do, is just on the issue itself. Would you characterize yourself in that way, too, or not?

Sen. Moore: No, I'm partisan. Of course. I've made a choice. A lot of people are born Democrats or born Republicans. Well, I was born a Republican and I made a choice, I changed. And since I changed, I have to keep proving, every day, that I'm a real Democrat. They don't let me show any signs of Republicanism, or any leanings. Otherwise I would be suspect. So, I'm a solid Democrat vote, which fits my personality anyway. Whatever the majority has decided they want to go with, I go with. Once in a while I get off the reservation, but rarely.

Ms. Boswell: Is it possible to be nonpartisan?

Sen. Moore: I've not known such a person, yet. I'm sure they think they are, but if you were nonpartisan, you would not lock up on a procedural motion. On all procedural motions, it is expected that you will support the leader. On bills, of course, under our weak system, you can do anything you want to do. The Republicans always vote on procedural motions as a unit. We do, too. I don't want to hear any of this business about "I look at the issue." That's baloney.

Ms. Boswell: Would it be a common practice for you, when you had a bill, to get people from the Republican party to cosponsor it?

Sen. Moore: Oh, yes. We have issues that shouldn't be considered partisan. For example, on unemployment compensation, the two minds that know anything about it in the Senate are Irv Newhouse, Republican, and Larry Vognild, Democrat. They cosponsor. They sponsor every bill like that. And, if you see the two names on an unemployment comp bill, you know it's okay. You know that business has been represented by Newhouse, and you know that labor's been represented by Vognild, and that's good enough for me. Newhouse is an exceptional asset in both

Houses. He is very strong and smart. We got on well socially, but in hearings and on the floor, I'm always alert because he can be deadly. Additionally, he knows Senate rules, which in itself is a killer weapon. Totally at ease farming or legislating. He has an austere side. I like and fear him, but when I see his name with Vognild as sponsors on that kind of a bill, I'm an automatic vote. I don't give it any further thought. I know I couldn't come up with anything as good.

Ms. Boswell: Are there other duos like that?

Sen. Moore: I cosponsored a bill with Jack Metcalf. He found out the Federal Reserve Board had never been audited, so I joined him on legislation asking Congress to establish audit procedures. We were never successful. It appears the "Fed" is a sacred cow and should never be questioned. I often wondered if it was my name or Jack's that did the bill in.

Ms. Boswell: What was your relationship with him like?

Sen. Moore: Jack really belongs in the Libertarian Party where you don't pay for any services you don't use. He loves politics and would rather make a statement than be effective. Physically, he's a cross between Abe Lincoln and Dick Tracy, but any similarity beyond that does not exist. He's quite certain he's always right. Although a veteran of countless poker games, he lashes out against gambling. He reminds me of the English nobleman, who, when told his peasants were indulging in sexual intercourse, ordered it stopped declaring it was too good for them. That is about as logical as Jack often was in the twelve years I served with him. But neither Jack nor I like to be programmed. That was our link. Try as I would, I could never dislike him.

Ms. Boswell: Any other people you often sponsor with?

Sen. Moore: Amondson. I think that if people see Moore and Amondson on a bill, why not? There is some respect for both of them in their caucuses.

Ms. Boswell: What kind of bills would those be?

Sen. Moore: Those would be bills that pertain to banking, pertain to regulatory reform, civil service. Those are all things that come through our committee. I learned a long time ago to be as brief as possible, so when I explain a bill, I try to do it in twenty-five words or less. Sometimes it goes so fast that people aren't really listening, so Amondson gets up on the Republican side, and maybe takes fifty words to explain. Sends a signal to the Republicans that they're supposed to vote for it. I've already sent one to our people. He's very gracious.

Ms. Boswell: Are there any other little tricks, or things like that, or relationships on the floor that make things go more smoothly?

Sen. Moore: Yes, and it takes time. It will never happen under term limits. Slim Rasmussen is proof enough term limits are unnecessary and are an evil. Slim is to this day the oldest member, most years as a Senate member, most consecutive years in the Senate. If, for no other reason than his institutional memory, he is a treasure. Believe me, it takes at least a term to discover who, among lobbyists, members, and bureaucrats, is *always* on the level. Some are salesmen and don't tell you everything they know about their product. Even staff are not always objective, having their own prejudices. Slim could corner the most adroit and I hold it was his years of knowledge that gave him the edge.

Ms. Boswell: Will you expand a little on your views of term limits?

Sen. Moore: I think term limits are an outrage. It's a quick fix, that on close examination, is quite destructive. I had been here about four years before I was able to detect the wheat from the chaff. After six or eight years, I had most of the bureaucrats figured out. I could tell from their answers whether they were lying or not—I don't think a legislator who's limited to eight years in the Senate is going to be able to do a real job. How many times do you get a Newhouse, or a Talmadge, or a Vognild? Not very often. One of them is a farmer, one is an attorney, and one's a fireman. From now on, they'll just get up to speed and they'll be out. No gain.

No, it takes years. Only this last session, last session a year ago, did I finally get close to Ann Anderson and Neil Amondson. I think they wanted to be friendly, and I think I was a little standoffish, a little suspicious. It turned out that I was wrong about them all these years, and they extended the olive branch. I accepted it, and mutual respect has blossomed. Amondson, for example, I now think of as a potential legislative hall-of-famer! They help me, and I help them. I can go to them, I can go to Newhouse. Newhouse is a little more rigid than they are. George Sellar, the minority leader, I can work with.

Ms. Boswell: You can do that without too heavy suspicions from your caucus that this is some sort of betrayal?

Sen. Moore: Oh, no. No, it's common practice. In fact, when I see a bill come from the House with twenty Democrat names and no Republican names, I know that's a partisan issue. I look at that before I look at the title of the bill, frankly, and I know then that I'd better think about this. But, if I see Dick King and Bill Reams on a bill from opposite viewpoints, liberal, conservative, I know it's probably been worked out, and I'm not going to inquire too heavily into it after that. I'll read the synopsis, and if it sounds reasonable, and isn't going to condemn the poor to be poor forever, I'll be there.

Ms. Boswell: What do you think about this past session? Are there certain parts of it that are memorable, or certain things that they passed that you think are particularly important?

Sen. Moore: I don't think this was a particularly heavyweight session. These short sessions, coming in a non-budget year, have a tendency to be overridden, or to be taken more seriously the next year. When you pass a bill in an even-numbered year, don't be too sure that it won't be seriously tampered with in the next session. When you're here for 105 days, although the budget is overriding, there's still enough time for a lot of other things. In these short sessions, everybody wants to get out of here because it's an election year. They want to get out with the best damage control they can achieve, so they don't take bad votes, or what might be perceived as bad votes.

Ms. Boswell: Were there any bills that particularly surprised you this year that did or didn't get passed?

Sen. Moore: I'm always a little surprised when anything good happens. I consider that financial institutions bill as being critical. It was done last year, but it was implemented, put into effect, this year. I was disappointed in the fact that a bill that I wanted badly, having to do with securities, died in committee in the House. A member who I've been quite close to in the House changed his vote in committee at the last second, so I lost the bill. He came over, kind of furtively, to see if I was going to kill him or not, and I said, "All

I'm asking is, why did you put Greenberg ahead of me in your thinking?" And he said, "It wasn't Greenberg," so then I knew somebody else had put the finger on him. I still don't know who it is. Of course, the chairman could have rapped the gavel down sooner, he gave plenty of time for him to change his mind. Pete Kremen was a disappointment. I may never know what happened there, and I don't care. What's done is done, move on.

Ms. Boswell: Another thing that this session dealt with, that many other sessions tried to deal with, is civil service reform. You talked about the state employees being a strong supporter of yours. How do you handle a situation like this one, where you're advocating certain types of reform?

Sen. Moore: You just tell them that this thing is inevitable, which I did. Now, what you have to do, is sit down with the governor, the governor's staff, and tell them how far you're willing to give, what is your bottom line, and once you have established that, then see how far the governor is willing to come to meet you. And you have to work it out. I might say, "I'm not in a position to help you. I will do what I can because I am your friend, and our goal is close to the same, but this is bigger than our personal whims."

Sometimes it's necessary to just lock all these players in a room, and you're outside with the key. No bathroom. You work it out. They get pretty frantic after a while, and they begin to work it out.

Ms. Boswell: What about the whole issue of collective bargaining?

Sen. Moore: I'm a strong advocate of collective bargaining at all levels. University-level professors like to think they're above it all, or should be sacred somehow. I think everybody's entitled to that, and I think everybody should be part of a unit. Otherwise, you're totally at the mercy of management.

Ms. Boswell: Youth violence has been an issue this session, hasn't it?

Sen. Moore: This is a harsh thing to say, but I am not sure that legislation is going to do any good. I think we must try, but every society that gets too crowded in space becomes violent. They turn to gambling and violence. That's man's tradition, and I think we're in that state of affairs in the United States. We have too many people in too small a space, and it's getting worse.

I'll tell you, if about one more of these people that has committed multiple rape gets a fifteen-year sentence, and for one reason or another gets out in four years, there's going to be a vigilante operation started in this country. It's going to be ugly. Innocent people are going to get killed. "Who needs a trial? Let's kill 'em." "Sucker won't do it again." And I see that in the offing, and that's a terrible state of affairs.

I hate to see the tort system tampered with. We've tampered with it in this state. There's an effort nationally, a Republican move by the far right, to call almost anything a frivolous case, and deny people the right to sue. That's another thing that's going to aggravate the situation. People will become frustrated on too many fronts. "We can't sue, or they're telling us we have to go to church," or some such. People are going to feel closed in on, and then one of these terrible, violent crimes happens. People are going to become over-exercised and take the law into their own hands.

Here I am, don't believe in capital punishment, but I can tell you that if anything happened to my first wife, or my daughter, or Virginia, I could come unglued, and I'm a pretty solid citizen. But I could get carried away. I could take a ball bat and just beat the

offender's brains out. If I'm getting in that mood, think of all the people that are a little wilder, a little less understanding. It could be just a terrible scene in this country, and it may be imminent.

Ms. Boswell: But you don't see legislation being effective on this issue?

Sen. Moore: I doubt it. I think it's the state of society. I don't think legislation can do anything. It's like, what can you do about a water shortage? Not much. Well, this is out of control too, and I don't think legislation will change people. And then, how can you legislate against drive-by shootings?

CHAPTER 9

CAMPAIGNS AND THE PARTY SYSTEM

Ms. Boswell: Now tell me, would you really have run again this next time?

Sen. Moore: No. I said in 1990, this is the last time. I told the committee, one more time, and I jokingly said, "That will give me .500 batting average, which was four wins and four losses." You know, my opponents hit me very hard, last campaign. I had a tremendous opponent. One-third my age, charismatic, good talker, and they ran ads every week for months. Dan Evans would sign one. Slade Gorton would sign one. Norm Maleng would sign one. Eikenberry would sign one, and Kraabel, the president of the city council, just beating up on me, week after week. So, he had a good shot at it. He spent a quarter of a million.

Ms. Boswell: What was his name?

Sen. Moore: Andy McLauchlan. He spent $250,000, and I think I spent $280,000 or $290,000. Pretty ridiculous for a job that pays $25,000. And pretty ridiculous to put that much money on a horse with no future.

Ms. Boswell: Well, hardly. That's not your reputation.

Sen. Moore: Thank you.

Ms. Boswell: What was the factor that made the difference in that election?

Sen. Moore: I always believed in sizing up the opponent. He started in May, going after me. We never responded. My supporters were getting desperate by July. August, they're out of their minds. September primary, I only beat him by 100 or 200 votes. There were just the two of us going head-to-head. By October, I hated to answer the phone. My friends and allies are already despairing. "When are you going to do something?" Well, this may be a little crude, but I always believe in allowing the opponent to become emboldened by taking his best blows, getting him into the teepee before letting him see the tomahawk. I want to get them in close quarters. And he kept becoming bolder and bolder, and beginning to make some pretty outrageous statements, all the while hiding behind Evans and all these good-government types.

Then, in the last two and a half weeks, we counterattacked. He made a terrible mistake in the campaign. When people get extremely confident, they sometimes do that. He was so sure of himself, and their poll showed that he was quite a few points ahead of me. So he put out a brochure showing himself shooting a basket.

It was the clumsiest whiting-out job you ever saw on his jersey, all across the front of it. You could even see the lumps sticking out. So, we seized on that. "What is Andy trying to hide?" That became the theme. Of course, what he was doing was trying to make it appear that he'd played in Seattle, because he maintained that his grandfather was a Seattle minister, and his father was a Seattle minister. Offhand, I said, "I wonder if anybody in his family has ever earned an honest living?" Of course that infuriates some people, but I felt good about saying it—it was a Vic Meyers shot.

Ms. Boswell: So, he was claiming to have played basketball in Seattle?

Sen. Moore: He let it appear that he was a Seattle boy. He was from Longview, and it said Lumberjacks on the jersey. So, that's what we built the campaign on.

There were other things that we wove into that. What is he trying to hide? And then, we had a guy—we called him the "French Underground"—who appeared out of nowhere. He went down one day to Andy's headquarters, and he said, "You know, I'm really interested in Andy's campaign. I'm new here and I don't know the candidates."

Andy's father was the only one in the office that day, and he gave our guy the literature, who then says, "Well, what's in those boxes over there?"

"Oh," Andy's father says, "That's the stuff that's yet to be used. I'll give you those."

So, he gave our guy everything that was to be used, Andy's entire mail plan! So, our stuff arrived the same day as his mailings. When he hit me, we had our rebuttal in the same mailing!

Ms. Boswell: Pretty clever, I'd say.

Sen. Moore: That guy would be a guy to be with in the underground.

Ms. Boswell: Would some people consider that sort of a dirty campaign, or not? How would you define a dirty campaign?

Sen. Moore: I think a dirty campaign is when you just outright lie about somebody. Say they say you are a Communist, and you're no more a Communist than Buffalo Bill. Lying, I think is dirty. I think if your opponent has a child who is sixteen, and already has four DWIs, I think that's bad to use in a campaign. It has nothing to do with your opponent's ability.

Ms. Boswell: So, family or personal attacks?

Sen. Moore: Yes. I understand what you're saying. Innuendo is borderline, and that's what we were doing. But, people began to wonder, what did he white out? It was "Lumberjacks" of Longview. All the time, he wants to leave the impression that he's from Seattle. Now, which is the dirtiest? His misleading the people, or me whacking him? I don't know. I think a case can be made for him and against him, and for and against me.

Ms. Boswell: Is it fair to say "that's politics?" Is that politics?

Sen. Moore: That's certainly a segment. Unfortunately, it's become well over half the campaign, now. Television's changed the whole thing a lot. You look good on TV, you've got a leg up.

Ms. Boswell: Do you use TV at all?

Sen. Moore: I did last time. Because we had so much money, I just thought, "Well, guess we'll do that, too." One of our people wanted to have me go on one of those cable stations. So, we ran about 300 spots.

Ms. Boswell: How effective do you think that was?

Sen. Moore: We had one where I was shown catching a Frisbee while I'm walking fast. And then it shows me striding off really fast, and going down some steps, hippity-hop, to counteract the idea that I'm so old I should be bronzed.

Ms. Boswell: Is age a factor?

Sen. Moore: No.

Ms. Boswell: Was that brought up a lot or not?

Sen. Moore: It was brought up when Murray ran. He brought it up, and the senior citizens went crazy. Unsolicited by us, they went down and camped in his office and wouldn't get out. He ran an editorial four years later saying I was too old. Of course, I was four years older then, and they were four years older, and they went wild again. Gave him a terrible workout.

Ms. Boswell: I almost got the impression that you used your age as almost an advantage that set you apart. "I'm going to be the oldest freshman in the Legislature." That seemed to be something that caught peoples' attention, not as a negative at all. Is that fair?

Sen. Moore: Well, of course, at that time, I was a young sixty-six. If I'd had a hairpiece, I could have been forty-six. I was kind of a model for older people. If he can do it, look what our guy can do, sort of thing.

Ms. Boswell: The *History of Washington* is what they use in many of the high schools, and in there they made the statement that Washington people vote for the man, not the party. It's been proven because of these interesting switches, and because of the fact that somebody may be voted in as governor, but whoever is elected for President may be of a totally different party. Would you say that's the case?

Sen. Moore: I would say so, although in the thirties, the big slogan was "Vote 'er Straight"—straight Democrat. The Republicans didn't get elected. Now, whether that was Roosevelt pulling them all along, or whether the country wanted to get on with change in '32, a chance to mature, I'm not sure. The proposition that there is independence among the voters here has been true, certainly since 1940. GOP Art Langlie was elected. Democratic Legislature. Democrat Mon Wallgren was elected, and two years later he had the wildest Republican group imaginable on his hands. Langlie was elected in '48, still had to grapple with a Democratic Legislature. And when Rosellini came in, he did have pretty solid control. But, ever since then, Evans had to grapple with a Democratic Legislature on both sides, both Houses. Dixy viewed herself as a Democrat, and in a sense she was, but she did not represent the mainstream of the Democratic Party. She had to grapple with a Legislature that was unfriendly.

For the party system to be effective in a democracy, there must be party discipline. With the advent of the initiative/referendum system, and the open primary system in Washington, political parties were weakened. With that evolution, discipline all but vanished. Since anyone can file as a Democrat or Republican or anything else, it has become a way of life in the Legislature to declare your party affiliation, not on ideology, but on demographics. So people run to get elected, not necessarily to follow the party positions. To me, it is ridiculous that the party platform is not written by *elected legislators*, but by the party mechanisms, two totally different entities whose relationship at best is civil, and at worst, a wink and a nod.

Ms. Boswell: What do you mean by party mechanisms?

Sen. Moore: Oh, the county or the state chairman appoints people to a party platform committee, and they write the platform. But, you know, their thinking is not necessarily representative of their legislative members. It's my belief that more often than not, the members of the platform committee are out of touch with the voters as well. They're coming out of party clubs, and they don't know what's going on in the districts with the average person. As an example, if I had to choose between attending the Thirty-sixth

District Democrat Club or the Norwegian Commercial Club, the latter would have won out.

So, you know, the party platform doesn't mean as much to elected officials, and why should it? There's no party discipline. It is difficult for the leadership to work constructively. The mavericks in each caucus force the leader in each caucus to pamper their agenda. Of course, when you are in the majority, the leader has the power to designate chairmanships, which can be used to keep people in line. Although I am a free spirit and rather outspoken, I do believe in party discipline, and my record of following the majority/minority leader is solid. I believe if we don't hang together, we will hang separately.

The only time the party is any kind of a vehicle is in presidential years, when they select the candidate for president. And that is now being eroded by all of the presidential primaries. So the party doesn't even have that much to say on that any more. In general, whoever spends the most money wins the primary.

You see, I'm a fan of the party system, but it's very difficult, as I said, where you have open primaries. Anybody can run. Look at the people in the Legislature from such assorted spectrums in both parties. More so in the Democratic Party. They have some very conservative types in the Democratic Party; they also have some very liberal types. Well, that wouldn't work in any other country. The party should pick the candidates. The public is not well-informed enough, and they are not that interested in becoming informed.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think that's a long-term thing, or do you think it's sort of cyclical?

Sen. Moore: No. It's long term, and getting more so. When I was twenty-five to forty, people were anxious to be precinct committeemen. You had something to say. Today, you have nothing to say. They are just kind of a straw organization out there, and I think it's a shame. But it can't be otherwise, so long as the party people have no muscle.

Ms. Boswell: Why do you say that?

Sen. Moore: When you get several candidates running for governor, the party's not going to take any part in the primary. They're going to sit it out, and perhaps properly, so winners are not beholden to the party. They raised their own money, their friends elected them, their charisma elected them, or whatever, so that's why it will not change. It won't get any better.

Ms. Boswell: Where does that lead—the end of the parties, or not?

Sen. Moore: I rather think so. I feel we would be better off if we had three or four parties.

As it is now, look at Perot. Mr. Nobody. What did he get, a quarter of the vote or something? Doesn't that tell you that they're ready for a third, fourth party? I think so. They're tired of us.

Ms. Boswell: Are the major parties now doing anything to try to stave that off?

Sen. Moore: No. They don't see it. And, do you think that if we were to put on the ballot a return to the closed primary, where the party selects them, do you think that initiative would go? Down, down, down. No, I think the parties will get weaker.

And one of the worst things are presidential primaries. That's taking what little they have left in most states. Now, it's getting to be a media event. "Why don't we have a block of states? We'll have it in January, so we'll be first, or, we'll wait 'till July and we'll be the last." Who pays any attention to the platform? If you paid attention to the platform,

you'd never get elected. I endorse the platform because I'm in a district where I could do almost anything, and Virginia and I are in touch with the voters, all kinds of voters.

Ms. Boswell: How much of that is the fault of the party leaders, whether they're at the county or state, or even national, level? Are they the ones that are missing the boat?

Sen. Moore: I think they know what's going on, but they can't stem the tide. There's no way. Just like if you put something on the ballot to return to the way I think it should be, it goes down five to one. If I think the party should select me as the candidate and they don't want me, I can go out and start a new party. Fair enough.

Ms. Boswell: Was the party helpful to you in your legislative races? 1974, '76?

Sen. Moore: It's my opinion, without answering directly, that parties can hurt your campaigns. How much they can help you is open to question. I could have done better, in 1986 and 1990, if I had the money they spent on organizing volunteers, manning a headquarters, etc. We could have presented more of a united front. As it was, the party was almost competing for the spotlight among themselves. In all fairness, does anyone pay attention to a party campaign headquarters with volunteers answering phone calls, stuffing envelopes with material most people don't even open? No! With campaigns being mechanized, the mailings are done by mailing companies. The old days of campaigning are over.

Now, who pays any attention to a sample ballot where all the Democrats are in big letters, and all the Republicans are in small letters? I think that's insulting to people. I opposed slanted sample ballots when I was county chairman. And yet, that's their idea of a campaign. It's the same as it's been for fifty years. They haven't had a new idea in a long time.

Ms. Boswell: Is your argument that they can be hurtful or detrimental, based on your recent experience, or are there other experiences that lead you to think that they're more harmful, their harm can hurt you more than their help can help you?

Sen. Moore: What you have is a district chairman beating the precinct committeemen over the head to get them to deliver sample ballots, and to stuff envelopes, and a whole lot of things that are outmoded. I think they could better use the resources tying in with individual campaigns directly. You have two prongs going out in the same direction. If you have a good campaign, it'd be better to have the party in the tent than outside. No candidate wants to get in the tent because the popularity of the parties is at such a low ebb. The party has little status.

Ms. Boswell: So, if you want to have an impact on the political scene in Washington, where would you go? What would you do? If the parties are that ineffective, and you have an issue or philosophy that you want to promote, where would you go?

Sen. Moore: Say you want a single-payer health plan. We're talking now about an individual. Well, you go to somebody in the Legislature. You get them to carry the torch for you.

Ms. Boswell: That's interesting. If we're talking about the lack of legislators' interest in the party platform, why bother? Why do they go through that process, then?

Sen. Moore: Why do they have a platform?

Ms. Boswell: Yes.

Sen. Moore: It's like a small town that has a I.O.O.F. hall. They probably should have quit fifty years ago, but they don't know how to quit. They don't know how to turn in their charter. There are just a few old people hanging around, there's no new blood. I think it's the same thing. Organizations outgrow their usefulness. As I pointed out earlier: why work for the party when all the goodies are in the hands of the winning candidate?

Ms. Boswell: Do you think that will change?

Sen. Moore: No. I think what will happen in the next twenty-five years in this country is that people are going to get awfully tired of Congress and state legislatures. I think somebody will come along, a demagogue. It could be a saleable Perot, and he'll sweep the country off its feet, and he will bring prosperity. Everybody will be working. It'll be hard on people that don't think the new party line. It will not be unlike Hitler. It won't be as brutal, although it may. I can visualize twenty-five years, maybe sooner, a big movement against gays, and perhaps other nonconformists. It may very well make McCarthyism seem mild indeed.

Ms. Boswell: Are you talking about the ascendancy of what some people might call the "religious right?"

Sen. Moore: I don't think it will take that form. I think they have a bad name, too. I think the religious right is, right now, about where the left wing of the Democratic party was fifty years ago. I think both extremes are not going to be acceptable. There is going to be a new extreme that comes right out of the middle, but it's going to be extreme. You will march to a rigid tune. We will hear, "This is the tune the forefathers meant, not what's been going on. You don't want any more of that, do you?" I think both parties, at that point, succumb.

Ms. Boswell: A slightly scary scenario, I would say. You don't have much optimism, I take it?

Sen. Moore: Did you ever see a thing called a "histomap?" It's about a foot wide, and about four or five feet long. Hangs on the wall. All different colors of cultures starting with 2,000 B.C. Egypt, which had half the world's power, and tracing by centuries when power and wealth shifted during the next 4,000 years. It shows in these confines who was powerful for what period, and there are dates along side. The United States is just going to be a little blip in there because things move faster now. The United States probably reached its zenith about 1970. Our arrogance only hastens our vulnerability. I think, if I were to draw a histomap, I would be moving us off to the side a little bit, and I would show Japan, India, Central and South America, and China, gaining a little in the last few years. The rest of them are pretty static, except for China. China has a big bulge that's coming, and it will crowd everybody for a while until something else happens.

We are likely to roll along until an overpopulation crisis strikes. The fact that we are now periodically encountering water shortages should dictate that we are planning for the future. Quite to the contrary. Except for Senator Karen Fraser, no one takes the water shortage as an omen of the future seriously. Pollution of air, water, and land is now at the turning point. We either put in place an orderly process using a 100 year plan for water, air, sewer, and other public needs or continue as we are, doing little or nothing.

I think we have peaked out. A question that has recurred frequently during these sixteen years is where the state, the United States, and the world, were and are headed.

Taking the state first, the trend toward suburban living grew faster than the infrastructure could accommodate. Planning is almost un-American. So with little planning, urban sprawl has been the order of the period. But the computer age brought business to the suburbs which helped the tax base, which made for better streets, schools, and everything we have grown to feel is necessary to our lives.

For sixty years, the Republicans have talked about saving America for their grandchildren, but how many times do they vote for planning or the environment? My guess is that little will be planned and western Washington will be as unattractive in fifty years as it was attractive fifty years ago. Look what we did to the best farm land in the state. The Kent valley is now paved, and that didn't happen before we knew better. San José paving firms had already ruined that valley's farm economy. We paid no attention to that prime example.

The United States is just beginning a cultural shock as we move from our claim to being the greatest, to one of several—perhaps many—countries sharing world leadership. I feel I lived in the golden age of the white man. When I started my sixty years in the work force, the only competition came from other white males. Were I starting out now, with no college degree—and maybe with one—I'd face women and minorities. When I started, women largely were expected to marry and stay home. Their job opportunities were largely limited to K-12 teaching, nursing, stenography, being a receptionist, and waiting tables. So as I progressed, little stood in my way toward advancing to better pay, better working conditions, and a good life. Today all that is changed, and for the better, with more equal opportunity.

And this means the white man—generically speaking—must come to grips with the fact that knowledge and emotions are not his field alone. If whites can accommodate to the changing structure of the world, they can survive. But, should we continue on our present "whites are born to rule" course, we are doomed. It is my hope that through intermarriage we can, in a few generations, be of more or less the same color. At least that will eliminate one area of prejudice.

I had an interesting thing happen. When I was ten years old, people used to say, "Well, I'm going to send my child to college so he won't have to work like I've worked." Do you know, in the sixties, I heard somebody say, "My child is going to college, so he won't have to work." That's thirty-five, forty years later. I think there's more of that out there than you think. That's why they all want to be brokers or work for the government.

Ms. Boswell: Do they think they actually don't have to work, then?

Sen. Moore: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: That's not why you became a broker, is it?

Sen. Moore: I became a broker because I needed the money. But, I did so many other things while I was being a broker, that it kind of salved my conscience for being a broker. I know one, two, I know three ethical brokers, and I probably know 200 brokers all together. Three out of 200 is not very good.

Ms. Boswell: No, it doesn't seem like it. Talking about a work ethic, and tying it back to the party, I had a conversation with Bob Greive, and he has a really interesting perspective on parties as well. My sense from him was that, it's not so much the party platform or even party philosophy, it's just a majority ruling the system, and keeping that system going, but having the power to dominate the system. Where the party fits into

that, is that this is where you get all your recruits to build a coalition which will allow you to rule, essentially. That may not be fair, and it certainly is a simplification, but maybe there's some truth to it.

Sen. Moore: Sounds like Bob, and I don't find fault with that.

Ms. Boswell: I'm thinking about all the hordes of workers, doorbellers, and the people who are at the base of a party, or at least of the base of a campaign to help whoever it is win. Is that really going by the wayside, too, as the parties weaken? This kind of core of people who will get out there and work for a candidate?

Sen. Moore: I think so. Media is going to take over in its place. See, in order to be an effective precinct committeeman, you must, and I mean must, circulate in your precinct all the time. You've got to know everybody. They have to regard you, maybe not as brilliant, maybe not even halfway smart, but as a sincere person who will help them.

You have a developmentally disabled child, three years old, and the precinct committeeman should be acquainted with that person, and say, "Why don't I come today and stay with your child while you get a day off?" Well, you know damn well they're probably going to vote for your candidate. But, we don't do that any more. Most of the committeemen that I know are not active in anything.

The other way that a precinct committeeman can do it is to be active in an organization, and earn the respect of the people in that organization. It is not enough to just join and belong. If you are a precinct committeeperson, belonging to a non-political group—like a community club, service club, social club, etc.—is in itself not enough to acquire respect and status. In any organization those who volunteer to do the tough jobs—membership, finance, program—these are commitments other members notice and respect.

Ms. Boswell: Does that commitment to the tough jobs, to personal contact, still happen with legislators in terms of their districts? Again, I get the sense that in the past, you have a network in your district that if anything happens, you help those people, whatever it might be. Does that still happen, or is that gone, too?

Sen. Moore: I think it's happening less than it did fifteen years ago. But, not a whole lot less. The problem now is, that there are assorted outlets for you. There is your legislator. There is the talk show. There are ways that the politician gets diluted by other things. So, I think that it may have leveled out. There will always be a few people like me who know they don't have the talent to project, or the force to project, their ideas across in a saleable manner, so they rely on taking care of people's problems. There'll always be some like that. And, believe you me, the constituent-oriented person is important. He or she is the only link between the voter and the bureaucracy.

It works so well in our district, because I relieved Helen Sommers of much of the constituent problems. They liked and respected Helen, but Virginia and I were the ones who largely took care of their problems. And so, in spite of the fact that they didn't have the respect for me that they had for Helen, they'd still vote for me because I was acting like what I suggest a precinct committeeman should be, on a larger scale. Now, as these districts get larger—you see, I had only 60,000 people when I was elected, and now I have 100,000—it's getting almost too big for that personal touch anymore. But we still keep the door open to friend and foe alike.

Ms. Boswell: Did you find that even now, with all the publicity, that you still get requests, and hear of problems?

Sen. Moore: Yes. They still write. They still phone. My phone rings in here, and Jim Hughes picks it up every day and solves the ones that he can, tells me about the ones that he thinks I need to know about—but he still tells me about all the ones he's doing.

Ms. Boswell: Do most of the legislators in today's Legislature lack that personal touch?

Sen. Moore: I think it's an inverse ratio to their egos. The ones with giant egos—take at a congressional-level somebody we both know, Norm Dicks—his ego needs gratification all the time. It needs to be on a grand scale. But Norm is equally interested in people who lose their food stamps or whatever. As the districts get larger, more people in them, I think that kind of gratification will be what drives people. I got enough gratification out of straightening out the bureaucracy when some snafu had taken place. That's all I want. In fact, I think I mentioned before that I never sought publicity. I didn't want it, and I was disappointed that I was unable to escape.

Ms. Boswell: The last burst of it?

Sen. Moore: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: In terms of party participation, what about the whole notion of having a fund to help other legislators?

Sen. Moore: I think it's appropriate. Some members can't raise money. I spent more on a campaign than anybody ever has, and probably may ever. I can raise money without trying. Talmadge's talents don't raise money. He's raised only $10,000 or $15,000 for the state Supreme Court, which makes me sick.

Ms. Boswell: What about the line there in terms of ethics? I suppose a part of it is your definition of what ethics is. Can you cross the line there by raising this money and doling it out, or getting people to vote with you, or go along with you on certain issues, because you've contributed to their campaign or done some other favor for them?

Sen. Moore: It looks different to everyone. I suppose it is a little like the Christian who says, "I am my own person. I'm not going to be part of this group."

"Well, what's going to motivate you?"

"The Lord." Well, you take any five people, and you'll have a hard time getting them to agree on what it was the Lord really wanted. So, even those so-called purists interpret God's will as they want to interpret it. Some say, "Turn the other cheek." Some say, "An eye for an eye." Both right. Both wrong. Then there is a situation in which an ardent "dry" would never own a bar, but would rent space in his building to a bar and collect a percent of the sales—I encountered this in my own life experience!

So, I think the important thing is to get elected, but I never ran a dirty campaign. I've been in some, but I never participated. I did send two checks back last time. One from the telephone company. They had supported my opponent, then wanted to "tip" me after the campaign was over. I forget who the other one was. You accept whatever it takes in the line of money to get elected. No amount can really buy your vote.

Ms. Boswell: If an organization, like the telephone company, gives you money—you explained the situation in that case—but what do they normally expect in return? Do they expect anything?

Sen. Moore: They expect to get in the door. They expect to get a fair hearing and some of them, a few of them, figure that you owe them, but not very many. They're just paying their dues to be able to get a seat at the table so they can explain their position.

Ms. Boswell: What about lobbyists? Did you find that the firms or the groups that are bigger, that have lobbyists and also contribute, do they expect something? Is that any different?

Sen. Moore: Yes and no. My all-time largest contributor was the public employees, but they knew from before I was elected that I was their advocate. So all they were doing was electing their friend, who was such a believer that if there had been a third of the money or a tenth of the money, he would have still been there. "We've got to save him, so we're going to give him whatever it takes to keep him—get there and stay there."

Why does Weyerhaeuser support certain people, and not support me? Because I think Weyerhaeuser was too slow to get the news on reforesting, and then they sought to plant trees that weren't indigenous. They planted trees that would grow fast, maybe didn't help the erosion or the fauna. But they have people who believe totally in Weyerhaeuser, so they support Weyerhaeuser strongly.

Then there are groups like the firemen and the police. I support the firemen and police strongly, always have. Gradually, down through the years, they became more supportive because of my position.

You're going to see a big change now with term limits. Buying and selling of legislators is going to be a very well-honed business. I believe that you will see big entities, whether they be labor, or business, or others, will have their own candidates.

Ms. Boswell: So you do see that there will be more, literally, control by special interests?

Sen. Moore: Oh, absolutely. And all this talk about, well, they won't be in long enough to cause any damage, I wouldn't count on it. Think: if a person's in just eight years, he'd like a job after he's out. You're going to see more people getting jobs, as a result of this business, than now exists. What's wrong with professional politicians? It's a revered field in some countries, but here character assassination is the name of the game.

Ms. Boswell: Are there really, truly corrupt legislators? Were there some when you were serving?

Sen. Moore: Well, how corrupt is corrupt? I don't know. I think, maybe, I might have known three or four that might qualify. But, if you are a member and head of a union, and through legislation you're able to fatten your union members up, or protect them from something or other, and you end up getting a pay raise from $40,000 to $60,000, is that corrupt? I don't know.

I've probably mentioned it before, but I'm not a big believer in good government. I think good government, very often, is the expensive way out. Purity does not necessarily mean competence. Purity is a wonderful thing. That congressman from Iowa, Leach, is pure, but as to a contribution to the general welfare of humanity, I don't see much.

Ms. Boswell: But you're not saying anything goes, either.

Sen. Moore: No. I can think of an improvement that I would make here. I would do away with the transportation commission. I'd put it back in the hands of the governor where there's some accountability. But, you know who loves it the way it is? The contractors. And when the recipients love something too much, you'd better take another look. It can be a cozy arrangement now.

Ms. Boswell: We've talked a little bit about your sense of the declining role of the party, but why is that happening? The party used to be the end all. Why has that come about?

Sen. Moore: Well, there is no patronage for a state chairman or a county chairman anymore. There used to be a saying in upstate New York, "Money makes the mare go," and they had a picture of a horse on this coin. It was a mayoral campaign, hence the play on words, and to the victor belong the spoils. Now, there is nothing in it for a precinct committeeman, except zealousness, love of the game, but they just don't have anything that they can dole out to help anybody—zero influence.

Look at Lowry's appointments. They don't come from the ranks. They come from business, labor, education, a lot of fields, but they don't come from the ranks of the Democratic party. And the same was true of Spellman, Gardner, Dixy, and Evans, and so on. Evans was a little more patronage-oriented. I believe he took care of his friends. Since that time, there's been very little of that.

The governors all seemed to be a little frightened, so they reach out and try to get this group mollified by appointing one of them to the Parole Board, the Liquor Board or to some environmental group. So, there's not anything that comes from the party and there's nothing that goes into the party. It's a structure that serves a purpose to nominate a president.

We've been around 200 years plus now, and there are only two parties. England has three. Other countries have multiple parties. The power structure that controls the economy of the United States, and controls the institutions, whether they be religious or economic, want two parties. They don't want three parties. Three parties could be quite embarrassing, or could disrupt the present system, which they have mastered. It'd make their life more complicated. It is true, when you look at Congress, and look at the U.S. Senate, there isn't that much difference between the parties. So, the power structure in this country owns both parties. You and I, and others, like to think that there's a liberal group, and we're proud to be in it, or a conservative group, and we're proud to be in it, but actually, you don't see very much of a progressive nature, or a regressive nature, going through Congress. Maybe that's good. But I'm not of that persuasion.

The thoughtful, disenchanted citizen should be afforded a place to go to protest both parties. I, for many years, when United Airlines was the dominant coastal carrier, always gave my business to Western Airlines just to keep UAL aware of the competition. Not that I disliked UAL, but it is good to have competition; and so it is with politics. Minor parties tend to affect the major parties with their ideas. Were I in England, I doubt I'd vote the Liberal Party, but I quietly enjoy their continued viability. The dissatisfied "Brit" can register positive disapproval of both Labor and Conservative Parties by voting "Liberal."

In our country, we protest by not voting. Wildman Ross Perot gave these voters a choice, and they did respond.

Ms. Boswell: Okay. This may be the last day of the session, think so?

Sen. Moore: I think so.

Ms. Boswell: What does that make you think about, now? Is there anything nostalgic or that's particularly hitting you as this last day comes?

Sen. Moore: Nothing ever hits me when I leave. I don't know what it is about me. I don't think I did the best I could have done these sixteen years. When I look at Vognild and Talmadge, I think my work was minimal. I think I could have done better. I don't know

quite how, but when I look at their achievements—you know, nobody understands that unemployment compensation business like Vognild. He's been able to work compromises for the good of the taxpayers and the employees. Just a lot of things.

Talmadge, of course, you know, his efforts are gargantuan. Homeric, they're so vast, over such a vast array of issues.

I've cast some deciding votes. I had a vote that people thought was a hard vote for me, but I've never had a hard vote, so I don't understand why people think there are any. This was one which was a matter of whether or not the State Investment Board should divest themselves of South African connections, and I decided that I would vote against divestiture, in spite of the fact that it was billed as a civil rights issue.

Ms. Boswell: So that was, at least from the outside, was a tough issue, but you knew what you had to do there?

Sen. Moore: I either go with the civil rights people and get off the board, or stay. I waited and decided I really had more importance to the board than this issue. Plus, the fact that it was kind of a specious issue to begin with. Do you think General Motors cares whether the State Investment Board sells their stock in General Motors? They're selling it to some other investor. It's not new money that's going to build a new General Motors plant in South Africa or some such.

Plus, how do you trace capital? It's not easy when you're dealing in cash or equivalents. A lot of things could be done that could help the South African economy, but could violate the spirit of that vote if I had voted with the civil rights people. So, it couldn't be as pure as everybody really wanted it to be.

You know, I recall that after I'd been in office for a year or so, I asked Martin Durkan, "How would you rate me as a senator?" After a short pause he said, "You're a journeyman senator." I could hardly wait for him to leave so I could look for "journeyman" in the dictionary. I accepted the definition as accurate: A competent but undistinguished worker.

Ms. Boswell: You're minimizing your achievements. Tell me, don't you think your constituents were generally happy with your performance?

Sen. Moore: Even today, I'll never know, but I think I could have won again.

CHAPTER 10

IDEOLOGY, CONVICTIONS, AND DOGMA

Ms. Boswell: I wanted to ask about your involvement with the capital punishment issue.

Sen. Moore: I've always been opposed, and my view was strengthened when I read an essay by Camus on capital punishment. I was mightily impressed. But, I had always thought it was terrible to kill anything, so it was an easy step for me. Albert Rosellini was, I think, intellectually opposed to capital punishment. That's where it started.

He brought out a fellow who was about to retire from the Michigan penal system. I was in the governor's office the day he got a phone call from Soapy Williams, governor of Michigan, who said, "I've got this guy and he just might fit your ticket." So, Garrett Heyns came out here and Albert hired him right away. He was violently opposed to capital punishment. He'd been in the penal system forever. Turned out that Bobby J. Rhay who was the warden at Walla Walla State Prison didn't think much of capital punishment, either.

I became—I don't know whether I was chairman or vice chairman of the Committee to Abolish Capital Punishment. There were just a handful of us. We had a bill in every time to abolish it, and it was always killed by John O'Brien in the House. One day, Garret Heyns and I were talking. I said, "I don't think we're ever going to pass this legislation, but what would you think if we went to the governor and said, 'Governor, what would you think if somebody called you and asked for clemency? Would you commute their sentence to life imprisonment?' What would you think of that?" Heyns thought, "Yeah, we've tried other ideas and failed." So that was done, and as a result, only one person was hanged in twenty years under Rosellini and Evans, and that one called and said, "Hang me." The rest of them called and said, "Don't hang me." So, a purpose was accomplished.

Intellectually, I am absolutely still as strong against capital punishment as ever. But what do you do with guys like Charles Campbell? I don't want people, in spite of the fact that they made people suffer, to die. I don't like an eye-for-an-eye application. When does it end? Hatfields and McCoys! But, if you give them an injection and they just go to sleep, I think I'm ready. I never thought I would get to this point, but I may be closer than I've ever been.

I read something about Chinese philosophy on capital punishment. When they catch them, and they've done a bad deed, whether it's rape or murder, or whatever, BANG, you're gone. "We know it doesn't deter these crimes, but that guy won't do it again." That's the Chinese attitude. It's a confusing area. Difficult, I think, for most people. And it's not easy for me to all of a sudden decide that the Charles Campbells of society should be singled out. Just where does one draw the line—you die or you live.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think that society has changed so that the kinds of violent crimes are so much more broad-based? You don't have somebody that kills one person, you have somebody who kills ten, or fifteen, or who makes these other horrible crimes that may or may not have been thought of, even.

Sen. Moore: There were epidemics before. In the twenties, Winnie Ruth Judd, I believe that was the person, she was big on killing people and putting them in trunks and shipping them someplace. Every time a trunk arrived at a railroad station, people wondered.

But there were no serious, violent movies in the 1910s and 1920s. Bill Hart and cowboy movies, but they always had a happy ending. There was always a bad guy in a black hat. We live in a very ugly culture here in the United States. We brag about our good works, trying to ignore our violent side. I think it more than a passing curiosity that no head of state has been assassinated in England or Canada, while we lost Lincoln, McKinley, and Kennedy, to say nothing of the unexplained death of Harding. Maybe, just maybe, easy access to guns in the U.S. is contributory. England and Canada have very few guns, and there are laws prohibiting ownership. Perhaps they value life more than do we.

Some say there are 250 million guns in this country. In some countries like Belgium, Holland, they don't have any guns. Who needs them?

Ms. Boswell: So, is gun control the ultimate answer, then?

Sen. Moore: Yes, including making it illegal to own a gun.

Ms. Boswell: Is that ever going to get passed?

Sen. Moore: I doubt it. I think there's an inherent fear in the United States that we are not going to be first, therefore we must be armed to prove we're first. Guns prove we're right.

Ms. Boswell: And no hope of changing that?

Sen. Moore: I don't think so. Our majority leader's son was accidentally killed in the family home with his father's gun. Didn't cause a ripple down here. Of course, we made speeches, sent flowers, etc. I'm somewhat discouraged about the long-range view for the United States. A society where everybody says "TGIF" is in trouble, and it is replacing our Bill of Rights as the code of our culture.

Ms. Boswell: It sounds to me like you aren't one of those people.

Sen. Moore: Well, I'm driven by fear. That's another thing. Nobody's afraid anymore. There's no fear of losing your job. "Oh, I'll go on unemployment comp." "Something will happen." I was always scared of losing my job. I was scared of being fired from Hotpoint. That's why I won the national sales contest three out of the five years I was there. Driven by fear! I was afraid I was going to be fired if I didn't come in first. Securities, same thing—always fearful I'd lose clients. And later, the voters!

Ms. Boswell: Was that fear conditioned by the Depression? By those years? Is it just the generations that were too far removed from that, or what?

Sen. Moore: I think that's a good point. In '29 everything looked great that spring when college graduates got jobs, and everyone thought life was going to go on like that. And then, I know a lot of them were just destroyed by the Depression. I was seeing their destruction all around me when I started to work. Well, what happened to them? "This isn't the way it was supposed to be. Here I am selling shoes, and I have a college education," or "I had this job with a brokerage firm or insurance and now..." and they never recovered. The expectations were too high, and I think I was lucky to have started work just at the right time—at the worst time. Although I was scared, I thought, "Things

can't get any worse," so I borrowed money my entire life. As soon as I was able to borrow $100, I borrowed it to buy something, and, of course, what happened: automobiles have gone from $600 to $12,000. A loaf of bread went from ten cents to a dollar and a half or two dollars. Butter and eggs, same thing. Essentials were so cheap. So, I was buying "things" such as rare coins and real estate, whatever it was, on borrowed money. I could have been ruined but for the U.S. recovery from 1935-40.

