# Robert C. Bailey

# An Oral History

**Interviewed by Dianne Bridgman**

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

*To my wife*

*Lee*

*and to*

*the legislators and staff*
*with whom I served*

## CONTENTS

# PREFACE

The purpose of the Washington State Oral History Program is to document the formation of public policy in Washington State. This is done by interviewing legislators, state officials, staff, and citizens who have been involved in state politics. Their recollections provide unique perspectives on elusive political activities.

Producing oral history transcripts involves several steps. First, our Legislative Advisory Committee selects an interviewee. Program researchers gather background material from government publications, personal papers, newspaper articles, and consultation with those closely associated with the interviewee. Next, we record a series of interviews lasting twelve to twenty hours. These interviews emphasize the subject's political career. The interviewee is encouraged to talk about early experiences which may have led to public service or helped define political values. Important events, achievements, and disappointments are discussed. Much of our dialogue concerns the functions of formal and informal political processes, and how they mesh.

When the interviews are complete, a verbatim transcript is prepared. The interviewer and interviewee correct grammar and punctuation. Repetitions are removed, but extensive substantive editing is unusual. The interviewee writes the dedication and provides the biography. The Department of Printing prints and binds the transcripts, and they are distributed to libraries and archives statewide. The original tapes, transcripts, and research documents are retained by the State Archives. Interviewees may restrict access to these materials. Senator Bailey has chosen to sequester his records for a minimum of twenty years.

The Oral History Program budget requires strict economy. Thus, the cursory table of contents is the only index. Chapter titles specify dominant themes, but discussion of some topics occurs in several chapters. We hope readers will be aided by Library of Congress subject headings describing the components of each chapter.

Careful readers may find errors. Editing errors are ours. Recollection and interpretation varies as it does in other historical records–official documents, newspapers, letters, and diaries.

It is the hope of Oral History Program staff that this work will help citizens better understand their political legacy.

# PREFACE

Reading and editing the following pages of my oral history interviews was sometimes excessively boring. It seemed to be a venture in extreme egotism. However, I put it into perspective by recalling the fact that I was answering questions posed to me by the interviewer.

Answers given are as I remember. My problem was not memory of the incidents as much as recalling the year. I had gone through so many legislative sessions, served on so many standing and special committees, and participated in so many other activities, that I could not always bring to mind the proper year.

It is interesting when three former legislators get together for lunch and discuss some former activity. You get three versions, all different. They are all honest, but from different points of view. Most of the incidents here represent my memory of events in my eighteen years as Senate majority caucus chairman. That position usually put me in the center of major legislative decisions.

I have tried to eliminate duplications, but since the interviews took place over a long period of time, some were inevitable. I hope I have removed most of them.

My statements are from my scrapbooks and my memory–the latter perhaps faulty, but the former pretty accurate. The pontifications express my own opinion. My wife says I have never hesitated expounding on everything! Why change now?

ROBERT BAILEY

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Washington State Oral History Program owes thanks to many.

Members of our Legislative Advisory Committee have consistently provided encouragement, ideas, and political savvy. They are also invariably friendly and cheerful.

At present the committee includes Senators Eugene Prince, Sid Snyder, Shirley Winsley, and Al Bauer; Representatives Ken Jacobsen, Sandra Romero, Don Carlson, and Kathy Lambert; Secretary of the Senate Marty Brown, and Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives Tim Martin. Ex officio members are Mr. Warren Bishop, Mr. David Nicandri, and former Senators Robert Bailey, George Scott, and Alan Thompson.

We are grateful for the service of prior committee members: Senator Rosa Franklin; former Senators Alan Bluechel, Ray Moore, and Peter von Reichbauer; and Secretary of the Senate Gordon Golob.

We depend on Secretary of State Ralph Munro for his loyal support. We commend Assistant Secretary of State Donald Whiting and Director of Elections Gary McIntosh for their patience and willingness to offer advice.

Our contract transcribers, Russ and Tina DeMaris, were quick, accurate, and willing to work on weekends. Our volunteer researcher, Janet Fisk, knows the scope, quality, and location of available resources. She also understands the subtleties of the legislative process.

Our oral histories are printed by the Department of Printing. State Printer Lee Blankenship, Production Planner Evonne Anderson, Estimator Kelley Kellerman, and Data Processing Manager Michael Cole are experts. They are also kind, understanding, and reliable.

Robert Bailey has our gratitude for his conscientious review of his transcripts, and for writing his candid preface.

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

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My first acknowledgments must be to my wife, Lee, and to my family. They understood the infinite time I had to be away from home. Sometimes the job opened up the opportunity for attending great events and meeting great people. Ofttimes, however, it seemed to involve political meetings and things of that sort which could be boring and tiresome to the family. They were patient and accepting through it all.

My second acknowledgment is to the staff and members who served when I did. The public has reason to be grateful to members and staff for the good they performed then, and perform now. With few exceptions, these people are extraordinarily devoted to their jobs. It is a shame that those few exceptions are highlighted out of proportion.

The Legislature is truly representative of diverse groups, occupations, and the like. This is as it should be. In one of my talks on legislative processes, I mentioned that legislators are no different than other groups. I observed that given a several-day meeting of devout churchmen in a city, you would find that after sessions some would probably seek a drink, some a card game, and some would be chasing after women. I said the rest would have liked to do one of the three but would be afraid of getting caught!

If the public wants saints, hopefully they will never find them in the Legislature. How could saints truly "represent" you and me?

We, the public, owe them our gratitude.

ROBERT BAILEY

## BIOGRAPHY

## ROBERT BAILEY

Robert C. (Bob) Bailey was born on May 31, 1918, in Raymond, Washington, His father, Arthur Bailey, was a Canadian by birth. He later became a US citizen. His mother, Asenath Bailey, was a native Washingtonian from the Elma area of Grays Harbor County.

Bob and his sister, Lorraine, attended Raymond and South Bend schools. Bob graduated from South Bend High School in 1935. During his high-school years–the Depression years–Bob considered himself lucky to get a job as a printing apprentice. After five years he became a full-fledged journeyman printer. He enlisted in the US Navy prior to Pearl Harbor, and served in the United States and aboard ship in the Pacific theater. In April 1946, he received his honorable discharge as a chief yeoman.

After returning from the Navy, Bob ran for and was elected Pacific County Clerk, a job he held for four years. During this time, he and his father acquired ownership of the weekly Raymond newspaper, *The Advertiser*. Instead of running for re-election, Bob decided to run for state representative, which was then only a part-time job.

He served three terms as state representative and in 1956 was elected state senator, serving until March of 1977. In the Senate he was in leadership eighteen years as majority caucus chairman. He was active in local and state Democratic Party affairs as well.

During those years, when legislative sessions were fewer, Bob served in many capacities in the "off- season." After selling the weekly *Advertiser* in 1952, he worked for several years as a linotype operator on the printing staff of *The Daily World* in Aberdeen. He resigned from that post in 1966 to become western administrative assistant to Congresswoman Julia Butler Hansen. He did not collect salary from Mrs. Hansen during legislative sessions.

When Mrs. Hansen retired in 1974, he campaigned unsuccessfully for Congress. His appointment as manager of the Port of Willapa Harbor at Raymond followed. He was on leave from this position to attend the 1977 Legislative Session when Governor Dixy Lee Ray appointed him chairman of the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. He served four years as chairman, and two as commissioner. He retired in January 1983.

Bob Bailey and his wife, Lee, live in Olympia. Their son and daughter-in-law, Mike and Siri Bailey, live at Elma, where they are raising two sons, BJ and Ross.

# INTRODUCTION

## INTERVIEWING BOB BAILEY

Americans seldom use the word "gentleman." Perhaps it implies inherited privilege, or an unseemly formality. Whatever the reason, I was curious when former Senator Robert Bailey's associates described him, again and again, as a gentleman. This was not retirement rhetoric–the newspaper articles I was using to prepare for our 1991 interviews extended back thirty years. My dictionaries helped. One emphasized a gentleman's dedication to proper conduct and etiquette. Another, more to my liking, described a gentleman as a man characterized by ideals of thought and action. Still, the repetition was singular. Why not the usual adjectives used to praise politicians–resolute, capable, respected?

I began to understand at our first meeting. Bob Bailey answered the door promptly, smiled, and shook my hand. A tall man, he has plentiful white wavy hair. He settled me in the cushiest chair. To make my research easier, he lent me scrapbooks from his lifelong collection. He reserved a room in the Senate office building for our interviews. It was his idea to schedule our interviews so I could avoid the hours of vexing traffic during my freeway commute.