I was very lucky. I was somebody that people may not have liked, but they had a kind of a respect for me because I was never a crying Charlie. I just kept working harder. I was invited into that farm situation across from Hanford because people knew I could take it if it didn't work out. The other people who were asked to come in were somewhat like me, if they lost, they lost. They weren't going to sue if it failed—it was just part of life. Of course, the farm worked out extremely well.

Ms. Boswell: It sounds like you've been somewhat of a gambler, then. From the land experience on.

Sen. Moore: Oh, yes. I'm a risk-taker, definitely. If you combine risk-taking with a little depth, I think you really have money in a better perspective, than if you're just scrounging all the time.

A couple here in Olympia, the Carlton Sears—he was a state senator—had a drug store here. He and his wife worked all the time. He went for years without any employees. They worked themselves hard. Their goal was to get one million dollars. They finally made it, and died. No perspective. Nice, God-fearing people who did all the right things. I don't do all the right things, but I try not to hurt anybody. I have a sharp tongue. Virginia understands and accepts me as I am!

Ms. Boswell: On the issue of societal ills—can you legislate change, besides gun control? We talked about violence, but what about other problems?

Sen. Moore: You can sometimes. We'll use civil rights for example. When we put that first little bill together in 1945, it really said nothing. Let's consider not beating up on people because of their race, color, creed, and so on. But, a few years later, the City of Seattle was starting to pass ordinances on fair housing practices, where if the house was for sale, they had to sell it to anybody. We attached the Public Accommodations Act, which meant anyone could sleep in hotels. When Paul Robeson came here, he couldn't sleep in a hotel in Seattle. He had to stay with a black family. He was the star in *Othello*. I went to see *Othello* in the old Metropolitan Theater. He was fabulous, but couldn't get a hotel room! So, you can give substance to things by putting them in statute.

I've also tried for many years to have an animal-cruelty bill. Finally, I became the issue, not the animals. It was Ray Moore, that freak, after us farmers again. Never my intention. But this time, Representative Romero from the House, a legislator from here in Olympia, wanted to promote it. I said, "Godspeed. I'm happy to have you do it." I was able to help her through a couple of rough spots. But basically, she did it all by herself. And we passed an animal-rights bill. But, now it's in a statute, and it'll be easier to amend that. Getting it on the books is the hard part.

Now, whether you make any long-range change in people, I don't know. You might affect another generation coming up, but you're not going to affect the present one, you know, the ones that want to use kittens as the bait for hounds. You're not going to change them, or the cock fighters. But, *maybe*, the next generation *might* be affected. But it's that cruelty that exists in the United States that's

very bothersome to me. And we're critical of bull fighting!

And, there's so much hokum. When I spent five months in France, I came away with an admiration that I didn't have when I went there. They do a little living every day. We, here, wait for the golden years. Well, I've been in the golden years for a long time, and they ain't all they're cracked up to be. The ads don't show the ravages of old age. I have the best of all worlds. I'm healthy. I have a great spouse. We have just enough wherewithal, so if we shop carefully and don't buy expensive automobiles, we're comfortable.

I know everybody thinks they have perspective, but I think you have to have perspective with reference to the food chain, the delicate balances in nature. You have to be thoughtful of all the animals and people that exist. Every once in a while, I say, "Wouldn't it be a hell of a world if people and animals respected each other and they'd just go on generation after generation." I think it was Loren Eisley who said, "The elephant is fully developed. The ant is fully developed. Man is four percent developed." And, there is an old proverb Mark Twain quoted that said, "If a man sees a starving dog and feeds it, the dog will be his friend for life. That is the difference between man and dog." I know it's pretty cynical, but I think it's an absolute truth.

How many times do people who are helped turn on their benefactor? I could be upset when I think about the help that I've given to our county chairman, and the good things that I've done for the Thirty-sixth District, before the matter of my residency surfaced. They turn on you just like that. They can't remember anything you did for them or society. In a mild way, I know how Joan of Arc felt! I've known this to be true since I saw the GOP love Wendell Willkie and then turn on him almost overnight.

Ms. Boswell: What would have been issues this session that you would have gone on a tear? That you would have argued vocally?

Sen. Moore: The pop tax. The beer tax. The cigarette tax. You see, I don't believe in taxing special groups for societal projects.

Talmadge and I, close as we are, disagree on this. He believes in taxing beer, wine, booze, and cigarettes, on the theory that they are causing physical problems, and therefore should pay for the health care plan. Not a bad argument.

I maintain that it's a societal issue, that everybody needs health care, therefore everybody should pay for it. Anyway, we got in a big brouhaha over that. I just get up and shout, and I don't use very many words. I don't belabor anything, then I sit down. I think I always underestimate myself a little bit, because I notice people come up to me afterward and say, "You did the right thing." And I notice one or two of them will switch over and vote with me.

I always took on causes that were not in vogue. I will not follow the mob. I won't do it. So, I took things on that perhaps weren't yet acceptable and tried to push them.

But, you know, I have been credited *wrongly* for always being on the side of the less fortunate. My theory is if people are ill-housed, ill-fed, unemployed and without medical care, a *revolution* will erupt. Who loses? Certainly not the "have-nots." In every meaningful revolution the "haves" lose.

Ms. Boswell: Interesting. And you just mentioned animal rights as a big issue. How did you come to care about that?

Sen. Moore: I read a story in the New Yorker about forty years ago about a woman who was married to a very rich man. I cannot remember who it was. She decided that she was going to put a stop to the methods of slaughtering. I had, when I was ten or eleven, gone to Chicago

and lived there for three or four months with my mother and father. My mother wanted me to see everything, so we went to a slaughterhouse, one of those big packing houses. I can still see it. Terrible scene. Terrified animals and unfeeling slaughterers. This woman set about to try to have the animals stunned with an electric shock, so they didn't know what was happening. She had a terrible fight on her hands. She pointed out that something like thirty percent of the meat is damaged in the death throes of an animal flailing about. It was much better to die peacefully so that they could save the meat. She gave that practical approach. These packing companies didn't want to hear anything about it.

I took that on as an issue too, and it lead to animal rights and animal protection. I don't know why animals don't have rights. They've got a heart. They have paws. They've got teeth, eyes, like people. They should have some rights. They should be granted some rights and respect.

Finally, it got down to the point that I'd given away everything in the animal rights bill. You can do anything you want to do to animals in rodeos. There was nothing left in that bill, but it was a start, and I think Representative Romero can pick up from here. In the next few years she can get some other things attached to it.

Ms. Boswell: You started that fairly early, that animals-rights interest?

Sen. Moore: Thirteen, fourteen years ago.

Ms. Boswell: What about the ACT Theatre? That seems very different. How did that come about?

Sen. Moore: A fellow came into my office one day, the brokerage office, and talked about securities. I think we did a little business. Then one day he came in and said, "You know, I'm resigning a position at the University of Washington. I've been director of Drama."

I said, "What are you going to do?"

He said with a smile, "Well, I'm transferring theaters."

I said, "A great idea. Seattle has been called the intellectual dustbin of America, so maybe it's time we did something about it." Sir Thomas Beecham, the conductor of the Seattle Symphony, said that about Seattle. So, that fellow and I talked some more in the ensuing weeks, and he asked me if I wanted to be one of the founders. And, of course, I accepted. But, like everything else I do, after two or three years I went off of the board and moved on to other things. I'd served as well as I could, but when it succeeded, it was time for me to move on. I don't want to be a grand old man of anything.

Ms. Boswell: Are you a drama fan?

Sen. Moore: No, I'm not. My first wife liked it, and Virginia likes it too, but it's just another thing with me. I guess I like the symphony best of all. As for opera, I can't stand the sound of the human voice. I like classical or semi-classical music.

Ms. Boswell: Civil rights is another area, not only civil legislation, but you were in the Urban League.

Sen. Moore: Yes. I was president for a couple of years.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about that. You were in the urban league in a pretty important time, in terms of civil rights.

Sen. Moore: Yes, the Civil Rights Act had just been passed a few years before, and we were trying to attach the Public Accommodations Act to it. A fellow came to

me, a black man, and said, "I'd like to see you on the board, and I'd like to suggest you to the nominating committee." So, I was flattered and said yes. So I was on the board, and then a year or two later, I was chairman or president, or whatever it was.

It was just after an exciting time. After that first civil rights act was passed, a year or two went by, and the black people were quite insistent that they get the opportunity for significant jobs. No more of this janitor business. Real jobs. I was sympathetic and I wanted to help, so I went to the president of Frederick and Nelson, Bill Street, and I said, "This civil rights business is the wave of the future. There's going to be more demand for equality all the time, and why don't you think of hiring somebody to work right out front in Frederick and Nelson?" My theory is, always start at the top instead of going to just any department store, or the Bon, or one of those others. Frederick's was the real pilot. He said, "Okay." He was quite enthusiastic, in fact. So, it turned out that an attractive black woman, with a combination of cream and ebony skin, was hired. She was truly beautiful. He put her in the cosmetics section on the first floor of Frederick's, where it had been forever. I'll tell you, every other store then rushed to get a black person out front in their store. Sometimes getting things done are done easily, that was an easy one. Other times, you have a knock-down and drag-out fight.

Real estate, that was a hard one, because people didn't want black people living next door.

Ms. Boswell: What were the dynamics of the Urban League at that time, in terms of racial issues?

Sen. Moore: Same old story, really. Jobs, equal opportunity in employment, and the right to eat and sleep anywhere without hassle. Those were the basic things that we were working on. We had a very good board. Willard Wright, whose law firm was originally Simon, Todd, Innes and Wright, was a member, and all the other good people on the board I can't remember. Willard Wright is still around helping the Urban League. Ed Pratt was the executive. He was, of course, the one who got shot. He opened his door and somebody blew him away with a shotgun. I've never understood that. He wasn't that troublesome. The fellow who had the job before was more dynamic. Ed Pratt was strong, but not abrasive.

Ms. Boswell: Was he effective when he was on the board with you?

Sen. Moore: Yes, he was effective. But, the Urban League, if you didn't have it dominated by white liberals, would never be anything. I think that's changing now, because there are enough black people moving up on the economic ladders. There will be some way that they can dominate it, and I'm sure that's good.

Ms. Boswell: What about Sam Smith?

Sen. Moore: Sam Smith was not a factor in the Urban League.

Ms. Boswell: He was not a factor?

Sen. Moore: I think Sam was only peripherally interested in the Urban League or the NAACP. Sam was just kind of out there all by himself. We both worked at Boeing during the war. He was abused. I remember one day when we trooped in to build B-17s at Boeing Plant 2. That day, Tim McCullough was on security looking in our lunch boxes, looking for what I know not. We all had to open our lunch buckets to show the guard. Some guards would grab your sandwich if you were black and go like this with it—

Ms. Boswell: And crush it?

Sen. Moore: Yes, as if they were looking for a concealed weapon and things like that. I didn't really know Sam, but when I saw him after the war, I remembered that incident. He was on good terms with one of my oldest friends, Bill, the Bull, Howard, so I had his input as to what made Sam run. The Bull saw him as a man whose word was good. He also thought the white community used Sam, not always to Sam's benefit. Sam did not want to be used, but how could he be sure? He masked it, but I felt it was there. One of the things I liked about Sam was his realness. He was more broad-minded than many of the stuffed owls who were fellow council members. Although Sam probably never thought about it, he was out of the Warren Magnuson school. Find out what people want and need and then get it for them, as opposed to *knowing* what is good for people and giving it to them whether they want or need it or not. Sam was a good influence on the city council, but he was kind of a loner in the field of civil rights. He was there, but not in an organized way.

Ms. Boswell: Within an organizational framework?

Sen. Moore: Yeah.

Ms. Boswell: We talked quite a bit about why you switched parties last time, but since you mentioned Boeing, one article about you I was reading said that your experiences at Boeing further pushed you toward the switch. I wanted to ask you about that.

Sen. Moore: That's interesting. You did some reading, didn't you? When I went to Boeing, I had come from GE Hot Point, and I'd been successful. I came to Boeing with this very right-wing attitude. Hated unions. Unknowingly, I hated management. I thought I liked them, but it turned out that the opposite was true. I had been there a very short time, three or four months, and Boeing workers, the aeromechanics, threatened to strike. Of course, the War Department couldn't let them strike during the war. Since Boeing was on a cost-plus basis, it couldn't lose any money, and the more they spent the more they kept! So, the National Labor Relations Board or its predecessor said, "Give them a nickel more an hour." It doesn't sound like much, but it was the difference between fifty and fifty-five cents. Since I didn't belong to the union, I didn't expect anything extra in my check, but I got a raise just as if I were a real person.

And, I began to get acquainted with some people at Boeing. Remember, during the war there were a lot of misfits in the defense plants. They were misfits because they were either dodging the draft or they were so neurotic that they wouldn't let them in the service, or they were just an orchard-run variety of malcontents. So I began listening to these people, and they began to make some sense, and I began to realize that management was really not out for anybody but themselves and the stockholders. I began to realize that wasn't necessarily good, and I kind of liked being one of the group. I'd never been in a big group before, and it felt good. I was truly part of the working class. I liked that feeling. I began to recognize that workers would be getting nothing if management had their way about it. I wouldn't admit, of course, that I was leaning toward the liberal view, so it took quite a while. That was '42 when that happened, and it wasn't until '52 that I got an idea that maybe I'm really a liberal after all. That was due to my daughter.

Ms. Boswell: In her Stevenson support, right?

Sen. Moore: Yeah. I just realized that, not all Republicans, but in general the Republican anxiety to save the system, is without

foundation. The system can survive if steps are in place to give everyone a piece of the pie. Everyone can't be rich, but everyone is entitled to a chance at a job, medicine, food and housing, and last but not least, dignity. Otherwise, big trouble lies ahead. Murder, rape and other violent crimes are unacceptable, but somehow we pay little attention to what may be the mother of crime—greed.

Ms. Boswell: When you made that switch, you didn't make an announcement?

Sen. Moore: No.

Ms. Boswell: Just went along in your own way?

Sen. Moore: Yeah. I don't like publicity. What is happening to me now is a bruising experience. I just like to go to work every day and do what I can, and go home. So, I didn't make an announcement. I didn't think I was important enough to make an announcement, so why make one? I just started being a Democrat. I didn't belong to the party, but I would go to cocktail parties for Magnuson and Rosellini, and then pretty soon it was clear Democrats were more in tune with issues in which I was interested.

People think I'm aggressive. Nobody believes that I'm shy. They just laugh. But I really like to be alone. I'm not terribly comfortable around people. I may appear to be, but I'd tell people, I'm really demure, and they'd just howl—different side of me, but that's the way I feel, and always have.

Ms. Boswell: How do you reconcile that with the disease of politics that you described? It's such an open, up-front, public thing to do.

Sen. Moore: I don't know. Ego. I think there are a lot of people that are shy that have huge egos. I think Ed Heavey is a guy with a big ego and a big desire. I think Al Williams is another one more like me. I know people view him as being really demure and shy. I think I'm kind of a throwback to another age. I probably don't really belong in the age in which I'm living. I probably belong in more of a hurly-burly, catch-as-catch-can political arena instead of this one where everybody dances, and more often than not, are not up-front.

Ms. Boswell: And politically correct.

Sen. Moore: And politically correct. Yes, indeed.

Ms. Boswell: We've been talking about the civil-rights groups, and I did want to ask you about one other one, and that's the Washington State Advisory Committee for Civil Rights. The Washington Advisory Committee for the U.S. Committee on Civil Rights. Tell me a little bit about how that came about?

Sen. Moore: I think I was appointed by President Johnson. It was a very interesting committee. Fred Haley of Brown & Haley, great, old-fashioned, white liberal. Ken McDonald, of McDonald, Hogue, and Bayless, (who brought me into the Hanford farm deal). Fiery, a little erratic, but always on the right side. Always on the side of the angels. Karl Maxie, black attorney, raised by the Indians on a Nez Perce reservation, thought he was an Indian until he was about twenty. He was running around with curly hair, so he began to wonder how come. A wild man. Sam Tarshis is smart and successful. I can't think who else was on it.

One day we were having a hearing in Tacoma because there had been a complaint lodged with the civil rights commission, nationally, that Tacoma had a policy, especially in the fire department, of not hiring

any minorities. This traditional, white fire chief came in a black tie and perfect white shirt—perfect uniform. Hair perfect. He was probably forty-five. He sat down and we began questioning him about the alleged exclusionary policy. "Well," he said, "that's wrong. We have lots of them. We've got Tony Gomez," and he went on with a few non-Anglo Saxon names. Some, maybe, were a quarter something or other, but there were no blacks. That's what Karl Maxie, the black, was after. He wanted to nail that down. So, he finally said, "How come, Chief, there are no blacks among Tacoma Firefighters?" This fellow said, with an absolute straight face, "Oh, it's a well-known fact that blacks don't like fire."

And this from a really nice guy, only twenty-five or thirty years ago. A good man, but he really believed that. Maxie, of course, went crazy. He's a huge man, just HUGE! But in this day and age, no one could believe he'd said it! So, you get some funny attitudes. Some funny beliefs—and not always from your basic bigots.

Ms. Boswell: What would the role of this committee be? To advise the U.S. Civil Rights Commission—a fact-finding type role?

Sen. Moore: Two things. One was to have hearings on things that came to our attention before they went to the federal level. Trying to broaden the Civil Rights Commission work so there'd be forty-eight or fifty little committees around doing whatever. And the other one was to pass information back in a report. It might only be a couple of pages, but we'd send this back to the Civil Rights Commission and recommend that they have a hearing at the national level, or sometimes we'd take it up (with a copy) to the Civil Rights Commission. We'd just take it up with a congressman or senator, and say we believed this was a necessary issue, legislation was necessary. And to work with that group. There were no dummies on our committee.

Ms. Boswell: How did your appointment come about?

Sen. Moore: Maybe because of the Urban League. And then I was reappointed by Nixon. Johnson and Nixon, I think that was it.

Ms. Boswell: But you weren't a big fan of Johnson's?

Sen. Moore: No. But, you know, I never asked, but maybe Magnuson might have helped me out. And, there's a man I mentioned the other day, Hugh B. Mitchell. He was a fan of mine, and he was so well-regarded that he could have recommended me to somebody in the White House or a congressman or something, or to Maggie. I don't really know how I got on there. I just got this letter in the mail one day.

CHAPTER 11

THE POLITICAL PROCESS: LOBBYISTS, LEGISLATORS, AND SPECIAL INTERESTS

Ms. Boswell: Since we last talked, I was reading an article that appeared in the *Seattle Weekly*, and it was about the media, the reporters. It was written by a man named—

Sen. Moore: Walter Hatch.

Ms. Boswell: Did you see that article?

Sen. Moore: No, I didn't see it.

Ms. Boswell: He was talking about the role of Olympia reporters and how they were too soft. At any rate, a lot about schmoozing at lunch time, and that there really may be too close a relationship between some reporters and some government officials or legislators, who, over a few drinks would discuss everything and everybody, and that was the sources of their stories, and that it was a little too cozy. I wondered if that was your perception. Did that take place quite a bit?

Sen. Moore: I don't know about being too close. Is it better to be too close and understand what people are saying, or is it better to not understand what they're saying and cold-call them, and then misquote them. I prefer the way where everybody knows one another. Walter Hatch was an interesting character on the scene here. He was a muckraker. He, for instance, wrote a story about me, saying that I had my way paid by the state to Hawaii for the Pacific Conference. Well, it was absolutely not true. I paid my own way and Virginia paid her way to go to this conference. Majority Leader Bottinger, when he came back from the conference, had been interviewed by Walter, and said, "Yes, this was a state-sponsored convention, and, of course, the state paid for it." And so Walter then said in his article that everybody else that went had been paid for by the state. I don't know about the others, but I had paid my own way, so Virginia called him in the office. He said, "Well, I just didn't have time to check with everyone." So, that's Walter Hatch in a nutshell. He was great picking up one-liners and expanding them into a little story. There wasn't a whole lot of depth in his work, but in all fairness, he was about par for the course among the media.

Ms. Boswell: Were there certain legislators, then, who had reporters that they would feed information to pretty regularly, that were sort of their reporters?

Sen. Moore: Yes. That's true at every level in every country.

Ms. Boswell: So you don't really see anything particularly bad about that? It's just the way it works?

Sen. Moore: You find that you can trust some reporters to quote you correctly, and not slant the story, you attach yourself to that person. He begins to be your person. The one that you want to have the advantage of the first story, and let the rest of them pick it up from there. I think that's pretty standard.

Ms. Boswell: What about the danger of manipulation of that person?

Sen. Moore: Manipulation of the reporter?

Ms. Boswell: Yes.

Sen. Moore: Of course. Of course that very well could happen. But, on the other hand, if you're feeding them the facts on the budget or something else, there's not a whole lot that they can do with that. All they're getting is a scoop, as opposed to other people.

Ms. Boswell: They need to check it out themselves, in other words?

Sen. Moore: Sure. I don't think it's a bad situation to have people—for instance, I have some people in the media that I won't talk to. And then there are some that I'm very open with, and in the middle of the conversation we can say, "Can we go off the record?" "Absolutely." And we do, and they don't violate it.

Ms. Boswell: One of the things that Walter Hatch also mentioned, that was interesting in that story, was that he saw there being a triangle of real power in Olympia. That essentially the leaders of the caucuses, their staff, and then some major special interest groups really ran Olympia. It was like a political machine, and you had to understand it, but that's the way it worked. Is that true at all?

Sen. Moore: It was more true fifty years ago than it is now. However, it comes under the heading of leadership. We elect the Speaker of the House, we elect the majority, minority leaders, caucus chairmen, president pro tem. We elect those people to be our leaders in our caucuses, so naturally, we expect them to come up with the best information. They can mostly get information from the staff. If we met all the time, year 'round, we probably would need specialists out there in Education, and Ways and Means, and Commerce and Labor, and Health, and all these different committees. We couldn't do it all ourselves. So, I think it's necessary that the management, the leadership, be briefed in depth by the staff. If we find that the staff is skewing things, then that all comes out in the caucus. Some of the sessions are pretty brutal. Since I've been here, we've had no caucus staff that I have run into who skewed things. But, when I say brutal, I'm talking about the openness of a caucus, where we really tell each other how we view each other's views and how it really is in our minds.

As far as the special interests are concerned, of course they're out there. The WEA is trying to get everything they can get for their view of education. The AWB—The Association of Washington Business—is trying to figure out how their members can pay as little as possible for these things, and they're exerting pressure on us all the time. Some people feel a lot of pressure. I don't feel any pressure. I don't think Larry Vognild or Phil Talmadge feel pressure, but some people do, and it bothers them. I think the majority of the members of the Legislature don't really feel much pressure. They listen and make up their own minds, or they've already made up their minds before they arrive here.

Ms. Boswell: What is it that makes some of them feel pressure? What makes them different than you?

Sen. Moore: Personalities. We had a House member from our district who used to be frantic over nothing votes. Helen Sommers and I just look at the issue and, early on, let all interested parties know, and didn't have any problem. Once everyone knew how we were going to vote, we were left alone. Personalities, insecurity in some people, I think, lead to feeling pressure. And some people want to be loved by everybody—the

Booth Gardner syndrome. And, if you have that, you just can't say "no" to anybody. You really are impaled. You just feel paralyzed, because you don't want to hurt anybody's feelings.

Ms. Boswell: What do you see as the role of the lobbyist, generally? I know they're advocating for their own causes, but, in terms of the process that goes on down here, how important a role do you think that they play?

Sen. Moore: I think they play an important role, and I think they should. If staff were to get cute and start skewing things, or in a subtle way, start manipulating the members, the lobbyist is there as a check on them. Now, there's always the problem of the staff and the lobbyist getting cozy. The lobbyists are here year 'round. The staff is here year 'round. They see one another, and there's no law that says that a lobbyist can't come to a staffer and present his or her side of the issue. The staff person has to say, "Well, this sounds good, but I'm not going to be influenced by what I've just heard." They have to be able to handle it. It takes a certain strong staff person to be able to do that. We have very strong staff members in the Senate, and I think the House, even before we improved, had people that could withstand that.

Ms. Boswell: Is that a bigger danger, really, undue influence on staff as opposed to legislators, themselves?

Sen. Moore: I think that is probable.

Ms. Boswell: Who have been the most effective lobbyists in your mind over your tenure in the Senate?

Sen. Moore: I think Bud Coffey from Boeing, who is always a gentleman and never exerts undue pressure. He hoped that you'd vote with him, and his arguments were pretty persuasive. He countered his desire to get what he was supposed to get, in his mind or his company's mind, he tempered that with always telling you what the downside was for you—politically, personally, every way he could think of. I think that is the sign of a really good lobbyist. There are a lot of other good ones, you know. You naturally view the people that are representing what is your inherent view anyway, you begin to gravitate toward them as your friends, and to be trusted.

For instance, I've always been sympathetic with labor. So, naturally, the Public Employees Union members have been friends and allies. They've worked on my campaigns. They've been extremely helpful. Last time, they were my largest donor. Somebody looking at it from the outside would say, "Well, you know, he's now owned by them." Well, far from the truth, because I was with them before I got to Olympia, and I've been with them ever since. We argue sometimes. For example, when they wanted a pay raise about ten years ago, I told the public employees, "Don't ask for it. Be a hero, step up to the bar and say, 'We know the state is in tight straights, financially, and we're not going to ask for a pay raise this time.' Be the first one."

"No." They had to demand it, and I think it hurt them because they didn't get what they wanted anyway. They could have been good sports and improved their image publicly and in the minds of the legislators who wouldn't feel the pressure to get them the money.

Ms. Boswell: What about Boeing? That wouldn't be a natural, necessarily, ally of yours.

Sen. Moore: No. As a matter of fact, they supported my opponent when I ran against John Murray. When Bud Coffey came to call on me in Olympia I really worked him over. I

said, "Here I am a businessman, and you didn't help me."

"Well," Bud said, "we always try to help the incumbent." And that is common sense. Democrat John Cherberg supported me when I ran for the House. When I ran for the Senate he wouldn't support me because, he said, "I never go against a sitting senator." My opponent was Republican Senator John Murray. So, I think you basically stay with your issues and the lobbyists will try to work with you.

I've always helped those people who have no money at all down here, the social lobbyists—looking out for the developmentally disabled, looking out for and trying to keep a place like Buckley open for the developmentally disabled. These are friends. They can't give me anything. They can't give me any money, but I work just as hard for them as I have the public employees.

Ms. Boswell: How much do lobbyists actually try to offer people dinners, gifts, whatever? How much of that really does take place?

Sen. Moore: Well, I don't know. I'm chairman of a fairly important committee, and I'm on the State Investment Board, the Gambling Commission, the Pension Policy Committee, and a few other odds and ends. Virginia and I are home almost every night. We don't get invited out very much. Apparently people know that I'm a pretty private person, and I'm willing to put everything I have on the line from seven in the morning until seven at night, but after that, I'm gone. We get invitations to go to a basketball game, maybe once a year. They know I don't care much about football. University of Washington always gives tickets, or seats, to senators and representatives, to assorted games. They entertain you with a brunch beforehand and all. I used to go to that because my finance chairman, George Lane, liked to go, so I took him, but I didn't really care about it. I don't care about football that much.

Ms. Boswell: So, again, are there certain personalities who like that sort of thing, and who, therefore, are maybe influenced in that way?

Sen. Moore: I don't know. I suppose. I see most people voting the way they talk privately. Brad Owen and Jim Hargrove vote quite differently from me. I think they could be taken out to dinner every week by, maybe, the public employees—I forget how they stand with them—but, in general, those two senators don't think much of, say, Evergreen College. Evergreen could entertain them all the time and it wouldn't change their minds. So, I think most of the members are happy to have gratuities, but I don't think it influences anybody very much, if at all.

Ms. Boswell: Any other lobbyists that you particularly think do a good job, besides Coffey?

Sen. Moore: Gary Moore, who represents the public employees. The two other Boeing lobbyists are outstanding—Al Ralston and Rob Makin. I've always thought that Weyerhaeuser was well represented here with Jerry Harper. I could name off a lot of others. I think, in general, the representation is pretty high-class. Mark Gjurasic is an outstanding hired gun. He is a contract lobbyist. Certainly, Jim Boldt, who represents an assortment of clients, including the grocers. We were often at odds, but I had a high respect for him. He found his niche as a hired-gun lobbyist. Has done well. These people do a whale of a job. Also, the two who can perform miracles are Martin Durkan and Tom Owens. Dick Ducharme is one of the heavies. I liken him to the greatest relief baseball pitcher. When the situation seems about to collapse, you call

in Dick Ducharme to save the issue, and save it he does! He truly has more moves than a belly dancer.

Ms. Boswell: Do legislators make any differentiation among the so-called contract lobbyists, as opposed to individuals just working for one group? Does that tint their view at all?

Sen. Moore: I suppose there are some purists who might think that a hired gun is insincere, but a contract lobbyist, who doesn't know his subject, is at a disadvantage. You're more forgiving, I suppose, of a lobbyist who works for Puget Power. He maybe doesn't have to know as much as a contract lobbyist. A contract lobbyist has to be better than an in-house lobbyist. Has to be more sophisticated about legislative ways, and also has to have a better handle on his issues. It's a difficult job when you're handling the gold and silver bullion dealers, the mobile home park owners, the collection agencies. You have to jump from one ice floe to the next pretty fast. It's a difficult job, and they're paid in proportion to the difficulty. Not just anybody can be a contract lobbyist. And not just anybody can be an in-house lobbyist, either.

Ms. Boswell: Are these people, mostly, here who have been in government service before and then come to this, or do they just come for—

Sen. Moore: No. Bud Coffey, Al Ralston—Al Ralston did work for the city of Seattle a long time ago. Rob Makin came from the Chamber of Commerce in Seattle. Mark Gjurasic just showed up on the scene and watched to see how other people did it, and then discovered a new technique. He won't take a client unless that client agrees to be part of the action. It used to be that you hired a lobbyist to go to Olympia and fix things. Fix the problem. Not any more. Gjurasic opened up a whole new avenue. Now, he wouldn't take on the mobile park owners (he is their lobbyist) unless they agreed that their association, every person in the association, particularly the directors, all participated. Had to get acquainted with their own legislators in their districts. Had to know them. Makes the contract lobbyist's job a lot easier if he can call on them to call on their legislators, rather than he having to disperse his efforts over all 147 legislators.

Ms. Boswell: It makes some sense to get everybody involved.

Sen. Moore: Exactly. Lobbying is better for it. A lot of other people have picked up on that technique now. To my knowledge, he was the one who started it, or at least expanded it, in 1979.

Ms. Boswell: You were telling me the other day when we were talking about a lobbyist who also got to know all the staff, and various people that worked around the Olympia area, also sort of building his network. Was that Coffey? Who was that? I've forgotten. He'd invite various members of the staff.

Sen. Moore: Oh, that's Tom Owens. There's nobody better than Tom Owens among the contract lobbyists. Just as Coffey is the superb one in his field of in-house. All contract lobbyists have slightly different techniques. Owens wants to know everybody from top to bottom. Almost from bottom to top. There's nobody too small here, in this arena, that he doesn't want to be on good terms with.

There are others that just deal at the top. They deal with the Speaker, they deal with the majority leader, and that's it. Not very effective any more because—I guess Huey Long said it first—"every man a king," as a result of perhaps PDC and perhaps Gjurasic.

A whole new era dawned in which each member became more important, and leadership began to have more trouble controlling them. So, they have to be included, and as you include them, it dilutes the power of the leaders. You've got all these people sitting out in front of the leader in the caucus, and the leader is telling them how it's going to be, and they say, "Well, wait a minute, that isn't the way I heard it." They start arguing and pretty soon the leader has to compromise. He can't quite put the deal together without them. I think it's all for the better. It's probably the only good thing that PDC did.

Ms. Boswell: I know when I interviewed people who had been in earlier Legislatures, and again, before there was a lot of staff, that at least some of them relied on the lobbyists to provide them with basic information. They had no staff. Now with staff, is that aspect of the information that a lobbyist can provide, is that lessened now, or not?

Sen. Moore: Well, I can't really say. I know the quality of lobbyists has improved since I've been here. There were some people that were living in the dark ages when I came here. They used to stand before a committee and say, "You can't do that." Well, we'll show you, and so we did! And, they never got the idea. They were still doing it ten years after they'd been slapped down the first time. They could not adjust to the new era.

Those people are now all gone, and, as a result, we have a new crop that is very competitive. When a new opening comes up, let's say somebody retires from the field, the fight that goes on to get his accounts is great. Each one makes an in-depth presentation of how he or she would handle the legislation for the grocers, or whoever needs somebody. The board of directors picks the lobbyist. And, if the lobbyist has any sense, he'll insist that they become part of the game, which means that they have to spend some time getting acquainted with their own legislators. Politics is a very personal business.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about the lobbying that went on during this past session, particularly near the end, to get some of the business tax exemptions passed at the very end?

Sen. Moore: There were the usual pressures this time, as there are in all short sessions. Everybody who didn't get his or her share last time in the long session has to try to make up for it by getting in the game this time. Likewise, those who don't want to pay any taxes, who think they were overtaxed last time, are back again claiming that they shouldn't be paying these taxes. So, those pressures are always the same. However, in the case of both the Senate and House, where you have Rinehart in the Senate with a superb staff, who shield her from intense pressure from the lobbyists, because the lobbyist has to prove to the staff person in charge of B&O taxes that certain groups should be exempt from the B&O tax. They have to convince the staff person first, and if they get by that hurdle, then she will ultimately sit down with the staff person and decide, how does this really fit in? Is this creating an exemption where everybody else will be wanting an exemption? She and the staff will work that out. Although the pressure is there, it's somewhat diluted as they have to work with the staff.

And, of course, in the House, you have one of the most dynamic personalities in the whole Legislature. One of the strongest and smartest, Helen Sommers. These two women are very strong, and Sommers never feels pressure. None. She can handle them all. Her staff is good also. I don't know them personally, but the staff director is very good.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about women in the Legislature. Even since you've come,

certainly there are many more women serving as legislators. What do you see as their role? Are there gender differences that you see? Have they changed the Legislature at all?

Sen. Moore: I think women in the Legislature are like any minority in any society. They're fighting for their place in the sun. There was just one here back in the twenties, Reba Hurn. She made a lot of noise. I did not know her, but as a high school student observing the Senate, I was struck by her presence, particularly since she was the only woman among all those men senators. She made a lot of headlines, but didn't get anywhere.

All these years later, gradually, gradually, more women came. Half of our caucus is now women. Fourteen men, fourteen women. I notice on some of the conference committees, the chairman of the committee might be a woman. Well, finally one day there were three women on a conference committee from the Senate. They had arrived. I think there's a tendency to help each other, more than men help each other.

Men have ruled this place since before it was a state, and you can tell from the facilities here that this was a man's world. There was no place to get into this building for people in wheelchairs. There was no restroom for the women in the Senate. They used the public bathroom. That's all beginning to change. The members' lounge is now the Republican Caucus room, and the majority caucus room is now our caucus room, the same as it's always been. The president pro tem no longer sits in the first office when you come in on the south side. She has an office right next to the caucus room, much smaller, and that other room has now been turned into the ladies lounge. So, all these physical changes are symptomatic of what is happening in people's minds. I think whenever you get a minority that begins to get a foothold, they have a tendency to band together. So, I think there is some of that.

Since I tried to write women into the first civil rights act in the forties, I have had no trouble with this. I've welcomed them. One thing that always bothers me is—and I don't know quite how to put this—but, I have trouble with people that cry. Tears, I don't want to see them. I don't want to have anything to do with them. And some women, because of a million years of using what weapons they had, have a tendency, when thwarted, to cry. Of course, the men have too much pride to cry. It's a little difficult, sometimes, when you have somebody that sheds tears and flounces away. We had one on the floor the last two or three days of the session. Things got a little heated, and one woman tried to do something that the chairman of a committee—a man—didn't like. Afterward, she came up and half way apologized. She was beaten, but had to also say, "Well, I was still right."

And the chairman then said, "No, you're wrong for these reasons: boom, boom, boom," and they got into it. She finally started to cry. It's hard to deal with that, but outside of that, everything is equal to me.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think that, generally speaking, the women have to be more strident, or to take on sort of male characteristics in order to be successful?

Sen. Moore: I think that's sort of the way it is. There's a great variety out there, but I think your question is a good one. You look around this building, and it was designed originally for males. Women still have to adapt, because of the building itself. Also, women have seen from men what works and what doesn't work. So, to that extent they have taken on male characteristics. A demure woman may get run over.

I'm thinking of Helen Sommers who wouldn't cry if you broke her arm. She's a

strong customer. Rinehart is the same way. Loveland, from the southeastern part of the state, very strong, very tough. Then, there are others that are smoother and more diplomatic, like Betty Sheldon from Bremerton. Then there's Margaret Hurley, who holds the women's record for tenure in the House—I think 1953-1978. Then she served in the Senate until 1985. She was possibly the most memorable member of the Legislature, the ultimate Catholic Democrat. There was only one issue she would not compromise, which was right to life. Funny story: Margaret guarded her age totally. Four of us were older than the rest of our caucus: Tub Hansen, I, Slim Rasmussen, and Margaret Hurley. Suspecting Margaret was older than I, I used to wait in caucus until Slim was absent—he was a year my senior—to make a short statement on an issue, prefacing my remarks by saying, "As the oldest member here—" Margaret never corrected me!

There are others that are fierce, like Wojahn from Tacoma and Prentice from Renton. Prentice was vice chair of the Labor and Commerce Committee when I was chairman, and I never had such support. She can tell at 100 yards the difference between "road apples" and the real thing. She is very kind, but don't take it for granted. If you deserve a whacking, she will do it. I consider her quite outstanding.

Lorraine Wojahn is wonderful, too. There can never be too many Wojahns in any legislative body. Usually right, and the ultimate in tenacity. After meeting Senator Wojahn in '79 and serving with her for a few years, it was clear she needed a more descriptive title than senator. So, one day in caucus, I dubbed her "The Norse Goddess of Terror". Well, Lorraine at first didn't know whether she liked this epithet, but sometime later I overheard her telling a group of legislative visitors, "They call me the Norse Goddess of Terror." I knew then that I was accepted! Few have done as much to help Tacoma, women, and anyone who can use a helping hand.

In 1990, a sour caucus campaign committee met, during which Senator Patty Murray announced the caucus should not support me because I couldn't win. Wojahn took a very dim view of Senator Murray's attitude because she knew what I'd done to help Murray in 1988, when she upset Bill Kiskaddon. Lorraine has an even longer memory than do I! I value her as a friend and ally, but I would say keep your seatbelt fastened and watch your step around the Norse Goddess.

Wojahn and Prentice are fierce competitors. There is no way that they're going to back off of any situation. They'll fight to the death for what they want.

Ms. Boswell: Back before women had the right to vote, one of the arguments against the right to vote was that women would be "tainted." An argument for women's right to vote and entry into politics was that they'd lift the moral tone of politics. Does that make any sense, these days?

Sen. Moore: No. Some of the most so-called moral types that have been here have been among the most offensive. My way or no way. They would have been witch-burners in another time. And yet, oh, so righteous, so pious.

Ms. Boswell: Any specific examples?

Sen. Moore: Yeah. I think Senator Craswell was one. I think Linda Smith fits that.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about them.

Sen. Moore: When Craswell was elected to the House she was billed as a threat/successor to Helen Sommers. Well, she ain't no Helen.

She soon moved to the Senate where she and her fellow religious-right advocates time and time again thwarted efforts to build a new and better way to deliver social services. Sometimes prayer is not enough when people need a medical plan, food, housing and clothing. She is sincere in her belief that the end justifies the means. She is pleasant, but that is not enough—I like to see a heart larger than a mustard seed.

It's the same with Linda Smith. I have a deep mistrust of anyone who has simplistic answers for social problems. I also believe in protecting the dignity and tradition of the Senate. Senator Smith helped erode this by her informality, bringing children onto the floor, and assorted out-of-place behavior. I was happy when she left the Senate to go to Congress. She and Speaker Newt Gingrich deserve each other. Her voter appeal is, without question, as strong as anyone's in my memory. She is truly a remarkable person, particularly when one thinks of how she has rationalized her personal problems. I do envy her ego, although clearly she was over-endowed. How anyone can be such a voluble expert on every issue is a mystery to me. Of course, I admit prejudice, because she stands totally on the opposite shore from me.

There are others besides Craswell and Smith, and I may be a little unfair to them, but that's the way it's appeared to me. I don't like piety. I can't stand it. Nobody has that right. That is saying, "I know best. I will decide what's good for you."

Ms. Boswell: What about leadership? I'm thinking that the people that rise to leadership positions, they have to want to be in that position. Isn't there a tinge of "I know best?" Not so much the piety part of it, but just that ego or self confidence that they know best. Is that what pushes them into leadership? How do you get into leadership positions?

Sen. Moore: Well, we've had all types here. We had a fellow that just had, literally, to be pushed into it, to be Speaker of the House. He was one of the best that ever was—Wayne Ehlers. He was pushing everybody else, and finally, people looked around and said, "What about you, Wayne?" He'd never thought of himself as Speaker. Turned out he was a top-flight Speaker. Clever, knew the rules. He had enhanced politician's status, both as a member of the House and as Speaker. He was a consummate diplomat, never lost sight of what others could rarely see. His genetic makeup included five percent Lyndon Johnson.

But, unlike Wayne, there have been others who were greedy for the title. They really didn't have anything in mind, but they wanted to have the title. They wanted to be seen up there on the rostrum. They viewed themselves as Tip O'Neil, or Tom Foley, or Sam Rayburn.

And then there were others who had an agenda. It might be, "We're going to see that the farmers get a break, we're going to get them real roads." There are others that wanted to be up there to protect the forest products industry. There have been others that were just so into legality, that all they thought of was in terms of the Constitution. That's a waste of time because nobody knows what the Supreme Court will decide on the constitutionality of anything. So, there've been those three types, for sure. I think all of them had ego, even Wayne Ehlers, but he was so generous in wanting to promote other people that it never showed.

There's a real upcoming battle in the House over who's going to be the next Speaker. Is it going to be Ron Meyers? Is it going to be Kim Peery? Helen Sommers? Who knows? It might even be a Republican. They all have egos. I think Helen probably prefers to stay in the field that she's good at, which is numbers and budgeting, but the other two, both of them, I think, would like to be Speaker. I don't know exactly what their agendas are.

To me, both of them are very fair-play type people who will have a balanced operation. They don't have any particular axe to grind.

Ms. Boswell: Let's say you wanted to be Speaker. How would you go about building the political base you would need to do that?

Sen. Moore: I would have come here and volunteered to help everybody from the sergeant at arms to the majority leader. And when we were in the minority, I would have spent time grooming potential candidates. For example, in '79, I said to the majority leader—we still had thirty votes—I said, "I think that we need to be building for the future. Some of the players are getting a little shopworn. Some of them are vulnerable. There's a Republican, conservative-tide fundamentalism in this country that may cost us seats.

I think that Virginia and I should spend the entire year from the spring of '79, to the spring of '80, on the road. We ask nothing. We'll just take our time and our money, and we'll cover the state from Usk to Long Beach and Forks to Clarkston. We will, with the help of the staff, find out who the people are who are key, who are up and coming. Not old, tired, names that are ex-mayors of Usk, or Newport, but let's see who's name appears in the local paper a lot. Who is a comer? Who's a doer who hasn't held office before? Maybe they're on the school board. Maybe they're city council members someplace.

Let's go out and interview these people, and let's build a farm team out there of Democrats that have potential—the right age, the charisma, the speaking ability, the ability to woo people. Let's get those on cards and have all the data about them, and begin to encourage them to run." The staff said, "No, no, no," and they convinced the majority leader not go with our program.

Well, we would never have been in the position that we've been in a lot of times. We'd have never lost the majority if we'd done that. We had nobody to replace some of these people who had been here forty years.

Ms. Boswell: Just shortsightedness, then, on their part?

Sen. Moore: Yes. For example, the perfect farm team example is Karen Fraser. Started out as a city council person in Lacey, then mayor, then county commissioner, then House member, now in the Senate. Not only did she hold these positions, but she left a legacy of efficiency as a model for those who follow. That's the kind of progression through the political process, or through community effort process, that you begin to weld these people into good candidates.

Ms. Boswell: Is that something that the party should be doing?

Sen. Moore: Yes. As I said, the party is on its keister. There's nothing there. They could be something, but they insist on putting in second-raters, or people that are so out of touch with reality. And who wants to be a state committeeman from Grant County? What does it do for you? You don't get anything out of it, so why should anybody of consequence want to do it? A cup of coffee still costs the same no matter who you are.

Ms. Boswell: What would you advise, then, to a younger person who is interested in getting into politics? Where would you advise them to start, rather than the party?

Sen. Moore: If I had some twenty-five year old who thought, "When I'm thirty-two I want to run," I would suggest they get very active, for instance, in the Queen Anne Community Council, a viable, non-dues-paying organization. There are a lot of rebellious types in there, a lot of what we call community

activists. I would do that. I would start subscribing to the *Queen Anne News* and the *Ballard News*, and I would look for names of people who are doing things. Letters to the editor. I'd start calling on these people. Get to know them. They'll get to know the young person who hopes to run. I would certainly belong to the Ballard Chamber of Commerce and the Queen Anne Chamber.

I think I would keep a low profile while I was doing all this. I'd volunteer to be the membership chairman for whoever needed a membership drive. I would offer to be the finance chairman for any community group. I'd get out and start doing things. I would try to get on the board of Queen Anne Help Line. I'd become involved in an assortment of things, none of which are counter to the other, but they're just what's right in that community. I'd go to the Sunset Hill Community Club, the oldest community club in the city, I think as old as I am. I would become a member, and I would find out what their fights are about out there. What is it that they want? And then I would work with the city council people to get these people what they want. Pretty soon they begin to think, "Gee, this guy's okay. I like him."