During the next months, we recorded twenty-six hours of Bob's recollections. He liked looking at his scrapbooks while I asked my questions. Answering, he watched my expression, and I studied him. Most times, his hand rested across the scrapbooks. When I asked about a serious or sensitive issue, Bob looked across the room, and curved his fingers around the edges of the scrapbook pages. He spoke without hesitation, but with care and precision. Listening, I learned why Bob Bailey is, indeed, a gentleman.

Bob is sympathetic, and believes that those with problems deserve help. He is without prejudice, yet also without illusion. Finally, he is convinced that the well-being of all is a proper concern not only of government, but also of every citizen.

Readers will recognize the origins of Bob's character in his childhood. He grew up in the milltowns on Willapa Bay, where Depression poverty was grim. Bob particularly remembers the kindnesses of his Boy Scout troop during these years. Families with no Christmas presents were given boxes of apples, and children provided with shoes so they could attend school. Later these families "contributed very much" to the town.

Bob learned at home, too. Bob's father explained how in 1912 Greek immigrants had been herded onto boxcars and forced to leave town because they were thought to be disloyal as members of the IWW. Eighty years after it happened, Bob remained indignant.

When Bob entered politics after WWII, constituents and colleagues found him understanding and resolute. In 1947 the Democrats who led the Pacific County party were radicals who supported Henry Wallace. When they planned a takeover using proxy votes, Bob wrote letters informing every member. The response was unanimous. ". . . the first time in history every member was in attendance," according to Bob. The suspect officers resigned and moderates were elected.

Bob didn't change during the twenty-six years he served as state representative and senator. As Senate Democratic caucus chairman, he worked with the Republicans to make the Senate more orderly and efficient. For the first time, Democrats and Republicans ate together. Each party routinely informed the other of their plans, and the Senate did accomplish more.

Bob Bailey saw to it that caucus meetings were a shelter where discussions could be candid, direct, and confidential. He recognized the few situations when the welfare of the entire caucus depended on his personal action. One of the worst was when Senator August "Augie" Mardesich had legal problems. Augie was floor leader and one of Bob's close friends. Other Senate Democrats were concerned and harried by the press. Bob went to see Augie, who promised to resign at the appropriate time, in order to preserve Democratic unity. Bob recalls the occasion: "Two guys, Augie and I, sat there with tears in our eyes."

Bob Bailey's values remain familiar public virtues. We do practice them differently. Tolerance is encouraged by diversity workshops. We help one another through bureaucracies–from food banks to Social Security. But it would seem that Bob Bailey's preeminent belief–acting for the good of all–has waned. I receive no ads for expensive seminars promising a new collective ethic. Have we forgotten that a purpose of our Constitution is to "promote the general welfare"? I hope readers of this volume will remember all Bob Bailey's principles. Such is an American gentleman.

DIANNE BRIDGMAN

**1**

---

## CHILDHOOD

**Ms. Bridgman:** Senator Bailey, will you please begin by stating your name, birth date, and where you were born?

**Mr. Bailey:** My name is Robert C. Bailey. I was born May 31, 1918, in Raymond, Washington.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Please explain how the life events of your parents led them to be in Raymond, Washington, at the time of your birth.

**Mr. Bailey:** My father was born in Ontario, Canada. His father had died shortly after his birth, and my grandmother--one of fourteen children--left Canada with my father, living in various cities of the United States, finally settling in San Francisco.

My great-grandmother followed two of her sons to Raymond, Washington, then a thriving mill town, where they worked in shingle mills. Once there, she set up a boarding house for millworkers. When my dad and his mother lost everything they had in the great Frisco quake of 1906, they came north to join her mother and brothers in Raymond.

My maternal grandmother followed two of her sons to Raymond, Washington, and she, too, ended up in Raymond running a boarding house just a few doors from my other grandmother. It was thus that the folks met and were subsequently married on July 6, 1917.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Can you give us the names of your grandmothers and the great-grandmother you mentioned, and explain where they came from?

**Mr. Bailey:** My great-grandmother on my father's side came from Ontario. I knew her very well before she died in 1931, at the then ripe old age of ninety-three. Her name was Caroline Hawk Taylor. Her dad died when she was very young, and she was raised by her grandparents, the Hawk family and the Lount family, later marrying Abraham Taylor.

The Hawks and the Lounts were mostly members of the Quaker sect. They had been in Pennsylvania with William Penn and his followers. Many fought in the American Revolution. Later, seeing another war approaching and with the promise of available land, they migrated to upper Canada (southern Ontario).

Quaker or not, the Lounts became deeply involved in the Canadian rebellion against the king in 1837. Samuel Lount, an uncle of my great-grandmother, was one of two rebel leaders caught and hanged in Toronto. It is said that just a few days after the execution, word came from London granting the home rule requests and ending the rebellion. A statue in Toronto commemorates Samuel Lount and his compatriot.

After my great-grandmother married, it seems the family lived in very poor conditions, as did a great many early settlers. When her husband died, leaving her with a fairly large family still at home, she finally, with the help of her married daughters, gathered enough money to join her shingle weaver sons in the Pacific Northwest.

Born in 1838, my great-grandmother's idol was Queen Victoria. Her house was full of pictures of the queen, the royal family, various flags and other mementos. One thing I remember was that Grandma Taylor always wanted to go back to Canada. She could never afford it, of course, and over the years many of the daughters came to Raymond to visit. Several members of the family moved here.

Due to the commonality of the name Taylor, we have never known too much about my great-grandfather. We do know that his family came from New York after fighting against England in the Revolution.

My maternal grandmother was born in Kansas and came to Washington Territory by wagon train when she was three, in 1879. The train started out with twelve wagons led by my great-grandfather and three of his brothers and their families. My great-grandmother's obituary says: "Twelve teams formed the train when they started in Kansas, but it increased so rapidly that when in Wyoming and Snake River country the train of emigrants extended as far as the eye could reach."

The brothers--the Ray family--took out homesteads or otherwise acquired property near Elma, Washington. They, too, along with their children, gravitated towards the woods and shingle mills, but retained a basic interest in farming.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Can you give me the names of your great-grandmother and your two grandmothers?

**Mr. Bailey:** My paternal great-grandmother was Caroline Hawk Taylor. One of her daughters, my grandmother, was Ida Berta Taylor, later Bailey. She married at least twice after that, once to a man named Pettus, later to one named Foote.

My maternal grandmother was named Avalena (Ava) Ray. In 1894 she was married to my

grandfather, Michael Butler Shambley, who was born in Ireland.

We don't know exactly the year he came over, but he was born in Carrick-on-Shannon in 1860. He always said he was eighteen when he came to America, so it must have been about 1878.

His original name was Shanley, but he said there were so many of them around that he changed his name to Shambley. He worked in good jobs as a millwright at Knappton, Washington, and other positions, finally settling in a general store in Porter, Washington, where he met and married my grandmother. They operated a hotel and stores at Porter and Elma, Washington, for many years.

Porter was a small town near Elma where the Ray family settled and still live. In addition to the store, my grandfather served as postmaster there.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You mentioned the relative poverty of your family. At that point did any of them have a chance for any kind of an education that you know of?

**Mr. Bailey:** First, the relative poverty I spoke of referred to my great-grandmother and their huge family in Ontario. On my mother's side, I have yet to hear of any great riches, but they were not indigent either. Many held considerable property.

As to education offered members of the families of that time, a grade school education seemed a must, high school was a luxury. The girls married young and began raising families, and comparatively few of the young people attended high school. Even in the thirties when I was in high school, there was not the emphasis to go on to college. Nowadays it is imperative. During the Depression you were lucky if you could.

Even with that limitation of the times on education, I am not aware of any of our family on either side being illiterate. I am sure there would be some, but most of them wrote very good letters, many of which I have read.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You have not described very much about your grandfather Bailey.

**Mr. Bailey:** We know very little about John R. Bailey. I got his name from my dad's baptismal records out of a little church in Ontario. Both the church and the town are long gone into history, but the Episcopal bishop of Ontario was able to dig these records out of the diocesan files.

Many years ago when I didn't have too much interest, my grandmother told me that she had been working at the tuberculosis sanitarium at Muskoka Lakes, where she met my grandfather, a patient. Anyway, they were married and he apparently died not too long after the baptism. Our family tried to check the records there but a fire in the late 1890s destroyed all the building and records.