And you can do that in any district in the state. Some districts are easier. I think ours is about average, because we have such a diverse population. If you represent Moses Lake, they're all farm oriented, even the business people rely on the farm income to sell tractors and groceries and everything else. That's the way I would do it. I would not become too far out front on anything. I'd work behind the scenes helping other people look good.

I'd become the community activist's boy. I'd become those people's alter ego, and pretty soon, that person will say, "Anything I can do for you?"

"Well, I hope to run for the Legislature some day."

"Well, let's get going. What are we waiting for?" You get some enthusiasm. As it is now, all these pumpkin heads get the idea about six months before the election, "Gee, I want to be in the Legislature." When asked, "Why do you want to run?" they all say, "Oh, I want to make a difference." Well, you know that's a joke. The legislative session is much of what the founding fathers had in mind, checks and balances, hoops and hurdles at every turn. It is a nice dream, but to think one can make a difference is the ultimate ego trip.

Ms. Boswell: Are there as many young people out there who are committed to public service as in the past? Or who have the idea that they may, in fact, want to run?

Sen. Moore: I think there are just as many as there have always been, and I think the quality is probably about the same as it's always been. A few good ones. A few mediocre ones. A few really poor ones.

I think that after this Clean Initiative passes, and I fully expect that it will, some of these people who are running now will get in office and find out that when they go to the chamber of commerce, they have to tell the chamber, "We can't accept the lunch. I know you asked me to be the speaker, but I have to pay for my lunch." It's embarrassing to the chamber, who wanted to do the right thing by thousand-year-old, accepted standards, and it's embarrassing to the person to have to say, "Here's my check. I'll pay for my own." It's like, I don't really want to be associated with you. I'll eat with you, but I'll pay for it. They're going to find that this is not all its cracked up to be with these new rules.

How much is a movie pass worth? Members get movie passes. We don't get to go to certain ones that are very popular, but we can always find something to go to. Well, if you went once a week with a guest, you're looking at a minimum of a ten dollar value. If you go once a week, that's $500 a year. That's

quite a gift. And that will be gone. Virginia and I use our pass quite a bit, because we love movies, but if you look back in the record, I was the one who put a bill in that they had to sweep the theater between every showing. Of course, I failed. They were too strong, but I've not been influenced by them. I didn't feel as if I should ease up. One day I stepped on some gum, and you know how hard that is to get off of your shoe. So, I thought, I'll just do this.

Ms. Boswell: Why is there such a ground swell of support for initiatives designed to "clean up the Legislature?" Why is there such a public perception that it does need to be cleaned up?

Sen. Moore: Because the press has spent all their time downgrading government. Government would not be the bad word that it is today, if it were not for the press jumping on it all the time. Everybody's a crook who is in politics! You can't do anything. It's just terrible. If reporters could write, they could do stories on the income tax, the impending water shortage. I could add to the list, but that gives you an idea of how they could be constructive instead of destructive.

Take Talmadge. Talmadge has hired a woman aide for quite a few years. She must have been there ten years. I'm sure that in his heart, some part of her hiring had to do with the fact that she needed work. She left for another job, as a lobbyist. So Phil brought his son in, who had just graduated from college, to be his assistant for six months, eight months. All of a sudden, Talmadge makes the headlines. One of the bad guys who is hiring a relative. Nobody here is more pure than Talmadge. Talmadge hasn't been to a cocktail party in sixteen years. He's spent one night in Olympia in all those years. He commutes back to Seattle all the time. He accepts no lunches, goes to no dinners. All of a sudden, you see, he's tainted. They don't take into consideration the overall picture, it's just, "I gotcha!" That's what journalism is all about today. I don't know what they're teaching them at the university under the guise of journalism.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think that it trivializes then, the process?

Sen. Moore: Yes, of course. We're all bums. I go into the district, and people say to me, "Well, how's everything in Washington? You still getting those free hair cuts and those free massages?" They think I'm a Congressman. They don't know. But they do their duty. They vote. And who do they vote for? The one with the best name familiarity. Not much of an informed electorate out there.

Ms. Boswell: Whose responsibility is it for them to be informed?

Sen. Moore: I think it's the legislator's responsibility, but Sommers and Kohl didn't have enough money to send out a questionnaire this year so I sent the questionnaire out. In it I said, "I will share this information with Representatives Sommers and Kohl." We're so handicapped with lack of facilities. How to communicate with them? You go to a community club meeting, you go once in a year, and that's all you need to go. They'll ask you to say a few words about the legislative session, and you give them your subjective view, and that's it.

I think the media owes a debt for being so exempt from the law. They don't pay any sales tax on the papers. As a result of the Sullivan decision, they can now say anything about a public figure. There's no way that they can be attacked. I think for those privileges, they owe the public more than they're giving them. And I think they should devote perhaps a page every day to major issues. Not just something

that is titillating, but something that really has meat to it. Of course, a lot of people don't like to read, they like to glance at a picture or a graph or something, but I think you can romanticize a lot of these issues by doing that. They have no intention of doing it, their editorials are uninformed, self-serving and often totally off the mark. Fortunately, their readership is minimal.

In 1990, I was in that bruising race opposed by Andy McLauchlan. Near the end of the campaign the *Seattle Times*, in an editorial, endorsed Andy. I took this as a serious setback. Virginia said, "Let's go out and doorbell." Off to Ballard we went. It was a cold, dreary day. We parked in an old part west of the business district. Virginia took one block and I took the adjoining one. After perhaps a few houses with little reaction I walked up to a tired old house with a battered screen door. I rapped several times before an old Norwegian in his underwear opened the door. As I asked for his vote, I noticed the *Times* on a table, so I said, "You should know the *Times* came out against me." His only response was unreal. He said, "Fok the *Times*!" I gathered up Virginia and we both agreed I'd win.

CHAPTER 12

PREDICTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Ms. Boswell: Now that you're leaving the Senate, what's your next challenge?

Sen. Moore: I'll be watching some things coming up on the State Investment Board that I hope turn out. The new members on the board are very strong. I just hope that in a few short months I was able to pass on to them the things to watch out for. You're talking about billions, twenty billion, twenty-some billion dollars in that fund. Every hustler in the world is approaching the board with a new scheme. I'm pretty good at detecting that kind of thing. As is Mark Brown and Sheryl Wilson—those are the two new ones—plus George Masten's back, which is a big plus. I'm happy, very happy, with Sheryl and Mark, but if I just passed on some of the pitfalls to watch out for, I will have made a contribution. The most important thing for the board is to always assess the risk—profit is secondary.

And then I'll also be interested in the outcome of the Pension Policy Committee. There's a plan one, there's a plan two, and then I proposed a plan three. At first, for some reason, Newhouse did not feel overly enthusiastic about my plan, but now the board is.

I believe that any pension system has to be very simple, like Social Security. You pay your money, and at sixty-two, or whatever age it is, you can take a lesser amount. At sixty-five or whatever it is, you can take the full bore, and that's it. There's none of this deciding at sixty, "Oh gee, I wish I'd paid." You can't back in. You have six months after you start to work for the state to say, "I want to be in that," or "I don't want to be in." If you decide not, that's it. Now, we're always opening windows. Some guy's in Europe for three months, he's a teacher, he comes back and finds that there was a window of opportunity in the month of July when he could have requalified. Now, he wants another window opened. Just think of the burden it puts on the retirement system with all of these different plans. I wanted to make it simple.

Ms. Boswell: But you were getting fought, weren't you, by a lot of groups?

Sen. Moore: None of them liked it. But in my view, I keep saying, look at Social Security. "I know, but that's different." What's different? You pay money into both. "I know, but I want it this way for our group," firemen, or policemen, or retired teachers, or whatever.

Ms. Boswell: How did that come to be an important issue to you, the pension plan?

Sen. Moore: I'm kind of a numbers person, the same as Helen Sommers. She's far superior to me, but I'm better than a raw hand. Way back before there was the current Pension Policy Committee, we had a little Mickey Mouse one in the Senate, and maybe the House was involved, too, but nothing ever happened. So we created this new body in statute with sixteen members, four from each caucus, and there were anywhere from thirteen to sixteen there at every meeting. So they're taking it seriously. We're deciding how that twenty billion dollars out there in pension funds, to whom will it go, and on what basis? So, it is an important body.

I generally volunteer for things in which nobody else is interested. I could have been on Ways and Means much earlier than I was, and I went on it once just to keep somebody else off. I was wrong, because I hated Ways and Means. When you're in the majority, you have a five or six vote edge, and half the Senate is on Ways and Means, so it doesn't have much prestige. Your vote is not important. And, when you're in the minority, you might as well not be there. I was on for two, four years, I can't remember. I got off as fast as I could.

Ms. Boswell: Had you been working towards a committee chairmanship? Is that something that is important to you?

Sen. Moore: I was chairman of Labor and Commerce, and as I told you, the Senate agreed to put Financial Institutions in there, so that means all business, labor, insurance, and banking are in that committee. There are thirteen members. Big committee, for the Senate. That's all I really ever wanted.

I didn't want a position of leadership. I didn't want to be majority leader. I didn't want to be caucus chairman. I don't want to be assistant anything. The problem with those positions is that, although now the leader gets paid ten percent more than we do, or something like that, think of the pressures, the nights, the traveling, looking for candidates, and a whole raft of other things.

I value my privacy. I remember my mother. When she was ninety, I said to her, "Mother, do you think I'm selfish?"

She thought a minute, "Yes," she said, "You're very selfish."

I said, "In what way?"

She said, "You've always been very selfish of your time." It's true. I want to be with Virginia when I come home.

We've worked together for sixteen years. She worked for the state for eight years for nothing. One day she said, "You know, this is ridiculous. I'm doing the secretary's job, and I'm doing my job," which is the political end of it, "and the constituents, and I'm tired of this. I'm not getting paid, and I'm losing Social Security quarters." So, I said, "Okay." I made an appointment with Bottiger, who was the majority leader, and we went in to see him. He has Marty Brown with him. And I had this speech. I said, "Ted, Virginia needs to be on the payroll." He's going like this, that's his sign.

Ms. Boswell: Time out. The "T."

Sen. Moore: I wouldn't pay any attention, I just plowed on. I said, "Here are the possibilities. I was once a Republican; I could be a Republican again. Second, I can just declare myself independent, and leave the caucus, or I can still be a Democrat and never go to the caucus. The other possibility is. . ." He's going—

Ms. Boswell: Time out.

Sen. Moore: I said, "The other possibility, Ted, is Virginia can sue you for denying her employment, and if she does, I'll join her." When I came up for air, he said, "She's hired. It's okay." Before this meeting, Ted had told me there was a law against it. Anyway, she's been on the payroll now, since November of '86. Virginia gets paid halftime when we're out of session because Jim Hughes handles the Olympia office, and I would say that she puts in thirty to thirty-five hours a week, whether in Hawaii, or whether we're in Seattle or Olympia. When she's here, during the session, she puts in about seventy hours a week. I'd say seven ten-hour days. She comes to work at nine and leaves at seven, seven-thirty, whatever. And we're always current. We answer all mail, all phone calls. I spend Saturday and Sunday calling people I couldn't

get to who have phoned during the week. That's where the secret army comes in.

Ms. Boswell: I've heard a lot of people say that you can't work with a spouse, that it's too close, too many conflicts. Seems like you haven't found that to be the case.

Sen. Moore: No. I think that we are equal. She does more work than I do. So, I think a lot of men can't adjust to the fact that a spouse could possibly know anything. Very difficult. I had a friend, a stockbroker in San Diego, worked with him in Seattle for years. He married a television salesperson. She was making probably $70,000 a year, and he was making about $40,000. He couldn't stand it. He killed himself. I think there's a lot of that out there in one form or another.

We have, I think, a unique relationship. She had previously been married, and I had been married one and a half times. Our expectations were not exactly the same as when you're twenty. You think it's Shangri-La forever when you're twenty. I was sixty-one, I guess, when we were married. Our expectations were modest. It was more of a merger than a marriage, so we were both surprised, I think, when it turned out to be so much better than we ever expected.

Ms. Boswell: She was interested in politics. Did she ever consider running?

Sen. Moore: We've talked about it. She's more popular than I am. She's very personable, very gracious, noncontroversial. I'm sort of rambunctious. She could run in my place. It would really be fun if she filed.

Ms. Boswell: Would she consider it?

Sen. Moore: No. Too happy in Hawaii. We've been approached over there by the Filipino community, which is a big block on the west side of the island, asking one of us to run for county council once we became permanent residents. I don't want to. It's kind of a nuisance living on the west side of the island. It's a ninety-five mile drive to the other side, and you need to be there four times a week. We just want to raise coffee.

A wonderful fellow lives down the road from us. He came to Seattle with his brother about forty years ago and they didn't have any money, but they managed to buy Norton Clapp's yacht. I don't know what kind of an arrangement they made, but they tore the boat all apart, turned it into a luxury ship. They took cruises with passengers, $5,000 a trip, down to Baja fishing. He ended up owning a hotel on Catalina. Then he left his wife and came to Kona. He's a hard-core Republican, but we don't ever fight—it's very civilized—and he has a few coffee trees, and we have a few more than he. We've talked about processing and retailing our coffee.

Ms. Boswell: The coffee craze—quality coffee craze—is really going strong.

Sen. Moore: Coffee went up two cents today.

Ms. Boswell: It sounds like that's a good, new challenge for you too, then.

Sen. Moore: I don't care whether we make any money or not. We just want to be doing something. We planted quite a few bananas which I can sell downtown. We've done a lot of things. We've owned three restaurants, three taverns, three farms besides the one in Hawaii. Never cared about making money, just as long as we had an experience.

Ms. Boswell: Are there any other major pieces of legislation that you would like to see happen in this state that have not yet been achieved?

Sen. Moore: Yes, the income tax.

Ms. Boswell: Are we ever going to get to that point where people will understand the income tax? It's been a Democratic issue for a long time, and it's never gotten anywhere. Do you expect it to get anywhere?

Sen. Moore: No. I think it's dead. I don't think there's any chance. Gardner had a chance, but as soon as he got a little flack, he wilted, and that was the end of that. I sponsored it in 1983 and several times since then, to no avail. The income tax coverage is where the press is very deficient. How many people do you think, in this state, know that the income tax, state income tax, can be used as an offset against your federal tax?

Ms. Boswell: Probably not very many. Can you blame it solely on press coverage?

Sen. Moore: No. I'm saying the press could do something positive. What has happened is, as a result of the terrible IRS—there's no fairness there whatsoever.

Ms. Boswell: You mean in terms of IRS systems?

Sen. Moore: Why should I pay little or no federal income tax for several years because I had enough write-offs, so that there is no taxable income? Why should I be able to do that when people working with me, making one fourth of what I'm making, are paying taxes? That's outrageous! The whole thing is designed to help the rich. The poor are overpaying. The middle class and the poor are paying way too much. So, the public has this terrible feeling about the IRS. It's a big ogre. They come after you. And, of course, there are lots of horror stories about where they take your house, and put you in the street, and then find out they were wrong. Those things are terrifying.

I said to a fellow once, about ten years ago, when I had just received a notice of an audit of my IRS a year or two before, I said, "I almost would rather have got one from my doctor saying that I had cancer." That's how terrifying that organization is. The IRS has given the income tax a bad name.

Ms. Boswell: But you don't think this state would be like that?

Sen. Moore: Absolutely not. You see, they shift the rules every year at the IRS, as you know. It's one thing one year, and another the next, and they have a lot of jurisdictional things that they can do themselves, without congressional authority. But our Tax Advisory Committee of 1983 recommended a constitutional amendment which would require two-thirds of both Houses to vote for an income tax, after which it would go to the voters. And the clincher is that a constitutional amendment cannot be altered, except by the voters. Contrasted with the IRS, it's tamper-proof. You put in the Constitution it cannot be changed by the Legislature, can't be changed by anything but you, vote of you, the voter. That's the only way it can ever come to pass. It could be sold, but it requires help from the media.

Ms. Boswell: And what else? Who could sell that? Would it have to be a governor?

Sen. Moore: It would have to be a governor, it would have to be legislative acquiescence, it would have to be AFL, and hopefully the Association of Washington Business.

Realistically, we're very lucky that Boeing is such a benevolent citizen. Can't ask for better corporate citizenship. But, it is a company state. We used to joke about Shelton or McCleary being company towns, well, this is a company state. Things revolve around Boeing, and, if they were a bad citizen, it would be terrible. But, they're very generous,

and they work with all the bureaucracies to try and work things out, and I think they've been given a hard time. I think Boeing has been put upon, not by state government as much as by local government. Local government can be very harassing.

Ms. Boswell: Is it possible that they will face so much of this harassment that they will withdraw a lot of their activity here?

Sen. Moore: It's possible. Somehow I doubt it, but if they had picked some place other than Topeka to have a major location, it might have been more attractive. I think there are a lot of people who want to live here, as opposed to Topeka. And some of their better skilled people in the upper brackets—engineers, scientists, technicians, who are making $50,000 and up—like the life-style here. Sailing, skiing, digging clams, all that stuff. Nearness to Vancouver. There are a lot of nice assets around here.

I'd also like to see automobile insurance, such as they have in British Columbia. The new figures just done by the insurance commissioner make a much stronger case for it than I had thought. Cheaper, no restrictions. As soon as you are sixteen, you can apply for a driver's license and you can own a car. You can drive a car, and if you're ninety years old, you're treated just as if you were forty. Women are not discriminated against. There's no discrimination because of being foreign-born, or looking different than an Anglo-Saxon. The repair people up there that do the work on vehicles, are happier because they get paid every month instead of letting it drag several months as some insurers do here. The public loves it. Almost all the big corporations in British Columbia utilize it. You have a standardized program. There are just a whole lot of pluses, and I see no minuses.

I've listened in to people in Vancouver, British Columbia, phoning, reporting their accidents, and they're all prepared. They have their account number, and they can tell you where the wreck took place. Arrangements are made in a very courteous way to have the car towed, or if it's drivable, bring it in, and we'll make out a work order, and send you to the garage of your choice to get it fixed. There's no additional cost. They don't have deductibles. If you have a lot of accidents, up go your rates. If you have no accidents for three years, it goes down. So, they're encouraging people to drive properly. They put a ton of money into education of kids on driving. It's a good system. I'd like to see that happen here. I've tried it for years, but they laugh at me. The insurance lobbyists are too strong. And most shocking, the Democrats who historically are for the consumer aren't there on this issue.

I would like to see a reforestation program that was really serious in this state. We're reforesting, but we're also reforesting with trees that grow a little faster than the native trees, so they can be harvested advantageously, more quickly. I think you replant the same thing that was there to begin with, so the natural habitat can come back—frogs and birds and rodents and deer and everything else, can find their place in the food chain.

Those are two things that I would do. And I've always envied Oregon on their parks system. We've been reluctant here to give away waterfront rights. When I buy a house on the water, that's my property, you'd better not set foot on it. Well, we've diminished that somewhat, but Oregon's been more progressive. In foreign countries, waterfront is everybody's waterfront.

I would like to see the Liquor Board diminished. I'd like to see there be a Director of Liquor in the state, and I'd do away with all the liquor stores, and give it to private enterprise.

Ms. Boswell: Why that?

Sen. Moore: It's much better for the public. You get wider choice. The hours and prices are better, they're all competing, and you can make the license high enough so that the state will have the same money it had before, maybe more. There will be a report out this fall, from the new Liquor Board member, which will suggest that. He wants to give it to just the big stores like Safeway, Thriftway and Albertsons, etc. I don't like that. I think that's discriminatory, and I would charge them a license in relation to what they sell. That's the way I would do it, but I'd let every little market, if they wanted to have a liquor section, have one.

Ms. Boswell: The arguments against that are what? Organized crime, or what?

Sen. Moore: No. The arguments are that the people would drink more because it's so available. I don't believe that. I think people will drink or they won't drink. I don't think it makes any difference. There are studies both ways. Take your choice. But I just don't like to tell people what they can do and what they can't do. That comes under the heading of telling them they can't do it. Presently, you can buy at certain hours from state stores, and their hours do not coincide with many shoppers' hours. It doesn't have anything to do with what people drink, or how much they drink.

Ms. Boswell: You've also been involved in the issue of gambling during your tenure here. Tell me a little bit more about that as a changing issue.

Sen. Moore: It's an immense issue. Just in these fifteen years, casinos have sprung up, not only on Indian reservations, but privately, as in New Jersey. It used to be nearly a monopoly, in Nevada. The fact that our lottery sells so many tickets—to say nothing of pull tabs, and punch boards, and that bingo and horse-racing are viable and they're all pretty big business—tells me that people want to gamble. I think that they should be entitled to gamble, casino, the whole business. But put everything under state regulation.

I probably would be careful. An example may be what's happening to the Indians. They're building casinos right and left. I think there's not enough money out there to support them all, and I think some of them are going to encounter bad times and maybe end up being worse off than they were before. So, I probably would license a few, and I probably would have them pretty much concentrated in areas that are resort destinations. I might make Tri Cities a resort destination, and have one there. I probably would certainly have one somewhere in King County, but probably just have a handful of them. People want to go. Why should they go to Nevada? Every hour there's a trainload or busload or planeload leaving for Reno or Las Vegas. Let each tribe, based on its size, participate in the profits.

Organized crime? Is that a problem in Nevada? Not that I know of. They've had some interests there, but it's all run so tightly with state supervision. It's such a powerful gambling commission down there, casino commission, that these people, if they have ownership, tolerate no rough stuff. I believe there are fewer murders per capita in Las Vegas than we have in Seattle.

Ms. Boswell: Are the kinds of gambling that are legalized in Washington right now a big source of income for the state?

Sen. Moore: No. It's not supposed to be. The gambling commission is supposed to be a self-sustaining entity. They don't get money from the general fund. They charge the licensees enough to support a pretty huge operation.

There are 120 employees now, and I think it's the third largest gambling commission in the United States.

Ms. Boswell: In Washington?

Sen. Moore: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: I had no idea.

Sen. Moore: Oh, it's a huge operation. I got off the subject. What were we talking about?

Ms. Boswell: I was asking you about the amount of money gambling brings into the state.

Sen. Moore: It doesn't bring in any because it's self-sustaining. It collects just enough to pay the commission, to pay the employees, and they do keep a surplus of two, three, four or five million dollars.

Spellman started a terrible thing, which now is going to cascade. It'll just be a new way of life. He took money from the Gambling Commission and put it in the general fund as part of his balanced-budget act. To me, that is illegal, but the licensees can't afford to complain—I'm not talking about money now—but they just can't afford to fight that because, as soon as they start fighting that, people will say, "Well, these people should be paying more." So, they just let it go, and they continue to pay more in fees, more in licenses, more in penalties, than are reasonable. There's enough fuel out there that once lit, could turn maybe the whole state into one where you couldn't even lag for pennies.

Here's an interesting example. Under the law, the local government is supposed to have jurisdiction over all licensees. To my knowledge, there's never been a police officer in any gambling establishment in the state, except to work off-duty hours as a policeman in the parking lot or as security. So, what happens is, the licensees are paying counties and cities who then put the money in their general fund, and it doesn't go for supervision of these places, as mandated by law. The state Gambling Commission has to keep the fees high, because they have a police force that goes out and does what the local government should be doing. So, the licensees are really being put upon.

I want everything organized. I want the licensees to be alive, and, if some of them get big enough so they could have a casino, fine. But the Indians have changed all that.

Ms. Boswell: I was going to ask you about that. Tell me about your views.

Sen. Moore: Well, there are card rooms now being closed all over the state. In Everett, Jack's Card Room, one of the oldest card rooms around, folded recently because of the competition from the Indians, who have BIG games, no limit games, boom! Well, that attracts players. People will go to a bingo game where there's a Cadillac prize. Although the odds are terrible, they'll go. They don't want to play for pots that have ten dollars in them, when they could maybe be playing for ones that have a thousand. So, it's hurting the licensees, that's what the Indians are doing.

Ms. Boswell: What's the philosophy of the state Gambling Commission about the Indians?

Sen. Moore: The Indians have Dan Evans and Dan Inouye, the U.S. senator from Hawaii. They opened Pandora's Box with their bill, and the gambling will increase. The bill gave a lot of power to the Indians in terms of gambling compacts with the state. I have no idea what Evans' rationale was in sponsoring that bill. Inouye's rationale was that the Indians needed some boost in their economy and this was a place where they could make

some money and improve their lot, which is true. But I suspect neither Dan ever thought about the licensees we have now, who are being hurt.

Now, the question is, "What is a slot machine?" Is video poker a slot machine? Looks the same, you just use cards instead of oranges and lemons. Video poker is an interesting aberration because it is a game of skill. You put in your quarter, up come five cards on a screen, and you have a pair of fours and an ace and a couple of other cards. Now, the ordinary goof will keep the ace—wrong. You have to have a pair of jacks to win anything. Much better to keep the two fours and get rid of the three other cards, because you now have three cards coming, and you just have to get one of them. So, it is just a matter of odds, and a game of skill, but a lot of people don't understand the percentages. Most people don't. So, should video poker be allowed, and slot machines not? Slot machines are just a pure chance game.

But they worked it around very quickly to where video poker is the same as a slot machine. And if there's a video poker game in the state, therefore they can have a slot machine. And the Indians are going ahead now, outside the compacts that have been drawn, in which the tribes agreed to certain things. They didn't have to give away much, though, because their federal law was so strong. They've agreed that the gambling commission will audit and a few other things, and they make some donations here and there.

Ms. Boswell: Is there anything the state can do to balance the different gambling interests?

Sen. Moore: No, although we have a good director, Frank Miller, lucky to have him. When he leaves here, he'll be so in demand throughout the United States, I don't know what his ceiling might be.

Ms. Boswell: How much power do the people on the commission, like you, have?

Sen. Moore: I don't have any because I'm an ex-officio member. The five members have quite a bit. They can decide whether video poker is coming in or not. Fortunately, all the members are pretty middle-of-the-road. In the last ten years, we've had only one radical member. By radical, I mean, didn't like much of anything that was going on.

Ms. Boswell: Do the Indians have lobbyists? Are they fairly active?

Sen. Moore: They had a lobbyist who now may still be their lobbyist, but he's working for the cities, I think. Good man. But it just can't go on like this. And another issue is Indian fishing rights, the conflict between commercial fishermen and Indian fishing. Pretty soon there won't be any fish left for anybody, so where will they be then? They'll be worse off than they were before the Boldt decision.

Ms. Boswell: So you see the fisheries issue as ultimately leading them down the wrong path, too?

Sen. Moore: Yes. They're a very privileged class. They have every right to be privileged because we abused them so badly. Ruined a wonderful culture. Brought nothing but disease. That's the only contribution we've made to the Indians. They were doing just fine. We owe them, but how much? Do we owe them for ten generations? A hundred generations? I don't know, but they have it both ways now. It isn't wonderful to be an Indian, but if they have a murder, who tries it? Is it the tribal council or is it the prosecuting attorney? The Bureau of Indian Affairs should be abolished. The BIA has a colonial attitude that is truly un-American. There's just a lot

of things that need to be addressed that we're dancing around.

They have to become regular citizens. We did kind of a halfhearted measure in the twenties when we gave them the vote. For forty years I've advocated that someday Congress should just step up to the bar and say:

"These treaties have got to be violated. Got to do away with them. We're going to cancel all the treaties. You can scream and have a tantrum, but this is it. We're going to buy your reservation from you. Going to put it up for bid, and it has a minimum bid, and if nobody wants to buy it at that price it won't be sold, or the government will buy it. We're going to sell the Navajo reservation. We're going to sell the Muckleshoots', we're going to sell everything, and give you the money. Now you're citizens just like the rest of us. You can apply for welfare, you can do anything you want. If you want to have a piece of property someplace with a long house on it and dance and do all the things that you think your forebears did, wonderful, we're not going to argue. No more than we do with the Italian Club, the DAR, Elks, or anything else."

Otherwise, this is going to go on for 1,000 years.

Ms. Boswell: On the other hand, if it's a land-based culture, and you take over their land and give them the money, what are they going to do?

Sen. Moore: How much of a land-based culture is it today? They're not living in wigwams anymore. They have plumbing. They get off the reservation, they come in and work, go back to the reservation. I don't see any respectable reservation houses. I don't see anything that is very wonderful.

What is a land-based culture? Our whole culture largely was land-based to begin with, and that's why we didn't have year 'round schools, because the kids were needed for harvest. Well, that's gone, and so is the Indian culture. I don't want to destroy it. I'm willing to subsidize keeping the language alive, since there was no written language. There's only the verbal language. I'm willing to do all kinds of things, but let's get rid of this reservation system—and that's a disgrace in itself. Reservation—it's like being in prison. What is that all about? It was a sop. I guess I'm pretty violent on that subject.

Ms. Boswell: Well, it's a complex issue. Now, what was the major opposition in terms of opening up the gambling?

Sen. Moore: It's interesting. There's a group which hates gambling, so they have an anti-gambling organization. The Gambling Commission gives them $50,000 a year, I think.

Ms. Boswell: Gives the anti-gambling organization money?

Sen. Moore: Yeah, I think the Lottery Commission gives them money, too. It's a PR job, you know.

Ms. Boswell: So they'd just be quiet and not bother anybody?

Sen. Moore: Sounds cynical, but yes—it is always better to be inside the tent than out—you just might be able to do a little steering.

Ms. Boswell: So does the major opposition against gambling come from religious interests?

Sen. Moore: No. It's the casinos in Nevada. They come up here and lobby.

Ms. Boswell: Oh really?

Sen. Moore: "You don't want these criminal elements coming in here." They join up with

a few council-of-churches types, and make a great case. Everybody goes, "Oh no, no! We don't want that!" You put that specter of organized crime, Mafia—"Oh no, we can't have that." No, it's the Nevada money.

Ms. Boswell: It's the competition?

Sen. Moore: Sure. They don't want any money siphoned off. They rely on us. We're a big source of income to them.

Ms. Boswell: What about the fear of organized crime? How does the gambling commission handle that kind of issue?

Sen. Moore: When I first went on the Gambling Commission, it was made up largely of police officers, retired FBI, retired sheriffs, and so on. Gradually, it changed. Now, there are none. There is an active attorney, there is a retired judge, there's a retired radio-TV station owner, there's a lady trucker, there's another woman and I forget what she does. Originally, the police officers kept saying, "No more licenses. Got to keep those—particularly card rooms—got to keep those card rooms out." Well, I know why. There is no money for the rogue police officer if you have licensed card rooms. It's the underground card rooms that are good for certain police. Just that simple.

I had a card room in my district on Queen Anne Avenue. Now, the police were going up and down that street all night long in their prowler car. They'd see the lights on, they'd see parking all over the place. Now, why did they never investigate? Why?

So, we've had no organized crime here. At one time they said, "If you have more than one card table, more than eight seats, organized crime is going to move in." Every time we have a bill to loosen gambling up, or to say we're going to license a premise at Vantage, we're going to have a gambling area, a casino, every time, all of a sudden, a whole lot of strangers show up that nobody's ever seen before, to tell us how evil it's going to be. And, like I said, they're all coming from Nevada.

Ms. Boswell: Because they don't want the competition?

Sen. Moore: That's right. Limitless money. If we ever got it on the ballot to have a casino someplace, Ocean Shores or wherever, you'd see ten million dollars appear by magic to defeat it. That money does not come from those little old ladies who oppose gambling!

Ms. Boswell: I'm showing my ignorance—I should know this but I don't—is the Lottery Commission directly under the Gambling Commission, or is it a separate commission?

Sen. Moore: No, it's a separate commission. Gambling Commission is a strong commission with a strong director. The Lottery Commission has a strong director and a weak commission. I've offered to sponsor a person to be on the Lottery Commission. He said, "Forget it," because the director does what she wants to do and then tells them, "Approve it." Nobody stands up to her. They have one member that does, but the rest of them all fold, partly because she's a woman, partly because she's a minority. "We'd be picking on this Chinese woman. That could lead to trouble, we could be sued."

Ms. Boswell: That's an interesting scenario, though, if you have various groups who might be "minority groups" in power, that they may have more power by the very fact that they fall into that category.

Sen. Moore: Oh, absolutely. Way more power than would normally accrue. We see quite a bit of that.

CHAPTER 13

LIFE IN THE PUBLIC EYE: CONTROVERSY AND CONFLICT

Ms. Boswell: You did get slammed in the press a little bit in recent times, as a member of the Gambling Commission being in partnership with somebody who is a bingo operator. Again, is that a conflict of interest, or is that a straw man, or what?

Sen. Moore: I suppose it's a conflict of interest. But what I did, what I kept trying to do, was to have more gambling, but be reasonable about the salaries that are paid. Some people believe in charitable gaming, which means that the Sisters of Providence will have a game, they will deal, they'll personally run the games. Well, they'll lose money if they do. You have to have trained people running these games. So, I always advocated paying for full-time dealers, etc. For example, I want all bingo parlors to have the opportunity to be open seven days a week. Three days for their organization, the other four days they can farm out, maybe for the cost of the wear and tear: $100, $200, $300 per night. And use their dealers, use everything that they have, all their people, and the proceeds all go to disabled children, or veterans, or whatever. So, I've always advocated that. Never did I do anything that didn't benefit them all. I was a proponent of controlled, licensed gambling long before I became co-owner of a duplex with a licensee.

You can make a case, yes, here's Ray Moore, now, he's known his partner for a very long time. The truth is, I actually put up more cash in the duplex than my partner did. Yet, it was implied, in fact the first story that was written made it pretty clear, that I had been paid off by my partner for a favor. But, their libel, slander attorney said, "No, we'll be sued." See, I can't sue them as a public figure, but my partner can sue them, and he was looking for something to go after them on. But they denied him that right at the last minute. No, I've never done anything that helped an individual. Help one, help all. And remember, I have no vote on the Gambling Commission.

Ms. Boswell: When you're in the position you are as a legislator on a variety of committees, do you have to really examine everything you do and say, "Is this a conflict of interest? Am I going to get attacked for this?" Is this a fact of life of a legislator?

Sen. Moore: I think three out of four legislators weigh that all the time. I, maybe one percent of the time. I don't pay much attention.

Ms. Boswell: Why would such a large percentage do, and you don't pay any attention?

Sen. Moore: Oh, they're afraid of the press and, obviously, I'm not. The press hasn't liked me for a long time.

Ms. Boswell: I wanted to go back—we talked a little bit about it, but do you want to tell me a little bit more about the workings of the Investment Board, especially the recent controversy?

Sen. Moore: Well, the controversy we're having is over the dismissal of the former

director of the board, Basil Schwan. We've had some trouble with the directors, lately. We used to have a fellow here running the State Investment Board more-or-less out of his hip pocket. He was quite talented, and made good money for the board. His name was Roy Pitt. However, after he left the new board did even better. The new man, John Hitchman, did so well from 1983 to '88 that, I think I mentioned this, we were running fifteen to twenty percent for the first five years I was on the board.

Then Hitchman resigned to take a job in private enterprise at about four times what we were paying him. By the way, he became quite well-off in three or four years, and I've heard he's back in Olympia now, retired. After he left, we did a search for his replacement. We couldn't find anybody who really was going to fit.

Part of the job is getting along with the Legislature, so we gave it to the assistant. The assistant turned out to be a caretaker who bought some stock that the state was also buying. Some of the people thought that was very unethical, although what can a couple of hundred shares do in a market with 100 million shares? Nothing. So, he was ousted. The board was made up of nine people, but there were five in addition who were ex-officio members, called the advisory committee. They sit with the members, they can't vote. Well, they began to think they had long pants and that they should be running the board. So, there began to be friction, and, by and large, they were a stuffy lot. When the board got rid of this director who hadn't measured up, we had a search to find a new director. As I said before, I was not on the board at the time. I was off for two or three years because we Democrats lost control of the Senate.

During this time, they hired Basil Schwan from the California Teachers Retirement Fund. I met him and we talked a little bit. And since we're in the majority most of the time, and I hoped to be back on that board, I got acquainted with him. I thought, "This guy is never going to get caught doing anything, *good* or *bad*." It turned out to be the case. He's been here two and three-quarter years of a three year contract. He has instituted many checks and balances, and he expanded the staff. Where we used to have three or four or five managers of money, there are twenty now. The fund, of course, is larger, but it's so diversified now that it's almost impossible to make or lose any big money, which is okay. I was not fascinated with him, I was not fascinated with his staff. His staff is what destroyed Schwan to me. That and his inability to communicate with the Legislature.

Ms. Boswell: Certainly there's been some controversy over the board getting rid of Schwan. What's your take on that?

Sen. Moore: Well, it's important that the director be able to communicate with the Legislature because they provide some funds for the board. The legislators who are key are the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the Senate, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the House. They did not think much of him.

Now, I'm going to give you an example. I went to him a year ago. I said, "Now, we've got these lawsuits against this outfit in Boston, and we're talking about two-, three-, four-hundred million. We may get nothing if we sit on our hands. What do you plan to do?" He said, "Oh, we're going to sue them." The attorney general was new, very bright, and she agreed. "So," I said, "how much money are we talking about?" because I'm an odds player.

For example, only yesterday I went down to have my eyes looked at. I asked the doctor, what are the odds, if you do this laser thing to clear up a little blur in my eyes? He says, "Two hundred to one, that it won't do any damage." Good enough for me. Boom, he did it. I just

want the odds quoted to me.

Anyway, the way to figure the odds was, how much can we possibly collect in a law suit? We could collect, if we get unlucky, sixty million, and if we get lucky, we might get $100 million. Going to be a loss, but if we do nothing, we may get nothing. I asked Schwan, "How much in legal fees?"

"Five million."

I said, "Five million? I want to talk to the attorneys." So, I went to Seattle with Virginia. We talked to the attorneys, three of them. I said, "I'm all for the lawsuit, don't get me wrong, but tell me about this five-million dollar budget that you're going to spend on the legal fees."

"Well, we're going to need three million," they said.

"Okay, what about the other two million Mr. Schwan's talking about?"

"Well, we're going to need a million for experts, expert witnesses."

"Okay, what's the other million for?"

"Oh, Xeroxing and all that kind of stuff."

I went back and, baffled as to the lack of detail as to where the money was going, I suggested Mr. Schwan needed to make a detailed budget, and discuss it with the key legislative players—Gaspard, Rinehart, Ebersole, Sommers, a few others. He talked to them. He went to each one separately. He did not impress any of them.

By that time the five million was up to nine million, and still no details. So, I, just for the hell of it, divided nine million by 200, assuming that they charged $200 an hour. It turned out to be 45,000 hours.

"You don't understand, Senator," Schwan and his staff kept telling me. Well, apparently, Sommers and Rinehart didn't understand either, because at first they didn't want to give Schwan *any* money.

I kept saying, "No, I think we should give him something, but let's get this budget cut down." I went to the lobbyist for the insurance industry, Basil Badley, and I said, "What do you do when you go to a foreign state, or your people go to a foreign state, and they need an attorney who can handle their affairs if they don't know anybody?"

"Well," he says, "I'll send you down the questionnaire."

So, he sent me this questionnaire, and it's about fifty pages, and I sent it to Schwan, and I said, "I think this is what you should be using."

"Oh," he said, "we're doing something comparable."

Well, it wasn't comparable, really. And Basil Badley told me, "We're generally able to hire really good talent for $150, $175 an hour." So, I was being generous when I talked about $200. But, obviously, they were getting way more than $200.

The argument for using this firm was, "Well, we hired them originally to help us, so now they know our problems, and it would be a learning process to give it to anybody else." I said, "I don't know about that." But anyway, they went ahead and hired these people. I would guess, that with the amount of money that the Legislature appropriated, which was about half of what they asked for, that they will be able to do a bang up job with the help of the attorney general. I want the attorney general deeply involved in all of this, because she is the one that defends the State of Washington. When we have outside counsel, even for boards and commissions, I think she, or whoever the attorney general is, should be really on top of it. Obviously, Schwan didn't handle the Legislature as well as he could have. Situations like that prompted his dismissal.

Ms. Boswell: Now, again, the Investment Board was under some scrutiny because of that decision to fire him, and you ended up being the—

Sen. Moore: No.

Ms. Boswell: There was a tie, but as a tie, he would have been gone anyway. Is that correct?

Sen. Moore: Now let me explain it.

Ms. Boswell: Yes, please do.

Sen. Moore: The people who wanted to retain him, when it got to that point, after many hours of wrangling about it, we got to the point where somebody had to make a motion. I cannot remember whether it was Gary Moore or George Masten, I think one of the two, made the positive motion. See, what I thought might happen was that the people who wanted Schwan to stay would have made the negative motion—"I move not to renew the Schwan contract." If that had been the motion, there would have been four votes for it, and four against it, and it would have failed, and the board would negotiate a new contract with Schwan. But, the people on the side that I favored, made the motion first, and once you've made the positive motion, you can't supersede it with a negative motion. If they had made the negative motion, then somebody or I would have made the positive motion, which supersedes the negative motion. So, it was the positive motion to renew the contract that was before us. They had four votes for it. That's all. They couldn't get five, because no matter what happened, they had only four votes. I wouldn't have voted—if it had been the negative motion, I wouldn't have bothered to vote. I even asked while we were in executive session, "Now, because of the position that I find myself in, not being allowed to vote, still being a Senator, I don't want to embarrass you, do you want me to vote or not vote?" Both sides said, "Yes, we want you to vote." So, I voted, but my vote didn't make any difference.

Ms. Boswell: So it was at their behest that you voted, then?

Sen. Moore: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: And then you got criticized for voting?

Sen. Moore: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: Did you expect that?

Sen. Moore: Oh, sure. As a matter of fact, one of these two reporters who has been giving me the hard time, said to a staff person here, "We're not through with Ray Moore, yet."

Ms. Boswell: And they were referring also to the controversy over your residency?

Sen. Moore: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: There have been some new developments there. Since we last talked about this in late March, your residency has been invalidated. In terms of the press, do you think there's a personal vendetta on the part of the reporters, or what's the reason for the comments that were made to the staff person?

Sen. Moore: No. It's not personal by the reporters, no. They've been prompted by somebody.

Ms. Boswell: Do you have an idea who?

Sen. Moore: Yeah, I do.

Ms. Boswell: Do you want to share it?

Sen. Moore: No. But they're huge, two huge public figures, of whom I have been publicly critical.

Ms. Boswell: And so you think that they are

powerful enough to control the press?

Sen. Moore: Oh, absolutely. Easily.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think that happens very often?

Sen. Moore: Since I've been here, five or ten times. Funny thing is, none of these things ever succeeded. They're an aggravation, but they didn't succeed in what they tried to do.

Ms. Boswell: Why? If these are powerful people, why doesn't it succeed?

Sen. Moore: Because the people they're attacking just hang in there. They don't budge. "Hit me again."

Ms. Boswell: What's given you the sort of where-with-all to hang in there and say, "Hit me again?"

Sen. Moore: There are two things. You have to have a thick hide in this business. The second thing is, I don't consider myself terribly bright, so I have succeeded in life by tenacity. In the market, in politics, I just stay. And I don't have any big enemies in the Legislature. In fact, I have quite a few allies.

Ms. Boswell: So you see tenacity as just an important characteristic, leaning on that a lot?

Sen. Moore: Yes. I guess my philosophy is, I'm going to outlast the bastards.

Ms. Boswell: Some people might suggest that sounds—this kind of explanation—sounds a little bit like a conspiracy theory, or something. How would you respond to that?

Sen. Moore: I guess my only response is, Vic Meyers once said, when they were always after him, he said, "Why pick on Vic?" Well, here I am. I'm in my eighties. I'm going nowhere. It is known that I'm not going to run again. What is so magic about trying to get me out now? No further session, why not just let me die on the vine? Why? I'm nobody. I never was anybody. I was lucky to be here. I didn't do much damage while I was here. I might have done a little good.

Ms. Boswell: Why prey on Ray?

Sen. Moore: Yeah, why prey on Ray? Thank you.

Ms. Boswell: Maybe you're selling yourself short, though, in terms of your impact?

Sen. Moore: But any impact I had was gone. I was a lame duck.

Ms. Boswell: Well, you hadn't announced that you were going to retire.

Sen. Moore: I announced it four years ago. I told everybody I'll never run again. They forgot, and of course, I'm not going to remind them at this point, because once I do, then I *am* a lame duck, and I have no oomph at all.

Ms. Boswell: So, you would say, though, that the reason this residency controversy is continuing is primarily—is it the press? Is it these forces behind the press, or what? The reason why this has kept on.

Sen. Moore: I don't think it's the press, although I do think the *Times* editorial board has not liked me for a long time. No, I think it's forces that the *Times* might want to accommodate. But, in January, this thing started out as a girlish prank, and it mushroomed. Do you know, one day I drove to Hilo—gone about seven or eight hours—I came back, twenty-two messages on the machine from reporters, from media. I did not

return their calls. I won't ever talk to them again.

Ms. Boswell: What about saying your side though? It's not worth it to you to talk to them?

Sen. Moore: How do you think it would come out? I made a heartfelt speech on the floor. It wasn't much of a speech, it was unprepared. What did they do? "In a rambling statement." You know. It *was* rambling, but they wanted to hurt me.

Ms. Boswell: You don't see, really, that there are certain individuals, whether they are reporters for their own careers, or something else, who are really keeping this alive for whatever purpose it might serve?

Sen. Moore: Oh, Barbara Serrano said to me, "Well, what do you think of my story?" I said, "I don't think you'll ever win a Pulitzer Prize."

Ms. Boswell: You told me that most of the reporters who covered this had been transferred.

Sen. Moore: The two key ones, I hear, have been moved out of here back to Seattle.

Ms. Boswell: *The Seattle Times* may have instigated this, but certainly, many other papers picked it up, and the more brutal editorials seemed to be from some of the other papers as well. Why did they all jump on the band wagon? Just a big story?

Sen. Moore: Well, you know, to show that they know what's going on, and that we should not tolerate this kind of behavior. Did a word ever appear about the fact that I organized Food Lifeline? Biggest thing in the United States of its kind. Feeds thousands of people every day.

It's like Gordon Walgren. They always refer to Gordon, not as the former majority leader, but as a convicted felon. Just anything to make it look more negative.

Ms. Boswell: After all that happened, why do you think that the King County Election Board decided, essentially, to invalidate your Washington residency? What do you think was behind that decision? And secondly, why have you chosen to not fight that?