In those days, and until fairly recently, it was usual for a tubercular patient to spend several years in an institution. Modern methods have changed this, and the new Muskoka Lakes San is still in use, but for what treatments I am not aware.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you give your father's full name, birth date and place?

**Mr. Bailey:** My father was Arthur Taylor Bailey. He was born at Gravenhurst, Ontario, May 19, 1896. He went for most of his life thinking it was 1897, but when I obtained the baptismal certificate, he reported to the Social Security people and received a one-year adjustment for being one year older than he thought.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You said your grandmother and father travelled to various locations in the United States?

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes. She worked in numerous things--canneries, hotels, and housework. My father was her only child and she had to support him.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you give us your mother's full name, birth date and birthplace?

**Mr. Bailey:** My mother was Asenath Catherine Shambley, born in Porter, Washington, September 12, 1901, to Michael and Ava Shambley. She is now in a nursing home in Tacoma and was eighty-nine just a few weeks ago. She is in good mental condition but ailing physically. She cannot get around without a wheelchair and is almost totally blind.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Were your parents married in Raymond?

**Mr. Bailey:** No. Both lived in Raymond, but they were married in Chehalis. It was the closest place outside the county as you could not go north from Raymond to Aberdeen at that time as there was no road, and the trains ran regularly between Raymond and Chehalis.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Do you have the death dates for your other grandparents?

**Mr. Bailey:** My grandfather Shambley died in 1943; my grandmother, who had long been divorced from him and was married to a man named Laughead, died in 1963. My other grandmother, Ida Bailey Foote, died in 1933, just two years after her mother, my great-grandmother, who died in 1931.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How much do you know about your Grandfather Shambley's life in Ireland?

**Mr. Bailey:** Actually, we don't know too much. He was born after the big famine, so that was probably not a factor. It was a custom then, though, for families with sons to send at least one to the priesthood and others to the United States to earn money to send back to the old country. All we ever

had on his family came from a cousin in Ireland who would write. Since my grandfather chose not to answer, that fell to my mother, myself, and an uncle.

Most of their letters were begging for gifts such as radios, cars, and things like that. They seemed to think we were very rich, and I suppose by their standards that we were. Their letters were full of clippings about family members making their reunion visits to Ireland from the United States. As their defiance of Britain escalated in the 1930s, they rebelled by reinstituting the Gaelic language--which caused their English to deteriorate considerably, and it became difficult to read a letter.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What role did this Irish background play in your grandfather's life?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, he was totally Irish. He could say anything he wanted to about the Irish or the Catholic Church, and usually did. If one of us would make a comment, though, we would get a stern lecture that "you don't know what you're talking about." And we didn't. I don't think there was any doubt about his being Catholic even though, to our knowledge, he never went to Mass. I think he was firmly a member of the church but with a very independent mind.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Did your grandfather speak Gaelic?

**Mr. Bailey:** Not to my knowledge. He used to refer to this form of rebellion as the acts of "a bunch of damned fools."

**Ms. Bridgman:** Did your grandfather belong to any Irish organizations here?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think so. I think at that time organizations like the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick were mostly in the larger cities. I can't remember him ever regretting coming to this country. I remember when we were small we would sometimes wear something orange on St. Patrick's Day just to aggravate him. We were sure to get a lecture and a little tongue-lashing, which we expected. I suspect now that he knew he was expected to respond.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What national characteristics did he attribute to the Irish, that is, to himself?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know if he would admit to it, but I would say that he (as well as myself) inherited a gift of gab. Grandad could and would speak on anything at any time. He was a terrific reader of Shakespeare, Spinoza, Adam Smith, and other classics--books I have hardly been able to open myself.

He was sort of an amateur philosopher and rarely talked religion. One time he told me that if Christ was not the Son of Man or the Son of God, he was at the least the greatest philosopher that ever lived. When you think about it, it is certainly the truth. Another time, an early Elma newspaper stated that "we had a visit from that Irish philosopher, Mr. Shambley, last week."

He never talked his religion, but some Sunday mornings when he would take a walk, we always suspected he might have gone to church. He never told us and we never asked.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Then there was not a large group of Irishmen for him to associate with?

**Mr. Bailey:** No. But my grandfather never isolated himself. He was in a rural area where my grandmother's family probably made up 350 out of the 400 people. He would circulate about a lot and often take the train to Elma, several miles away, stay overnight, and return the next day.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did he get along with the other immigrant groups?

**Mr. Bailey:** As far as I know he had no problems. He was very broad-minded. He lived in a rural area where immigrant problems would not be the same as that in a big city. As I said, much of the area was composed of my grandmother's family and others that had been longtime Americans, coming from North Carolina, Virginia, Ohio, Iowa, Kansas, and on out West. It was not really a big issue in that little town insofar as I know.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Was your grandfather a naturalized citizen?

**Mr. Bailey:** That is a funny story. He never took out his papers, but had served under two different presidents as postmaster at Porter. When he left the post office the first time, in 1892, he overpaid the department and they gave him a money order for three cents, which I still have.

When Jim Farley, postmaster general under FDR, visited Centralia, Washington, my grandfather just had to go. Farley was his idea of a successful Irishman. He asked Farley to sign the old three-cent money order, but rather than hold up the line, Farley asked that he allow him to take it back to Washington with him, which he did. My grandfather sweat for a few weeks, but always kept the faith, and one day it arrived in the mail, signed by Farley, along with a letter from Farley, both signed in the green ink for which the postmaster general was famous. It was a high point in my grandfather's life!

Back to citizenship. When he applied for the state old-age pension about 1935 or so, he was turned down because he did not have citizenship papers. A good friend and lawyer, also of Irish descent, told him, "Mr. Shambley, if you were living here at the time Washington became a state, the law declares every such person automatically a citizen."

My grandfather reapplied, and armed with the attorney's letter, the money order, and the letter from Jim Farley, he was accepted, and never questioned again.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Did he vote?

**Mr. Bailey:** I know he did after that, but do not know for sure what he did prior to that time. He was always a person of definite opinions on people and issues, and I just can't imagine him not voting. I don't think he had ever been challenged, and having served on election boards, as postmaster, and other things, the challenge really was a shock.

He had a lot of initiative and went from one business to another, buying, selling, building, rebuilding. He enjoyed the store to talk to people, walked about and socialized, and it was a joke in the family that Grandad would always get into some business where my grandmother could do the work.

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

**Ms. Bridgman:** You said your great-grandmother was a Canadian, always wishing to go back. Why was that?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think it was just part of her memories. Most of her large family had married and spread out all over Canada. Some came to the state of Washington. Things would never be the same as she remembered them.

As she got older she got very demanding. Her youngest son, a bachelor, provided her with house and home and looked after her every need. When she would have a "spell," the whole family would be alerted and soon make their pilgrimage out to Raymond to visit Ma (pronounced as in baa).

**Ms. Bridgman:** Was she a Canadian citizen when she died?

**Mr. Bailey:** I am sure that she was as I do not think she ever took out citizenship papers.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Your grandmother, Ida Taylor Bailey, ended up near her mother, having traveled around the United States with your father. Do you know why she left Canada?

**Mr. Bailey:** I suspect there were more opportunities to earn a living in this country and support my father, her only child. She once told me that my grandfather had been a patient at the tubercular sanitarium. When he died, his folks came from Toronto and tried to get my father away from her. She went to Sault Sainte Marie where she had a sister, and on to the United States.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Was your grandmother an American citizen?

**Mr. Bailey:** I doubt it very much. There really wasn't much incentive in those days. You know it was only in 1922 before women could even vote under our Constitution.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did she feel about her Canadian background?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think that she just remembered it as anyone does their childhood memories. I don't think she ever considered or talked about returning to Canada. The United States was her home, and she was part of it, vote or not.

I think my father was the probably the first member of that family to take out his citizenship papers.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Considering the different jobs and travel your grandmother did to earn the living for herself and your father, how much optimism did she maintain about her chances for success and security here?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I remember her very well. She was always upbeat, joking and full of fun, laughing. I remember many times when she would come to our house and stay for a few weeks between jobs--or husbands--and she was always upbeat.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What specific presidential elections do you remember talking about?

**Mr. Bailey:** The only one I remember was in 1932 when she was very strong for Herbert Hoover. I recall I had differed with her myself as I had become a young fan of FDR. My grandmother died about a month after the inauguration. Of course, that had nothing to do with it, but it was my only memory of her and politics. Actually, politics were not the family's chief interest.