Sen. Moore: Why was it that the board of three at first said I was a voter? And a month later, Kendall raised this question again? And so, John Charles, who was Gary Locke's treasurer, heard the case all by himself and decided against me?

Ms. Boswell: Oh, all by himself?

Sen. Moore: All by himself. It has a suspicious feeling, that the politicians—Locke, Maleng, and the head of the elections department, John Charles—heard it and decided I was okay. A month later, all of a sudden, with no new evidence against me. I presented new evidence. Kendall did not.

Ms. Boswell: Oh, you did?

Sen. Moore: Kendall presented no new evidence, and in the findings by John Charles, he said, "Senator Moore offered no new evidence, and Kendall offered new evidence that made me do this."

Ms. Boswell: So he reversed, then?

Sen. Moore: On nothing. I had the evidence. I furnished him a document saying that I had spent forty percent of my time in the last—he wanted it for a certain period—I gave it to him. Forty percent in Seattle, forty percent in Olympia, twenty percent in Hawaii. I don't see anything wrong with that for residency.

And why am I not fighting it? Although I thought it was an unjust decision, it costs too much money to fight it. It is not worth it. The first legal services bill, I paid, which was very nominal, $500, $1,000 or some such. The next bill I got was between four and five thousand, which the attorneys charged off as pro bono—and I'd had no prior relationship.

Ms. Boswell: This is attorney's fees?

Sen. Moore: Yeah, and first-class work. Just outstanding. And, of course, they're willing to fight it. But, I've decided that I can't afford the luxury, which comes under the heading of "don't fight city hall." And, we'll do something in the next week or so. I don't know what it's going to be yet.

Ms. Boswell: So, you don't think you'll continue to fight it, though?

Sen. Moore: Well, if I show up in court, it'll be a semi media event. If I don't show up, the press will just say, "Well, he was a no show." If the court decides that I'm right—hollow victory. If they decide that I was wrong, and that John Charles was right, and they uphold his decision, I'll draw half a dozen editorials, saying, "Why doesn't this senile old man get out? He's already ruined his reputation, but he could salvage a little something if he'd just resign." So, that's the way it would play out.

I haven't decided what to do. The case comes up on the tenth, I think it is, of August. It was set for December. Maleng got it moved up to an earlier date all of a sudden, which tells me, because he said he didn't want to touch it before, it tells me that somebody's put a little pressure on him to move it up. So, we got a postponement for three weeks to the tenth or eleventh of next month, of August.

Ms. Boswell: You had mentioned Maleng earlier, and I was going to say that Maleng has essentially said, "This is not my fight to fight. I'm going to let the Legislature take care of its own."

Sen. Moore: But he's feeling something from somebody, and he told our attorney, they had a conversation, that this was a terrible spot to be in because, and this is a direct quote, "Ray and I go back a long way." And I've supported him against Democratic opponents. And yet, he came out against me in '90. So, I've been with him a long time, he's been with me most of the time. We're on good terms. We're both strong animal rights types, and agree on many issues.

Ms. Boswell: What about the role that Steve Kendall played in all this? Do you understand it? You mentioned in March that he had worked on a campaign of yours.

Sen. Moore: After he had that unfortunate incident in Auburn, and resigned as a school board member, he never surfaced again. And here he is fifteen years later, crowding forty, and he's a custodian for Metro. He asked Talmadge and me to recommend him for a legal—paralegal—job. Phil and I talked about it, and Phil said, "I can't do it. I don't know him that well." And I said, "Well, frankly, I haven't seen him for years, and so I don't know," and so neither one of us did. And I think he saw an opportunity, here, to fix my clock, so he jumped in. I think he may have been encouraged by the gay community, because they wanted me out badly, so that they could maybe get their person in to replace Cal Anderson as the gay in the House Democratic caucus. The only way they can get me out is to make life so difficult that I certainly won't run again, and Jeanne Kohl can move to the Senate, and they can maybe elect a gay to the House. Well, they're not going to get the House. I don't think their candidate is going to win.

Ms. Boswell: Just not good enough?

Sen. Moore: I think the gays have become overly aggressive, and I think there's going to be a little backlash against them this fall. Reese Lindquist's son, or my choice, Chris Snell, I think, and who knows, maybe Mary Lou Dickerson, being the only woman—there's half a dozen of them in there—will win.

Ms. Boswell: Is there any kind of backlash at people who are supporters of you, that feel the same way you do, that this might have been part of the issue?

Sen. Moore: Yeah. Yeah. We have quite a lot of correspondence from people that have thrown in little bits and pieces. We have a pretty good idea of how it all happened. I've found practically no erosion. I know it sounds boastful, but I think if I had reregistered and filed, I could have won the primary.

Ms. Boswell: But would you have wanted to?

Sen. Moore: No. No, I'm having a wonderful life. Life is good. There is life after the Legislature.

Ms. Boswell: Does this controversy affect your day-to-day life at all, over there? Do you think about it? You said you had twenty-two phone calls waiting on one day.

Sen. Moore: No. No, we don't.

Ms. Boswell: You don't think about it, really? You don't talk about it, you don't worry about it?

Sen. Moore: Oh, we laugh about it occasionally. "What a romp," Virginia says. I'm pretty tough. One day Virginia answered the phone and a reporter's on the phone, "Senator Moore there?"

"Who dis calling?" He gave his name. "Who you wit?" She does very good Pidgin, oh *very* good. So he told her he was with the radio station. He apparently said, "Who's this?"

"Oh, I jus' de housekeepa."

Ms. Boswell: Has she made any statements? Has she talked to any press?

Sen. Moore: No, no need.

Ms. Boswell: Didn't I hear a story that you talked to the Associated Press, though, or something like that, or am I making it up?

Sen. Moore: I called John White, and said, "John, you've been decent to me all these years, and you haven't jumped on me this time, and when I have a statement to make, I'm going to give you the exclusive."

"Oh," he said, "thanks." Next thing I know, he told his partner that—what the hell's his name? Ammons?—one of those guys on the beat down here, and the next thing I know, it's in the *West Hawaii Today* newspaper, under this guy's byline who said, "Senator Moore will be making a statement soon, and I'll have more details." So, White couldn't keep his mouth shut, either. He's an older guy that the young guys all laugh at and think he's over the hill. That's why I wanted to help him. But, now I can't, so I either won't say anything and either just drift off into the ether, or I may make a statement.

Ms. Boswell: And if you do, who will you call?

Sen. Moore: Nobody. I'll just mail it in. I may just ask the Senate to release it to whomever.

Ms. Boswell: When all this came up, was

there somebody, or more than one in the Senate, that you went to for advice about what you should do?

Sen. Moore: Down through the years, I found out early that I didn't know as much as I needed to know, and I went, always, to Sid Snyder, when he was secretary of the Senate. This time I didn't go to him immediately. I talked to Marty Brown, who succeeded Sid, and I've been in touch with Marty almost daily since January. His advice is good.

Ms. Boswell: May I ask why you chose not to go to Sid Snyder?

Sen. Moore: I didn't go to him immediately, but within a week I started talking to him about it. He's very sound. He's a good old boy. He's a solid guy that will keep the boat from capsizing, and Marty is extremely smart, a good writer, and an attorney. So, the questions I had were more appropriate to go to Marty, really. Nothing personal on Sid, nothing has deteriorated there, we're the same as always.

Ms. Boswell: If you could encapsulate the kinds of advice that you got from Marty Brown, what would it be? Were there really specific questions?

Sen. Moore: I think he confirmed my feelings—don't talk. I have avoided the press since I've been here, and I should have kept on that tack, but I also felt that since Serrano had been able to get to me, that I probably owed the rest of the press an opportunity, and I thought maybe some of them might decide that they wanted to be more—a little kinder. Not a single one of them. It turned out, they were all jackals. They're all vultures. I trusted a guy from the *P-I*, with whom I was straightforward, and he distorted the interview.

It's been suggested that I might have a press conference. Well, they're going to only pick out what makes me look bad. So, if I don't talk, they can't say anything. They just say I'm avoiding them and, of course, now, O. J. Simpson saved me. Jackie gave me a little respite when she died, and Tanya Harding helped.

Ms. Boswell: In some respects it could be gratifying to be among the great headliners of the year. When they do, at the end of the year, the top ten stories of the year—

Sen. Moore: I should be there.

Ms. Boswell: You should be there.

Sen. Moore: Well, I wish I could tell you more. When we're all through with this, I'll tell you what I think is going to happen—in rethinking what I've just said, I hope I don't come off appearing paranoid, but we had more than enough evidence to show validity.

Ms. Boswell: Okay, that will be fine. Two more quick questions. You did, after the legislative session ended, a few months later, resign from some of the commissions that you were on. What prompted that decision? When I talked to you about this last March, you were pretty firm—"This isn't going to scare me off, I'm going to finish my term, and that's that." Why did you change?

Sen. Moore: The Senate is going to undergo a tremendous upheaval this time. Even if we retain the majority, the majority party without Talmadge, Niemi, Williams, me, Bluechel, a couple of others, is going to be a whole new deal. So, I decided in April that I should really consider getting off these boards and committees and giving people a chance to get into the work involved, and still have me around if they wanted to ask any questions. Gaspard and I talked it over. I called him one

day, and I said, "I'm thinking about this." Well, I'm sure he was relieved, although he didn't say so. I think it made life easier for him. So, he appointed Sid Snyder, who is at least as capable as I am, to the Investment Board, and the only person in the Senate that could possibly do it. Unfortunately, he had a heart operation, so he's not moving as fast as I wish he could. On the Gambling Commission, I knew that Margarita Prentice wanted to be on that, and I wanted to be around to work with her. I had a meeting with her for three, four hours this morning. We see things pretty much together. On the Pension Policy Committee, I was scheduled to be chairman, and Al Bauer will be a better chairman than I, anyway. Again, we've got experience in Snyder and Bauer, so I thought, "You know, let's get them rolling," and at least doing it now, I'll have a little input as to who gets those jobs. It worked out just right, I wanted all three of them to have these positions.

And, next January, it will be such a melee, with all these new players coming in, and a lot of people that have been here, two, three, four years will now think they are somebody. I didn't want some of those people taking over these positions, so I changed my mind.

Ms. Boswell: You said that you did talk to Gaspard, did he have advice?

Sen. Moore: No, he said, "It's up to you." I said, "Well, you're right, it is up to me."

Ms. Boswell: Has he been generally supportive? Did he try to talk you into resigning?

Sen. Moore: No, he did not try to convince me to resign. I don't say, had I been another person, I can't guarantee that he might not have. They know me pretty well, and they know no matter what they say, I may not pay any attention to them. He has been supportive. But deep in my heart, and in his, I'm sure both of us know that he wishes I'd go away.

Ms. Boswell: Generally, in the Legislature, and particularly in the Senate, would you say that most people feel that way, they'd just rather it was over, or do most of them say, "Stand in there and fight?"

Sen. Moore: There are two people in the Senate that want me out, Mary Margaret Haugen and Dwight Pelz. The rest of them have been, I'd say, enthusiastic to nominally supportive. Twelve Republicans have communicated, saying that if it ever got to a vote, they'll be with me. I think George Sellar would just as soon that I stayed in, because then during the campaign, he can say, "Look at these Democrats, they've got this criminal in their group, and they can't even control him. Do you want these people running your state?" So, I think George would vote to vote me out if it got to a vote, but he wants me in as a whipping boy.

My district organization sent me a questionnaire this last December, and I answered it 100 percent the way they wanted. And they knew from my past voting record that I was there for them, but they decided that they wanted to get rid of me. The issue of my residency is not the issue. The issue is: how can we get a gay in the House from our district? They can't run against Helen Sommers; she'd whip anybody! Jeanne Kohl is probably too strong, although not in a class with Helen. So, how can we do this? Well, they've got to move me out. If they get rid of me, Kohl can move to the Senate, and the gay can maybe get the House seat. In this scenario they'll have a gay in the Democratic caucus in both Houses. Cal Anderson is coming over from the House to replace Janice Niemi. So, that's the internal workings of the strife. That's the way it appears to me.

Ms. Boswell: Why are they so intent on that, to have that gay representation? And why that district, rather than any other district?

Sen. Moore: The second-largest gay population is in our district, so this is their best shot. The third-largest gay population is in the Forty-sixth, which is where Rinehart is. University and Laurelhurst and Sand Point.

Ms. Boswell: So this had been going on long before any of the residency issues came up?

Sen. Moore: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: Did you have that same kind of action in the central committee when you were GOP county chairman? Did you see some districts trying to get some particular person or thing through?

Sen. Moore: Yeah. The fights mostly occurred over the presidency. Who were going to be the delegates? There'd be Dewey, there'd be Wilkie, there was Harold Stassen, and a lot of other Republicans were mentioned. And so, you picked somebody as a committeeman, and then if you had enough influence, you could get some other committeeman to go for that person, and pretty soon you've got a little block that has to be dealt with. But, when you have an open primary, like here, the party doesn't mean anything. It's just a straw man. I could file as an independent. I could have a convention and run as an independent right now, and I'd probably get thirty-five percent of the vote.

Ms. Boswell: So name recognition is more important than party affiliation?

Sen. Moore: Absolutely. And I might pick up some people if I did it just right and ran against Karen Marchiaro, who is a dirty word in our district. And run against the *Times*. The central committee, itself, run against the district organization. "Ray Moore is independent. The bosses aren't going to push him around." One could make quite a campaign out of it.

Ms. Boswell: Did you have people doing that when you were chair?

Sen. Moore: I did everything. Whatever was called for, but I stopped short once. I invited Nixon to come up to Seattle in 1950. He spoke at the old Pantages Theater, and it was an hour program, and, as I remember, Bill Boeing, Jr. or somebody bought an hour of time on all three networks. The whole state was covered. Langlie was going to introduce the featured speaker—Nixon—but we had all kinds of people running for office, county offices, Legislature, and it started at seven o'clock. The choreography had to be perfect so that Langlie could come on at exactly eight o'clock when we had the time on the air. He was to take a couple of minutes and introduce Nixon, the "giant-killer" from California. Well, I did a good job of getting everybody on and off the stage, they all got to speak, but it was a close call. I had about thirty seconds left over. Nixon made a great speech, and afterward he said, "That was a remarkable job you did. I know how difficult it is when you have all these people who want to talk." He was a very nice guy, in that way. He recognized difficult situations. He could identify with them. So, I said to him, "We're probably going to lose this next election." And, I said, "It doesn't look good for us, but any suggestions you have, I'd like to hear them." So he came to the office the next morning before he left town and he told me how to do it. Just don't run any ads, don't do anything until the Sunday before the election. Then run full page ads, double page ads if you have money for it, in all the dailies accusing the opposition of being Communists, fellow travelers, pinkos, etc.

Ms. Boswell: He advised you to do that in 1950?

Sen. Moore: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: What was your opinion of Nixon, especially after he told you that? Did that influence you in any way?

Sen. Moore: No. Whatever the cards are that are dealt to me, I'll play them the best way I can, but I won't resort to politics like that. So, we didn't do it, and we lost the election. We might have lost it anyway. I won't do *just* anything to get elected. I can't do that. It's contrary to my being.

CHAPTER 14

CONCLUSION

Ms. Boswell: You don't regret having done what you've done? You don't regret having been in the Legislature?

Sen. Moore: Oh, no. As I said in my so-called "farewell address," what other eighty-two year old has had such a good sixteen years? I defy anybody to name one. I've had the ultimate. What more can I want?

No, I don't have any regrets at all. I had to run last time. I wasn't going to run, because I only generally last about ten years in any one spot. I wouldn't have run, but I knew that I was the only candidate we had who could raise the necessary money. And, I was the only one out there that people knew. So, I had the ingredients that nobody else in the district had, except Helen Sommers, and Helen wouldn't do it. And, why should she?

She had been in the House forever. She is the ultimate power over there, her respect level is so high, and she's happy where she is. Nobody ever could do anything to her. So, I ran, and it's fortunate that I did, because I believe Andy could have beaten anybody else. Although I finally beat him fifty-five, forty-five. He was really a good opponent, and he was putting on a great campaign. If we'd come up with an unknown, I don't think we could have kept that seat for the Democrats.

Ms. Boswell: What do you think will happen now? Do you think when you don't run that seat will be preserved?

Sen. Moore: Yes. My guess is Jeanne Kohl. She's in for more trouble than she thinks. She should win it, but Mark Lindquist is a going machine, and he has the youth and vitality that I don't think she can match. He will doorbell that district twice, which is horrendous. He's already covered forty precincts. He's out of the Adam Smith school of politics. Just see everybody, just keep telling them who you are. I think he can be more of a threat than she may think. Of the two other candidates, one of them will pull out and run for the House, and I think the other one will be forced out, too. I may be wrong, we'll see.

Ms. Boswell: Now, you've said you weren't serious when at some points you've said, "I'm going to run again. I'm not going to let this get to me." But would you really have done it? Did you want to run again?

Sen. Moore: No.

Ms. Boswell: You really weren't serious?

Sen. Moore: No. Never. That may sound like, "Who is this senile old bastard?" but I have to maintain I'm running because I can't be a lame duck during the session. I've got to keep these people out here—

Ms. Boswell: The lobbyists, you're talking about?

Sen. Moore: Got to keep them working on me. They can't be waiting for me to expire. I have to keep all of this in place to be effective.

Ms. Boswell: Did you find all the publicity that you did get affected your effectiveness?

Sen. Moore: Yes. I think it cut me down. It probably cut me from 100 to ninety. It wasn't so much the media stories, but every time you turn around there's another reporter, and you have to be careful not to give them any ammunition and still have some substance. It's been a great problem. And, I think I deserved it. I think I deserved everything that's happened, because, in a sense, I've lived dangerously. So, I'm sure that it was my turn in the barrel.

Ms. Boswell: In terms of that, when you look at your legislative career, are you disappointed? Sure, it's not the way you wanted it to end, but does it bother you much, all this happening?

Sen. Moore: No, I think I maybe told you before, I never wanted to wait around in any organization for the gold watch and the turkey dinner, and that's why I've done so many things. And, I think this is another experience. I can't say it was enjoyable, but there are some assets to experience. Now I know how much heat I can take. I know. I always thought I was a potential war hero, never in a war, but I always thought, "Boy, I'd have really been tough." Well, once we had an earthquake in Seattle, and I'll tell you, I was like Mickey Mouse running around the room, trying to find a little rat hole to go through. I was no hero, I found out that day. I was just a regular coward.

It wasn't enjoyable, but it's nice to know how much you can take, and the rest of the time has been wonderful. I've been well treated. I waited my turn. I let people get onto Ways and Means Committee before I went on. I had seniority, all I had to do was ask. But, I thought, "That will help Nita Rinehart. She's younger, I'll give my place to her." Get her started, and now she's chairman.

Knowing that I had no future made it easy to just rock along and, then when I made a demand, I made it stick, like when I asked that they put the Labor and Commerce Committee together with Financial Institutions. So, I was not aggressive, not demanding, and always was there, on every vote. There was never a hard vote for me, it was easy. If it helped people, I didn't care what it cost. I'm willing to pay the taxes. I was sole sponsor of the income tax. They can very well say, "He never saw a tax he didn't like." That's very possible, because I'll vote for the money to do all the things that help people through life.

Ms. Boswell: Is that your legacy? It's sort of a high-flown thing to think about your legacy, but, there are certain things that you're proud of?

Sen. Moore: Yeah. I think my performance on the State Investment Board was outstanding, if I do say so myself. In 1987, in February, we had a board meeting, and I told them, "I think we have way too much money in equity. We have sixty-two percent. I'd like to see us get down to half that."

They said, "Okay, maybe that's right." So, they started selling. All spring, all summer, into the fall. When that big crack in the market came, they had thirty-two percent in stock. This saved the pension fund maybe $500 million, more or less.

Ms. Boswell: Did you have a sense that was coming, or was it more just good, solid, politics?

Sen. Moore: No, I had a sense. When every TV station, every radio station, every commentator, is talking about the market being at a new, all-time high, it can only go on so long. It's like a chain letter. Finally, they run out of players, and then somebody wants to shake hands with his money, and the avalanche starts. Now, that was a very extreme situation, but I sensed that there were too many

people in the market who might want to get their money out, soon.

And, I think my performance as chairman of the Financial Institutions Committee in 1983 was remarkable. I saved the pensioners, the retirees at Seattle First, and at Old National Bank. If those two institutions had gone down, they'd have got nothing. And, I made it possible for Old National to merge with US Bank and save itself. And Seafirst to be part of Bank of America.

The accomplishments are few and far between, but some of them are pretty big. See, the insurance companies for years fought to keep from paying what I think is their fair share in taxes. The insurance commissioner's office traditionally had been funded from the general fund. This worked well until the Republicans gained actual control of the Legislature in 1981, when Dick Marquardt was insurance commissioner. With their natural sympathy for business, and lobbying by the one-man gang known as Basil Badley, representing the insurance companies, the easy way to hamstring the Insurance Commissioner was to strangle his budget. The insurance commissioner would have to go hat in hand to the Ways and Means Committee to ask for money and, of course, the insurance lobbyists were strong enough so they would go to the members and say, "Oh, I don't know, I think the insurance commissioner's got enough money. That Marquardt's a lightweight. He'll blow it. I wouldn't give him any more money." Basil and I were friendly, but absolutely pulling in opposite directions. Well, we Democrats were able to pass legislation to fund the commissioner with a premium tax, which the insurance companies paid rather than the consumer. The screams of anguish from insurers were like a symphony—they were all in tune! "We're going to leave the state, blah, blah, blah." I said, "Well, why not? We need socialized insurance here, anyway. Who needs you?"

Well, they all stayed and paid, and this tax adequately funded Marquardt's office, which meant he could do his job as the statute required. You see, this was not a new concept because the same process already funded the UTC, the Liquor Control Board, the Gambling Commission, and others. The insurers screamed murder, rape, and anything else that came to mind, and the proponents screamed with equal righteousness, "Is there no end to their greed?" Anyway, it was a hollow victory because Basil appealed to the worst side of every Ways and Means chairman, pointing out their power to appropriate was being eroded. Each chairman couldn't stand for that, so it was decided the insurers would pay but the Ways and Means chairman would control how much of this tax would go to the Insurance Commission. Now, the insurers hide behind the Ways and Means Committee. The committee is much too powerful. Justice is a many splendored thing!

Ms. Boswell: Do you have any regrets? Things you would have done differently?

Sen. Moore: Yes, I wish I'd been more aggressive. I just presented my case and sat down. I think I'm a pretty fair country politician, but I could have been more aggressive in the things that I wanted, but I'm basically very under-confident. Who wouldn't be after trying to get here for thirty-two years? You finally get here, you're sure you're only going to last three weeks—somebody's going to "getcha."

I also don't think I've ever utilized my time to the fullest. I think I could have been more productive.

Ms. Boswell: How could you have worked harder?

Sen. Moore: I think I had to work hard and longer to be effective at all, because I have a

feeling in spite of my long hours, there's a lazy streak in me. I know I could have done more. I'm not sure what it was.

Ms. Boswell: Will you miss it here?

Sen. Moore: Not until fall. As I mentioned earlier, when I leave, I leave. Just walk away. They'll never see me here again. I did go to my fiftieth high school reunion. That was the exception to my rule.

A funny thing happened. I was over at the Red Robin the other day having lunch, and as I'm walking out, a woman's voice said "Ray!" and I turned around and looked at this woman, and three seconds later, it dawned on me. I said, "Dorothy!" I hadn't seen her for sixty-four years. Can you believe that?

Ms. Boswell: But you both recognized each other?

Sen. Moore: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: Pretty amazing.

Sen. Moore: I'll miss Talmadge. I have an unusual relationship with Vognild. He's the one guy that when we're in a tight spot, I can depend on, like that legislation I told you about concerning the Supreme Court decision involving Maytag. He was one of the Grade-A legislators I encountered in our sixteen years together. Phil and I are much closer, but it's a grandson-grandfather relationship. I'll miss those two.

I loved Tub Hansen; he was just a wonderful guy. He was the old cowboy. Bought land when he was a boy. Quit school in the third grade. Nine years old and he quit school and started to work. If he got a little money, he began to buy land on the tax sales near Grand Coulee, long before Coulee Dam. He was not handicapped by objectivity, but he never forgot his district. Tub did not have a huge vocabulary, often relying on four-letter words for punctuation. Always a straight shooter, his word was good, and, above all, he had a steadfast dedication to his lifelong mate, Wanda. A wonderful couple, always good to be with. Virginia and I loved them both. When Tub used a hyphenated ten-letter word not common to drawing-room conversation, Wanda always said, as she had for years, "Oh, Tubby."

There was a staffer, Barbara Smith, whose job it was to prepare Tub's campaign speeches. Well, she spent the better part of a week readying Tub for a major confrontation with his opponent, Sid Flanagan. For six years they both represented their district as House members, so they knew each other very well. Barbara was very nervous, wondering as they drove to Royal City if Tub had mastered her speech strategy. Sid spoke to the overflowing crowd first. He gave a good, traditional Republican speech decrying the state of the state, blaming everything on the Democrats and Tub. After twenty minutes or so, he sat down. Tub, in his usual garb—cowboy hat and boots, walked slowly to the podium and said simply, "When you send me back to Olympia, two things are going to happen: I'll get you a new school, and a stoplight out on the highway." He sat down to a royal welcome. Three weeks later, he won the election. All of Barbara's painstaking work was for naught. Tub knew what the people wanted and he usually delivered. You see, in Tub's district, pork was not a dirty word! I'll miss him.

I'll miss, of course, Sid Snyder. Sid will be remembered long after the rest of us are long forgotten. Did you know Sid's introduction to Olympia was as an elevator operator in the House?

Ms. Boswell: I think I may have heard that before.

Sen. Moore: He wasn't content to just do his

job, so he volunteered to help out the chief clerk of the House then, Si Holcomb. There is no more agreeable person than Sid, in addition to which he has always had a knack for hiring outstanding employees for both the House and Senate. Sid helped me more than I probably deserved. He knew about my past as a Republican and of my four losses to elective office. He always treated me as if I had a future, and not just a modest past. Sid was—is—the most powerful person in the Senate. As secretary, he was a confidant to many people, because his advice was sound and he gave it generously. He saved me from numerous faux pas. He had a lot of success in the private sector as well—both in business and politics, he never hurt anyone and helped anyone who wanted to help themselves. He's in my hall of fame, without question!

I'll miss these people, but as long as I have Virginia, the void is filled.

Ms. Boswell: Sounds like you're pretty lucky to me.

Sen. Moore: I've been lucky. Oh, there are a lot of funny vignettes that I love to think about, and always will.

There was a guy who served in the House in the '30s and '40s. Later he served in the Senate until '67. His name was Dr. David Cowen. He was a smallish man, with elevator shoes and a cigar. He was a Spokane advertising dentist who did a forthright job of protecting his profession in general, and his own brand of advertising dentistry. Colorful does not begin to describe him. Often, during World War II, he would rise from his Senate seat to be recognized by Vic Meyers, on a matter of personal privilege. After a brief but flowery and flattering speech, lauding the female staff in the Senate, he would present them with silk stockings which, during the war, were in short to no supply. Such showmanship happened two or three times a session. I was visiting once when he distributed wrist watches. Once in 1938, I visited his Spokane dentistry office and saw sacks of potatoes and boxes of apples he accepted in payment for dental services. He then gave the produce to orphanages and hospitals. Truly, one of nature's noblemen. The Legislature was a poorer place when he left after his thirty-two years of service.

There was another guy by the name of Tisdale, Clyde Tisdale. He was a raw-boned, rough character from Pacific County. I was in the gallery one time, about forty-five years ago, I guess, and he's up on the floor making a speech. All of a sudden, right in the middle of the speech, he takes his upper plate out, reaches in his pocket to get his bifocals, and he goes like this with a pencil, he flicks a seed out—

Ms. Boswell: Out of his dentures?

Sen. Moore: Puts them back in and continues on.

Ms. Boswell: Oh, my God.

Sen. Moore: He was one of those lovely people who was so vulgar and so crude you could not take offense, which is a particularly endearing quality. He was a funny fellow and a common-sense senator.

Ms. Boswell: Well, that's classic.

Sen. Moore: I do hope Senator Snyder is interviewed next. Between the two of us, we have a continuous memory of Washington state politics from nineteen twenty-five to now. Seventy years.

Ms. Boswell: What will you remember most fondly?

Sen. Moore: In my life?

Ms. Boswell: Yes.

Sen. Moore: I think the fact that I always put up the worst case for myself. I never put up the best case I could. I was so intent on full disclosure. I remember when Governor Langlie got a number of us together in 1948, after he'd been elected governor, and said, "One of you people is going to be the new county chairman."

We went around the room. There was Al Westberg, who was the father of the Civil Rights Act in this state. He said, "No, I have to practice law."

Another fellow said, "I'm just back from the service. I, too, have to practice law."

Another one said, "I'm a lawyer. Solo practitioner. I can't afford to do it."

Another one said, "I can't do it because I'm a whiskey salesman."

It came to me. I'm the last one. And I said, "I can't speak. I am not very well organized, and I think that you should pass over me. Plus the fact that I made an indiscretion a few years ago, which I'm not very proud of. I did it in ignorance, but it was still a serious transgression." Langlie didn't say anything.

Four or five days later, his manager, Clarence LaFramboise, who owned a newspaper in Enumclaw, called me and said, "I want to come and talk to you." He said, "What was this transgression that you made such an issue of?"

I said, "I didn't know any better, but I asked an old friend who was on the state Supreme Court, how he thought a certain decision was going to go, and, because of his friendship for me, he told me what he thought. I did not use it to any personal advantage, but it was something that I should never have done." And I said, "He wouldn't have done it if he hadn't trusted me so much." I said, "I want everybody to know that. I don't want any surprises to come out. So I have to excuse myself."

He said, "No, Langlie wants you to be county chairman." So, I became county chairman. That reminds me of another story—should I not tell it?

Ms. Boswell: No, no. Go ahead.

Sen. Moore: Oh there are some funny stories. This fellow that I just mentioned, this state Supreme Court justice. My father was sitting in Governor Roland Hartley's office one day and they were just talking. All of a sudden Amy Albright, the secretary, came in. You see, in those days you didn't need an appointment. Nobody ever came to see the governor. There was no need to. The Legislature met every two years for sixty days. Transportation was difficult. She said, "There's a man here who wants to see you. He's quite insistent that he wants to see the governor." So, my father stood up. Hartley says, "No. Sit still, C. Rea. Show him in."

So, this fellow came in and he stood rather erect, and he said, "Governor, Justice So-and-so is retiring, and I want the appointment."

Hartley, you see, had never been to school, but he was a real snob when it came to education. His daughter went to Vassar and the two boys went to Yale. He said, "What's your education?"

"Well," he said, "I don't have any, but I took the Bar. I studied for the Bar and I passed it the first time I took it."

And my father told me Hartley was already to dismiss him, but he changed his mind. He said, "Tell us about yourself."

"Well," he said, "My mother and father came across with Ezra Meeker in a covered wagon to Tumwater. We've been here a long time. I now have a boy and a girl in high school, here." They were friends of mine. And he said, "You know, I think I can do this job. I've been his clerk for two years, and I think I can do justice to this job. I really want it."

Then he became really quite eloquent, my

father said, and he began to expand, and then he finally said, "And furthermore Governor, I'm honest."

And Hartley suddenly said, "What was that?"

And the fellow said, "Well, I'm no fanatic on it."

A few days later he was a justice. And a good one. He served several terms. Now, I ask you, is that system, where the governor just up and appoints whomever, so bad, or is the current system, where the State Bar Association submits a list of about 10 names and from this group the governor makes the appointment, worse? He can always take credit if the choice is popular and conversely, if the choice is unpopular, deny it.

Ms. Boswell: And his name was?

Sen. Moore: William J. Millard.

Ms. Boswell: What a great story.

Sen. Moore: Yeah. There are other great stories, too. I'll tell you another one. I was not a witness to this. The person who told me is long since gone, so this may be accurate or it may not be accurate, but there are some parts of it that make me believe there's some truth to it.

The Democrats passed an income tax in the 1930s. It was found to be unconstitutional. The state was nearing bankruptcy. The City of Seattle was bankrupt. The warrants with which they met their payroll and bills were worth maybe ten or fifteen cents on the dollar. Really hard times. So, Governor Martin, who, as I've said, was one of the two great governors, and in my opinion a conservative Democrat, decided the only hope of saving the state to have a broad-based sales tax. Two percent sales tax. Well, the Democrats wouldn't vote for it. They were angry because they'd lost the income tax, and they weren't going to vote for anything that was regressive. It turned out that there was an old-fashioned boss in Seattle. Nobody was really sure of his background. He all of a sudden emerged. He had a radio program, and he ran, and was elected as one of the three county commissioners. He was a cigar smoking, rotund fellow.

Ms. Boswell: What was his name?

Sen. Moore: I mentioned him earlier, I think. Radio Speaker John C. Stevenson**.** He had his name put on the ballot as "Radio Speaker John C. Stevenson." Well, Radio Speaker controlled the King County delegation. They all voted against the sales tax. There were only three Republicans, one senator, and two House members in King County. So, obviously it was a heavily-dominated Democrat block. Martin was desperate. He just didn't know how to put this together, because when they voted, the sales tax went down because the King County Democrats all voted against it.

Meanwhile, almost at that moment, an extradition notice arrived for the guy that is John C. Stevenson. I'm not sure whether he had changed his name, or what. It was a securities fraud charge, mail fraud charge in the state of New York, asking that he be extradited there for prosecution. So, Martin was just as cool as anybody ever was. His eyes looked like marbles. He called Stevenson, who was getting ready to run against him for governor. He called him and said, "John, can you come down?"

"Of course." Stevenson came down, cigar and all, he's sitting with the governor.

The governor said, "Y'know, we've got to have that sales tax."

"Sorry, just can't do it. Our people hate that tax," Stevenson said. "Just can't do it. No way."

The governor said, "If we don't get that tax the state will be unable to pay its bills,

including the payroll."

At this point, he handed the extradition notice to Stevenson. Stevenson is a cool, tough guy, too. He looks at the governor, and says, "What are you going to do?"

Governor Martin said, "I don't like extradition. I've never been a big fan of that, but I sure would like to get that sales tax."

They brought it up two days later, and every Democrat in King County voted for it. And Radio Speaker was never extradited.

Now, today, all hell would break loose if that same situation came about. Was a good thing done, or a bad thing done? Who knows? It's in the eye of everybody's conscience. Well, personally, I don't think anything bad was done, because they got the sales tax. The state was solvent, and I don't think the price was very high.

Ms. Boswell: I agree.

Sen. Moore: On the other side of it, the good-government people would rave and rant, saying that was a terrible thing. And he didn't pay the price that he should have paid for the terrible thing, whatever it was, that he had done. I'm not an indictor type. I don't like indictments. I don't like that kind of business. I believe that almost always you can work out a deal where somebody is punished by taking their money away from them, if that's the most important thing to them. But I don't think you have to ruin a family. Every time you get an indictment it ruins a whole lot of people who were innocent bystanders. That's why I never liked Bobby Kennedy. He was an indictor. He indicted on any pretext. I like people who work things out and have a strong humane streak.

Ms. Boswell: Did you have a positive role model that you really admired?

Sen. Moore: Chris Gregoire. She will see that justice is done, but I don't think that she's going to be one of those indicting types. Smith Troy, attorney general about fifty years ago, I guess. He was not an indictor. You know, some people could say they're dealers, but I don't believe in hurting families. The disgrace, the cruelty, it's inherent in that. See what you can do to put the thing at rest without all of that.

Ms. Boswell: Did you ever find yourself in the position of having to make one of those moral or ethical decisions like that, that could have hurt somebody?

Sen. Moore: We talked about him earlier**,** but I was about to be county chairman when Canwell was on his big tear. I was not yet county chairman, but I knew him by observing his antics from the assistant chief clerk seat. I remember one day at a Young Men's Republican Club meeting, he referred to me as one of those pointy-headed liberals, pinkos, I think he said, I'm not sure. But, he was causing a lot of anguish for some people who really were not guilty of anything but having gone, much as I did when I was in school, to meetings. I went to Huey Long meetings. I wanted to see, "What are these people talking about? What's going on here?" Well, these professors went to some meetings that undoubtedly were communist, or front organizations for communists, but, if you don't join, I think you're a broader person for having taken a look. Or, even if you join, and decide that's the way you want to go, good luck!

Well, as you know, he was getting on Melvin Rader, Angelo Pellegrini, and several others, and I tried to head off pure "guilt by association." I saw to it that some names of other people that he might consider looking at were given to him, and encouraged him to go after them. Well, they were pure. They couldn't be tagged. So, did I do a bad thing

by trying to save those other people? The worst they'd ever done was go to a meeting. You don't hear the term much anymore, but zealots talked about, well, "He's a REAL American." How do you define that? These people were American, just like everybody else. I did try to maneuver, manipulate, so that he would ease up on them and maybe go after some other people.

There have been some bills in here that are pretty bad for gays. Wanted to bar them from teaching and this, that, and the other. It is physically and intellectually impossible for me to, in my wildest fantasies, imagine being gay. I can't come to grips with it. But, it isn't a new phenomenon by any means. It's been going on forever. I don't want to impose my will on anybody, and I don't want them imposing theirs on me. And that's one of the things I've found—obnoxious may be too strong a word, but I'm going to use it anyway, because I found the Republican Party knows what is good for people and they want to impose their will on society in general.

A funny thing happened about forty years ago at Victor Rosellini's 410 restaurant on Pine Street. Senator Magnuson was there. He'd been drinking his lunch, and I was leaving about one-thirty to go back to work, and I stopped at his table on my way by. He was in a jocular mood, and so we exchanged a couple of insults, and he said, "You know, you Republicans know what's good for people. We Democrats find out what people want and then we get it for them." Grudgingly, I thought, "This sucker's right."

Ms. Boswell: That's a great line. Is there anything, of course you've not been away very long, but is there anything that you will miss in the future, at this point?

Sen. Moore: No. Nothing. I base that on the fact that when I left Puget Power I never went back. When I left Hotpoint, I never went back. When I left Boeing, I never went back. When I went in the investment business, we sold our business to Walston. When I left Walston, I never went back. Then I went to Bache, which is now Prudential. I never went back. Shearson, I never went back. I'll never come here again. It may be, that when I leave this time, which is Wednesday morning, I may never come back. I'll never go back to Olympia, and I may never even come back to the mainland.

Ms. Boswell: Friends?

Sen. Moore: I don't know. In my lifetime, I might have had five friends. One of them just died. I've made what may be three friends, strangely enough, in Hawaii. Two Japanese and a haole. I have maybe, three friends here.

Ms. Boswell: Too busy, too private, to have friends?

Sen. Moore: I don't think anybody has more than four or five—that's the max that anybody's ever had in a lifetime.

Ms. Boswell: You mean "real" friends?

Sen. Moore: Yes. Oh, it's fine to have all these acquaintances, and "hi-ya Joe," but to have people who understand you, who forgive you, who will help you, and to whom you can relate, that's different. I have a good ally in Seattle. He would do anything he could for me. He can't, he has nothing to give. But, he'd do it if he could. Well, I have to view him as an interesting character in my life, but not a friend. It has to be reciprocal. No, I've had a hell of a life, with minimal regrets.

Ms. Boswell: Goals for the future?

Sen. Moore: I'm debating now whether to sell the raw cherries to the processor, or whether

to do all the processing myself, and with a mailing list of about a thousand that Virginia and I have, retail it out of our house a pound or two at a time.

Ms. Boswell: When you say "raw cherries," is that another term for coffee beans?

Sen. Moore: The first thing that you see is a cherry. It's about half the size of a pie cherry. It's fairly small.

Ms. Boswell: Top of your fingernail sort of thing?

Sen. Moore: Yes. You pull them off the trees when they're pale red or dark red. They grow in clusters and they're hard to get off sometimes. You pick them, put them in water, and any that float to the top are no good. You throw those away. Then you immediately pulp them, which means taking off the meat—what would be the edible part of a cherry—and throwing it away. You keep the seeds, which are the little beans. You put them in water to soak for a day, changing the water periodically, and mixing the beans around two or three times.

The next day the water is just ugly, slimy, and you reach in there and get any other floating beans, and throw them away. Then, you take a hose and, with the strong spray, you rinse the beans three or four times, so they are not slimy anymore. At that point, I get rid of all the water and spread them out to dry. It takes about a week or so in the sun.

The way you test them to see if they're dried is by trying to crack them with your teeth. If you just can't do it, they're dry. At that point, they still have two layers of parchment on them, hermetically sealing the bean in. You have a machine that goes "shoosh" like this, with a big blower, that strips the parchment. Pretty soon all that chaff gets knocked off and blown away. At that point, you have a green bean ready to sell to somebody like Starbucks for roasting. Or, if you don't want to sell them to Starbucks, you send them to a local roaster, who will roast them the way you want them. Black, dark brown, brown, and some say the more you roast them, the less caffeine. If you want no bitter taste, you put them in a freezer and store them for a year.

Ms. Boswell: A year after they're roasted?

Sen. Moore: Either before or after. Doesn't seem to make any difference. You can put green beans in, roasted beans, generally roasted. And, when you grind those up, there's no bitterness, there's a different kind of flavor. So, we're thinking about retailing them as "genuine, aged Kona beans," something like that. I think people would buy that. And, charge less than Starbucks. Starbucks is around fifteen dollars. It'll be twenty before long. Maybe sell it for twelve-fifty, and I think there are enough buyers out there who will do it. And, I should have, they're guessing that in two years I'll have 15,000 pounds, which will be about 2,500 pounds of coffee. At ten dollars, $25,000. It pays the taxes, it pays for Virginia's and my sins!

Ms. Boswell: And a few wins on gambling, and you'll be all set. Right?

Sen. Moore: Yeah. A hundred dollars a day on the commodity market.

Ms. Boswell: I wish you every bit of luck on that.

Sen. Moore: Thank you. One thing that you should always keep in mind, I don't know your background, I don't know your spouse, I don't know anything, but successful speculators, successful gamblers, have the best perspective on money. They have money in the right

perspective. They know that they can get more. They know how to spend it better than people who scrounge and save, and are so careful. I am neither scornful nor envious of those people. That's the way they are. I'm in that other bracket. I'm a gambler, I'm a speculator.

Ms. Boswell: And you've done well at it.

Sen. Moore: Well enough, but I still reserve a lot of time for myself. I said to Gordon Bowker, one of the founders of Starbucks, "Gordon, you could have made a ton of money if you'd stayed."

"No," he said, "if I'd stayed and waited for the big payola, I would have given up three years of my life." So, he said, "I just took a few million. I have time with my family, we do what we want to do."

You see, that's what I mean. I'm a penny-ante version, really.

Ms. Boswell: Hardly.

EPILOGUE

The final year of my time in the state Senate had some trying moments, and I resigned the office in August of 1994. I would be remiss not to acknowledge those who wittingly or unwittingly influenced Virginia's and my decision to retire to private life: Gary Locke, Norm Maleng, Jeanne Kohl, John Charles, Don Moreland, Steve Kendall, and certain political leaders of the gay and lesbian community. We went on to yet another great adventure…coffee farming, participation in Democratic Party politics, community activities, and an interesting social life in the diverse culture of Hawaii.

RAY MOORE

Appendix A

Ray Moore's Profiles of Washington State Elected Officials

Senator Sid Snyder: A Political Portrait

In 1922 I met my first politician, and throughout the next seventy years I've known many public officeholders: Dwight Eisenhower, Richard Nixon, Hugh Scott, Henry Cabot Lodge, Thomas Dewey, Warren Magnuson, Arthur Langlie, Albert Rosellini, and hundreds of others.

To me, one person is the ultimate standard by which I measure political ability.

With modest education, he found employment in 1949 as an elevator operator in the Washington State House of Representatives. Taking his job seriously, he found time to volunteer his help wherever a need occurred. Soon, Chief Clerk Si Holcomb observed this newly arrived eager beaver, and used this young man as a substitute anywhere a vacancy occurred. Before long, he was assistant chief clerk; in 1969 he was elected secretary of the Senate; he became a senator in 1993, and Senate Democratic leader in 1996.

Admittedly, this sounds routine. So what makes this person unique? He did it all while helping everyone with whom he worked, and more importantly—without hurting anyone. He has given more than he has received. Every politician could and should learn from the best all-around politician in my memory. Had I known Sid Snyder earlier, I might have been a better man.

God speed, Sid.

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE

A. A. ADAMS (D-27, House, 1969-1981) Big Daddy Day's chiropractor counterpart in the House, each being chairman of their respective committees that covered health care. Well, for a very long time, the medical profession had made life miserable for chiropractic. Now it was the chiropractors turn with the whip! When I went to the Legislature I could scarcely tell a chiropractor from a buffalo chip! As I listened to the M.D.s I was reminded of long ago when dentists were trying for independence from doctors. I like competition and underdogs, so I basically threw in with the chiropractors, and I never wondered why the M.D.s wouldn't support me. "Doc" Adams was a good man although sometimes he and my chairman, Bill Day, did not agree. Tradition dictated that I support *my* chairman. I learned much from both, and to this day, Virginia and I use chiropractors.

BRUCE ADDISON (R-34, House, 1979-1987) From the moment I saw him I thought, "ferret." But throughout our eight years together, he was always respectful of my opposing views. Never

tried to embarrass people testifying in committee. He had a manner that could have propelled him to higher office. Just as my respect for him was blossoming, he quit for the good life in the private sector.

OTTO AMEN (R-9, House, 1967-1983) Underrated, he was a steady legislator. Served his constituency well. Although we served four years together, I really never knew him well.

JAMES A. ANDERSEN (R-48, House, 1959-1967, and Senate, 1967-1973) personified the best we can ever hope for from a person in public life. Jimmie is the type you could know really well and never know he was in the Battle of the Bulge in World War II. He just never thought it worth talking about, although he was in the thick of it. After the war, the GI Bill helped him get a law degree, and after passing the bar exam, he applied to the Republican Prosecuting Attorney, Charles O. Carroll, for a position as assistant prosecutor. This was a first for me, since Chuck Carroll was the only Republican elected official to ever ask my opinion as to the employability of anyone! Chuck was a good prosecutor and an equally good politician, and now, at age ninety, any politician would do well to seek and follow his advice. Anyway, Jim got the job and soon earned the reputation as a tough adversary.

From that first meeting, I followed his progress, starting with forming a law firm with Paul Moats. When the Forty-eighth District was recreated in 1958, (there was no Fourty-eighth District from 1933 to 1957. It had been part of the original Forty-sixth District) James Andersen was asked by the GOP to run, and run he did, being elected five times. He only left the House to become the best senator they ever had. Always pleasant, always over-prepared, always clearly understandable and always respected. He served six years in the Senate before resigning to become a State Appeals Court judge, where his bad habit of overwork continued. With Jimmie, a short day was twelve to fourteen hours!

And, finally, on the Supreme Court, retiring (but not stopping his normal work schedule) in 1995. The most universally respected politician in my lifetime. Anyone who doesn't agree should book a one-way ticket to Menninger Clinic.

ANN ANDERSON (R-42, Senate, 1987-1999) A definite asset to the GOP caucus. She knew her issues thoroughly and made effective cases. Although we were usually on opposite sides, we found an area of agreement—simplifying the permitting process to ease the burden on both small and large businesses. We had enough support in both houses, but Governor Lowry, in his wisdom, opposed us. We failed. Lowry was wrong. Either he did not understand or his overrated staff had some other concept. I hated to lose that fight. I think if our leader, Marc Gaspard, had really supported this legislation, we would have prevailed.

B. ROY ANDERSON (R-36, House, 1933-1935, and 1943-1955) was a first-rate gentleman and legislator, was always above pettiness, and had a light side. His Thirty-sixth District, from 1895 to 1933, sent Republicans to the Legislature. B. Roy managed to win in 1932, a rarity in the year when Roosevelt swept all sorts of "wannabes" into office. B. Roy was a customs broker. When Eisenhower was elected in 1952, and I was county chairman, B. Roy was my choice for a federal appointment as customs collector. I liked this man a great deal.

CAL ANDERSON (D-43, House, 1987-1995, and Senate, 1995) A very pleasant legislator.

As a gay man, he was basically driven by that issue. As a Democrat, he had empathy for other people's problems, so he fit Democrat traditions.

EVA ANDERSON (R-12, House, 1949-1961) After Belle Reeves' departure in 1939, came Eva Anderson ten years later representing the same constituency. Eva was a new breed of Republican—more of the Governor Langlie variety. She was a good legislator, and, although most of her years were spent in the minority, she was not unpopular with the majority.

MARLIN APPLEWICK (D-46, House, 1983-1999) A thoroughly good man who would have made a good Speaker. He was always cooperative, but could be stubborn when he *knew* he was right! A real asset to the Democrats, and I wish him well.

H. C. "ARMY" ARMSTRONG (D-33, House, 1937-1949) Like many of us not born to lead, he was always a tough-minded, labor-oriented man who never left the New Deal, nor did he fall for the un-American activities committees of the late 1940s and early 1950s. A good man whom I didn't appreciate at the time. I changed, he didn't.

SETH ARMSTRONG (D-36, House, 1981-1989), Helen Sommers and Ray Moore—those may have been the best years for the District. They certainly were for me! Seth had an almost pixie-like dimension, which made his unique humor and desire for perfection an asset to both Helen and me. His education and innate intellect were in happy unison with his job and with both of us. Seth did his share of constituent problem solving, but it did not override his desire to produce top-flight legislation. I was proud to be associated with him, and when a near-fatal auto accident cut short his legislative career, I felt for him and for the loss of a very competent legislator. As a legislator, he chaired Law and Justice. His counterpart in the Senate was Phil Talmadge. No two legislators could match their education and intellect, but they were often in opposition. Phil wanted to get the job done. Seth wanted to be sure it was perfect. "Never the twain shall meet"—as defined by Kipling. As a result, sloppy bills made no headway in either committee. I loved those six years with Helen and Seth. I like to be in the presence of good minds.

FRED ASHLEY (R-4, House, 1943-1949) I knew through my association with his seatmate, Speaker Herb Hamblen. A dignified, solid, reasonable Republican in an era of many mad-dog GOPs.

BOB BAILEY (D-19, House, 1951-1957, and Senate, 1957-1977) A politician's politician, Bob always remembered who got him to the Legislature, which, to me, is appropriate. As a member of the UTC (for which he left the Legislature) he was evenhanded with a slight bias toward the consumer. A thoroughly believable person, his Senate seat was hard to fill.

CLIFF BAILEY (R-39, Senate, 1983-1991) suffered from Booth Gardner disease—loving to be loved. I know he felt hurt when some of us cast a malevolent eye at him after he dutifully voted for one of Majority Leader Hayner's heartless bills. He was a very nice person, almost too nice to be a legislator.

ARCHIE BAKER (D-38, House, 1947-1949) was high on my list to go far as an electable official. He had a good mind, but possibly lacked the desire. I only saw him at close range in 1947, but my memory is very positive.

HOWARD BALL (R-7, House, 1947-1957) was one of two Eastern Washingtonians to survive from the GOP tide of 1946. Elmer Johnston was the other. I only knew Howard through my father, who held him in high respect. He was a quiet man.

CLYDE BALLARD (R-12, House, 1983-) is a man who proved one of my comforting hypotheses, which is that elected officials are never as good or as bad as you thought. Clyde Ballard has been tested both as a member and as Speaker, and from my observance, he is much, much better than I presumed. I originally thought of him as just another Reagan-style troglodyte, but as he matured, I realized I had (as I often do) underestimated Clyde Ballard.

E. F. BANKER (D-17, House, 1917-1931) He loved politics, served seven terms under seven different Speakers and was mildly progressive. But, in general, he was a traditionalist. I have wondered what he would have been like had he served when the "New Deal" was the rage in the '30s.

NEWELL J. BANKS (R-37, House, 1947-1949) In 1934, when I started work as a meter reader for Puget Power, I shared a room in a rooming house on 15th Northeast, in the "U" district, with Doc Banks, as we called him. He was struggling to be a lawyer. He was always cheerful and I liked him a lot. He died young, and I've often wondered what might have been his lot had he lived.

PAUL BARDEN (R-33, House, 1967-1973) As a legislator, he was careful to neutralize groups which normally would oppose him. Always pleasant when it counted, his public image has been something between adequate and good. I was never a fan of Paul Barden, but I *always* respected his electability!

HOWARD BARGREEN (D-38, Senate, 1940-1947, and House, 1949-1951 and 1951-1963) I knew slightly because he was a Rosellini supporter. Not only was he a successful politician, but he also built a solid business. And what an assortment of governors with whom to cope: Langlie, Wallgren, Langlie again, Rosellini, and then Dan Evans! He was a good man.

DICK BARNES (R-33, House, 1973-1989) A journeyman, never spectacular, but a credit to his party. He was a party-liner.

SCOTT BARR (R-7, House, 1977-1983, and Senate, 1983-1991) No more dedicated person appeared during my four Senate terms. Always friendly, but unyielding. He was a good listener and enjoyed discussion in or out of committee. A small-town farmer, he was generous and among our most affluent members. He could be aggravating, but I liked him.

DICK BARRETT (R-5, House, 1981-1987) served his constituents well. He was likable, a joy with whom to work. I felt he fit his constituency well.

BOB BASICH (D-19, House, 1985-1997) Like many of us, not brilliant, but a good, solid legislator who more than occasionally has a good idea to throw in the legislative pot. Now that I think of it, I've liked and admired every Democrat from Willapa and Grays Harbor. Must be their easy access to clam juice!

AL BAUER (D-17, House, 1971-1981, and Senate, 1981-) and I served together for fourteen years and, although periodically I'd be furious because he couldn't see my point of view, he never allowed our relationship to deteriorate. A gentleman, a schoolteacher, and a solid, ethical politician, he became a balance wheel in the Senate. Al must have been a good K-12 teacher: He made cooperation a cornerstone of his life philosophy, and that's a good formula. Al Bauer is a hardworking and effective campaigner and senator. If there were an Al Bauer fan club, I'd be proud to be a charter member. To this day, I miss his judgment, not always in tune with mine, but sound. He had a rare quality that somehow made me want to cooperate, and when he was with me on an issue, I felt I must be right!

FORREST BAUGHER (D-15, House, 1985-1991) Looked after his constituents, but as the district turned toward the right, he was the victim.

DEL BAUSCH (D-22, House, 1973-1977, and Senate, 1977-1981) Like most of us, he was an average senator who helped us lose the majority by going on his honeymoon during his reelection campaign. Since I worked sixteen hours a day, with never a day off for any reason during my campaigns, I was offended by Del's lack of dedication to the Democratic caucus. A likable man who, while he served, was a loyal Democrat and a decent legislator.

C. W. "RED" BECK (D-23, House, 1961, and Senate, 1974-1979) succeeded Booth Gardner as senator. Booth—small, trim, boyish—vis-à-vis Beck: overweight and a horrendous appetite. Booth and Red were as unlike as Senators Talmadge and Craswell. Red was mostly famous for being Red and not for his legislation. You had to like him!

JOHN BECK (R-21, House, 1987-1993) A reasonable and professional politician with whom I had minimal contact, but he wore well and his word was good.

MARY KAY BECKER (D-42, House, 1975-1983) had a very bright future as a real comer in the Democratic Party. Mary Kay, I suspect, wanted more out of life than what politics might offer. Her departure was a loss to both our party and the state.

RICK BENDER (D-44, House, 1973-1983, and Senate, 1983-1991) Always sympathetic with labor, he was favorably inclined toward social programs. We usually voted on the same side. Rick had exceptionally strong feeling for his parents. He loved and admired his labor-leader father so much that only after his father died did Rick really emerge as his own man. In my view, Rick may be one of those people who, the higher he rises, the better will be his performance. There was one noticeable difference between us—I liked campaigning better than legislating. With Rick, it was the reverse, and though he was a better-than-average legislator, he lost a race that was his to lose, to Tim Erwin. That loss cost our Democrat caucus the majority. But, Rick parlayed that loss into the presidency of the state AFL-CIO. Rick really turned a lemon into lemonade.

MAX BENITZ (R-8, House, 1969-1975, and Senate 1975-1990) Gave his best to his party, constituents, and the state. He was a farmer who sacrificed much, to his personal detriment, in order to push society in the direction he thought right. He truly lived his beliefs.

DUANE BERTENTSON (R-40, House, 1963-1981) A politician's politician. His trademark was his ability to out-trade anyone, always getting more than he gave—at the same time making you think he'd given you a helluva deal. He always shortchanged me because he never needed my vote—that's hardball, with which I have no problem! Although from opposing parties, and representing the same constituency, Duane, as Speaker, and Senator Lowell Peterson got on well together.

JOHN BETROZOFF (R-45, House, 1983-1993) Well-mannered and forthright. Our paths crossed so infrequently I never felt I knew the real Betrozoff.

DR. J. R. BINYON (D-46, Senate, 1943-1947) was such a household word in Seattle that I'm sure many people thought he was an old-line political figure instead of a one-termer. The reason was simple: in the days before TV, radio was the new advertising medium. He was an optometrist who was right across the street from Sullivan, the florist. So, they ran radio ads saying, "Dr. Binyon, right across the street from Sullivan the florist," and "Sullivan the florist, right across the street from Dr. Binyon!" It was my first introduction to the double whammy! And so it was, Dr. J. R. Binyon needed no political campaign—he was getting name familiarity around the clock every day of the year. He might have been a senator forever, but 1946 was a bad year for Democrats. That was my first race—defeated in the primary by Phil Shank, the eventual winner who defeated Dr. Binyon in the general election.

STEWART BLEDSOE (R-13, House, 1965-1973) was talented, personable, and fit the House well. He worked well with Governor Evans, and when he left the Legislature, he really never left Olympia. A good man.

JAMES BLODGETT (R-5, House, 1946-1948) Elected in the 1946 GOP landslide, Blodgett was a quiet, serious House member who did not take himself all that seriously. His loss in '48 was a long-term blow to the GOP. As assistant chief clerk, I watched him as a potential future House great. He had little in common with his seatmate, Al Canwell.

ALAN BLUECHEL (R-45, House, 1967-1975, and Senate, 1975-1995) A rare bird. A Republican with an eye to the future, he was always worth listening to. Some of his ideas were squirrely, but even those had more than a kernel of merit. Alan could be downright impossible, mostly because in his engrossed state of mind, he couldn't listen to arguments counter to what he wanted. He was a first-rate senator, with a mind to match. I used to wonder if anyone knew the real Senator Bluechel.

DICK BOND (R-6, House, 1975-1987) Never in doubt, he probably fit his district well. He was arrogant, but likable.

ROBERT BOOTH (R-37, House, 1905-1907, and Senate, 1907-1911) was my uncle. As a

young attorney, he appeared to the party leaders to have a future. Although elected to one term in each house, he found he couldn't support both his appetite for good real estate and my aunt. So, although it was not his intention, he dropped out of sight and died in the service during the first flu epidemic of World War I. It was in their house, on Webster Point in Seattle, that I was born.

BRUCE BRADBURN (R-44, Senate, 1979-1980) Known mostly for his almost record-setting short tenure! A very pleasant fellow.

DENNIS BRADDOCK (D-42, House, 1983-1993) was a natural politician. Always optimistic, agreeable and, as Janice Niemi discovered, he was irresistible! Dennis could have run, and probably successfully, for any higher office. A thoroughly good man.

DONALD BRAZIER (R-14, House, 1967-1969) A thoroughly good man regarded as reasonable by both sides. A dedicated member of the UTC. Later, as a lobbyist, I found him easy to work with. By that, I mean he always started with the things on which we could agree, and then tried to work toward a compromise that could be good for the general population. Obviously too objective to fit in as a PDC member, whose attitude is: "Let's hang him/her first, and then we'll have the trial" (this view, of course, is post–Graham Johnson, an outstanding administrator).

JOANNE BREKKE (D-32, House, 1977-1993) Warmhearted Earth Mother, she had little time for those she considered obstructionists. Born on my own birthday, I always gave her the benefit of the doubt, figuring Aries had to be directing her!

DAN BRINK (D-35, House, 1959-1963) Bright and ambitious, he could have benefited by a longer tenure. But, he wanted, prematurely, to try for higher office, left the Legislature and never returned.

TOM BRISTOW (D-7, House, 1985-1989) was an outstanding legislator and his people have not been so ably represented since Charles Hodde. A big man in every sense of the word.

PETER BROOKS (R-16, House, 1985-1991) A decent man hoping to do the right thing. He was not illustrious as a lawmaker, but a good representative for Southeast Washington.

JEAN MARIE BROUGH (R-30, House, 1983-1995) came to the House with vigor and personality. Another Republican who hoped to compete at the level of Helen Sommers. No way can ordinary mortals compete with Helen's mind, memory, and perspective. Jean Marie was better than an "orchard run" representative, and I found her cooperative—within limits. A quick-fire personality, albeit in a slow league.

BILL BURNS (D-43, House, 1977-1985) loved the scene and brought true realism to the House that only a true salesman can accomplish. He was friendly and I always wanted to help him, though he never asked for much. Bill was real and had a heart.

EMILIO CANTU (R-41, House, 1981-1985, and Senate, 1985-1996) Almost too polite for

my comfort level. An engineer by trade, a Boeing supervisor by choice. His constituency was upper-middle class, well-educated, and conservative, with universal dislike of the word "tax." Emilio fit his district, but not as well as his predecessor, the classic George Clarke. I felt Senator Cantu decided on a position and then set about to marshal arguments to prove he was right.

When the GOP suddenly took over in 1981, GOP Majority Leader Hayner decided—at the urging of von Reichbauer—to professionalize the committee staff. Cantu became chairman of this new Employment Committee. He set up a procedure whereby partisanship and favoritism would be eliminated. It worked well as long as he was chairman, but when we gained control and I was chairman, *his* rules no longer were valid, and he tried one way or another to alter *his* rules. No luck. We all thought things worked just fine. Emilio was a thorough senator, but gives credibility to my theory: there should be a *very* small quota of engineers in the Legislature.

MARIA CANTWELL (D-44, House, 1987-1993) A carpetbagger. First surfaced as the Alan Cranston for President designee in the spring of 1984. In 1983, former U.S. Senator Hugh B. Mitchell, George Lane, gay businessman Don Moreland, Blaine Gibson, Virginia (Mrs. Moore), and I formed a Cranston for President organization with the blessing of Senator Cranston. We and others thought we were doing pretty well, when, upon the arrival of Cantwell, we were dismissed, preempted, or whatever, by her and replaced by people unknown in the community. It was all downhill from then on for Cranston. There was an ugly rumor that she was on two payrolls, Cranston and Mondale, the eventual nominee. I doubt the rumor, but her treatment of Hugh Mitchell was, at best, in poor taste, and, at worst, showed poor political judgment. Hugh Mitchell was probably the most highly regarded Democrat in the state.

In 1986, Maria became Paul King's seatmate, and had a meteoric rise culminating in her 1992 election to Congress. She had built a name for herself, but she left in her wake those who disliked her obvious feeling of superiority. I am no fan, and I'm sure she couldn't care less. She is tough!

PHILLIP CARLYON (R-22, Senate, 1913-1929) When I moved to Olympia in 1925, Senator Carlyon was a very big name. He had started Carlyon Addition (between Olympia and Tumwater). He was ahead of his time in several ways. His ego was controlled, his effectiveness in a fast Senate was never in doubt. He was cheerful and even took time to say hello to me at age thirteen! A rarity in those days. He could shift from the good salesman role to his senatorial "toga" with equal grace. He served with Senate heavies Guy Groff, Reba Hurn, Oliver Hall, Elgin Kuyknedall, D. V. Morthland, Frank Barnes, Louis Hart, William Coyle, and W. Lon Johnson.

CHARLES M. CARROLL (D-33, House, 1947-1950) "Streetcar" Charlie truly started from scratch and worked all his life to improve his lot and help his family, his church, his community, his city, and his state. He was truly a thoroughly good man. He believed in labor unions, collective bargaining, abhorred the use of threats or force, and was a much better legislator/Seattle councilman than was ever recognized. Though he had strong views, he would work with anyone to solve problems. I valued him as an ally and friend. The moniker "Streetcar Charlie" came from his early occupation as a streetcar conductor.

W. E. CARTY (D-17, House, 1933-1943, 1945-1953, and 1955-1961) was always outraged that he had opposition. It was his seat, and opponents ran at their peril. He was old-fashioned, a

Republican by tradition, and a steadying influence in the wild melee of the '47-'48 House. Having been around since the wild '33 session, Mr. Carty had seen and heard it all. During the '47 session, when the GOP had its first majority in the House since 1932, the Republicans had to scramble to fill the ticket, and they offered the voters some weird candidates. But the mood was similar to '32, when any yellow-dog Democrat was elected. Carty talked with me about the good old days in the '20s, when the GOP ruled almost everywhere and with ease. Looking back, I wish we had the benefit of his memories. His oral history would have been a jewel. He had staying power. Defeated twice, he came back twice. Not an illustrious legislator, but a worthy one.

DAVE CECCARELLI (D-34, House, 1967-1977) was a happy House member and had a future which too soon became a past. While driving intoxicated in Olympia, he failed to negotiate a curve, which thereafter was known as "Ceccarelli curve." It was not a fatal accident, but he garnered the attention of the public. The media did him in. There were many poorer legislators than "Checkers," but one misstep and he was history.

ROD CHANDLER (R-45, House, 1975-1983) to me was endowed with a presence, as was Governor Evans. After serving in the minority for four years, the Republicans gained a tie, 49 to 49, and the majority was to last two years. As lucky politicians do, he stepped off the escalator at the right moment, leaving the House and getting an immense pay raise as a new Congressman, replacing Joel Pritchard in 1984. Although I had a certain admiration for his vote-getting ability, I was never able to determine if there was more froth or substance.

BOB CHARETTE (D-19, House, 1967-1979, and Senate, 1963-1967) Smart, articulate. I did not know him well, although I thought it interesting that he first served a term in the Senate and spent the next twelve years in the House. Most people "graduate" to the Senate, not the other way. He fit the wild melee of the House better than the more ordered Senate. I liked him—he always let me know where he stood. Since I really wanted to be a House member, I think I understood him.

DONN CHARNLEY (D-44, House, 1973-1980 and 1983-1985, and Senate, 1980-1983) A community college teacher who was well regarded by his students. It seemed Donn had a way about him that created interest, fun, and arguments. Without philandering, Donn genuinely appreciated and liked women, perhaps better than men. A good trait! Donn liked the give and take in the Legislature, and he was a good man to have around because he was inclined to question friend and foe alike. An old-school, New Deal Democrat, he was a liberal pure and simple. He was a good legislator, but not quite in tune with his era.

BILL CHATALAS (D-33, House, 1961-1975) An old-fashioned politician, a thorough Democrat, and a man who loved to work on compromises. I think he figured if you achieved part of your goal, it was progress! I really liked him and respected his abilities.

NEWMAN "ZEKE" CLARK (R-43, House, 1949-1961) was a good, thorough, if somewhat prejudiced man, who really would have fit the Legislature better in the nineteenth century. He was an attorney, and his mores were so adjusted that there was nothing wrong with representing

a client's interest in the Legislature, which is the way it was in the twenties. To Zeke, it was just an extension of his law practice. I don't say this critically, but times were changing and professional, paid lobbyists were beginning to have undue influence. In earlier times, it was assumed that most members had a personal reason for being there—other than ego gratification or good government. Zeke was forthright in all his dealings. I liked him personally, and as a legislator.

His ego led him to believe he was gubernatorial material. In 1956, he ran with gusto in his campaign for governor. Although his showing in polls was poor, he stayed in the race beating up on his main opponent, Lloyd Andrews, all-American boy from the Inland Empire. Good looking, a good speaker, he was a formidable candidate. It was critical to the Rosellini strategy that Zeke stay the course and say as many derogatory things about Lloyd as possible. By July, Zeke was becoming apprehensive. He drew small crowds and was about as colorful as U.S. Senator Bob Dole.

To keep him in the race, forces unknown to Zeke began furnishing him with quite negative material with which to hit Lloyd Andrews. He was happy and grateful for this research, but his money was nil, so these same forces used to call on me, leaving an envelope on the corner of my desk. I didn't touch the envelope, just left it there, and within an hour a different person would drift by, unobtrusively pick up the envelope, and depart. This happened several times. As the "drop," I was the only one who knew both players, and I was in touch with Zeke's campaign. With the advent of the envelope, Zeke ceased worrying about money for his campaign, which gave me a clue as to the contents of the envelope.

In order to flesh out the Rosellini campaign, it was critical that Clark attack Andrews as viciously as possible, so Al could then say in the final election between him and Andrews, "Well, here is what Lloyd's Republican primary opponent said about Lloyd." In the general election it was Albert who fired shot after shot using the material fed to Zeke and which could be attributed to Zeke. Albert always planned ahead. Of course, as a Republican, I was hoping for a Clark primary victory—I thought Zeke would have been a good and decent governor.

GEORGE CLARKE (R-41, House, 1967-1971, and Senate, 1971-1985) could have, in another era, been called "Gentleman George." I first met George in 1938, when we both lived in the same precinct on Mercer Island. The Mercer Island Community Club was the focal point for arguments as to the viability of the proposed Mercer Island bridge to Seattle. I sort of liked the nearness yet remoteness to Seattle. Relying on the ferry was a mild aggravation, but not all that bothersome. George opposed the idea of the bridge, and before the first pontoon was afloat, George *just knew* it would never float. Then as the pontoon bridge neared completion, George *just knew* the first and prevailing wind from the south would blow these pontoons up to Kenmore at the north end of the lake. I must confess I wasn't sure George was wrong—he was very persuasive. George had courage and I have always admired him. They just don't build them like George anymore.

Arriving in the Senate, I was glad to see George and I were always on good terms. I remember one day he agreed when I suggested being a senator was a pretty good job for old guys. We rarely voted on the same side, but George wouldn't allow unpleasantness to fester into meanness. I regard George Clarke with warmth and respect. Lamentably, he was irreplaceable.

GRACE COLE (D-1, House, 1982-1993) Fit her district. Good solid legislator. In tune with

Democratic liberal views. A very good listener.

A. B. COMFORT (R-26, House, 1943-1953) was legitimate as a Republican to the nth degree. Of his ten years in the House, eight were in the minority and the two were the 1947-1948 years, when the House was not to his liking in spite of being in the majority. Kim, as he was known, yearned for a return of the GOP to power with its attendant dignity. He did not like anything about the New Deal—he just knew a return to the '20s was the best goal for Republicans. Had he lived in another time, he could have been a Royalist, although in his time, the Bill of Rights fit him well. I liked him for his purity as an old-line Republican. He had class and dignity.

FRANK CONNER (D-33, House, 1953-1957, and Senate, 1957-1975) had three interests—the Catholic church, umpiring baseball games, and the Democratic Party. A simple man with simple tastes and ideas. No kinder man ever sat in the Legislature. Even his campaigns were the ultimate in simplicity. Billboards, handouts, yard signs all read, "Frank Conner, a Democrat's Democrat." No space wasted on issues, just his name. To know Frank was to be inspired with hope for humankind. To Frank, everyone was to be liked. I know I could use a dash of Frank Conner.

W. W. CONNER (R-34, Senate, 1923-1931) Once again, I didn't know Billy, but he was a big fact of life in the Senate. He had sharp Irish wit, which I only heard from a gallery seat. I can only imagine what he must have been like in the caucus! He was the last Republican to hold that Senate seat for forty-four years.

HENRY COPELAND (R-11, House, 1935-1937, and Senate, 1937-1961) was a man among men. I've often asked myself why there is such legislative talent among farmers—Charles Hodde, John Goldmark, and Irv Newhouse to name a few besides Henry. Henry Copeland knew in his soul that private enterprise was what had brought America so far, so fast. He was a marvelous man, a thoughtful legislator. He was my kind of guy. Deliberate may best describe him.

THOMAS COPELAND (R-11, House, 1957-1973) Like Henry, he had staying power, rising to the Speakership in 1970. Not an illustrious career, but a solid one. I knew him slightly and my impression was positive.

ARTHUR CORY (R-20, House, 1943-1953) was a rotund, smallish man who enjoyed being a legislator in spite of the fact he was usually in the minority. A firm vote for private enterprise, he was always ready to listen to those with different views. I liked him.

LAWRENCE COSTELLO (R-30, House, 1947-1949) was swept in on the GOP landslide of 1946, but couldn't survive the Truman coattails in 1948. A really nice, humble man who never meant anyone harm, but perhaps didn't like the catch-as-catch-can life in the House. I liked him a lot.

MARGARET COUGHLIN (D-46, House, 1937-1939) made such an impact on the House that to me, it seemed she was there longer than two years. An outspoken, pure liberal, she never stopped advocating for those who had no official voice. An environmentalist. As far back as I

can remember, she could sink her teeth into a public figure until she got and held their attention. Not generally thought of as lovable, but to me she was!

PAUL COUGHLIN (D-44, House, 1949-1951) was, in my view, one of the best minds in the House. He was strong, thoughtful, kind, and a true liberal, using any dictionary definition. I remember he was appalled at the high cost of dying, and he tried to help by promoting the founding of the People's Memorial Association—a very low-cost burial plan. I joined and kept my membership long after leaving the Washington Athletic Club, the Tennis Club and the College Club. At least I knew PMA would take care of me when I couldn't care for myself. A similar plan exists in Hawaii and I transferred right away. Thank you, Paul.

HENRY CRAMER (R-46, House, 1943-1947) took himself and his job seriously. I was an active supporter in both of his victories. It was just his way, but he did not recognize the troops who helped elect him. This is a flaw, because volunteers need recognition and sometimes pampering.

ERNEST CRANE (D-31, House, 1983-1991) Almost too nice to be a legislator. He brought strength of conviction to the House and was always helpful to me.

BARNEY DAHL (D-2, Senate, 1943-1959) A never-in-doubt stalwart voice who strengthened Governor Langlie in Stevens County, for which he was barely recognized. A thoroughly good and dedicated legislator.

FLOYD DANSKIN (R-5, House, 1921-1933) He served almost continually for thirteen years, except for two of those thirteen. He became Speaker the year Hartley became governor, 1925. As I recall, he got crosswise with Governor Hartley, which ended his Speakership. He was not a memorable or great Speaker, but at the time was a force.

PETER DAVID (R-37, House, 1921-1923) I never knew him, but Olympia's Crane's Restaurant served "Olympia Oysters Peter David". It was said to be his favorite.

WARD DAVISON (R-32, Senate, 1943-1951) A typical community small businessman. He had an appliance store on North 45th in Wallingford. Popular, a go-along, get-along man with no enemies and a very supportive spouse who worked in the store and kept the Davison volunteer army happy. They were solid Republicans of the Langlie ilk, the only kind of Republican that had a chance to election in the liberal Seattle of the 1940s. He was elected in 1940, the year twenty-year-old GOP Jack Thomas narrowly lost election to the House. Fortunately for me, Jack never ran again and devoted himself to my county chairman victories. What a friend!

W. C. DAWSON (R-43, Senate, 1933-1947) was quiet, dignified, and was a vote-getter. He was a Coolidge-Hoover type, believing in the Bill of Rights and preservation of the status quo. He was friendly to my uncle, William E. Grimshaw, from whom I heard of the many virtues of Senator Dawson.

BILL DAY, **JR**. (D-3, House, 1985-1993) the son of "Big Daddy" Day, he played the role of a

legislator but seemed to lack the deep commitment of his father. Likable and quite helpful to me. I wish him well.

ALEX DECCIO (R-14, House, 1977-1981, and Senate, 1981-1989 and 1993-) Probably miscast in his Olympia roles. I visualize Alex as a Baltimore city councilman in the 1920s. He is a splendid minority member, but when he has the whip, his other side is not to my liking. His best assets are that he is neither strong nor stubborn, and he has the good fortune to have an exceptional spouse. A Supreme Court justice dubbed Alex "Captain Lasagna."

ARLIE DEJARNATT (D-18, House 1961-1971, and Senate 1985-1990) Always the gentleman, he was blessed with wit, a commanding voice, and an overriding desire to do the best he could for society. In spite of his dignity, he was capable of good lines. Shortly before his death, he met candidate Adam Smith, aged 25, and remarked, "Hell, I have hemorrhoids older than you." So out of character, and so refreshing. We all loved that ability which he never abused. A wonderful and remarkable man.

DENNIS DELLWO (D-3, House, 1983-1997) was, to me, a disappointment. He came to the House in 1983, and because I'd regarded his father so well, I perhaps had too high expectations. I found we were very often in disagreement over bank and insurance issues. Perhaps we both *knew* we were right and because of my advanced age and financial background, I felt he could have learned from my experience. But, looking at the bright side, he is a Democrat if not a populist.

DEWEY DONOHUE (D-10, House 1949-1961, and Senate 1961-1969) Although I did not know him, his colleagues regarded him highly. Memories of him lingered on for at least fifteen years. I would have wanted to serve with him. When he first surfaced in 1949, I was just starting my county chairmanship. As time passed he never changed, but I did! He came from a conservative background and district. My exposure to the realities of liberal and big-city politics undoubtedly influenced me, so by the early '60s, when Dewey was in the Senate, I was fast becoming a liberal. However, I always held both him and his son, Hubert, in high esteem.

HUBERT DONOHUE (D-9, Senate, 1973-1981) The son of Senator Dewey Donohue, considered by those with whom he served as a heavy hitter. Hubert truly enjoyed the Olympia life and all the accompanying accolades. I remember my shock at Hubert holding up an inch-thick document in caucus saying, "Here's the budget, take a quick look at it because we're going on the floor in ten minutes to vote on it." Wow! Though I'd been in politics forever, this was my introduction to how a bill becomes a law! I always liked him, and missed him when he was replaced by E.G. "Pat" Patterson.

FRED DORE (D-37, House, 1953-1959, and Senate, 1959-1971) was underestimated by nearly everyone. He was so natural, people couldn't believe he was electable first to the House, then to Senate, and finally to the Supreme Court where he served as chief justice. Fred was sometimes vague and forgetful, but he had a quality of kindness, which I look for in a politician. And then he has a secret weapon, Mary, his wife. If a voter knew them both and was in doubt, the voter would vote for Fred because of Mary! Sometimes Fred took himself more seriously than he did

his job, but, to me, his good heart more than compensated for his self-important moments.

EARLE DOUGLAS (R-45, House, 1947-1949) was an average man who enjoyed life. We talked a lot during the 1947 session. He was a decent person who was better than an average member.

JEFF DOUTHWAITE (D-32, House, 1971-1979) Articulate and friendly, he was easy to listen to. Always well organized, he was never a time-waster. Though too educated for my comfort, I regarded him well and was sorry to see him leave. A true academic liberal. He was a definite asset to his Democrat caucus. Although we never really served together, I liked what I saw.

BOB EBERLE (R-34, House, 1963-1965 and 1979-1983) equated being in the majority with brains. A not uncommon disease in politics. He was the point man for the House Republicans when redistricting occurred in 1981. He grabbed the initiative and preempted the Senate effort. He worked on redistricting to the exclusion of all else. He was lauded as a near genius. In fact, his effort to redistrict to cinch a Republican majority in both houses worked so well, the GOP was in the minority for the next ten years, and the Senate Republican's high-water mark for those years was 25 of 49. Where is Bob Eberle when we need him? Incidentally, Senator Jack Metcalf, thought the Eberle plan was so perfect he gave it a seven minute hearing in the Senate, allowing no discussion—all of which proves almost anyone can be a congressman.

BRIAN EBERSOLE (D-29, House, 1983-1995) A Kentucky transplant. Did well as a legislator and, above all, a compromiser. He was in the right place at the right time to become Speaker. A number of new members arrived in 1983 when the GOP lost control. Freshmen classes have a tradition of sticking together, so Brian had a nucleus of a dozen or more on which to start building for his future. I found his word to be good. We were not close friends, but our relationship was to my liking.

JOHN EDDY (R-43, House, 1933-1943) Out of the same political school as his senator, W.C. Dawson. He always was a gentleman. Both hung onto their seats in the worst of times for Republicans (1933-1943). Like Senator Dawson, Representative Eddy was a friend to my uncle, Billy Grimshaw, through whom I met both of them.

LOUIS EGGER (D-7, House, 1983-1985) A man afflicted with Booth Gardner disease—wanting to be liked. He was a good legislator and a credit to the Democratic Party. It seems he didn't like Olympia, so he ran only once.

DON ELDRIDGE (R-40, House, 1953-1969) I did not know him well but he epitomized the era of Governors Langlie and Evans. He was a credit to the Republicans, the Legislature, and a better than orchard-run politician. When Evans appointed him to the Liquor Board it was the Legislature's loss.

WES ELDRIDGE (R-32, House, 1947-1953) The son of a well-known auto dealer in Seattle, it seemed to me Wes was trying to find his niche. As county chairman, I liked and encouraged

Wes to run. His worst liability was indecisiveness. But after he filed, he really worked, and effectively. I suggested he doorbell as many houses as he could and just ask whoever came to the door to please vote for him. He appeared somewhat ill at ease, which I think elicited sympathy, and I think that's why he was elected and served three terms. A nice person who would never knowingly hurt anyone. Today, the Legislature could use more like Wes Eldridge, who was a good, honest listener.

CHARLES ELICKER (R-10, House, 1967-1969 and Senate 1969-1973) Considering his short legislative life, he left behind many memories of his astuteness and cleverness. He once ran against Henry Jackson, portraying himself as Teddy Roosevelt, for whom he was almost a dead ringer. The loss was predictably enormous, which he expected. I'm sure he enjoyed displaying his charm, wit, and knowledge, so to him, running for U.S. Senator was fun. We had a longtime acquaintance dating back to his UW student days. He was someone to cherish. He had life and the world in perspective—totally.

HARRY ELWAY (R-21, House, 1958-1959, and Senate, 1959-1963) A rollicking, robust personality who loved the Olympia scene. One had to like him—he was never in doubt.

JOE ENBODY (D-20, House, 1977-1979) From an old Olympia family, Joe was another open book, forthright type who probably didn't fit the model for Lewis County. A good laborite and a liberal vote.

JOHN ENG (D-37, House, 1973-1983) was shrewd, effective, and, although we served only four years together, I liked his style.

JOHN ERAK (D-19, House, 1977-1983) is a real person. I never could understand why he lost in 1983. His profile fit the district. He had taken no votes to enrage the district. He seemed to be in touch, but he lost. I worked well and easily with John. I had no quarrel with the winner, Carol Monohon, but I missed John Erak.

PHYLLIS ERICKSON (D-2, House, 1973-1983) An institutional Democrat. I would liked to have known her better. I admired her.

TIM ERWIN (R-44, Senate, 1991-1995) Likable. It seemed to me he was dominated by the lady of steel, his leader, Jeannette Hayner. He never found his niche, if any. Since the Senate was such a slow league while he was there, I was always expecting to see him emerge, but he never did. However, his ambition knew no limit, as shown by his filing for Congress with no legislative record and minimal financial support.

MARY FARQUHARSON (D-46, Senate, 1935-1943) One of the smartest and most opinionated people ever to serve in the Senate. A fierce Roosevelt proponent of the New Deal, she gave her best to help the state's Depression-riddled society recover by helping the unemployed. She was a precursor to the era of Senator Lorraine Wojahn! What women—take your choice and you'll have a winner.

ROY FERGUSON (R-48, House, 1987-1993) A sound thinker, understood well the roles of majority and minority. A fair compromiser, he was a good listener and could understand opposite views. His departure lessened the reasonableness factor in the House. A thoroughly good person.

GREG FISHER (D-33, House, 1989-1996) had the normal fantasies of greatness, but lacked the base from which to spring. Rightly or wrongly, I sensed Greg weighted PR heavier than substance. Greg was a difficult person for me to know. When he came to the Legislature, I thought, "Here comes another Adam Smith." Greg just didn't live up to my early expectations.

RUTH FISHER (D-27, House, 1983-) How can one district simultaneously produce Fisher and Wojahn? Fortunately, while serving some of the same years, they were in separate houses. Ruth was a gem in that she made up her mind and then stayed put. I liked her style. Given time, she will inherit the awesome stature of Wojahn, the Norse Goddess of Terror.

PAT FISKE (R-40, House, 1981-1985) At one point, there was a move by the women's lobby to conduct a study of the monetary value of state jobs. The study was to see if women were making the same amount as men in state jobs or not. The thinking was that they were not, and it would be corrected using the results of this study. Pat proposed an amendment to determine what the various jobs were really worth, regardless of what particular genders were being paid to do them. His amendment proposed that once the true value of the job was determined, employees should be paid just that.

Foreseeing a possible decrease in income, the women's lobby did not approve of his amendment; they did not want the study to determine actual value of the jobs. Well, in spite of my longtime record of promoting anything to improve the lot of working women, I joined Pat, trying to explain I was still the same Ray Moore, but that I saw nothing wrong with doing a job evaluation. The women's lobby and the public employee's lobby came down hard on me. Since Pat's amendment died, I was forgiven. Pat was an eager beaver and quite effective and very likable. I would still support that amendment of his any day.

E. J. FLANAGAN (R-15, Senate, 1943-1957) A tough, grizzled old guy who seldom had doubts. Strong and likable, he served well.

SID FLANAGAN (R-13, House, 1961-1983) Like others from the Thirteenth District, Sid served eleven terms and could beat anybody except Tub Hansen, who defeated him in a rough campaign for the Senate in 1992. Tub ran ads congratulating Sid on his seventieth birthday, which of course pointed out how old Sid was (Tub was even older)!

GEORGE FLEMING (D-37, House, 1969-1971, and Senate, 1971-1991) parlayed a solid football career into a good thing. No doubt being black in a predominately white Legislature is difficult. Being a Democrat helped because we are the party to which most nonwhite aspirants gravitate, and we try to be more than fair. George had been in the Senate a few years when Senators Goltz and Wilson did the unforgivable. After the Mardesich scandal, they convinced the caucus they should be splitting authority between the majority leader and caucus chairman. When I arrived I couldn't believe they conceived such a plan, and why the caucus fell in with it.

It did work okay when Walgren was leader and Odegaard was chairman. Gary accepted a

secondary role. When Odegaard left, Fleming became caucus chairman. Walgren left and George insisted he was an equal partner with Ted Bottiger, our new leader. After all, George had the rules and how could we deny our only black his place in the sun? If we thought Odegaard was not strong enough to control our caucus meetings, we saw a caucus out of control under Chairman Fleming. It was so wild George would try to keep order, and failing, would throw down the gavel with, "Oh, shiiit!" It didn't bother Ted as much as it should have partly because he couldn't hear very well, and he was running at 110 percent capacity, himself. I don't say George abused his position, but he used it positively for George! Had our two leaders spent less time on protecting themselves from within, and more time going after the Republicans, we might have benefited.

A staffer once told me her version of George: "If I say 'Good morning, Senator' he somehow can turn it into a civil rights issue!" In making one of my rare floor speeches, I lambasted the Republican version of the budget ending by accusing them of being "niggardly nickel nursers." As I finished, Fleming grabbed his microphone and started screaming about *that* word. Meanwhile, Senator Talmadge was trying to tell him to sit down, but George was so out of control he would listen to no one. After the furor subsided, someone anonymously sent *Webster's* definition to George, pointing out "niggard" is of Scandinavian origin and means stingy! I guess I would have thought more of George if he had privately admitted his error, but remember, ego power transcends all in the marble halls of Olympia.

Nonetheless, George is funny and I enjoyed lots of good moments with him.

FRANK FOLEY (D-17, Senate, 1957-1973) A true, old-fashioned Democrat who never forgot how he got there. Always had time to reminisce and loved it. A good old boy who used common sense when all else failed.

BOB M. FORD (D-23, House, 1941-1943 and 1945-1953) A good, old-fashioned, New Deal Democrat. He was well liked and had the good sense to be a solid caucus member and stay out of trouble. Very likable.

ELMIRA FORNER (R-47, House, 1990-1995) Our paths rarely crossed. She was businesslike, punctual at meetings, had strong opinions, and voiced them in a nice way.

PETE FRANCIS (D-32, House, 1969-1970, and Senate, 1970-1977) An outstanding political figure. He had a broad, if partisan, view of everything from his neighborhood to more cosmic problems. He was a first-rate legislator, and additionally endowed with a warm personality.

ROSA FRANKLIN (D-29, House, 1991-1993, and Senate, 1993-) A thoroughly good person who knew where she wanted legislation directed. A traditional Democrat with a strong belief in government social programs. She spoke forthrightly and diplomatically, and was always worth listening to. I wish that we had served longer together.

ROBERT M. FRENCH (R-1, House, 1937-1949, and Senate, 1949-1953) Rancher, quiet, a dependable vote for Governor Langlie. A good old boy (a term I use to describe those endowed with seniority and/or common sense) who enjoyed legislative life.

BILL FULLER (R-20, House, 1977-1981, and Senate, 1981-1985) The Fuller name in Lewis

County was synonymous with generosity and decency. The Fullers were in the grocery business and during the Great Depression of the 1930s, extending credit to people who couldn't pay. Well, this history made pleasant, unassuming Bill Fuller electable. He looks like anyone's uncle whom you'd be happy to see at Thanksgiving dinner. Although we were not on the same frequency, I liked him personally.

ART GALLAGHAN (R-26, Senate, 1979-1983) A long shot who defeated Red Beck as Red was clearly vulnerable, if not over the hill. Art would have fit our caucus. He was a motorcycle-riding bureaucrat who was discovered by the GOP as a possibility to beat Red. I suspect the GOP caucus was surprised at his appearing in the Senate. Art had his eye on living more than legislating, and he did. Although he voted with his caucus, I had a feeling there was not a lot of conviction. All in all, a good member who would rather live a full life than worry about reelection.

MIKE GALLAGHER (D-45, House, 1943-1944 and 1949-1951, and Senate, 1944-1947 and 1951-1967) was so real it was hard to believe. As opposing party chairman, I did everything I could think of to beat Mike in the 1950 election, but he won easily. He was so natural his every action appeared effortless. Mike had a sixth sense about what an envelope contained. It was said Senator Gallagher always opened the mail, but only those containing checks! I don't know how he knew, but he did. A devoted advocate for Al Rosellini, Mike chose to stay in the Senate throughout Governor Rosellini's two terms. He loved the Senate, never turned down a drink, was socially liberal and his word was good. Now, really, what more could you expect from a senator?

P. J. GALLAGHER (D-29, House, 1961-1991) P. J. became a part of the House decor. Only John O'Brien had more seniority, and for years these two Irishmen, from different districts and in so many ways different, held their positions as house fixtures. I always smiled when I saw them sitting together in the front on the center aisle. P. J. was for whatever I wanted, but sometimes he needed reminding he'd made a commitment. P. J. was a dependable, old-fashioned Democrat.

SHIRLEY GALLOWAY (D-49, House, 1979-1985) was friendly and I was sorry to see her leave. I always thought she didn't have a strong enough political virus.

AVERY GARRETT (D-11, House, 1977-1985, and Senate 1985-1988) A longtime politician and a good old boy who never deserted his allies.

AGNES GEHRMAN (R-19, House, 1941-1943 and 1947-1949, and Senate, 1941-1945) was overmatched in the legislature. She was decent, and tried to do what was good for the whole of society, but just couldn't get the hang of legislative infighting. When I was GOP King County chairman, she was, for two years, vice chairman, so I knew her quite well. She was not a difficult person with whom to work, although she had limited resources. Her dedication to building a better society was never in question.

CECIL GHOLSON (R-14, House, 1939-1941) Endowed with an outgoing personality, he was a man of many talents. In another time and place, he could have been a soldier of fortune. Always loyal, never forgot a favor or debt. He had a grocery store, was the Boeing lobbyist in

Olympia, represented spirits companies before the Liquor Control Board. Had he continued in the Legislature, he would have been a deal maker, and a good one, one with whom you could place your trust. In 1952, he and a banker friend, Wilbur Scruby, supported Taft, and I was with Eisenhower. Our workers, when they found someone leaning toward Taft, would say, "You know Taft is supported by 'Screwby' and 'Goolson', and of course you wouldn't want them involved." Cece knew who started this, but it never hurt our relationship. In fact, he used to joke about it.

BILL GISSBERG (D-39, Senate 1953-1973) Good personality. Easy to work with. I only knew him when he became a lobbyist for the Bar. Having served under Governors Langlie, Rosellini, and Evans, he had seen and heard it all. Bill could detect the chaff from the wheat—a real asset in our business!

JOHN GOLDMARK (D-1, House, 1957-1961) A Harvard-educated eastern boy who came west to dry farm in the Okanogan. Endowed with a brilliant mind coupled with a liberal view of life. He was always on the side of the angels, though I had a feeling he wanted to provide for the poor as a self-protective measure. He disliked strife and wanted to protect the good things about capitalism while trying to blunt greed. Although I disliked him personally, I testified for him in the Goldmark case in '62. He was a big asset to the Democrat majority during the Rosellini governorship.

"BARNEY" GOLTZ (D-42, House, 1973-1975, and Senate, 1975-1987) gave entertaining floor speeches and was well regarded. Barney had a personality and a presence that made him attractive in and out of politics. His loss was extremely serious to our caucus because we soon lost our tenuous majority. When he left, Ann Anderson replaced him as a Republican, and we soon found the GOP in charge. Barney had two sets of voting rules: One applied to his county, Whatcom County, and one applied to the rest of the state. Prime example: the Chicago Bridge and Dredge development damaging shorelines in Whatcom County, for which he voted. Normally, he was a strict environmentalist! He also was anti-gambling, except when it came to punch boards and card rooms in his county. All of which may go to prove consistency is not always a virtue in politics.

I'd been in the Senate a short time when at breakfast Barney asked me how I liked Senate life. I admitted I loved it. Barney said, "Think of it this way. The Senate and House are really two swimming pools with Governor Dixy Lee Ray acting as lifeguard in her elevated chair. She is watching ninety-eight kids in one pool, and forty-nine in the other. Governor Ray knows someone is peeing in the pool, but which one?" Not a bad description of the Legislature!

BILL GOODLOE (R-32, Senate, 1951-1959) has been politically active for over forty years achieving a Supreme Court justiceship. A decent man, with possibly over-simplistic solutions to simple and complicated problems alike. He was a jewel in 1950 when he ran and held the seat just vacated by Ward Davison. The joke during his election was, if all his many children could vote, he would win easily! When he ran, it was as a successor to Ward. However, it soon was apparent that he was becoming more conservative by the hour. He did no damage to the liberal cause, and overall was an asset to both Republicans and the electorate.

J. CHESTER GORDON (R-9, House, 1949-1957) loved the legislative scene. Served as sergeant at arms in 1947 as I was serving as assistant chief clerk. Some thought him erratic, although I thought of him as impatient. I describe him as likable and irascible. He was probably a better legislator than a politician.

SUSAN GOULD (R-21, Senate, 1975-1983) Sent by the League of Women Voters to shape up the Senate. A charming person who must have held her nose while voting for the Hayner hard line. Always wanted to support social programs if only there were enough money. I always felt she would have liked to be a Democrat, but our gentility level wasn't up to her standards.

BARBARA GRANLUND (D-26, House, 1979-1983, and Senate, 1983-1985) Spouse Win Granlund was appointed to fill the unexpired term of Barbara (Senate 1985-1987). Barbara and Win were dependable caucus votes, were well-liked and excellent candidates. However, sometimes strange things happen on the way to and from the forum. Barbara decided she needed more time at home, so she quit part way through her term, tossing the seat to her husband, whom we all counted on to run as the incumbent and hold the seat. After a few months, Win announced tearfully to the caucus that his health prognosis was so "iffy" that he wanted to spend what time he had left on his boat enjoying his family. Well, who can argue with that scenario? So we faced reality and with some good luck Bill Smitherman from the House ran and was elected. Win's anticipated obituary never appeared, but he did, looking very fit as Kitsap County Commissioner! Assorted deities have been given credit for this minor miracle. Or, it may just have been the Granlunds didn't like the Legislature.

GARY GRANT (D-11, House, 1963-1973, and Senate, 1973-1977) certainly makes my list of the ten best politicians I've known. I'd like to meet the person who could prove he didn't like Gary Grant. Many misread Gary, thinking that because he often appeared not to take his job seriously that there was no depth. Wrong! He has the ability to think (a rare commodity) and then come to workable solutions. He also knew his own strength and was not ambitious beyond his talent. I feel fortunate to know him.

WILLIAM A. GRANT (D-16, House, 1987-) Well regarded. He was the first Democrat elected since 1976 in the Sixteenth District. Likable, he is a stabilizing force. Given a chance with the majority, he could become a man to be reckoned with.

AUDREY GRUGER (D-1, House, 1975-1982) Went a long way on a modest talent. She never forgot her roots or friends. I liked her.

SAM GUESS (R-6, Senate, 1963-1987) An engineer turned politician. He was a Southerner by birth and a "good old boy" by choice. A few buzzwords could really set him off: bureaucrat, welfare, and asphalt. He was our resident authority on paving and, according to Sam, asphalt was the ultimate in valuable inventions. He could be downright exasperating, but then when you remembered he was a Southern army officer, having just missed the Civil War, you relented. I liked and admired him.

TED HALEY (R-28, House, 1975-1979, and Senate, 1979-1985) A doctor by trade, I expected

more of Ted than perhaps was reasonable. For, after all, his brother, Fred, was a man of exceptional talent and warmth who ran the family's Brown and Haley candy company with ease and style ("Brown & Haley Makes 'em Daily"), while being deeply involved in Tacoma School Board affairs and politics. He and I both served as presidential appointees to the Washington State Civil Rights Advisory Commission. Fred had an instinct for how best to get things done, and done right. We met at the UW when we were roommates at the Sigma Chi fraternity. So, when a sport-model version of Fred appeared, in the person of Ted, I thought, "Good, now we will see brains, style, class and judgment." In fairness, I expected too much and when, by my standards, Ted didn't deliver, I was shocked. How come he didn't use his genes as did Fred? Ted was an off-the-wall senator/M.D., whose concepts of how life/society should be structured sometime were hard to follow. Although not unlikable, I was not sorry when he left.

TOM HALL (R-18, House, 1947-1949, and Senate, 1949-1957) arrived in the irrational '47 session. From farm life to that Olympia madness had to be a cultural shock few could handle. Tom was so sound he could handle anything, and he was able to quietly distance himself from the paranoid Communist hunters. As a Republican, he was liberal. When he ran for governor, I supported him. I was not known for picking winners. If I liked them or their ideas, I was for 'em! He would have been a good governor, but the GOP power structure couldn't accept his almost populist ideas.

WILBUR G. HALLAUER (D-1, House, 1949-1957, and Senate 1957-1969) Astute businessman, possibly the best from rural eastern Washington in my lifetime. Courageous and well organized. A true liberal and a heavy. An ACLU member from Okanogan County—that has to tell us something!

STUART HALSAN (D-20, House, 1983-1985, and Senate, 1985-1988) One of the best-educated members, he resigned, paving the way for Republican Neil Amondson to take the seat which cost the Democrats the majority. It seemed as if we were doomed in that district. Stu was an outstanding free spirit of a senator. I liked him right away, and when he turned to lobbying he was just as trustworthy as he had been as a senator. I shall always cherish our relationship in spite of his costing us the majority—politically, a cardinal sin!

SHIRLEY HANKINS (R-8, House, 1981-1990 and 1995-, and Senate, 1990-1991) was quite outstanding in representing her people. She was a solid Republican who understood the art of compromise. I enjoyed her presence in the House. She is a social delight.

RON HANNA (D-26, House, 1975-1979) A man worth more than a four-year stint in the Legislature. He had a good perspective on economic and social issues. A thoroughly good man.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN (D-18, House, 1939-1961) belonged in the House even as she belonged in Congress. Every woman aspiring to political elective office could take lessons from her reputation and stances. If one wanted a role model of an old-fashioned Emily Post, Lady Julia wouldn't fit. But, if you wanted to follow in a general way a real up-front woman, she's your model. Rough talking and hard drinking, she could handle small talk or she could go head-to-head with the erudite. Sometimes after an evening hearing Julia, Perry Woodall, Grant

Sisson, and I would adjourn to a room my father kept in the Olympian Hotel, which was well supplied. After an hour or so, we would go to Cranes (on Capitol Way between 4th & 5th), or a nearby Chinese restaurant. Woodall, Sisson, and I were Republicans, Julia the lone Democrat. I can't speak for them, but I loved these outings. I could have learned much more if I'd listened more to Julia's ideas. She was a force for good and simply couldn't stand unkept promises. One of my all-time favorite politicians. Definitely in my hall of fame.

JOHN HAPPY (R-6, Senate, 1947-1962) was swept in on the GOP 1946 tide and survived until his death. A good man with a name to suit, he was well liked and, for a Republican, open to change. He fit right in during the era of good will in the Senate, which was traditional for nearly 100 years, ending in 1981.

CLINT HARLEY (R-43, House, 1943-1945, and Senate, 1947-1950) was well-to-do and rather liberal for his time. He carried himself with a senatorial demeanor. I can't recall why he left, but it was a loss to the GOP.

"DOC" HASTINGS (R-16, House, 1979-1987) is a pleasant fellow and an underrated politician. Not an original or a deep thinker, he carried the ultra-conservative GOP banner well.

MARY MARGARET HAUGEN (D-10, House 1983-1993 and Senate, 1993-present) Opinionated and stubborn to an extreme. Her husband, Basil Badley, an insurance company lobbyist, and I enjoyed a fifteen-year running battle over his issues. For whatever reason, I was unable to have that relationship with Senator Haugen, thus I never knew her very well. I envy her self-assuredness.

DWIGHT HAWLEY (R-44, House, 1950-1959 and 1961-1971) was mild mannered, polite and fit his district, particularly the business community. He came into office while I was county chairman. We got along well. After all, electable Republicans in King County were not an everyday occurrence. Dwight served with Governors Langlie, Rosellini, and Evans. He made it well with all of them. Dwight was one of a few good Republican politicians and vote-getters in the 1950s and 1960s.

ED HEAVEY (D-31, House, 1967-1969) A solid Democrat. Ambitious, hard working, he could have done well had he chosen to stay. Opinionated, but rarely unpleasant, he had talent that needed more time to mature. Virginia and I supported him in his subsequent political forays.

DENNIS HECK (D-17, House, 1977-1985) was a very strong legislator and a force for progressive change. Serving on the Tax Advisory Council with Denny, I noted how quickly he grasped concepts not his own and very often offered improvements. I had a feeling that when Denny and I met, he rather brushed me aside as if he knew I was to be a one-term senator, and because I was nearly sixty-seven would be going nowhere but out! The odds favored his view, so I noted it but was not offended. Years later, it was my turn to make a mistake. Denny ran for Superintendent of Public Instruction against Judith Billings. Tub Hansen and I were the only senators to endorse Billings. She won, and were Tub and I ever wrong! Billings turned out to be just another front for the status quo at the SPI office, ineffective and not well regarded by many

legislators. Denny would have been much better than Judith. Sorry, Denny.

DICK HEMSTAD (R-22, Senate, 1981-1985) served during a tumultuous period in the Senate. From being elected as a minority member, within five weeks he found he was in the majority as a result of the von Reichbauer switch. Then, in 1983, he was back in the minority for the remainder of his single term. I had always regarded Dick as a good person with no mean streak, and that was the way I saw him as a senator. He may have been more comfortable as a law professor at the University of Puget Sound, where students anointed him "the killer moth."

ED HENRY (D-32, House, 1937-1941, 1944-1945, and 1951-1953) A fiery original out of the New Deal liberal mold, he was always consistent. If I remember right, Al Canwell (of Canwell committee infamy) was sure Ed was a pinko, a card-carrying Communist. After leaving the Legislature, he became a superior court judge. As a Republican, I considered Ed quite subversive, if not downright dangerous. Later, as a Democrat, he suddenly became a good American! What a difference subjectivity can make. Ed and Governor Rosellini got on well. I like and respect Ed.

ANDY HESS (D-31, House, 1951-1957, and Senate, 1957-1964) was elected to the House during my second term as county chairman, and was I ever wrong about him. Andy appeared too well groomed for his redneck constituents, and I figured we could beat him. Well, he sent our candidate home in a basket. He overwhelmed us and just continued to win election after election. Andy had a good mind and made his way to a respectable and comfortable life. I always appreciated the openness with which he accepted me when I turned Democrat. Surprising, since I'd done everything to try to beat him back in time. He has the mark of a gentleman.

LORRAINE HINE (D-33, House, 1981-1992) arrived in Olympia fresh from mayorship of Des Moines, Wash., ready to move up in the House, and she did. A strong person, and a successful one, she was a spark plug in the House, although I dealt with Lorraine more after she was hired by Governor Lowry to wipe up the blood from bruises on legislators left by Mike. She was good at protecting Mike while exuding the feeling she was with you in spirit. When Lorraine served on the pension policy committee, her domineering streak showed, which, although we got on well, bothered me mildly; control was not my style. Nevertheless, I admired and liked Lorraine Hine, and she was definitely an asset to government.

HAROLD HOCHSTATTER (R-13, House, 1991-1993, and Senate 1993-) Every legislative body is entitled to one Hochstatter, but not two! He was always a gentleman, but without the stability of a Nat Washington or a Tub Hansen. He is a dedicated practitioner, but somewhat out of touch with the real and ever changing world. I couldn't help but like him.

DAVID HOEFEL (R-8, House, 1945-1955) was a quiet, deep man who was always pleasant but quite private. He served under both Governor Wallgren and Langlie. A strong supporter of the "farm to market" highway program. He was effective. I liked him.

NEIL HOFF (R-27, House, 1951-1953, and Senate, 1953-1957) seemed a likely Republican with a political future. Breaking into a Democratic stronghold brought him instant gratification,

but after four years in each house, he disappeared, never to be heard from. I was still GOP King County chairman when he went to the Senate and I watched his progress, anticipating that his development could lead to higher office. Somehow it never happened, and I was disappointed.

BRUCE HOLLAND (R-47, House, 1983-1993) Had he not run for King County Assessor, he could have had his House seat indefinitely. He was always pleasant, dignified, and among the most traditional Republicans. Compromise did not come easily to Bruce. Since he spent those ten years in the minority, he left just as the GOP was ascending, and with his seniority he could have been an important player.

FRANCIS E. HOLMAN (R-1, House, 1967-1969, and Senate, 1969-1973) A potential star. Smart, courteous, logical. Had he stayed he could have been ranked among the best.

JACK HOOD (R-41, House, 1959-1965) hit the political market just right. Always in the minority, he was a strong Governor Evans supporter, which paid off in that Jack was appointed to the Liquor Control Board, which I've always equated with a nine-year paid vacation. Jack was a good House member, and a good Liquor Control Board member, and a genuinely nice person. By the way, I always wanted an appointment to the Liquor Control Board!

PAUL HOUSER (R-31, Senate, 1923-1935) was a power in the GOP of the '20s. His future looked bright, but after the 1932 election, there was little room to advance for Republicans. I felt he was electable to higher office. I only knew him through my uncle, William E. Grimshaw.

E. L. "POP" HOWARD (R-42, 46, House, 1927-1929 and 1931-1933, and Senate, 1933-1935) Founder of Howard Ford dealership on East 45th and 10th Northeast (Renamed Roosevelt Way) E. L. was already an institution in the "U" district along with Ray Eckman. "Pop" Howard was not a voluble man, and he had strict rules by which he operated. I bought my first car, a 1934 Ford, from him and he always treated me well as a person and customer. How "Pop" managed to win in 1932 as a Republican, I never understood. He always preferred "Pop" to "Senator."

JERRY HUGHES (D-5, House, 1977-1981, and Senate, 1981-1985) was quick-witted. He was never in doubt and a traditional Irish-Catholic. A strong voice for social issues. He had such great potential, but lacked consistency, and I suspect he was handicapped by not really knowing what he wanted. If you couldn't like Jerry, you probably couldn't like anybody.

ELMER HUHTA (D-21, House, 1951-1959) Another robust, fun-loving, solid New Deal type who always simplified life—stay with your friends!

HOMER HUMISTON (R-26, House, 1965-1969) A firebrand who, as a M.D., violently opposed fluoridation of water systems. Whether one agreed with him, it is good to see people who are willing to take and lead unpopular positions.

ELMER HUNTLEY (R-9, House, 1957-1965, and Senate 1965-1973) A very decent person and a sound conservative in tune with his voters, and certainly Ernest Huntley's son. After

government service he stayed on to retire in Olympia.

ERNEST C. HUNTLEY (R-9, Senate, 1941-1949) A strong Langlie man. He was a key player in Langlie's campaigns and administrations. Always deliberate and always sound—no better ally did I have during my county chairmanship.

GEORGE HURLEY (D-37, House, 1943-1947 and 1975-1979) Truly a privilege to know a genuine unadulterated liberal, and one who instinctively could tell right from wrong. If legislators, city, and county council people could learn, they would do well to take a course from George on how to do their jobs without posturing. In 1947, I worked hard for Newell Banks, who defeated George, although I knew deep down that George was the better man. George is a Gompers, Debs, Green type of guy. I admire him.

JOSEPH HURLEY (D-3, House, 1939-1943 and 1951-1953) First elected in 1938, during the heyday of Roosevelt's New Deal. He served two terms, then after an absence of eight years, he staged a comeback, serving one term. He was succeeded by the brains in the family, his wife Margaret.

HARRY HUSE (D-5, House, 1933) Elected in 1932, he was a strong Clarence Martin supporter, who appointed him director of Licensing, which meant Huse had a four-and-a-half month House tenure. Almost a record!

RAY ISAACSON (R-8, House, 1979-1987) An engineer representing the Tri-Cities area. He was dubbed "Radiation Ray". Serious, likable, and worth listening to as he talked about the geology of the Columbia Basin. He was a good legislator with whom I could always reason.

FRANK JACKSON (R-37, House, 1907-1911, and Senate, 1911-1915) Of the old politicians, Frank was conservative. He had been active in the time of Teddy Roosevelt through Harry Truman. He was so old-school that you could depend on his word! He lived in the best and worst of times and was hardworking, cheerful, and likable. His counsel to me: return to the good old days.

KEN JACOBSEN (D-46, House, 1983-1997, and Senate, 1997-) is a real person! I'd feel comfortable in a lifeboat with Ken. He has standards from which we could all learn, and he is possibly the least prejudiced person with whom I served. He could give classes in doorbelling. During my last campaign in 1990, Ken came over to my district to help me canvas. At the end of the day, he had put up over a dozen yard signs in homeowner's yards with their permission. In the same time frame, I secured two! He told me how he did it, but that's his secret. Ask him. He's so generous, he'll tell you.

JIM JESERNIG (D-8, House, 1987-1991, and Senate, 1991-1993) A real pusher. Early in the Senate, he took the lead on regulatory reform. As chairman of Labor & Commerce, I was sympathetic and we worked together. A big man with an athletic background, he wanted whatever it was to happen now. Jim's Senate tenure was shortened through his appointment by Governor Lowry to be director of Agriculture. I missed his "let's get going" attitude.

CHARLIE JOHNSON (D-22, House, 1951-1953) A quick learner, he soon figured it was more profitable to be a legislative employee than to be a member. He was House sergeant at arms from 1955 to 1957, and then he struck it rich as Senate sergeant at arms from 1957 to 1981. These were Charlie's golden years, and along with others he was another von Reichbauer victim. Samuel Clemens, Will Rogers, and Gilbert and Sullivan could have built many best-sellers and musicals about the activities of Charlie Johnson. He may be best described as a sly dog. Charlie's motto: "I take care of you after I take care of myself." I've always considered it a privilege to know and appreciate rogues, and Charlie never knowingly did anyone any harm. After all where would society be without the occasional buccaneer?

STANLEY JOHNSON (R-28, House, 1980-1984, and Senate, 1984-1992) A Democrat at heart, he had just enough Republican views to be comfortable in their caucus. A salesman/entrepreneur, he was full of life, a decent man who served the Senate well. I liked Stan and felt if he and I were the only members, we could work compromises easily and without acrimony.

ELMER JOHNSTON (R-6, House, 1947-1966) Probably the most debonair and best-groomed legislator in my lifetime. He walked the tightrope very well, and had mastered the art of appearing sincere, but he was not noted for his legislative ability. He had a love of being part of the process, and was the last survivor of the class of '47. He enjoyed his role as a senior statesman. Except for a certain austerity, he was, at heart, a good old boy. I felt I never knew the real Elmer Johnston.

ASA JONES (R-31, House, 1947-1949) truly didn't care whether school kept or not. Since the Republicans had 71 of 99 seats, it really didn't make much difference how members voted or *if* they voted, because the Speaker could always find fifty votes. The Speaker, Herb Hamblen, was kind, patient, and so busy with a House full of freshmen, there was more bedlam than order. If you think it's sometimes out of control now, just turn up the volume and you have the House, 1947. I was there with the best seat in the House as assistant chief clerk! Asa's seat was in the back row, just in front of the drinking fountain which splashed on him, so he sat on the back of a leather davenport with his feet on the cushion! He, too, had a good view. If he was having fun, he voted "Aye", if there was no fun, he was a "No." He had never taken anything seriously, so why should the Legislature get special treatment? The Legislature can afford one Asa. Two might be a bit much. I enjoyed him.

D. W. JONES (R-12, House, 1939-1949) A pleasant man whose chief interest in life and the Legislature was the advancement/protection of mortician's interests. As I recall there were, during his tenure, three other funeral-home types in the House. For ten years, they pretty much got what they wanted. However, it was during this period the high cost of dying was a very real issue out of which grew "The People's Memorial Society", an organization dedicated to no-frills, cheap funerals. Naturally, the funeral home owners screamed, charging this was another socialist plot. But, other than "PMS," the industry grew and prospered. I was a member, transferring my membership to the Hawaii equivalent when we moved to the Big Island.

JOHN D. JONES (R-48, House, 1970-1973, and Senate, 1973-1983) Affable describes Jack Jones. A model liberal Republican when in the minority, and a fierce, hard-core conservative

when in the majority. If you doubt it, look at Jack's voting record in 1979-1980—up to Friday the 13th of February in 1981. Then compare with votes from post-February 13, 1981. After the von Riechbauer defection, Jack was a changed man, checking on every Democratic senator's operation to try to remake us in the new Senate image of Bluechel, Hayner, and Jones. What a chameleon, and I still like him, but no thank you as to lifeboat joint-occupancy. To his credit he did confide in me late in the 1981 session that von Riechbauer was no jewel.

JOHN R. JONES (D-1, House, 1933-1943 and 1949-1955) was likable and able. What might be called a journeyman legislator. A mortician by trade.

HERMAN JOSEFSKY (R-1, House, 1923-1929) He was blessed with an unusual asset which he honed to a fine point—lip reading. I knew him and watched him put his asset to good use. He knew what was taking place in every conversation if he was within fifty feet. So, in caucus he was brilliant at predicting upcoming events, all the while keeping this ability his secret. When he served the GOP, control was always in excess of seven to one. I thought often how great he would be today, where advance knowledge of tomorrow's agenda would really help.

JOHN JOVANOVICH (D-31, House, 1979-1981) was, perhaps, ambitious beyond his electability. He was a Democrat who probably didn't fit the structure of Legislative bodies.

HUGH "BUD" KALICH (D-20, House, 1965-1971 and 1973-1977) was a dependable, outspoken man who believed in freedom of all kinds. He was my kind of legislator. You see, it doesn't take a nuclear physicist to know whether something is good, bad, or indifferent. Common sense can solve most legislative matters. He didn't have to think things over ad nauseam. Bud told you right off if he was for or against it. Really refreshing in this day and age when often legislators say, "I'll have to think about that," which *often* means they want to see if there is a poll on the issue or to check their large contributors. Bud had his own style—direct and now. I relished that.

JAMES E. KEEFE (D-3, Senate, 1949-1979) His private career was in retail movie theaters. Likable and capable, he was a friend of both my father and Lieutenant Governor Cherberg. I was denied the privilege of serving with him because he was dying of cancer during my first session. I've always suspected he let more kids sneak into his theater than he caught. A good old boy in the best sense, his good will and wit kept the Senate on a reasoned course.

LYLE KEITH (D-6, House, 1935-1939) During the tumultuous sales tax fight, he was a big help to Governor Martin. He was personable and effective.

ALBERT KELLY, JR. (R-3, House, 1921-1923 and 1929-1931) was a big guy in Spokane. As a boy I remember him as a friendly, warm person who always gave me horehound candy from a big jar.

CHET KING (D-19, House, 1945-1967) A solid New Deal Democrat. Had staying power. He survived the 1946 election in which Nixon, Ford, and McCarthy launched their anti-Communist campaign, and he survived the Eisenhower sweep in 1952. Legislative bodies need Chet Kings.

He knew who he was! Nothing more, nothing less.

JOE KING (D-49, House, 1981-1993) did not know his own strength. He was born to be an insider, but he wanted to be governor and that defeat dealt him out of the House where the joke was, "Is it Joe King or King Joe?" I liked him, but he always seemed to leave Senate Democrats out of his maneuvering, which left him with little support in our caucus. He seemed to be working Governor Gardner and Republican Senate leader Hayner, which puzzled me because we never had fewer than 24 votes of a possible 49, a force with which he should have reckoned.

PAUL KING (D-44, House, 1983-1991) I remember one day in 1983, Blaine Gibson said, "Come with me, I want you to meet someone." The House was in session, and as Paul came off the floor to greet Blaine Gibson, I actually laughed out loud—Paul had on a three-piece suit and Nike shoes. What a sight! But, I also saw a much smarter man than the clothes implied. Anyway, I always liked Paul and wish him good health and happiness. Unique best describes Paul, both as a person, a legislator, and a trial attorney.

RICHARD KING (D-38, House, 1965-1995) One of the last of electable Democrats from the 1960s. In my view, underrated. He had a good memory and certainly helped me when I asked.

GEORGE KINNEAR (R-36, House, 1939-1943 and 1947-1950) Scion of our state's oldest political family, he was himself an extremely able politician, always seeking middle ground. When I was GOP county chairman, he did more than anyone to placate people who didn't like me or my benefactor, Governor Langlie. In fact, when Langlie disapproved of me it helped me with the old guard! George was a moderating voice in that 1947 session, among the wildest in my memory, including the 1933 and 1935 sessions. Conservative, but willing to compromise, I consider him one of the better Republicans. Some have and others should use him as a role model.

ROY KINNEAR (R-43, House, 1937-1947) I can see him yet. Only Kinnears had those marble eyes, perhaps, I imagined, a sign of nobility. He was so austere and dignified that when, in 1954, I was coincidentally in the Eiffel Tower elevator with him, he absolutely acted as if I weren't there, and I actually knew him. There is an old wheeze that you can't ride in the Eiffel Tower elevator and not see someone you know. I thought it quite natural to see someone I knew, albeit slightly strange. Roy certainly meant no offense—it was just classic Kinnear! He was an unyielding House member, wishing for the pre-Herbert Hoover era. At the time I was of the same stripe and my admiration of Roy Kinnear was great, indeed.

DOUG KIRK (R-36, House, 1951-1957) A simple, uncomplicated man I knew both as a politician and as a client. I felt he was more than happy with his life, playing on a Rose Bowl team for the UW, loving his wife, Gladys, certain he had the best of all possible children. He could never fathom my shifting from Republican to Democrat. He wanted to support my Republican opponents, but he had been a schoolteacher, and I was for higher teacher salaries and pensions, and he knew I was pro K-12. What a spot for Doug. We lived only a few blocks from one another on Bigelow North. Were Doug still around, the GOP could use him as a standard for "family values." He was a seven-day week Christian, and always kind. We could all take lessons from Doug.

GLADYS KIRK (R-36, House, 1957-1973) succeeded her husband, Doug, doing much the same work as had he. Always there for K-12. She and Doug shared the same values. I liked her for her courage and diplomacy. She represented the district well.

BILL KISKADDON (R-1, House, 1967-1973, and Senate, 1981-1989) Psychologist. Hard to categorize. Thought-processes were hard to follow. Friendly but who was the real Bill Kiskaddon?

HARRY KITTLEMAN (R-31, House, 1947-1949) Seatmate with Asa Jones, but so different. Harry was intense and serious, wanting always to do a thorough job. He was a solid thinker and deserved more seasoning. Had he lasted he could have blossomed.

RALPH KNAPP (R-43, House, 1917-1919 and 1921-1933) was truly an old-fashioned politician. He tried to move with the times, but it was even more difficult than for those of us who are now old-timers. A nice man with a hard side. When I became county chairman, he was helpful although I always suspected when people said I wasn't fit to sleep with the hogs, he disagreed, saying I was!

WILL KNEDLICK (D-45, House, 1977-1979) a.k.a. "Walkin' Will," made the biggest splash of any one-termer since Al Canwell. I liked Will and I can't tell you why. Maybe I've always liked knickknacks, or was it his eccentricity? When he was elected I think the party felt he was a comer with energy and ambition, but then his outlandish streak brought him down as much as anything. Nonetheless, I found him likable, and had he lasted he could have contributed.

WALT KNOWLES (D-4, House, 1971-1981) served with good will, not famous for legislating, but worked for his district and its people. He truly enjoyed helping people.

PAUL KRAABEL (R-46, House, 1971-1975) A liberal Republican, if there is such a thing, was a force in his caucus for the good. We lived in the same Thirty-sixth District, where he cherished privacy while performing well as a city councilman. Although I supported him, he preferred my opponents!

MIKE KREIDLER (D-22, House, 1977-1985, and Senate, 1985-1993) Spouse Lela replaced him when he was called to active military status. The Kreidlers between them served two terms. Lela did at least as well as Mike as a senator. Mike and I were never friends, and were only held together through caucus protocol. He was a good senator. We just came at issues from different viewpoints. I believe his rigidity probably cost him his seat in Congress.

PETE KREMEN (D-42, House, 1985-1995) is not a man with whom to share a lifeboat. He is a good politician, almost too affable, who has more moves than a hula dancer. Not destined for greatness, he is, like Charlie Johnson, a survivor. The concept of quid pro quo was foreign to watch-fob Pete.

DAN LANDON (R-32, Senate, 1911-1931) Fearless, and independent. First served as a Republican (1911-1915), then as one of four Progressive senators (1915-1917) and the only Progressive (1917-

1919). He was a bullheaded, bull-moose type, a free spirit, and a free trader. He always made his positions perfectly clear. He knew who he was, where he was, and knew how to survive until death parted him from the Senate in 1933. He served with Governors Lister, Hart, Hartley, and Martin. To him they all put on their pants the same way, one leg at a time.

JOE LAWRENCE (R-45, House, 1953-1955) succeeded me as county chairman having been administrative assistant to the King County GOP Central Committee. A retired naval officer who had come up from the ranks, he was a good man to have around, and I always appreciated his help and advice, and was doubly pleased when he won election to the House.

WILLIAM LECKENBY (R-31, House, 1967-1971 and 1973-1979) Although I really didn't know Bill (he left the year I arrived), my impressions are of a generous gentleman who had done well and was dedicated to doing good. He helped people both in and out of government programs. I regret never having served with him. He was a Republican elected in two Democrat districts, and was a classic and too-rare example of a successful businessman well suited to politics. He was so well regarded that he overcame great odds to win five consecutive terms. Were the GOP to field more Bill Leckenbys, they would win more often. The problem: There is only one Leckenby.

MRS. IRWIN LECOCQ (R-41, House, 1953-1955) was known as just that. I'm not sure what her own first name was. Elected for one term, she was Mrs. Republican statewide—popular, dignified, warm. She was very classy.

ELEANOR LEE (R-33, House, 1975-1979, and Senate, 1978-1991) If she doesn't hold the record for offering amendments to pending legislation, my research has failed. Another Republican who voted differently after she was in the majority! Consistency is not necessarily a virtue in our business!

VIRGIL LEE (R-20, House, 1941-1943, and Senate, 1943-1953) looked like a senator, acted senatorial, but I never saw in Virgil any strong convictions. That may be why he became undersecretary of the United States Treasury under Eisenhower! Although an Eisenhower delegate to the national convention, he did little heavy lifting in getting himself elected as a delegate. Virgil was one of those people who commanded respect because of his demeanor. The candlepower may have been there, but it never surfaced in my presence. My negative attitude is personal, because he was a good legislative voice and more than welcomed as an electable GOP candidate. And, believe me, in those days we never questioned credentials. Any elected Republican was to be cherished.

AL LELAND (R-46, House, 1957-1959) seemed an unlikely winner (much like Ray Moore), and I was just as surprised when he lost. I can't tell you why, but I liked Al.

ERNEST LENNART (D-41, House, 1943-1945 and 1951-1953, and Senate, 1953-1969) was his own kind of old-fashioned (circa nineteenth century) orator. He could really get into his subject. Needing no microphone, he could carry on, not always logically, but somewhat persuasively. He loved the political scene in general, and the Senate in particular. He was

always in the minority, except for his first Senate term. Ernie was not a funny man, and later in his career, Bill Howard, Ernie, and I were gossiping and I suggested we Republicans did all right until he came to the Senate, after which we lost the majority. He was offended and I beat a retreat.

JUNE LEONARD (D-11, House 1985-1984) could have fit my definition of good old boy. A steadying influence. She understood the art of compromise. I cherished our relationship.

ROCKY LINDELL (R-45, House, 1957-1959) was a long time ally of Insurance Commissioner Dick Marquardt. He was conservative, and during a two-year stint in the House as a minority member, he was his usual quiet, dignified self. He would have been a very good legislator had he stayed.

RODERICK LINDSAY (D-4, Senate, 1940-1943 and 1949-1956) was a business-oriented Democrat who fit Spokane and his era to a tee. He was conservative, likable, and able to compromise. Although not totally on the same frequency, he and Rosellini got on very well together.

MARK LITCHMAN (D-45, House, 1955-1973) was a vociferous voice for civil liberties and liberal attitudes in general. I always liked him for his determination, and he never, to my knowledge, engaged in personal attacks. A good man who had his share of problems, but was always resilient.

GARY LOCKE (D-37, House, 1983-1995) encouraged the mantle of brilliance to clothe him. Personable, mastered the art of appearing sincere. He wore all the accolades with a certain attractiveness. Somehow, I doubt his ability to have real friends. Were it not for Helen Sommers, I suspect Gary would have given me short shrift sooner than he did. I'm not mad at Gary, I'm just happy there are three thousand miles and a mountain range between us.

MILTON LONEY (R-11, House, 1941-1949 and 1951-1957) A decent man, perhaps too good for the shifting sands of the Legislature. A man of real beliefs, and like Henry Copeland, a man with no meanness.

CURTIS LUDWIG (D-8, House 1991-1993, and Senate, 1993-1994) An old-fashioned, common-sense type who was a very good legislator. Always unafraid to take the unpopular vote which may have caused his short career. He was my kind of guy.

EUGENE V. DEBS LUX (D-11, House, 1975-1987, and Senate, 1988) is related to the other famous Eugene V. Debs. A laborite from hell, our Gene was a colorful liberal and a dedicated Democrat. He and I had similar voting records but he enjoyed taunting the bankers and insurers. They finally had enough. Leo Thorsness ran against him in 1988 in their traditionally Democratic district and won. Gene is a lovable gadfly.

KING LYSEN (D-31, House, 1971-1979, and Senate, 1979-1983) dedicated himself to uncovering malfeasance or misfeasance. In the Senate during his lonesome four years, he worked

with little staff and overwhelming opposition. King Lysen pointed to contract violations in a ferry building contract, and how the Washington Public Power System was out of control borrowing money and then wasting it. Overruns were several times the original contracts. A public disgrace, but King was already known as a gadfly, so it was easy to poo-poo him as having few facts from which he was embroidering these already looming disasters. King Lysen had a good mind, but would have been better cast as an investigator for "Barracuda Bobby Kennedy." I liked King and have always regretted his short tenure in the Senate.

KEN MADSEN (D-2, House, 1985-1988, and Senate, 1988-1993) started as a staffer in the Senate and became a favorite of Ted Bottiger. He is a politician's politician. Not brilliant, but sound considering the quality of politicians nowadays. He is almost a jewel. He understands infighting and compromise.

MICKEY MAHAFFEY (R-46, House, 1945-1949 and 1959-1971) did not fit the Republican mold, as the ruling hierarchy would have liked. He was a new breed who knew how to get votes the hard way, by asking, door by door. He was liberal for his time, and probably had a broader view of the world than most Republicans. Possibly somewhat like Wendell Willkie.

DAN MARSH (D-49, House, 1965-1973, and Senate, 1973-1981) amazed me with his ability to make powerful, noisy arguments on the Senate floor. And when he sat down, it was as if he had never spoken and was quite detached from the ensuing procedure. He was smart politically. He had mastered the art of easily keeping in touch with constituents who wrote or used the hot line to voice their ideas. To his secretary, he had dictated several paragraphs, each one numbered. When he reviewed his constituent correspondence, he would note numbers on each letter. The secretary would see, for example, numbers 1,4,6, which meant she was to write the constituent using just those three paragraphs in the Senator's response. He had these paragraphs so well put together that any combination read well and made some sense. Since I wasn't bright enough to follow his lead, Virginia and I individually hand tooled every letter so there were never two letters alike. I was always "hard way Ray."

Dan understood the psychology of caucus life as well as anyone. There was always a certain mystery about Dan, which I could never define; it was just a feeling. I liked his demeanor and he helped me several times for which I'm still appreciative.

JOHN MARTINIS (D-38, House, 1969-1984) robustly represented his views and those of his constituents. Extremely likable, outgoing. I would have taken a chance in a lifeboat with John. Live and let live was his creed. The House is a poorer place without Big John Martinis.

FRED MAST (R-35, House, 1953-1959 and 1963-1965) had the same "let's get acquainted" attitude as fellow Republican West Seattle pharmacist, Charlie Richey. Fred had an appliance store on 4th Avenue between Seneca and Spring streets. I swear he didn't care if you were there to buy or just talk politics, you got the same warm welcome. Fred was better than an orchard-run legislator. He was there for veterans, schools, and business. Although a dedicated Republican, he didn't always vote the party line. Fred was the last Republican from the Thirty-fifth District until 1991.

BILL MAY (D-3, House, 1961-1979) Possibly the most good-natured member of the House, he served about twenty years. He was always willing to help me with legislation when it went to the House. A quality good old boy.

FRED MAY (R-41, House, 1985-1993) A solid and friendly Republican, he did a workmanlike job.

MALCOM "DUTCH" McBEATH (R-42, House, 1953-1957) As young marrieds, we lived a few doors from each other in View Ridge, a new Seattle subdivision. He was the hardest worker, next to our neighbor, Angelo Pellegrini, in the whole area. I liked him and when he moved back to Bellingham after the war, I was pleased and surprised to see him as a rising GOP star in the Legislature. He later served as chief clerk, from 1967-1973.

MARY ELLEN McCAFFREE (R-32, House, 1963-1971) An effective legislator working the system well, both in the minority and majority. I really did not know her but she was clearly an asset to the Republicans, proving once again that it is so important to keep a civilized rapport with the opposition.

DAN McDONALD (R-48, House, 1979-1983 and Senate, 1983-) Always a gentleman. Always sure his budget solutions are for the overall good. When I sat on the Ways and Means Committee with Dan as chairman, I was often amused, thinking back many years to what U.S. Senator Magnuson told me when I was a Republican: "You Republicans know what's good for the people, we Democrats find out what they want and get it for them." Dan epitomized the essence of that Magnuson profundity.

During Ways and Means hearings, which can be boring, Dan used to tell us, "Janie and I sit down at the kitchen table and do our budgeting. We know how much we have to spend, and we tailor our budget to fit." Life is so simple to Dan. One day I whispered to Senator Talmadge, "And whatever is left over, they save. But does he have a solution for those whose income can't even pay the rent, the energy and food?" Dan strengthens my argument that there should be no more than one engineer per legislative body. Nonetheless, I respected and liked Dan. I always am drawn to people with good manners—Dan certainly qualifies. He is a good, pedestrian legislator, like many of us.

ALEX McLEAN (R-12, House, 1986-1993) was a workmanlike legislator. Not destined for greatness, but the House could use a few more Alex McLeans.

MIKE McMANUS (D-21, Senate, 1983-1987) Knowing Governor Gardner and a few other politicians, he felt therefore he was a politician. He was energetic, smart enough, and had enough credentials, but he lacked a key ingredient: political savvy. He overestimated Gardner's affection toward him and was disappointed when Booth distanced himself from Mike. Knowing Booth, some of the rest of us were not surprised. Additionally, Mike tried too hard to woo his implacable enemies, which had a two-pronged effect: wasting time on an impossible challenge and neglecting the people who elected him. Now, in all fairness, most of us do this, but in reverse order. Wooing enemies should be perhaps ten percent instead of Mike's eighty percent. Mike was a good senator and, although he sought my advice, rarely followed it! Had Mike won his reelection

bid, our caucus would not have had to be constantly attacked from his successor, Gary Nelson.

DAVID McMILLAN (D-2, Senate, 1935-1943 and 1959-1969) Fit the district well and worked well with Governor Martin. He understood politics and what was possible.

PATRICK McMULLEN (D-40, House, 1983-1987, and Senate, 1987-1993) was smart, capable, and a legislator worth listening to, for he always knew thoroughly what he was talking about. And, he was popular! His legislative career was cut short because of a cancer, which subsequently has been in remission. He could have been a bigger asset to the Democrats than any of us can imagine.

LEONARD MENDEL (R-35, House, 1947-1949) Another one-termer, very eccentric. I remember one January day in 1947, Leonard dragged a laundry bag of clothes to be washed down the center aisle in the house chamber and left them on the counter in front of my desk. Chief Clerk Si Holcomb didn't like this performance a lot. Since Si was a Democrat, and Leonard a Republican, that may have been the cause of irritation. Anyway, I took care of the problem. I can't remember if Leonard paid or not.

RON MEYERS (D-26, House, 1987-1995) was an unusual addition to the scene, combining an easy personality with aggressive daring and a dedication to the process. On a touchy piece of legislation, the intent of which was to overturn retroactively a state Supreme Court decision, interested parties included corporate giants and considerable money. This was the last important bill that came to the Labor & Commerce Committee when I was chairman. Ron Meyers instantly saw the implications and precedents this bill would have on future laws. Were it not for Ron Meyers' clear vision, I could not have succeeded. Many felt Ron was overly ambitious. I feel that is the essence of politics—naked, unadulterated ego. To be king you must show desire. Ron was willing to go for the gold, as we say in Olympic years.

Senator Bottiger tells a revealing insight into Ron. When Ron was in law school, he worked in Ted's law office in Parkland. Ted thought he was okay but probably not destined for greatness. After graduation, Ron hung out his shingle. Unwilling to wait for clients, he started a billboard campaign representing himself as an "experienced trial lawyer." When Ted saw the billboard he almost drove off the road. In spite of this gross exaggeration, Ron was immediately successful. I've always admired chutzpah!

TODD MIELKE (R-6, House, 1991-1995) Limited ability. Listened overly much to lobbyists. He was consistent, voting the same whether in minority or majority. I would not choose him as a lifeboat companion.

DON T. MILLER (D-1, Senate, 1941-1949) Serious, polite, likable, newspaper publisher, a thinker. A good friend to my father, C. Rea Moore.

DONALD B. MILLER (D-5, House, 1937-1944, and Senate, 1949-1953) was charged with indecent exposure after nearly two terms in the House. He spent time in Eastern State Hospital. After leaving, he was elected to the Senate, where, speaking on a matter of personal privilege, waved his discharge paper from Eastern Hospital declaring, "I'm the only member of the Senate

who has proof of sanity!"

FLOYD MILLER (D-45, House, 1937-1939, 1941-1943 and 1949-1957) A thoroughly good small businessman selling spices and herbs in the Pike Place Market. His House career was cut short by his election to the Seattle City Council. Floyd was congenial, knew those who needed help and had no lobbyist to represent their interests, and was an all around "live and let live" guy.

LOUISE MILLER (R-45, House, 1983-1994) A good legislator, personable, strong and reasonable. She had few prejudices and had an ability to understand quickly what a bill really was all about.

MARTIN MILLER (R-22, House, 1947-1949) was my track coach at William Winlock Miller High School (Olympia's only high school in the '20s). He had hopes for me and I know I was a disappointment, athletically! He had been a miler at USC, where, because of his stubby stature, he became known as "the man who sprints the mile." I liked and respected Mr. Miller, and I'm sure had he come to the House earlier he would have left a real mark. Anyway, he was swept in on the GOP landslide and swept out in the Democrat resurgence in 1948. At least he was good enough to be the only GOP House member from Thurston County between 1943 and 1951. As a citizen, he gave more than he received.

JAMES MITCHELL (R-39, House, 1979-1985) was the best of opponents because he always left the door open for further negotiation and, best of all, he was the same whether in the majority or minority—a Republican rarity!

CAROL MONOHON (D-19, House, 1977, 1979-1985. and Senate, 1977) had a wild legislative career, serving in the House *and* Senate in 1977, failed her reelection bid, then came back to the House in 1979 to serve three terms. Carol was a good House member, underrated by members and lobbyists. Later, as a lobbyist, she was trustworthy and I liked her.

CHARLES MOON (D-39, House, 1963-1977 and 1983-1985) had tenacity and was more than willing to stay the course. I liked his assets: courage, warmth, and penetration. He certainly was in the top bracket when it came to courage.

DONALD MOOS (R-8, House, 1959-1967) had political savvy and staying power. Popular and well regarded for his legislative skills. He served later as Director of Agriculture.

CHARLES MORIARTY (R-36, House, 1957-1959, and Senate, 1957-1967) A sensible man with a low ego to be in politics. He was well liked by both Democrats and Republicans. I always have felt the legislative scene was not his kind of challenge. He served during the era of good will in both houses. I envy him that! I was very fond of his father and regarded Chuck equally well.

SID MORRISON (R-15, House, 1967-1975, and Senate, 1975-1980) Friendly describes Sid best. Impossible to dislike, he can be a legislator or an executive. Never flashy, but totally

trustworthy. I supported him when he ran for governor in 1992. My choice in the finals was made when Eikenberry beat Morrison in the primary. I voted for Lowry. Sid was a good Congressman, never having had a chance to shine since he was always in the minority. A good man whom I trust, and regret he was unable to give the voters a choice between him and Lowry.

BOB MORTON (R-7, House, 1991-1993, and Senate, 1993-) Having been raised in his district, I can see how well he fits. He is a gregarious Bible-thumper, a hunter, and stump rancher. Voters trust him because he is personable and believable, although they don't know, or care, how he votes. He spoke more frequently on the floor than anyone with whom I served. How the hell he can be an expert on so many issues beats me.

DR. JOHN MOYER (R-6, House, 1987-1993, and Senate, 1993-1997) was a highly respected M.D. It is rumored he delivered half of his electorate! He was easy to like, a good raconteur, and a decent human being. Intellectually, he was a cut above the average legislator.

ED MUNRO (D-31, House, 1955-1959) An original! He was Democrat county chairman while I was his Republican counterpart. Because we worked full time at playing county chairmen, we were often invited to appear to debate our respective party positions. Well, on a good day, I'm barely articulate, and from our first encounter, he had me on the run. As these debates continued, he became bolder by telling his audience what I was going to say. I didn't have sense enough to turn down these skewering sessions. I guess I was so flattered to be on the same platform with the monster I just kept getting within an inch of my political life. Masochism is its own reward.

Well, one day I had my chance. Ed filed for county commissioner and I had the good fortune to discover a welfare recipient living in a skid road hotel. His name was also Ed Munro, and with modest encouragement he filed against Ed, who went wild trying to find this other Munro, who spent his days panhandling and his nights in the courthouse park, because, of course, the activities of "Ed Munro" made it into the paper. As the legitimate Ed Munro's scouts took up the hunt, our Munro, armed with a bottle of cheap wine, began spending his nights in a tree, hiding. Eventually the leaves fell off the trees, our Munro was exposed, and Ed again bested me, for they found his namesake and got him out of the race.

Ed was elected, and over the years we had lots of laughs. It was next to impossible to best Ed Munro, who not only was a heavy, but very glib. An outstanding legislator/county commissioner, he was an asset to politics and gave more than he got. I've always thought I was better than a raw hand at evening a score, but Ed always beat me and often left me feeling I was about as effective as a bowl of Jell-O! He later became a client, and always helped me after he retired.

PATTY MURRAY (D-1, Senate, 1989-1993, U.S. Senate, 1988-) Not since Don Magnuson was elected to Congress without a campaign has the state seen such a success story. From her local school board to state Senate to U.S. Senate in four years. She never deviated from her single-issue campaign for the U.S. Senate: "A Mom in Tennis Shoes." She is blessed with an unequaled ego, which, if you have one asset, that might as well be it. Her weaknesses may never catch up with her. She is not an original thinker—she can be very tenacious in grabbing a current issue and riding it hard. She is not loyal, which often goes with unbridled ego. Nonetheless, I wish her well.

DARWIN NEALEY (R-9, House, 1983-1993) A good and reasonable man. We served at the same time, but our paths crossed infrequently.

MARSHALL NEILL (R-9, House, 1951-1957, and Senate, 1957-1967) Personable, ethical. He was in touch with the temper of southeast Washingtonians. He spent those sixteen years mostly in the minority, as a voice of reason. He was so circumspect it was often hard to tell how he might vote.

DICK NELSON (D-32, House, 1977-1993) As austere as Brekke was boisterous, they represented the Thirty-second District for sixteen years. A joke in our adjoining districts was, if there is a public meeting attended by three people, Dick and Ray will be two of the three. To give credence, this actually happened once! I considered Dick one of the House heavies, and I always listened to what he had to say, and then usually voted with Tub Hansen!

GARY NELSON (R-21, House, 1977-1987, and Senate, 1987-1995) A telephone company manager, and though he was successful at it, I suspect he liked legislating much more than the totally structured telephone company atmosphere. Gary could be downright impossible, including an anger, which showed me a person frustrated in life, and in the Senate, he could let it all hang out. I liked him best when he was really irritated. He could be charming, which I'm sure his voters saw and liked.

CHARLES NEWSCHWANDER (R-28, House, 1967-1969, and Senate, 1969-1979) I served five months with Senator Newschwander who, politically, was a rock solid, unbending Republican, but socially friendly. When wearing his legislative outfit, he was downright stubborn, but he always changed when in a social environment. A good way to be!

JANICE NIEMI (D-43, House, 1983-1987, and Senate, 1987-1995) A former Superior Court judge, she was a stand-up liberal voice. She desperately wanted to chair Ways and Means, and after losing to Nita Rinehart, Janice lost interest. Whether or not Majority Leader Gaspard led her down the garden path before naming Nita is a secret to which I was not privy. I was disappointed to see her give up. The Senate was a much lesser place without her.

FRANCES NORTH (D-47, House, 1973-1981) A popular, moderate Democrat who did not get enough credit for the job she did both in and out of the Legislature. No relation to Lois North.

LOIS NORTH (R-44, House, 1969-1975, and Senate, 1975-1979) and I had quite different ideas. She was probably born to be Little Miss Perfect. In spite of my strict upbringing, somewhere along my lifeline I began to think life was a funny experience on the way to the grave. My longtime friend, polio-stricken Bob Block, had given me a tie, apropos of the business in which we were both engaged—stock brokerage—showing bulls and bears engaged in procreation with each other. For the fun of it, I wore the tie to the Senate. As luck decreed, Lois approached me to explain pending legislation in which she was interested. As she talked, her eyes wandered to my tie. She stopped in mid-word! First she turned red, then white, and finally mottled. It was months before she could even acknowledge my presence. Later, when

Lois ran for the higher-paying county council, she sent the usual mass mailing asking for help.

I returned the card with the signature of our cat, Bigelow Moore, who also happened to be a TV personality, indicating he would be happy to endorse Lois for the county council. Soon, a phone call came from North headquarters for Bigelow. I said he was gone on a hunting trip, and was there any message. Well, it was a request to put a Lois North yard sign in Bigelow's yard, to which I answered saying that Bigelow was a nature lover and considered yard signs an ugly intrusion by man on natural beauty. A few days later came another call for Bigelow. I said he worked nights and slept days, and could I take a message. The caller hoped Bigelow would host a coffee hour. I told this one that Bigelow was really a loner and wasn't that keen about socializing. Next call asked for Bigelow to make a donation. I said he was not quite self-supporting, and that we tried to help him by giving him room and board.

The climax in the Moore-North relationship came when I saw Lois at a holiday party following her victory. To make conversation, I asked her if she noticed the name "Bigelow Moore" as an endorser on her brochure. When she said, "No," I let her in on the secret—she had been supported by our cat, Bigelow, a black Republican. Again, Lois thought this very unfunny. Democrats do have more fun!

BUSSE NUTLEY (D-49, House, 1985-1991) A strong player in the House and a real loss to the Democrat caucus. She went on to a better-paying job as county commissioner in fast-growing Clark County. Another who, had she stayed in the House, could have been a powerful player.

ANN T. O'DONNELL (D-37, House, 1959-1965) Aggressive, personable, and liberal, Ann was doomed to an early death. She was a comer for the Democrats. I suspect she had a political future.

HARTNEY OAKES (R-32, House, 1953-1959) was agreeable. Out of the Ward Davison mold, he served under Governor Langlie whom he regarded highly, and Governor Rosellini in whom he could see little good. As a Republican, I viewed him as doctrinaire and a district asset.

GARY ODEGAARD (D-20, Senate, 1969-1980) was our caucus chairman when I came to the Senate. Probably miscast as a legislator, he was a peaceful man who had trouble being firm as a caucus chairman, and too pure to deal. He resigned, leaving us without an heir apparent to fill his vacated seat. The loss of this seat to popular GOP Bill Fuller turned out to be devastating. Although we still had a 25-24 majority, we lost everything with the defection of von Reichbauer. Fairly or not, a case can be made that Gary Odegaard cost us the majority. He just wasn't tough enough for the harsh, cruel business of politics.

MIKE ODELL (R-4, House, 1963-1965) A one term John Bircher who had real potential. I would have liked to see how he might have matured.

BOB OKE (R-26, Senate, 1991-) A serious, dedicated, narrow-gauge senator who is a religious rightist. Likable socially, I can see him as perhaps dying in office. He was lucky to draw Smitherman in his race. He's proven his ability to hold the seat. Bob considers anything he abhors to be sinful, and government should put a stop to it. At the same time, he is quite sure the

Christian-right interpretation of the Bible transcends the Bill of Rights. I admit to being just the opposite. Bob is a true believer in less government and fewer government social programs. I always felt that should the Christian right gain control, Bob would argue against shooting some of us, but could opt for gassing!

OLAF OLSEN (R-4, House, 1917-1925) represented North Spokane and the rural area as far north as Deer Park. He was a quiet man who understood the art of listening. He resigned in 1925 to accept a cabinet post with Governor Roland Hartley. He and my father were allies in the Hartley cabinet, which meant little because it was a one-man gang. Hartley's cabinet was proforma—the script was whatever drove the governor.

RAY OLSEN (D-35, House, 1951-1967) was the kind of legislator you wish there were more of. Always willing to work for compromise that would be good for the greatest number. Very fair. Like Saltwater Ed Riley, he always supported me. I shall always regard Ray Olsen as a model legislator.

WILLIAM ORNDORFF (D-3, Senate, 1935-1949) A solid citizen who represented Spokane with ability, and was a strong voice for Governor Martin. Although elected in a strong New Deal period, he was not as liberal as the time dictated.

GEORGE ORR (D-4, House, 1991-1993) Good man in a nominally GOP district. Had he lasted more than one term, he would have had potential.

FRANK OSTRANDER (R-45, Senate, 1947-1951) was an average Republican candidate, and in all honesty, Frank was only electable in a sweep like 1946. His major contribution was that his victory resulted in a tie, 23 to 23, in the Senate. Frank was a solid Republican and citizen, and he really worked at the art of compromise.

RICHARD OTT (R-8, House, 1933-1937) Always a stalwart Republican, very likable. Conservative in the best sense. He eventually became a Supreme Court justice. Probably Ritzville's most famous citizen.

BRAD OWEN (D-35, House, 1977-1983, and Senate, 1983-1997) Small of stature, fearless when he feels he's right, entertaining, and personable. Much too conservative for me, there have been times when I wished he'd evaporate, but there were an equal number of instances when I could really relate to him, his life, and his hopes. Brad can certainly never be accused of blind loyalty to his caucus. I wish him well in every way.

MIKE PADDEN (R-4, House, 1981-1997) Very conservative and a hard worker. Although we did not see things in the same way, we had an amiable relationship.

A.J. "BUD" PARDINI (R-6, House, 1969-1979) Hail, well met, and energetic. He was universally liked. He was agile and worked well with both sides of the aisle.

MIKE PATRICK (R-47, House, 1981-1983, and Senate, 1990-1991) As a legislator, he never

quite achieved his goals, but being in the House minority, and with only one year as part of the Senate Republican majority, he didn't have time to mature. Of all the senators with whom I served, I never knew the *real* Mike Patrick until he became a lobbyist. He was one of the best, forgot political prejudices, and was sensitive to member's feelings. I shall always remember Mike with affection.

E.G. "PAT" PATTERSON (R-9, House, 1973-1981, and Senate, 1981-1993) was a man of class. Open to new ideas, he was attached to Washington State University. A good listener, and one of a few deep thinkers in the Senate. He was effective, independent, and still a good GOP caucus member. Imagine a southeastern Washingtonian who openly and strongly supported an income tax and survived.

W. KIM PEERY (D-17, House 1987-1995) was truly a standout. Friendly, dedicated, and effective. Although not a rough-and-tumble type, he fit into his wild, wonderful caucus. A deep thinker, his specialty was education, although he was a quick learner and had a handle on most issues. I liked him extremely well.

DWIGHT PELZ (D-37, Senate, 1991-1997) A solid liberal, but not destined for greatness. Could possibly handle an oar in Larry Phillips' lifeboat.

BOB PERRY (D-32, House, 1959-1977) Extremely bright, and well suited to the rough-and-tumble life in the House. He lived life on the edge. I liked him for his quick grasp of complicated legislation. Often criticized by liberal Democrats for his ability to work with business, I thought we were lucky to have someone of his stripe and ability. I remember him for many things, but when I filed for the House in 1974, he called to offer support. Since there were few to none, I appreciated his offer and encouragement. I was always sorry I was never able to reciprocate. Bob was an activist in the House. He participated in the 1963 coalition, which elected "Big Daddy" Day as Speaker. I liked Bob. He was unafraid to promote his ideas of what the Democratic program should be. His problem was that he always flew close to the flame, and eventually, too close.

LOWELL PETERSON (D-40, Senate, 1965-1987) Probably fit his district as well as anyone in our legislative history. Well-mannered, quiet, and rumpled without being disheveled. He was a classic old-line Democrat. Some took him lightly, and some took him as he was—a truly good, decent man. He helped when asked, but didn't press his ideas on others. Some thought Lowell had a drinking problem. Personally, I couldn't tell when he had had a drink or not. He was always the same old Lowell. In 1980, he was perceived by the caucus to have a tough race and we sent an operative into the district to assess his vulnerability. After a few days our man reported to the caucus that the Peterson image needed modernization which could easily be cured by getting Senator Peterson into a three-piece suit. Now, this would have killed him with his large base of working men and women. Lowell had no intention of getting a three-piece. He knew, as did many of us on the Senate Democrat Campaign Committee, that Lowell would be laughed out of every bar in Skagit County if he showed up in such an outfit. Well, Lowell did it his way and won again. When he resigned in 1987, I really felt a big loss.

PAYSON PETERSON (R-41, House, 1929-1931) ran in almost every election for probably

thirty years. A powerful, rambunctious speaker, he was one rabid Republican. I liked him, although his perpetual candidacy became somewhat of an embarrassment. Payson was a victim of bad timing. Elected in 1929, there was little room for a Republican during the heyday of the New Deal. By the time Republicans became popular again, Payson was old hat.

TED PETERSON (R-44, Senate, 1955-1959 and 1963-1975) The quintessence of Ballard, he did a good, if pedestrian, job of representing the district's business community in particular, and the welfare of the constituents in general, as seen through his Republican eyes! Ted is a good person, and I've always wished him well. Serving under two governors—Rosellini and Evans—he saw it all.

HAROLD PETRIE (R-14, House, 1953-1959) A serious middle-ground Republican. Highly respected.

LARRY PHILLIPS (D-36, House, 1989-1993) is like a few other politicians I've known. Larry comes first, and anybody else is a distant second. Although he did not respond to our requests for help from him in our previous campaigns, when he announced his desire to replace Seth Armstrong, we donated funds, the use of our basement as his campaign headquarters, and encouraged some of our most key supporters to help him. His popularity remains untarnished and, as county councilman, he is certainly a black belt fence-straddler. When he was in the House, he sponsored a bill identical to one sponsored by Senator Rick Bender. Instead of graciously giving support to Rick's bill, he insisted he was the originator of the language and managed to keep Rick's bill in abeyance while pushing his bill. Rick needed this bill to help in his reelection bid, which he lost. Now that Rick is president of the statewide AFL-CIO, I wonder if Larry is looking at his hole card. Larry is not one with whom I'd want to share a lifeboat.

BILL POLK (R-41, House, 1971-1983) served as Speaker in his last term. He was aristocratic in manner. I sometimes felt he was fortunate to have lived here and now. Two hundred years earlier in France, he could have lost his head! Bill was smart and a good leader for the Republicans.

PHILLIPS POST (R-5, House, 1930-1931) was a one-termer. The 1932, Roosevelt New Deal" tide ended what modest career he might have had. He was not easy to know.

W. G. POTTS (R-35, Senate, 1903-1911) Since Senator Potts was gone from the Senate a year before I was born, I knew him only as state treasurer (1925-1929). He was a Republican, and was on the inner circle even when he was between jobs, for 14 years, as senator and treasurer. He was nice enough to me, but he thought kids and the Capitol weren't compatible.

GEORGE POWELL (R-37, House, 1947-1953) Seatmate with Doc Banks, George stayed longer in the Legislature than perhaps he desired. I've always considered George as an ideal lawmaker—smart, rather conservative, and always able to find middle ground. Had he had the desire, he would have gone far politically.

EUGENE PRINCE (R-9, House, 1981-93, and Senate, 1993-1999) Probably he and Sid Snyder

know and understand the process as well as anyone. Independent thinker; invariably can tell the wheat from the chaff, as well he should as a wheat farmer. He is smart, courageous. Always leaves the door open, knowing that today's opponent may be tomorrow's ally. I rate him outstanding.

PAUL PRUITT (D-34, House, 1977-1985) Described by a fellow legislator as "A man with a perpetual look of surprise." Pruitt was a minister who did a good job of trying to represent his constituents. Paul and I had similar voting records, though we came at problems from different directions. I regarded him well.

WES PRUITT (D-26, House, 1987-1995) A quiet, firm man who wore well as a middle-ground Democrat.

KENT PULLEN (R-47, House, 1973-1975, and Senate, 1975-1990) Ultimately unique, knew no fear, and had one of the Legislature's best brains. He was able to speak to the point without arousing ire, held the state chess title, and his imagination was well directed. Together, he and I sponsored mental sports legislation, directed toward developing the mind along with the body, by promoting memory enhancers such as chess, bridge, Go, dominoes, etc. After several tries it finally became law and was assigned for implementation to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Judith Billings, the SPI, obviously was thinking of other things because after a couple of meetings it slid into oblivion, although the law required an annual report! Perhaps a new SPI will perform resuscitation.

Kent is a strict constitutionalist, exercising his right to bear arms by carrying a gun. His positions were always defensible. He had principles and he never deviated. He could be as aggravating as Slim Rasmussen, but the IQ of the Senate suffered with his departure.

J. T. QUIGG (R-19, Senate, 1977-1985) A libertarian at heart, he barely fit the GOP caucus. He was an idea man. It was up to the rest of us to understand what had a chance of working and what was appealing but impossible. He never met anyone he didn't like. A risk-taker, some did not take him seriously, but I always was fascinated by his arguments, however specious they might be. Every group needs a J. T. Quigg.

A. L. "SLIM" RASMUSSEN (D-28, 29, House, 1945-1961, and Senate, 1961-1993) I had known Slim since 1947, when he was only in his third year of forty-eight in politics, most of which was in the House and Senate, except for a term as mayor of Tacoma. His office was a mess, but he and his assistant, John, could find anything on a moment's notice. One day I was explaining a banking bill, referring to an article in the *Wall Street Journal* which I didn't have, mostly because it was many years back. I noticed Slim pick up his phone and within three or four minutes a page handed him the article from 1964! Of course I used it to strengthen my case. Later I asked Slim, "From where did you resurrect that article from over twenty years ago?" He just smiled, thanked me, and went on his way!

People were always trying to weaken the homestead law. It was Slim's number one "sacred cow." A roof over a family was never to be denied, and he made a believer out of me. When Slim saw a bill that might erode homesteading, his research was accurate, his arguments flawless, and he never forgot the perpetrator!

Slim, throughout his career, terrified friend and foe alike, mostly because Slim couldn't tell the difference. He could be outrageous. Once, when speaking against legislation he interpreted as giving special privileges to homosexuals, Slim flat out declared his animosity toward "them queers." Although the members feigned shock I suspect more than a few thought, "Good for Slim. I wish I had the guts to say it." Formal education did not have a chance to spoil Slim. He spent his work life in a railroad roundhouse. I recall Slim as one the few greats to grace the Senate.

MARILYN RASMUSSEN (D-2, House, 1987-1993, and Senate, 1993-) A farmer with an ego to match her size. Basically, a solid Democrat with a dangerously inconsistent streak—well-meaning but a bit too erratic for my taste.

W.C. "BILL" RAUGUST (R-8, House, 1943-1950, and Senate, 1950-1967) was very real. Born in Russia, he appreciated how well he had done in the U.S. as a farmer. He was a common sense senator. He did not believe government at any level could compete with private enterprise. He was dignified, knew where he stood, and, to him, a promise was a sacred thing. His word was good.

MARGARET RAYBURN (D-15, House, 1985-1995) A solid Democrat riding a district inclined toward GOP. Serious, effective, and friendly.

KEIRON REARDON (D-39, Senate, 1933-1941, 1943-1944 and 1945-1949) A friend to my father, and stubbornly faithful to his friends and his word. I'm not sure anyone really knew Keiron—a good legislator and man.

FRED REDMON (R-14, Senate, 1961-1969) A practical, practicing Republican. He served Yakima well, working well with both Governor Rosellini and Governor Evans. I would like to have served with him, partly because of him and partly because that was a period of good will and humor in the Senate.

MARK REED (R-31, House, 1915-1931) was a capable leader, with little effort handling issues as they appeared, and allowed no encroachment on the God-given rights of loggers to slash and burn. He was the archetype of early 1900s Republican businessman and legislator. He would have fit right in to most big business and legislative scenes anywhere. He probably was not awesome, but he had all the accouterments, and, to me, as a high-schooler watching him, I felt a giant presence. He was Speaker in 1923, which was the last two years of Governor Hart's term, and as far as I knew, they made beautiful music together. Mark Reed was most imposing. His successor, L. D. Hack, was swept out in the Roosevelt landslide of 1932, and except for Asa Jones and Harry Kittleman (1947-1949), no Republican in the Thirty-first District held Mark Reed's seat until 1967. Truly, a long, dry spell!

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN RENO (R-42, House, 1939-1943) We all have our own image of Ben Franklin. Well, B. F. Reno was just the opposite—thin, slight, with hair. I had known him since 1931 at the UW. He was smart and shrewd, with a sly streak. I liked him, and when he went to Olympia, I thought a legislative position fit him to a "T". After the war, I lost track of him.

CHARLES RICHEY (R-34, House, 1947-1949 and 1953-1955) A pharmacist by trade, he had a unique knack of making quick and permanent contact with everyone. He loved a joke, the Legislature, people, his store, and his family. I loved Charlie. Elected in the GOP sweep in 1946, he lost in 1948 through no fault of his own—just a victim of President Truman's victory. However, unlike other Republicans in Democrat districts, Charlie came back to win in 1952 with Eisenhower's national victory. If the Republicans had a whole stable of Charlie Richeys to enter in all the races around this state, the legislative complexion might have been quite different. He was a smallish man with a smile and a hearing aid—he missed nothing. He was the epitome of the neighborhood druggist. Charlie Richey was a jewel.

BOB RIDDER (D-35, Senate, 1967-1973) A good man and a good legislator. I would have enjoyed serving with Bob, who was filled with good will. Just about a perfect public school senator. Dedicated to K-12 education, I found little with which to disagree. Also, another fine product of William Winlock Miller High School in Olympia.

RUTHE RIDDER (D-35, Senate, 1974-1983) A worthy successor to spouse Bob. They saw life pretty much the same, so I suspect they would have voted alike. Ruthe was a help to me both in and out of the Legislature. Good luck, Ridders!

EDWARD F. "SALTWATER" RILEY (D-35, House, 1939-1951, and Senate, 1951-1963) Better than a journeyman politician, he was affable, quick to see problems, and above all, good with people. We first became acquainted in 1947, and, although I was just assistant chief clerk and a Republican, he always acted as if I was a real person. In those days he was more liberal, and I more to the right, but, as time went by, he shifted ever so slightly to a centrist and I moved to the left. We never really disagreed, and when I ran in his district, in all six campaigns, he was there for me. A true gentleman and friend.

EDWARD J. "FRESHWATER" RILEY (D-7, House, 1935-1945 and 1953-1955) Ed was twice Speaker. He rode an uneasy steed—keeping his troops marching to his tune as they were being wooed by Republican Governor Arthur Langlie. He did well.

NITA RINEHART (D-43, House, 1979-1983, and Senate, 1983-1995) I shall always remember the Rineharts (John and Nita) staying with me when the likes of Patty Murray had written me off. I'm the type who has two lists, those who help, and another of those that have tried to hurt. I've never failed a political friend. That's my code and that's that!

Nita ran the best Ways and Means Committee during my sixteen years. She actually had weekly mini-forums for members to learn how the budget was being developed. She encouraged questions and input. It sounds like an obvious idea, but she was the first to do it on an ongoing basis. Nita is an outstanding internal politician, meaning she handled all the egos well. She could have been a good governor.

PAM ROACH (R-31, Senate, 1991-) Smart and clever, she can smell an issue before almost anyone. By my standards, an ultimate rightist who has no doubt regarding her views. I doubt we ever voted together, including recessing for lunch. Her dedication is admirable, but her direction lacks the human touch. I doubt she would have much in common with such GOP leaders as

Lincoln, Hoover, Wilkie, Dewey, or our own Dan Evans. This could be open to debate, but that's the way I call it.

JACK ROGERS (D-23, Senate, 1945-1961, and House, 1963-1966) had my admiration for his optimism, warmth, decency, and senatorial demeanor. I regretted never having served with him, but our relationship was enhanced by our serving together on the State Investment Board. His grasp of new financial products such as options and leveraged buyouts surprised me, because this was my field, not his! A thoroughly good man, he had more than his share of disappointments, but always took whatever happened with good grace. A gentleman and a gentle man.

HUGH ROSELLINI (D-28, House, 1939-1947) In January of 1939, two newly elected Rosellinis (Senator Al and Representative Hugh) stood on the Capitol steps congratulating each other. Hugh said his real goal was to be across the street as a state Supreme Court justice. Not to be outdone, Al said, "I want the governorship." Two nobodies with lofty goals. They had distinguished and popular careers as legislators, and, wonder of wonders, they both achieved their goals. I did not know Hugh until he came to the Supreme Court, although I had heard good things about him from my next door neighbor, Angelo Pellegrini. A longtime friend, Bernie Lonctot, introduced Hugh and me over coffee in the capitol cafeteria one morning, and I liked him right away. Hugh epitomized that old saying, "Take your job seriously, but don't take yourself seriously." I began watching his Supreme Court opinions and saw, from my standpoint, the perfect jurist, not only knowledgeable of the law, but always was able to weigh in on the human side. It is well and good to follow the law, but without a touch of compassion and humanity, you cannot be a truly great Solomon-like decider of people's problems. I've known many justices who were better steeped in the law, others became legends in their own minds, some arrived accepting the position as early retirement! Hugh Rosellini gave it his best, which was plenty good enough.

JOHN ROSELLINI (D-34, House, 1967-1973) The only son of Governor Rosellini, he appeared to have it all. Good looking, youthful, even his father's unforgettable handshake, he seemed poised for a shot at greatness. But, he lacked the toughness and will to win so critical to success in our business.

HOWARD ROUP (D-10, Senate 1937-1941 and 1945-1961) A solid vote for free enterprise. He was quite old-fashioned. He liked proven ways but would listen to new concepts just in case he heard something meritorious.

RICHARD RUOFF (R-32, House, 1953-1961) appeared out of nowhere and, after winning a hard race, many of us thought he had tremendous upward mobility. Although he lasted twice as long as Don Eastvold did (Attorney General, 1953-1957), Dick and Don had the same disease—they were unable to control their political appetites. They had to have as many and varied life experiences as possible. Both had plenty of talent, but lacked the stuff of which champions are made—judgment and timing. I liked them both and thought Ruoff was destined for semi-greatness.

JOHN RYDER (R-46, House, 1953-1955, and Senate, 1955-1971) started out as a Republican

Committeeman, then district leader, and finally as a four-term senator. Few did so much with the cards they were dealt as John Ryder. As I recall, he had no college education, but he persevered to become a strong voice and an executive at Washington Mutual Savings Bank, his lifelong employer. He knew the banking business as well as anyone in town. When I met John in 1946, I was a candidate opposing his choice, Phil Shank. John viewed me as an interloper, although my GOP credentials were as valid as his. I think the fact I'd only been in the Forty-sixth District five years—albeit I was precinct committeeman from 1942 to '46—bothered John. I think the underlying problem was our different view as to the future direction of the GOP. For example, I admired decent Alf Landon; Wendell Willkie, clean-cut with a broad world-view; Tom Dewey; and local vote getter, Arthur Langlie. John was often suspicious of anything new, sticking with Robert Taft and more conservative types. We were not close, but had a certain mutual respect for almost fifty years.

JERRY SALING (R-5, House, 1965-1971, and Senate, 1985-1993) spent his life in education and continued the fight after he came to the Senate. He was not well treated by his GOP caucus. His independent streak did not please Senator Hayner, his leader. He could be difficult politically, but always socially gracious.

PAUL SANDERS (R-48, House, 1977-1983) was a loyal friend, which in politics is a great asset. We got on well, but he was always suggesting to Virginia that I should get a hairpiece. Well, of course, I could use one, but as she reminded Paul, "You want to ruin Ray Moore?" Me in a toupee is as ludicrous as Senator Lowell Peterson in a three-piece suit! I liked Paul, who was never appreciated by his party.

DOUG SAYAN (D-35, House, 1983-1991) Smart and personable, always trying to cut through palaver and get a solution for the problem at hand. A very good legislator who was just coming into a position of strength and respect when he quit. I felt we worked well together.

ROLLIE SCHMITTEN (R-12, House, 1977-1981) was endowed with optimism, charisma, and nonstop energy. He had both legislative and executive abilities. I envied his talents, if not his politics. As a former Republican myself, I always hoped he'd see the light and join us. But he went on to positions of power under Governor Spellman.

DICK SCHOON (R-30, House, 1983-1991) A truly decent citizen who lacked the necessary hard, uncompromising streak to be a Republican, but he went along with their views as a good party member. His eight years were spent in the minority so he cannot be condemned or lauded for what he didn't do.

BILL SCHUMAKER (R-2, House, 1969-1973) A good man and a born good old boy. Definitely a journeyman and a good one.

GARY SCOTT (D-39, House, 1979-1983) had great potential, and I'm sure he aspired to higher office, but for personal family reasons left the scene after only four years. A good man, capable of handling shifting legislative sands.

GEORGE SCOTT (R-46, Senate, 1971-1983) had a resume—including Marine Corps service, appearance, and arresting name—that had it all. When I met George in 1979, he was hyper-friendly and we were off to a good start. Two years flew by, and then the von Reichbauer defection gave the GOP control and George Scott was, out of nowhere, Ways and Means chairman, which was his high-water mark. I don't know whether it was friction with his majority leader, Hayner, or ineptness, but he did not live up to my expectations. George may be one of those people who *plays* his role but does not *feel* the role. I feel he was insecure, and although many of us also have self-doubt, he couldn't handle it with the necessary aplomb. He was motivated as a senator, I think, by kindness, wanting to be liked, and an inner force that pushed him too hard for his innate talent.

PAT SCOTT (D-38, House 1984-) is one strong woman. A good campaigner and listener. I found her sensible, sympathetic, and a born winner.

CARLTON SEARS (R-22, Senate, 1949-1957) was a dedicated Republican, a popular figure in Olympia. I remember calling on him to place an ad in a high school play program. He turned me down, and that was the end of my patronage! During his tenure the majority changed hands almost every election. It is always interesting to see how member's personalities changed as they move from majority to minority and minority to majority. One thing about Carlton, he outwardly never changed, although inwardly he was as emotional as the next fellow. Carlton was a sound lawmaker but somewhat on the purist side.

ED SEEBERGER (D-1, House, 1975-1976) served a single term. He came from a traditional Republican district. Since 1937, Ed was only the fourth Democrat from his district elected to either House. After his lost election in '76, he decided Olympia was for him and today he is director of Committee Services for the Senate. He is well liked, considered a heavy, and when he leaves his departure will be a blow to the Senate. As author of *Sine Die*, his work is a textbook for students of state government at all levels. As a counselor, his advice is the best. He is a true treasure.

GEORGE SELLAR (R-12, Senate, 1972-) The ultimate conciliator. I don't know how he has maintained himself as leader/caucus chairman of such a diverse caucus as the GOP has fielded since 1981. He had/has little upward mobility which can be a positive asset. If you can't move up politically, because of ability, age, or ambition, you may find you're the one everyone can accept for a caucus position. Were I still a Republican, I could have worked well with George. I liked our relationship.

LOOMIS SHADBOLT (R-14, House, 1941-1953) A trusting soul and a serious legislator. Always willing to take the hard vote if it would help Governor Langlie.

BILL SHANNON (R-43, House, 1947-1950, and Senate, 1950-1963) One of the more alert senators. If he didn't know what was going on, he could have fooled me. A smallish, almost dapper man, he was a credit to the Senate.

TIM SHELDON (D-35, House, 1991-1997, and Senate, 1998-) A good young man who called

on senior senators to get acquainted and seek advice. If he stays, he could, at worst, be a journeyman legislator.

MARION KYLE SHERMAN (D-47, House, 1975-1983) I really liked her style. She always seemed comfortable no matter what were the circumstances. I was truly sorry to see her depart the Legislature.

LINCOLN SHROPSHIRE (R-14, House, 1953-1963) A man with positive views hoping for a better, more inclusive, GOP. He represented the economic needs of Yakima County. He always seemed too liberal to be a Republican. Perhaps that was why I was attracted to him.

HERB SIELER (R-20, Senate, 1939-1940) An unreconstructed Republican. He was a solid anti-New Dealer, as I was in those days. He was a good workman and it really showed to his advantage as assistant secretary and secretary of the Senate (off and on from 1934 to 1942). He was quiet, unassuming and helped me in my quest to be chief clerk of the House in 1947.

JEAN SILVER (R-6, House, 1983-1997) Ever gracious, she has never had a chance to shine for two reasons: she is almost always in the minority, and in the shadow of Helen Sommers, one of the House all-time greats.

GRANT SISSON (R-40, House, 1923-1927, 1941-1945 and 1947-1953) A hard-core, old-guard Republican. Loved the Legislature and its social life. He saw nothing beneficial about Roosevelt's New Deal and I believe he shared the same views and values as the farmers of Skagit County. Even in 1947, when I first met him, he was even more conservative than I was at that time. I liked him for his stubborn streak.

SYLVIA SKRATEK (D-47, Senate, 1991-1995) had potential, but had little political knowhow. In the Senate, you had better be seen more than heard for your first couple of years, unless you really had something important to offer. Aggressiveness is not a virtue for freshmen senators in the eyes of senior members. Sylvia came across as being abrasive and crabby, not endearing traits in a body which prides itself on dignity. Personally, I liked Sylvia, and it always bothers me when I encounter brains without judgment. She just couldn't wait for her turn!

ADAM SMITH (D-33, Senate, 1991-1996) The only man since Phil Talmadge with the potential for greatness. He and his confidant, contemporary, and advisor, Jeff Bjornstad, thoroughly outlined a program to win the Senate seat from veteran Eleanor Lee. During his first campaign in 1990, a few in our caucus thought his plan to win would work, but the big question was would he follow through? He started doorbelling in January, and by November he had covered the district twice! I know what this means. I started doorbelling in 1940 for Arthur Langlie and Wendell Willkie. In my prime, even in my own races, I never reached that level of dedication!

After winning at age twenty-five, eclipsing Phil Talmadge's record of victory at age twenty-six, Adam was in constant touch with the voters in the Thirty-third District, and at the same time began to quietly make a mark in the committees, in the caucus, and occasionally on the floor. At first I thought he was too distant, and although it's true he is no Ronald Reagan or Bill Clinton, he really is a warm person who is his own kind of humorist. I predict a solid and

perhaps exciting and important future. I've always tried to help young hopefuls trying to break into politics. Being rebuffed, talked down to, and laughed at by old timers (hacks), was bruising and disheartening as I struggled for recognition. I just don't want new, young voices stifled. Go, Adam, go!

CURTIS SMITH (R-13, House, 1979-1989) Cantankerous, fiery, he always seemed in a constant turmoil. Or maybe he was just hyper.

VERNON SMITH (R-46, House, 1933-1935 and 1939-1943) An ambitious man whom, I think, was sales manager for Kenworth truck manufacturer. He was shrewd, conservative, and always had Vernon Smith first, last, and always on top of his list of favorite people. I liked him because he was optimistic and just never quit.

There was never a coin too tarnished to not be cherished by Vernon Smith. I liked him when he was in that field in 1946, when I made my first race. He encouraged me to continue in politics.

BILL SMITHERMAN (D-26, House, 1983-1986, and Senate, 1986-1991) had the makings of a very good legislator, and he was blessed with a spouse who probably could have done better than he. Bill was black, which I've thought is a rough handicap, particularly in his district, and he soon was thought of as a hard-drinking, late-hours legislator. He was likable, but not attentive to his constituent's needs, which can soon catch up to an office holder, no matter how talented. Bill was a good caucus vote, but was too busy playing senator. Something had to give, and it was his roots in the district that gave. Bill had lost touch with his voters and perhaps reality. Even so, why he should have lost to Bob Oke is, to me, a mystery

RICHARD SMYTHE (R-49, House, 1967-1973) and I never served together, so I only knew him as a telephone company lobbyist. There was little room for negotiation with Dick. It always seemed to me that it was his way or no way! Socially, he was likable enough, but I wasn't his type, and vice versa.

DUANE SOMMERS (R-6, House, 1987-1991 and 1995-1997) He was likable, trustworthy, and almost shy. He was also ambitious beyond his talent, which is not rare in politics.

HARRIET SPANEL (D-40, House, 1987-1993 and Senate, 1993-) A good politician fitting her district. She rose to a position of respect in the Democratic caucus as majority floor leader. A $600 claiming horse, she felt she was ready for a feature race—Congress! In politics, disgrace is rare, but to be beaten by an overage, $600 claimer, Jack Metcalf, comes close. Harriet is likable and as floor leader, very fair. I liked her, and she did a workwoman-like job.

DAVID SPRAGUE (D-37, House, 1967-1971) is real. Probably too intellectual for a legislative body, but outstanding, and his leaving diminished the stature and IQ of the Legislature. I would have liked serving with him.

ART SPRENKLE (D-39, House, 1987-1993) A good man, perhaps miscast as a legislator. I

liked him and found him easy to work with.

JOHN STENDER (R-30, Senate, 1963-1973) was strong, rarely if ever in doubt, and controversial. I knew him only from observation. He served during Governor Evan's years, and as I recall, they often collided.

SID STEVENS (R-45, House, 1947-1949) was pleasant, if rather rigid, and narrow in his oversimplified views of life and the world. As a member of the infamous Communist hunters known as the Canwell Un-American Activities Committee, he was second only to Chairman Canwell in his dedication!

CHARLES STINSON (R-16, House 1927-1929, and Senate, 1929-1945) First elected near the end of the Republican era, 1889-1933. He was agreeable, kept the fences mended in his district, was a man of the people, and kept his peace about all the strange new programs of the New Deal. Did nothing outstanding, but amazed one and all by his survivor-ability. All through the toughest of Republican times he kept getting reelected.

CHARLES STOKES (R-37, House, 1951-1955 and 1957-1959) Charlie was a rarity—a black Republican, a good speaker, fun to be with. He was a speaker at the 1952 Republican convention. His campaign slogan was always the same, "Stokey is Okey." A good man in a tough district for a Republican.

LOIS STRATTON (D-3, House, 1980-1985, and Senate, 1985-1997) The successor to Margaret Hurley in the House and the Senate. A solid and somewhat stubborn Democrat, she was a dependable caucus vote.

JOHN STROM (R-44, House, 1947-1949 and 1951-1959) A very decent man who, although conservative, could see the need for better funding for schools. I liked him for his hard work, both in and out of the Legislature.

GENE STRUTHERS (R-16, House, 1977-1985) was a first-rate legislator. Always willing to listen and compromise if he felt it was for the overall good. Highly underrated, he tried to keep a waning spirit of goodwill alive between both parties. I suspect, had he so chosen, he could have been reelected forever. A thoroughly decent man.

DEAN SUTHERLAND (D-17, House, 1983-1988, and Senate, 1988-1996) Born to the business of politics, he could have gone farther, but, all credit to Dean, he put his personal (the good) life first, which is hard to do once the politician virus enters your soul. With most politicians, it is a fact that if the voters don't catch up with you, the Grim Reaper will. Politics is a disease for which there is no inoculation. Dean served on the Labor and Commerce Committee with me. Although he did not always support me as chairman, he was careful to not make me look bad. In fact, he helped, and then saw to it that I got the credit. A rare and wonderful technique!

PAT SUTHERLAND (D-37, House, 1949-1951, and Senate, 1951-1959) Successor to Al Westberg, he was at his best campaigning door to door. He listened well, agreed with everyone,

and was never defeated. Jokingly, Pat never had an honest job—legislator, member of the Public Service Commission, prosecuting attorney. Pat was just as popular when he retired as ever. He was a great politician and a good public office holder. After I switched parties, Pat just acted as if I'd always been a Democrat and had just been out of town for awhile.

THOMAS SWAYZE, JR. (R-26, House, 1965-1975) succeeded his mother, who resigned to accept a cabinet position with incoming Governor Evans. The Swayze name was synonymous with Republicans in Pierce County. Tom Jr., whom I knew very casually, was Speaker during the middle of Governor Evans' three terms. Since the Democrats gained control during his Speakership, his potential as Speaker was cut short. I felt he could have been among our better Speakers.

JACK SYLVESTER (D-37, House, 1937-1941) Perhaps our youngest Speaker. He soon figured there was more money in the practice of law than in making the law. I knew him better when he came to Olympia to lobby. Likable, though we differed on issues, he more conservative, and I more liberal.

JOE TANNER (D-18, House, 1983-1986, and Senate, 1986-87) could make a strong argument for anything with little or no evidence. Of all the people with whom I served, Joe was the biggest disappointment. He had political talent in excess, but had little judgment. When challenged by Linda Smith for the Senate seat to which he had been appointed a year earlier, he did not take her seriously, was overdressed for the religious redneck district, and did not work for the voters. I can sympathize because no Republican had held this seat since 1957 when unbeatable Don Talley took over. Joe was young, and so believed in his invincibility. He took his election as a fait accompli. I, at age seventy-five, doorbelled his district more than the candidate did, and after a few precincts, it was clear he was in trouble. Without demeaning Linda, he should never have lost. Joe had the education, personality, and legislative skills to have been a real legislative force.

REN TAYLOR (R-4, House, 1979-1989) had the tenacity of a bulldog—he was a hard-core conservative. He was a nice guy, particularly when in the minority.

JEANETTE TESTU (D-34, House, 1943-1945 and 1949-1963) A liberal and a thorough Democrat, she was one of three women to monopolize Speaker Pro Tempore for ten years. Julia Butler Hansen (1955-1961) and Ella Wintler (1963-1965) were the other two. Jeanette was a voice for the people who had no lobbyists.

DELORES TEUTSCH (R-45, House, 1979-1983) personified energy and perfection. She was the ultimate League of Women Voters type, filled with knowledge, facts, and the ability to articulate. Somehow we seemed to be on different frequencies. She was Republican by party, but it seemed to me there was an element of denial—maybe too much GGS (Good Government Syndrome).

ALAN THOMPSON (D-18, House, 1971-1982, and Senate, 1982-1986) As a legislator, he had several sides. He had a perpetual boyishness, which tied in with his considerable athletic ability. His instincts were dominated by survival and advancement. I liked him and he was an

asset to our caucus and the Senate. Since I was not one of the noisier members of our caucus, Alan noted this. He also noted if I felt the caucus was wasting time (theirs and mine), I would explode with a few short, pithy remarks. One day he passed a note to me that said, "You are ominously quiet." I gave this scrap of paper back, and every so often he would pass this well-worn note to me. I began to think I was Pavlov's dog, because I felt obligated to go into my tirade when I saw this note! I wish him well.

ALBERT THOMPSON, JR. (R-48, Senate, 1959-1967) Regarded well enough by Governor Evans to be appointed to the Liquor Control Board. As a senator, he was always in the minority. That is an aggravating but good position, because you cannot be blamed for anything—it was always the Democrat's fault! And, Senator Thompson was an artful dodger!

LEO THORSNESS (R-11, Senate, 1985-1993) A man who dared to be great only to find he was a $600 claiming horse competing in the Derby. Sincere, but too narrow and hard-nosed to fit coastal society. Only two Republicans had been elected to the Legislature since 1946 in Leo's district: Fred Mast and Mike Patrick. Leo Thorsness made it three in forty-two years—quite an accomplishment. Leo was just an orchard-run Republican with a POW badge of honor.

EARL TILLY (R-12, House, 1973-1987) in my opinion, was underrated as a player in the Olympia scene. Always polite and agreeable, he knew what was possible, particularly as a minority member. Ten of his fourteen years were spent as a minority member. I have a unique view, being sixty-six when first elected, of the other and younger legislators with whom I served. Some took one look at me (already a four-time loser), and figured the voters or the Grim Reaper would get me soon. Others thought, "Maybe this old man might just be a fact of life for awhile." Earl Tilly treated me with respect, which I noted with appreciation.

ROBERT TIMM (R-8, House, 1951-1959) A good legislator, well regarded by both sides as well as Governors Langlie and Rosellini.

CLYDE TISDALE (D-19, House 1937-1945, and Senate, 1945-1953) If central casting was looking for the perfect person to represent Pacific and Grays Harbor counties, Tizzy would have been the man. Earthy, quick, funny, and could see the bottom line before it appeared in print. In the 1947 session, I talked with him a few times and always came away with a new thought. He treated me better than some GOP senators of equal seniority. He was a populist and understood loyalty and obligation. One of my all-time favorites. The Senate was a richer body when he was there.

CHARLES TODD (D-44, Senate, 1933-1939, and House, 1941-1943) Well educated, worth listening to, he was the son of Elmer Todd, publisher of *The Seattle Times*. A very good man and a thorough thinker. He was probably too good for his caucus, although there may have been a side to Charlie that enjoyed the robustness of those caucuses. His departure was a loss to both the Senate and the House.

JOHN TODD (D-31, Senate, 1943-1957) A solid supporter of Democrats and followed the Al Rosellini program in the Senate.

MIKE TODD (D-31, House, 1983-1991) Intellectually smart, but he seemed to me unable to gauge the dangers inherent in campaigning. A good man, and I would have liked to see him continue as a solid caucus member in the House.

STEVE TUPPER (R-44, House, 1979-1982) The best of the new breed of Eikenberry-Taller-Reagan Republicans. He had both class and style, the hallmark of a first-rate politician. When my Thirty-sixth District needed to be expanded to include a population of 100,000, the commission could have moved the boundaries south and southeast which was heavily Democrat, or they could have combined the Thirty-sixth with the southern end of the Thirty-second—lower Ballard—which was also Democratic. Well, the Republicans on the commission, wanting to make my life miserable, inserted a weird-looking dogleg—western Ballard from the locks along Puget Sound out to 115th—which included the high-rent (Republican) part of Ballard. 1982 was my first reelection bid, and having won, 51 to 49, in 1978, I now had a Republican strip in Ballard with which to contend. And it was clear the GOP had Steve Tupper ready to take me on. Probably my biggest political break came, when in the spring of 1992, Steve became part of the Reagan administration. What a break! Steve had it all and I would have been in trouble. Whew! I shall remember Steve Tupper with fondness.

TED TURNER (R-46, House, 1939-1944) was so impossible you had to like him. If Ted had been in charge of the world, nothing would ever have changed and very little would have happened. With Ted, any change had to be perfect—that's why he was known as "Technical Ted." I worked hard on his first election in 1938, not a stellar year for the GOP. I knew him from way back.

Nobody enjoyed appearing before any legislative committee on which he sat. He would argue with every witness over the minutest details. Think how lucky they were he was never chairman, because the Democrats had solid control. Much later I was appalled when, as a King County Superior Court judge, he was chosen to sit as judge in the famous Goldmark trial in Okanogan. I testified in that trial, and I found Judge Turner far from neutral. I was sorry to change my opinion of him after twenty-five years of admiration. His prejudices got in the way of fairness. Oh well, nobody is perfect.

ROBERT TWIGG (R-7, Senate, 1967-1975) A fun-loving senator who represented his district well. He was a serious legislator who did not take himself seriously.

WES UHLMAN (D-32, House, 1959-1967, and Senate, 1967-1969) A strong, young, liberal voice, he served under Governors Rosellini and Evans. A party supporter of the Democrats' programs in the House and Senate, he earned respect and loyalty from other members. Resigned his Senate seat in 1969 to become mayor of Seattle. He promoted cheap senior citizen bus fare, small neighborhood parks, and worked well with the business community, which surprised them because they had opposed him as just another wild Democrat liberal. They never had it so good! I was/am a "gray-top" fan, as he was affectionately known. When Wes moved to Bigelow Boulevard, where we lived, I knew I had made no mistake—Wes has a nose for real estate value! In his career, Wes has shown he's a man for all seasons. I like him.

JOLENE UNSOELD (D-22, House, 1984-1988) caused more problems than she solved. Jolene

was the proud "mother" of the initiative creating the Public Disclosure Commission. I voted against it in 1972 when it passed, and consistently opposed efforts to expand its powers. Jolene cannot be charged with anything but having played into the hands of special interests. Zealousness is its own reward. I think Jolene forgot who sent her to Congress. Since Don Bonker left as the congressman from southwest Washington, the quality of representation has gone into a sharp decline. Retirement suits Jolene well!

GEORGETTE VALLE (D-31, House, 1965-1967, 1973-1983, and 1985-1987) A traditionally liberal Democrat who was always there on social and women's issues. A dedicated campaigner, she always appeared vulnerable, but she kept on being reelected. Likable, she could be a little intense at times.

DICK VAN DYKE (R-39, House, 1985-1987) Why the House seated him is beyond belief. He was a latter-day throwback to the Richard Nixon-Ken Eikenberry school of campaigning: the truth is irrelevant, all that counts is perception. Anyway, the good news was that he was a one-termer.

RAY VAN HOLLEBEKE (D-1, Senate, 1973-1981) A kind man, a devout Catholic whose ambition was to be an attorney. Good in business.

MAX VEKICH (D-35, House, 1983-1991) Among the best educated in the House, Max lacked the real desire to win. His loss was important to the Democratic caucus. After all, how many longshoremen hold Masters degrees? And, with a spouse like Ivy, how could he lose? But Max managed to lose. Max was non-confrontive and easy to work with.

JERRY VROOMAN (D-40, House, 1977-1981) filled a vacuum by being the first Democrat elected to the Legislature in Skagit County since Emma Abbott Ridgway in 1955. Our paths crossed infrequently so I really didn't know him except as a Democratic winner in a Republican district.

ROBERT WALDRON (D-3, House, 1939-1943 and 1951-1953) served Spokane and Governor Martin well. Unspectacular, with a good sense of the possible, he served as Speaker with some very difficult members.

HARRY WALL (R-12, Senate, 1941-1949 and 1953-1957) A solid Republican who loved senatorial life. He was a strong supporter of Governor Langlie, but his expectations for himself were never fulfilled by Langlie. One might say, "Join the group."

F. "PAT" WANAMAKER (R-10, House, 1967-1973, and Senate, 1973-1981) A gentleman, a good old boy, and a thorough Republican. I liked and respected him although we rarely were on the same side.

ARNOLD WANG (R-23, House, 1953-1967) The only Republican to hold a House seat in his Kitsap County district from 1933 to 1967. Arnold took office the year I resigned as GOP chairman in King County. I followed his career and I can see why he had seven terms as a Republican in

a Democrat district. He was just liberal enough and labor-sympathetic to keep his popularity. Two fans of his were Speaker Mort Frayn and Chief Clerk William S. (The Bull) Howard, who gave him high marks.

ART WANG (D-27, House, 1981-1994) Tougher than he appeared. He was always ready to listen and equally ready to counter with what sometimes seemed specious arguments. He is destined to move up. How far depends on desire and luck. At first blush he appears affable, but behind that is a tough-minded player. I feel a kinship with Art in that we both value our time, and particularly as it pertains to our family life.

FRANK WARNKE (D-30, House, 1965-1967, and Senate, 1983-1991) Cleverest of the clever. Endowed with a quick-fire personality. Proud of his Indian and Montana heritage, he was a very dangerous opponent. I always hoped Frank was on my side because he was an opponent I didn't need. Frank was mischievous. Once, just for kicks, he spread the word that a repealer appeared, buried in several bills, one of which would have repealed the hotel and motel tax. Well, this drove staff and members crazy, looking in thousands of bills trying to locate the RCW in question. Frank laughed and laughed because the rumor was just that. Every senate should have Frank Warnke, but only one. It is not possible to dislike Frank. If I asked him to help he was always there. He wanted to be asked because there was implied reciprocity for Frank.

NAT WASHINGTON (D-13, House, 1949-1951, and Senate, 1951-1979) An all-American boy. Not since 1934 had the Republicans held a seat in either house in District 13 until the GOP landslide of 1946, when they managed to win the Senate seat. It was as if the Democrats sent young Sir Gallahad in to make sure it didn't happen again. Nat Washington held the seat for twenty-eight years. As the GOP began to pick up House seats with such heavyweights as Sid Flannagan and Stewart Bledsoe, no one could touch Nat. Nat was studious, attentive to the needs of the district, and endowed with a desire to perfect legislation. I liked him as a citizen and a lawmaker. I'm sure C. Percival Wren (the author of *Beau Geste*) would have knighted Nat with the epithet "Stout Fella."

MAX WEDEKIND (D-34, House, 1945-1953 and 1955-1964) added a real dimension to the House. As the powerhouse in the Inland Boatman's Union, he was earthy with his own kind of reverence for the Legislature. Immensely likable, he could bluster with the best, and, in his own rough way, be a gentleman. He always remembered his roots. Today, this House could use a few Max Wedekinds.

JIM WEST (R-6, House, 1983-1987, and Senate, 1987-) succeeded Sam Guess. Shortly, we wanted Sam back. Jim is smart enough, but his eccentricity will probably limit his ambitious nature.

AL WESTBERG (R-37, Senate, 1947-1951) was an enlightened Republican who was the sponsor and driving force behind the state civil rights law. This was quite an achievement. Only New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Massachusetts preceded Washington. And, to be sponsored by a Republican! Al lived too short a life. He was such a force for decency. Always

friendly, he could see, in spite of his seriousness, how ridiculous were the ludicrous antics of man. We saw things much in the same light.

JONATHAN WHETZEL (R-43, House, 1965-1971, and Senate, 1971-1975) An outstanding example of a really good legislator. He had an unusually strong will, which never overtly manifested itself. His IQ was among the highest, and he was ever gracious. What a combination! The best of his era of Republicans, he was liberal on civil rights, including ERA and related issues, yet a budget conservative. Jonathan was a model to which we should all aspire. Truly a heavy.

OLAF WIGGEN (D-44, House, 1939-1943 and 1945-1947) owned a Ballard mortuary, which gave Olaf the opportunity to know the surviving relatives and friends, as well as the deceased who had probably voted for him. In my doorbelling in Ballard, I never found a single person who did not speak well of Olaf Wiggen.

AL WILLIAMS (D-32, House, 1973-1978, and Senate, 1978-1995) Intellectually, possibly the most underrated member during my four terms. He reasoned well and could defend all his votes. Under-utilized by both the Senate and the executive branches, he continued to work for the general welfare without trying for self-aggrandizement. Always both a gentleman and a gentle man, he was worth watching and working with. We both graduated from William Winlock Miller High School in Olympia many years apart. All of which only shows Olympia High turned out a wide variety of products! Senator Bob Ridder and attorney/lobbyist Vern Lindskog are also “Oly” grads.

BOB WILLIAMS (R-18, House, 1979-89) A political Roman candle, he sparkled as a member. A gadfly by nature, he was in a constant state of exasperation over perceived government inefficiencies. He held that government should be run like a business. I agree, business and government should both be held to the same management and employee standards. But, if business is such a great model, why are they periodically downsizing to create more efficiency? If they are so great, why do they allow themselves to grow fat with excess managers and employees in the first place? Bob seemed unable to see that businesses are as imperfect as is government. We were in the Legislature together, and my impression was he had all the answers. He was sincere, but often he was drawn off by the unimportant, by minutia that, although accurate, drew attention to the unimportant side of an important issue. Every legislature can afford a Bob Williams, but let it rest at one.

JOE WILLIAMS (R-41, House, 1985-1989) and I had little business together, but I liked his style. I always knew where Joe stood.

WALTER B. WILLIAMS (R-43, House, 1961-1963, and Senate, 1963-1971) Son of a mortgage banker turned politician, Walter Williams was cautious, and to me epitomized a Republican. A good legislator and an ally of Governor Evans, he really never had a chance to shine, since he was always in the minority. Walter would never lower his standards to make personal attacks or remarks.

"SIM" WILSON (R-10, House, 1973-1993) A good legislator and a very good minority leader. Coming to the Legislature while it was still a pleasant place with professional respect, he saw the change to ugliness in both bodies starting with the 1981 session. Sim was a politician's politician and had no stomach for meanness. I enjoyed him politically and socially. The House is a lesser place without him.

KARLA WILSON (D-39, House, 1985-1991) A solid legislator who had good, decent instincts. I did not know her well, but was sorry to see her leave.

JESSE WINEBERRY (D-43, House, 1985-1993) acted with abandon! I believe he had potential, but lacked judgment. His overuse of his "free" phone is an example.

He lived in Seattle in a compact district, so why should he have, by far, the largest long distance bill at state expense? It's a funny psychology, but if a legislator has the highest phone bills, highest travel charges, or whatever, he or she is seen as, at best, imprudent. Likewise, if you are too frugal, you're seen as maybe a do-nothing. Better to be anonymously lost in the crowd.

I've likened following Jesse's political maneuvering to following the trail of an elephant with a nosebleed through newly fallen snow. He might be a rascal, rogue, or whatever, but I liked him, regardless.

ELLA WINTLER (R-17, House, 1943-1949 and 1951-1957) A southwest Washington school teacher, she was an early leader working to improve K-12 education. When I became a Democrat in 1964, I wondered why she was always a Republican because we were in agreement on expanding the party base, pushing social issues, concentrating on K-12, and not caring all that much about personal wealth. She was a thoughtful legislator.

DAYTON WITTEN (R-30, Senate, 1947-1955) A quiet man whom I felt moved in mysterious ways. A good politician, he had connections that paid off at election time. He seemed to operate with equal ease whether he was in the majority or minority.

JEANNETTE WOOD (R-21, House, 1988-1994, and Senate, 1995-1999) A hard-core, uncompromising, right-wing Republican. She was just the opposite from her predecessor, Katie Allen, who might well have been a Democrat.

PERRY WOODALL (R-15, House 1939-1943 and 1947-1952, and Senate, 1957-1975) Colorful, intense. Worked hard, played hard. Perry lived a full life. He had a sharp mind with a tongue to match. As a Republican, he sounded somewhat like Everet Dirksen, but with more depth. He believed in Robert Taft, who was really not his kind of guy, but there was some attraction there. A good old boy at heart, he stayed with his party, his friends, his caucus, and his Senate. He was a traditionalist and a realist. I was attracted to him, but I felt he thought I was operating above my ability, and in all honesty, I felt the same.

DIANNE WOODY (D-39, Senate, 1977-1985) Kind to a fault. I remember when I sponsored the dog bite bill in 1979, Dianne, after much debate, inquired of Lieutenant Governor Cherberg, "Who is going to speak for the dogs?" Dianne was a good senator, always warm and fuzzy, and

was always there ready to support our leader.

RALPH "BRIGHAM" YOUNG (D-13, House, 1943-1959) was a barber by profession. His longevity in the House was due to taking care of constituent needs and a dedication to being a politician. He was a journeyman House member. Like Nat Washington and Tub Hansen, the district sent him to the House eight times. The Thirteenth District motto could be: "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."

VICTOR ZEDNICK (R-36, House, 1911-1919, and Senate, 1943-1959) Ultimate good old boy, was well wired into the power structure. His motto might have been "Go with the flow." He always considered me an upstart but was courteous and semi-friendly. He truly represented his allies and friends. Not a great lawmaker, but like many, his survival skills were legendary. No one in the Senate could equal him when he spoke with righteous indignation! His whole being shook, and afterward he was cool as cool can be. He literally died with his boots on while speaking in his district. After speaking he, without warning, dropped dead.

HAROLD ZIMMERMAN (R-17, House, 1967-1981, and Senate, 1981-1988) A decent person who did not like the Hayner yoke of bondage, but, like the rest, his voting record mirrored hers. In a body short of intellectual attainment, he was well read, and had an abiding interest in the world in general. To me, he seemed as out of place as a Republican, as I had been in a prior life.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNORS

EMMETT ANDERSON (R, 1953-1957) Elected while I was Republican county chairman. I can best describe Emmett as benign. He served adequately, but was always operating in the shadow of Governor Langlie, who always seemed to be everywhere all the time. Emmett had an easy tenure because both he and the Senate were Republican during those four years. Emmett looked like a lieutenant governor, whatever that may be!

JOHN A. CHERBERG (D, 1957-1989). He had the best manners I've ever encountered. I've seen him entertain at the same time, an over-the-hill boxer, three retired schoolteachers, a half dozen from a small-town PTA, a daughter of a fellow football player and her husband, and to top off this motley group, three Teamsters in another cluster. Now, John introduced them to one another as a courtesy, but with no thought that they wanted to get acquainted. They all sat in little groups having refreshments of their choice as he kept moving from group to group, spending enough time so they all felt their visit did indeed have meaning. And, best of all, he related by speech and manner to each one genuinely but differently. John showed real affection for everyone except those who had caused him trouble. He was nice to everyone, but he could wait a lifetime to get even with an enemy.

One day during a dull Senate session, I walked up to the rostrum where the Lieutenant Governor was presiding to ask him a question. He looked up into the gallery, stopped floor proceedings to introduce a former member who stood up, leaning on his cane, and waved to the

members. This was after the most flowery, laudatory statements by John about the former member. As members clapped their approval, John whispered in my ear, "The old SOB," all the while clapping along with the rest of us. Now, my point is, Lieutenant Governor Cherberg always did the proper thing, but don't think all of his comments were necessarily heartfelt.

Once John called me, asking if I could come over to his office. When I arrived I realized something important was going to be discussed. He closed the door and asked me to be seated. Then he told about his most recent trip, which took him to Yugoslavia. He became quite animated as he described visiting an aunt well into her 90s who told him, "Johnny, we are not Yugoslavs, we are Turks. Our name is Chebeg." I suspect the name changed to "Cherberg" at Ellis Island. Picture Cherberg in a Fez, and you have the real thing. I had always thought he was probably French, but, no, now I'm dealing with a Turk. Ever after I cherished the idea of Anglo-Saxon Washington with a Turkish lieutenant governor.

W. LON JOHNSON (R) had served as a senator from 1919 to 1923 when he resigned to run successfully for Lieutenant Governor, and was back in the Senate as presiding officer until 1929. A tall man for his time, over 6 feet as I recall. When he and Roland Hartley appeared together, as they often did, he was probably 6 inches taller, but, although Johnson was impressive, Hartley made it clear that he, Roland Hartley, was THE governor. I grew up in Stevens County and Mr. Johnson came to our house occasionally. I was in awe that my parents actually knew such an important person. That would have been 1920-1922. He always treated me as if I was a real person, so, naturally, I thought he was great!

SECRETARIES OF STATE

EARL COE (D, 1949-1957) Definitely a good old boy and a decent man. Perhaps ambitious beyond his talent. As secretary of state, he established a political base from which he hoped to become governor. It was not to be. He was more of a back-room, old-fashioned, cigar-smoking type.

J. GRANT HINKLE (R, 1920-1932) A pleasant man who fulfilled his duties, but somehow did not fit my picture of what a secretary of state should look like. A smallish, baldheaded figure, he looked to me more like a bookkeeper with a green eyeshade. He was devoted to his family, and once invited me to his office just to look around. I was friends with his son, Truman, which probably helped. He was an Olympia fixture until the 1932 Democrat landslide dealt him out.

ERNEST HUTCHINSON (D, 1933-1937) Ernest's story goes that in 1932, he was unemployed with few to no prospects. But Ernest had the good fortune to have a creative son, Brubaker Neville Hutchinson, known all over Seattle as "BN," a PR type. As told to me by Bruce Bartley, Bruce and BN are sitting around one day late in July 1932, talking about the problem facing BN—his father was unemployed and BN could ill-afford to support him. Early in the afternoon they came up with a solution. BN, his father Ernest, and Bruce drove to Olympia and among them they barely had the filing fee for one of the cheaper state offices, secretary of state. Ernest

filed, was nominated, and swept into office in 1932, when it was next to impossible to lose if you were a Democrat. Just to prove his election was no fluke, he was reelected in 1936, after which he died in 1938, gainfully employed!

A. LUDLOW KRAMER (R, 1965-1974) reminded me of a latter-day Don Eastvold, a little too much of a swinger to be acceptable to regular Republican society. I liked "Lud the Dud" as Ed Donahoe (*Washington Teamster* editor) dubbed him. He had progressive ideas, but just did not fit the Republican version of good government.

RALPH MUNRO (R, 1981-) Best known for his bagpipes and kilts. As good a qualification as several whom came before. Every political generation threatens to abolish the office of the secretary of state. With unemployed ex-legislators looking for work, why do away with this office, which I've always regarded as early retirement with a larger than normal retirement check? At least an unemployed legislator could find "employment." After all, it is an honorable station from which to make trade mission trips to your favorite country. Good luck, Ralph, you already hold the longevity record as secretary of state!

BELLE REEVES (D-12, House, 1933-1939 and D, 1938-1940) Very personable and very strong, she aspired to greatness. I used to wonder why someone so vital, popular, and imaginative would quit the House for early retirement as secretary of state. At least her heirs can brag that Belle is, and was, the only woman secretary of state, and the second woman to hold statewide office, the first being Josephine Preston who was Superintendent of Public Instruction from 1913 to 1929.

TREASURERS

OTTO CASE (D, 1933-1937 and 1941-1945) A powerful voice for old age pensions. Otto asked little for himself and there was no meeting too small, or too far, for Otto Case to attend if it had to do with pensions. I never knew him, but I went to meetings in the late 1930s at which he spoke. I, being a young Republican, disagreed with everything he advocated, but I was impressed by his dedication.

CHARLES MAYBURY (R, 1953-1957) It seemed to me Charlie was in politics forever. He was, from 1913, a solid Republican who, as a politician, was very good, serving as chief clerk of the House (1913-1927), director of Licenses under Governor Hartley, and state treasurer. In his time, there were few huge issues, and Republican politics really was intramural skirmishing. Charlie always seemed to be on the winning side. And, of course, as chief clerk he could always claim neutrality. He always had a good reputation for keeping his word. I knew him through my father, and when I was a boy, Charlie and I tried to learn golf together. I'd hit wild shots rather consistently and he always helped me find the ball. Charlie must have been well over retirement when he had his last hurrah, becoming state treasurer while I was still GOP county chairman. Naturally, I worked hard for his nomination and election. He was agreeable, and had a reverence

for government, particularly state government.

BOB O'BRIEN (D, 1965-1985) was a solid, old-school Democrat politician. I liked him, and I never understood why the purist segment of the party was critical. After all, he hired good people, and he escaped scandal-free. A good twenty years, I'd say!

AUDITORS

BOB GRAHAM (D, 1965-1989) operated a very user-friendly, businesslike office. I regarded him so highly that he was to serve as executor of my estate—if any—and to serve without bond! The Grahams had several children. Once, after an election year speech in which he mentioned his fine family, he was approached by an elderly lady inquiring if he was Catholic. "No, just a passionate Presbyterian," he answered, proving auditors have life in perspective.

CLIFF YELLE (D, 1933-1965) After Cliff retired, it occurred to me one day that maybe he ran eight times just to break the record of his predecessor who ran successfully seven times—there's a bit of trivia. He served with Governors Martin, Langlie, Wallgren, Langlie again, Rosellini and Evans. I knew Cliff slightly, and viewed him as a competent public servant with tremendous responsibility and very low pay.

ATTORNEYS GENERAL

DON EASTVOLD (R, 1953-1957) was better suited to a kingship. He was so ambitious he could not wait to mature. He was a goer. I shall always remember his outstanding speech at the 1952 Republican convention. He was born to turn any circumstance to his advantage. After the war, it was not uncommon for state legislatures to vote bonuses to returning service men and women. Eastvold claimed residence, I believe, in Minnesota and Washington, allegedly taking a bonus from each state. This was an issue in his 1952 campaign, which coincided with attacks on Richard Nixon and his famous "Checkers" speech. Well, Don talked his way out of the evidence, and won the Attorney General race. Don had great talent politically, but, later as a real estate promoter, he was in a class with P. T. Barnum.

Two mutual friends, Dr. Glen Deer and Max Mondschein had loaned Don money to help him put together a real estate deal in Mexico, and after hounding Don for repayment with no results, they went South to get repaid. When they returned, I asked them if they accomplished their mission. With modest embarrassment, they said that not only did they fail to collect, but they gave him an additional loan! What talent!

KEN EIKENBERRY (R, 1971-1977) Always leaning to the conservative side, he was really

out of tune with the societal needs of the state and, as time went on, he showed not only a mean streak but also an overwhelming cynicism.

As an example, after his loss to Sommers, he soon surfaced as GOP state chairman, during which time he published a Republican manual, which stated that: "Winning elections was how the public perceived a candidate, not *who* or *what* the candidate really was." That idea made me take another look at Ken, and thereafter his actions fit his cynical view of voter stupidity. After losing the governor's race to Mike Lowry—probably Ken was the only one Mike could beat—Ken returned to a step-up or step-down to the state chairmanship. Democrats hope he will forever be GOP state chairman.

CHRISTINE GREGOIRE (D, 1993-) has not been in office long enough for me to have an opinion as to her ability. She runs a good office, and my guess is she will rank along with predecessors Tanner, Dunbar, Troy, and O'Connell. I was surprised at how stubborn she is, and once she decides on a course, there is no way to continue dialogue.

JOHN J. O'CONNELL (D, 1957-1969) In my opinion, the best attorney general since Smith Troy. Neither one had a mean streak, which, in an AG, is a critical asset. When one had the power vested in the attorney general, it is easy to make a case even when evidence is imperfect, which really can be a tool known as harassment. I, perhaps, have undue admiration for fairness by public officials. Willful harassment is not uncommon in many societies and we are getting there fast. If John could figure out a way to see justice done without costing the alleged offender undue expense and hardship, he would work toward that end. A good attitude in a good man.

SMITH TROY (D, 1940-1953) holds the longevity record as attorney general—twelve years and nine months. A regular guy, small, well groomed, a natural politician, he was a product of Olympia and equally at home in the Elks Club, the Democratic Party and in his role as attorney general/prosecutor. It seemed to me that he, of all attorneys general, best took the job in stride. His tenure overlapped World War II and the postwar years when un-American activities committees were the rage with the Legislature, tinkering with people's lives and raising questions of constitutionality. He was busy, but never overwhelmed. Extremely likable.

SUPERINTENDENTS OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

LLOYD ANDREWS (R-5, Senate, 1953-1957 and NP, 1957-1961) The first of the new "Arrow Collar-ad Republicans" was a good speaker, personable in an impersonal way, and a fairly good listener. I barely knew him, but I liked him right off. I think he was not well suited to the SPI job, perhaps too often eyeing the 1960 governor's race as his goal.

JUDITH BILLINGS (NP, 1985-1997) had my support in her first election in 1984. I believe Senator "Tub" Hansen was the only other senator to support her from April to the November election. I regret this as much as any political support I ever gave. I soon grew disenchanted.

Her performance was not what was promised. After her election, she fulfilled the constitutional requirement that there be a Superintendent of Public Instruction. My question, "What happened between 1985 and 1996 to the promise of upgrading and streamlining the department?" Like Governor Gardner, she treated both friend and foe alike and not appropriately.

BUSTER BROUILLET (D-25, House, 1957-1972 and NP, 1973-1985) I have a tendency to look with favor on statewide elected officials who have had legislative experience. They bring to their higher office a certain subtle sympathy with the legislator's problems, and, even more importantly, the veteran legislators feel rapport with an ex-member. I felt Buster was able to use his former legislative membership to his and our advantage. There was no austerity about him, and he was always welcome in most, if not all, legislators' offices.

He mostly was able to make a reasonable case for more K-12 funding. Teachers' salaries did not keep pace with inflation or other jobs requiring considerable and continuing education. Buster made a case for protecting public education from the public funding of private schools. Over all, certainly a cut above a journeyman SPI.

LOUIS BRUNO (NP, 1961-1973) I met Mr. Bruno a few times, but never knew anything about his administration. Must have been okay, since he was there twelve years, and was never indicted.

JOSEPHINE PRESTON (R, 1913-1929) took her job seriously, and as the first woman statewide elected official, she worked hard for very little money. No one has ever held the position longer—sixteen years. She was SPI when I was in grade school at Valley, Washington 1918 to 1924. Although travel conditions were hard, she came to the Colville Valley visiting schools, meeting with teachers and parents. We rarely saw any really important public figures, so people really turned out for her. My father was a school board member, and when I met her I was really impressed. She was always trying to get new schoolbooks. Some of ours were published before 1900, so we were really ignorant of what happened up to, and including, World War I.

N. D. SHOWALTER (R, 1929-1937) A dignified old-school type who had to operate on literally no money because the state was near bankruptcy during most of his tenure.

PEARL WANAMAKER (D, House, 1929-1931 and 1933-1937, and Senate, 1937-1940; NP, 1941-1957) scintillated perpetually. If she had down time, it never showed in her public life. I rate her as one of the three best Superintendents of Public Instruction in my lifetime, the other two being Noah Showalter and Buster Brouillet. Possibly the most vigorous pursuer of K-12 improvement of all our SPIs, her personality was not only full of goodwill, but she had character. Having been a legislator, she understood all a legislator has is ego. Absolutely tireless, filled with a "can do" spirit, she seemed to be everywhere at the same time. She served as SPI during the war years—1941 to 1945—during which time education was in second place to the war effort. But, once the war was over, she came on strong. Mon Wallgren, as governor from 1945 to 1949, helped Pearl, although somewhat passively. When Republican Arthur Langlie served as Governor for his second and third terms, his ideas and Pearl's often did not mesh. She had a hard time because Langlie was one stubborn man, and she often had a Republican House, or

Senate, or both, with which to work. I mostly felt she was right, and she did crowd Langlie to support modest salary increases for teachers, as well as a substantial building program. She worked well with an assortment of groups. We could use her attitude and energy now.

COMMISSIONERS OF PUBLIC LANDS

JENNIFER BELCHER (D-22, House, 1983-1993, and D, 1993-) After her election, the media and Republicans charged incompetence. She has been under attack from within and without. She has done well in being fair to everyone, and if the state auditor finds no serious problems, that is good enough for me. She was a strong legislator who was hard to move from a position, but not unreasonable. Temperamentally suited to politics, I was not surprised when she won election as Commissioner of Public Lands. She was born to win! I've always admired people who can take heat without flinching. Jennifer is such a person. She is crisp, likable, and well suited to public administration.

BRIAN BOYLE (R, 1981-1993) was elected on the tattered, age-old idea: "It's time for a change." He came into office with great promise and he did a workmanlike job. He had two able assistants, but the inherited bureaucracy slowed his good intentions. Progress at the top was adequate, but it was sort of like a racing boat dragging a sea anchor. I liked Brian as a public official, and he should be rated higher than is the perception of the job he did.

BERT COLE (D, 1957-1981) How he managed to hold onto the toughest job in state government for twenty-four years is a minor miracle in itself. He was in office about the time the environment became an issue. In managing the state lands, he, like others before and since, was torn between preserving the natural state of things and schools' need for more money. The state was growing faster than trees were growing, and faster than public land's income. Bert did his best, which was very good, but after twenty-four years his number was up, and out he went. Charge it to the will of the voters urged on by Republicans and the media.

JACK TAYLOR (D, 1941-1945 and 1949-1953) In the 1930s, he ran successfully for King County commissioner as "Progressive Jack Taylor." I never really knew Jack until I became a Democrat in 1964. The ultra-purist Democrats never welcomed me, but Jack Taylor acted as if "better late than never." Having the support of someone with his Democrat credentials must have influenced other Democrats to accept me. I've always appreciated his warmth and goodwill.

As commissioner of public lands, he followed tradition in administering management of our huge public-lands ownership. It is one of those jobs where the better your performance, the greater public expectations are for the future. I believe it is perhaps the hardest job in state government.

INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS

DICK MARQUARDT (R, 1977-1993 and R-45, Senate, 1967-1970) Although I knew a little about all of Dick's predecessors, he is the only one I really knew. He beat Mike Gallagher in a Senate race in 1967, which I was sorry about at the time. But Dick became a steadfast ally, always accepting me for what I was, and not worrying about whether I was a "D" or an "R," and I reciprocated.

He was extremely popular in the Senate, and as insurance commissioner, in 1977-1993, probably the most evenhanded we've ever had. Inevitably, he became my standard of what to expect from the insurance commissioner's office.

No more charming person has ever held statewide office than Dick Marquardt. He was ever thoughtful of anyone with whom he had contact. Every official has his/her style of management. Dick Marquardt had competent, if not always exciting or articulate, people. They did good staff work, as well as establishing good relations with both Republican and Democrat office holders. Dick did not nitpick at them—he let them do their jobs. Critics felt he should be more involved in the nitty-gritty. Friends felt he wanted to free himself to look forward to the future. Among his innovations, he made the office into a clearinghouse for citizen/consumer ideas and problems. He established an office to act as a senior citizen liaison. Having served as a legislator, he understood their low pay and huge egos better than anyone I know. Dick Marquardt was also famous for his golf tournament, the annual "Fly Open," an all-male affair. Women grumbled and had their own tournament, "The Double Cup." I enjoyed the Marquardt era a lot!

DEBORAH SENN (D, 1993-) sought the insurance commissioner job with vigor and a "born to win" drive. I did not support her for two reasons: (1) Dick Marquardt had a good staff with whom I, as a legislator, was able to work, and (2) I have never left an ally or friend in need. To Deborah's everlasting credit, during and after her election, she treated me warmly and thoughtfully. She has done a great public service, always mindful of the need for reasonable insurance rates by all insurers under her jurisdiction. She came to the office with little experience, but she has shown she is a fast learner. And she has all the earmarks of a populist.

Appendix B

Ray Moore's Reflections on Government

RAY'S OBSERVATIONS

Washington's First Years

I think it interesting that as late as May 14, 1889 (the date on which seventy-five state Constitutional Convention delegates were elected), of the seventy-five delegates, only one was a native Washingtonian. The other seventy-four were transplants from twenty-four different states. At least eighty percent of the men were from jurisdictions east of the Rocky Mountains. There were ten from Missouri, eight from Ohio, seven from New York, seven from Illinois, six from Maine, four from Kentucky, and four from Pennsylvania. Their occupations were twenty-two lawyers, fifteen farmers, six physicians, five merchants, five bankers, four stockmen, three teachers, four millmen and loggers, one preacher, one surveyor, one fisherman, and one engineer. Their average age was forty-five.

With such diverse geography and occupations, they produced a product that has stood us in good stead. Of the eighty-six amendments, few are of a revolutionary nature, most are clarifying, restricting or expanding what exists in the original 1889 document. I am sure these Constitutional Convention delegates had the normal human frailties, but they knew they were making the rules under which they wanted to live. Their ability to compromise is shown in the preamble to our constitution: "We, the people of the State of Washington, grateful to the *Supreme Ruler* of the universe for our Liberties, do ordain this Constitution." So easily they could have used "God" but they carefully chose a phrase that created a big umbrella under which they could all comfortably fit.

Some will say, "What a shame there were no women." But women did not participate in men's work, and men did not participate in women's work. The mores of the time included hard work, entrepreneurship, and a literal interpretation of the Old and New Testaments. Men were expected to provide for their families. An average housewife was swamped from her wedding day until death. Five to ten children, fixing three meals a day, every day, working a vegetable garden, canning, head-to-toe upkeep of clothes for the family, feeding chickens, plucking and cleaning the same, to name no more than ten percent of her work. I actually knew a forty-five-year-old woman who had been pregnant nineteen times, which means she spent fourteen years enjoying the long wait! Thirty percent of her life was spent this way. Men worked hard, too, but frankly my sympathies lie with the women of that era and their role in the Northwest.

The Parliamentary System

With full recognition of my mental and physical limitations, I can, in all truth, say I have only one political regret—not to have lived under a parliamentary form of government. To me, a parliament has several advantages:

1. The party platform has meaning and is adhered to by party members;
2. The head of government is chosen by a majority of parliament;
3. The citizenry knows for what it is voting;
4. All candidates stand for election at the

same time.

The party platform is a specific statement of objectives, and after the parliament is convened, and a head of government (president, premier, or prime minister) is selected, the voters know the goals espoused. During the election of members, rules will be quite strictly followed. Under a parliamentary system, lobbyist influence is minimal because the strength and discipline of the party dilutes their influence. The head of government, being chosen by the members, puts the responsibility squarely on the members. They have chosen one of their own persuasion. This process eliminates any possibility of a split government. In the United States, anybody can declare candidacy as affiliated with a party (no further proof is necessary), run, and be elected—and then the voters find out it was a matter of convenience, with the candidate having no more in common with the party than a buffalo. Elected legislators increasingly change parties shortly after election.

In a parliamentary system, all members are elected. There are no holdovers. This means the will of the voters is given full weight, by electing everyone simultaneously. As soon as the election is over, a leader is chosen to head the government and assumes his or her position immediately. There is no waiting period as we have (November to January). The major advantage of the ruling party is their ability to call for an election anytime, providing it is within a specified maximum time (in England it is five years). Advantage lies in that the majority party can call for an election when they feel they are most likely to win. Rarely does a campaign last more than two months, and usually lasts only one month. I like it because the will of the voters is immediately gratified.

I believe those who wrote the United States Constitution did not, and could not, foresee the sorry state of direction our elected officials have taken. In establishing the three branches of government, the Founding Fathers had to have believed this system would work, otherwise they would have made it easier to amend! But, with a President of one persuasion and a legislative group of another, how can the result be anything but what we now face. Too heavy an emphasis is given to how can both sides better embarrass the other. Doing the peoples' work is largely forgotten, as both sides try to destroy each other. The result, inevitably, will be a third party, which will act as a conscience for both parties. England's Liberal Party has served the people well by keeping both parties (the Labour and Conservative) focused on the needs of society.

Legislative Philosophy

You are elected by your voters. Use your position to do what you and your constituents believe is best both in the short and long term. But there is more that you can do that is not in your job description. The prestige of your position is not to be taken lightly by you or those whom you represent. Help your district by quietly using your position to get people who want change and improvements to work toward positive goals. It may involve other branches of government, businesses that want a new project to be finalized, or whatever. Do not take over the effort, give others the credit. After all, the benefits to you become evident and more solid as time goes by. You cannot be totally successful in all you try to do, but you will become known as a "helping hand."

One day, soon after I was elected, Dick Rhodes of Queen Anne Thriftway store called asking if I could come by his store. There I met Pastor Dick Denham and we soon agreed to create a new entity to be known as Queen Anne Helpline. We wanted to help needy people who could not qualify for shrinking city, county, federal, and state social programs. We created a local board with local

funding (no taxpayer dollars) and one underpaid and dedicated person to coordinate our efforts. Fifteen years later, Queen Anne Helpline is respected by the community and is stronger than ever.

In February of 1979, a new study appeared suggesting 22,000 people in Seattle were eating fewer than seven meals a week! I took this, if true, to be a serious societal threat. After checking the food banks, we found they had little to no food with which to help. So I called on Bud Coffey of the Boeing Company, "Red" Davis of Safeway grocery, and Pat Fahey of Seafirst Bank for suggestions. They quickly established a goal—to get food to the food banks. After organizing, and with a substantial board of "doers" in these eighteen years, they have distributed food in quantities never imagined possible. They now have their own "modern warehouse" known as the Food Lifeline. Both of these organizations might not have happened so quickly had not legislators acted, and reacted, to a community need. So use your title to help communities be better for your efforts. Again, do not become the dominant factor, but rather just another concerned citizen. And, again, do not hog the limelight—remember if it shines too brightly, your voters may see your feet of clay!

What Would You Have Done?

When Francisco Franco, the Spanish dictator from 1939 to 1975, died, International Telephone and Telegraph faced a very real dilemma. Their communications holdings were vast in Spain and the company had prospered for the thirty-six years of Franco's reign. Prior to his death, there was speculation as to what the successor government would be—left or right, socialist or capitalist? ITT acted within hours of Franco's death. They sent several of their operatives to Madrid to ascertain the mood of the people. These men acted independently. Their mission was to report back within a couple of days as to what direction they thought Spain would take.

One of these agents was in North Africa at the time. He was nearing eighty. He flew to Madrid, took a taxi to the end of a mile long line of mourners, and stood in line listening to what people were saying. As soon as he viewed Franco's body, he took a cab back to the end of the line. For forty straight hours he stood in line several times without a rest. He phoned his supervisor telling him there would be no revolution and that Juan Carlos (the King in exile) would succeed Franco. He had listened to people as he walked along and concluded they actually wanted Juan Carlos, and business as usual. The other operatives predicted a revolution and chaos, which would have been very destructive from ITT's standpoint.

Now, why did they arrive at opposite conclusions? They talked to cab drivers, bartenders, waitresses—who enjoyed being asked, and painted a scary picture for the benefit of the tourists. But the old man, listening, reading the depth of the people's emotions, decided Spain would continue as a stable society.

The old man knew where to go to get the true feelings of Spain. His name was Wellington (Duke) Rupp. He lived in Magnolia. A legend in his time and my true friend for nearly sixty years. He gave me my first job as a meter reader.

• • •

The following true story is poignant, amusing, and more importantly, a real thought-provoker. A youngish couple bought a run-down nursing home in our state, worked hard, and improved the facility to such an extent that they soon had a waiting list. In the course of a state inspection, the inspector was impressed but noticed there were four more

patients than there were beds. The explanation seemed reasonable: four elderly men (ages seventy-five and over) lived in an off-campus house. So off went the conscientious inspector to add the house to his report.

He arrived on an unusual nursing home scene. The four residents were playing cards, their housekeeping was nonexistent, the kitchen was not up to par in cleanliness. The whole house was unkempt. But these four guys were the happiest of the nursing home's entire population. Every morning they drove to the nursing home, worked in the laundry, had lunch, and departed for their house to enjoy their card game, put together a dinner of sorts, and off to bed. The inspector, by all standards, should have cited the owners for many shortcomings. But as he said, "I just could not disrupt such a happy scene, so I gave the facility a good report and went on my way."

Question: Did he do the right thing? We all know from our own experiences that nursing homes, at best, are poor, sterile, and institutional. Had I been the inspector, I would hope I would have the good sense to leave a good thing in place. What would you have done?

RAY'S RULES OF THE GAME

Rules for All Legislators:

1. Be yourself. If you are not, fellow legislators will soon see the real you, and you will have shown you are a fraud—not a good image.

2. You will learn of others' strengths and weaknesses *if* you listen. Meanwhile, you have not exposed your own foibles.

3. The fewer bills you sponsor, the more your peers will notice those you do sponsor.

4. When in doubt, vote no.

5. Never sponsor or vote for legislation that is clearly unenforceable. This is a very safe rule.

6. If you do not have a bandwagon of your own, do not jump on any other bandwagon. You cannot get credit, but you can get blame, particularly in your next election.

7. Your greatest strength will come through being a true conservative or a true liberal; always with good will, never mean-spirited.

8. Cross the aisle when you can, in all honesty. Be a conciliator. Which reminds me of one of Lieutenant Governor Cherberg's sayings, "Be kind unto thine enemies—it drives them nuts."

9. Remember in politics that everyone is a potential ally, and equally, a potential enemy. Today's friend is tomorrow's enemy and vice versa.

10. Treat staff, minor legislators, and your constituents with warmth and respect.

11. When you are part of an organization, always volunteer for the job nobody wants. An example: in the National Guard we went to summer camp for fifteen days. Volunteers were needed for garbage detail. A friend and I stepped forward. The next year, volunteers were needed for the officers' mess. This was a prize detail, waiting tables and eating the same food as the officers—a real step up. Everyone stepped forward. The captain picked my friend and me because we had done a good job on garbage detail. We were so alert and polite we were the officers' choice the next year. This could be called the Sid Snyder recipe for success—from elevator operator to the most respected legislator in my memory. He just kept volunteering.

12. Notice who is friendly with whom. Often this will show you a side view of a person's needs. Those are important because they can help you build alliances, etc.

13. Publicity-seeking legislators are, by definition, shallow—"show horses", not workhorses. Some examples are Joe McCarthy and Al Canwell. Give me a Sam Rayburn, Jack Garner, Hugh Mitchell, or a Helen Sommers.

How to know a Lobbyist:

1. The lobbyist is in the game to get you to do what is good for him. Do not ever forget it.

2. When a lobbyist seriously does pro bono work, give him or her extra points, even if you do not like the issue.

3. When you detect a lobbyist who really feels that you are a lesser person, give him or her a wide berth. They will be against you come the next election.

4. Lobbyists often give to both you and your opponent. Lobbyists also know incumbents usually win. If you and your opponent both receive equal support, you know the lobbyist hopes you lose but is taking out insurance in case you win. If they give a big contribution to your opponent and little or nothing to your campaign, you are now a free agent in the best way.

5. A lobbyist who does not tell you the whole truth and nothing but the truth is a fool. After all, it is you who has the vote, and if the lobbyist blindsides you even *once*, distance yourself fast.

6. The legislator and the lobbyist are both professionals. Keep it that way.

7. Be accessible. Do not cut off a relationship for any but the most offensive reasons. Once you slam the door shut, it is hard to reopen it with dignity. By continuing a relationship, you and the lobbyist both have a better chance of accomplishing your goals. Several times, when by my standards a lobbyist misbehaved, I put him or her in the penalty box (as in hockey) for at least a month or as much as a year. They are not to waste their time on my deaf ear, and I do not have to listen. It worked in the long term with indifferent success, but I always felt better.

8. Why lobbyists? In my memory—going back over seventy years—I remember when there were perhaps five lobbyists. Now there are more than 100 times that many. Lobbying is one of the greatest growth businesses. To me they are both helpful and necessary. Although I met constantly with lobbyists, they had to convince the staff with whom I worked of the legitimacy or necessity of their cause before I came to a decision.

How to know a Staff:

1. Let staffers know what you expect from them and how you want them to relate to members, lobbyists, and the constituents.

2. Try to understand their short-and long-range goals. If they have some issue of real interest, encourage them to pursue it full-bore. Do not become their psychiatrist. Be warm and friendly, but do not get personally involved at any level. Good staffers are not by definition always strong or without problems. When staff comes to work they must put their personal problems on hold until the workday is over. You, as a legislator, cannot afford to try to help—you have problems of your own. And remember, the strong—you or anybody else—cannot pull the weak up, but the weak will pull down the strong by sapping their strength. Most of us want to help, but just say no and get rid of staffers who are not professional.

3. In hiring, beware of those with advanced degrees. Give me someone who has the

fundamentals and a strong and friendly demeanor. The rest will fall into place.

4. In balancing a staff, you need some "long-termers" (for their institutional memory) and some who are destined to move on after giving a good performance. I found men and women to be of equal value. Judgment and objectivity are the key ingredients. You as the legislator can furnish subjectivity and prejudice!

5. Encourage staff to give you a pure bill together with a compromise (fall back) position. Seek their advice and encourage them to have open dialogue with you.

Generalizations:

1. Members are driven by ego.

2. Staff are driven by ambition.

3. Lobbyists are driven by money.

These are the drivers in making law.

INDEX

D

E

F

G

H

I

J

K

L

M

N

O

P

Q

R

S

T

U

V