**Ms. Bridgman:** We talked about your grandfather Shambley who was from Ireland, but considered himself American. Would you characterize your grandmother Bailey the same way?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think my grandmother never thought of herself as a foreigner. She was thoroughly American and seldom, if ever, talked of Canada except to reminisce.

**Ms. Bridgman:** When we last talked about your parents it was when they were at Raymond at the time of your birth. Did they continue to live there?

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes. For a few months after I was born we lived in Centralia where my dad was a printer in a newspaper there. They returned to Raymond and were there when my sister was born eighteen months after I was, so it could not have been too long. He worked in shingle mills and from time to time would work in print shops. I suppose it was the wages to be had that determined where. And the shingle mills would open and close with market fluctuations, strikes, and so on.

**Ms. Bridgman:** And this was in the twenties when you were a very young boy?

**Mr. Bailey:** My dad had worked in newspaper offices as a printer as early as 1916, and also, off and on, in printing from 1919 through 1921. About 1924 he finally went into printing at the *South Bend Journal* and stayed at the trade, going to our own paper at Raymond for four years, on to Tacoma about 1954, and retiring there later.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How long did you live in Raymond?

**Mr. Bailey:** With the exception of a brief stay at Centralia, we lived in Raymond until 1926-1927, when we moved to South Bend.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I would like to talk a little bit about your nuclear family--your father and mother and you and your sister Lorraine. What kind of relationship did you have with your mother at this time of your life?

**Mr. Bailey:** Golly, that's a hard thing to say. I don't think it was anything extraordinary. Mom was always boss of the house. That didn't mean that my dad didn't have something to say about it, but he left the details to her and she took care of us kids very well. Of course, I now realize that she was only sixteen or so when she married, so we must have been quite a chore for her, too. My dad never neglected the family, but he didn't bother about daily details. He backed up my mother when she needed a little help.

We were just a common, ordinary, peaceful family. I can't remember any violence of any sort inside our family. If they had any fights--and they surely must have had some--it was outside of our sight or earshot. I will never forget the very few times when I got a good licking from my dad because we did not obey my mother. They were rare occasions and you usually tried to see that they didn't happen again.

My sister, being a girl, was the apple of my Dad's eye. She could tease him out of getting her whipping, but I just never tried. It was easier to get it over with.

As a family we had all of the basic necessities even though money was scarce from time to time. My dad, when in the mills, had periods of unemployment. It seemed that when others were employed, he was not. Later, in the printing office, things were steady and almost everyone else was unemployed.

All in all we had a good family life.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What kinds of things did you do with your dad?

**Mr. Bailey:** Not much, I suppose, but I never considered it neglect. He was always interested in early radio, building his own sets at first. He worked on cars quite a bit, and we had some of the first Model T Fords in town. He was from time to time active in the Eagle and Moose lodges, serving as secretary in both. He was very diligent in this work, and I remember many nights when he worked late in keeping all his books up to date.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Did your parents read to you?

**Mr. Bailey:** They must have done so because I could read at a very early age and so could my sister. That's the only way I ever heard of a child learning to read early--when someone reads to them. My sister and I could read and write fairly well before we went to school, and while I cannot remember the incidents, I am sure that it had to have been with the folks' help.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What do you remember about your mother teaching you the alphabet or other basics?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, she had to, but I can't really recall her doing it. The folks were both very patient with us in these matters. I was ready to go to school long before I went. When I did go I did not stay in the first grade very long since the teacher told my mother I knew everything that had to be known in the first year already. She put me in the second grade.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did your mother run her household?

**Mr. Bailey:** Mom kept things pretty neat and clean. Things were always up to par on the cleanliness side. She was a good cook and could take "nothing" and provide a meal for everyone. I don't know how she did it, but if a dozen people turned up unexpectedly, they would not leave without eating. She could always stretch somewhere. She had a great knack for adjusting to a situation. Her recipes, when asked for, were always "a little bit of this and a little bit of that." It was always good when we ate it. I think she sewed most of the things we wore.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did she get along with other people?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think that most everyone got along with her. She wasn't much of a hand to go out. She was strictly a homebody and went out very seldom. Of course there would be neighborly visits. The folks would go out to dances once in awhile and hire a baby-sitter for us. When he was active in lodge work they also had dances, Christmas parties, clam feeds, and things all of us would attend.

They stayed pretty much at home when he was not working. Later, when legalized, my dad would like to take in the taverns, have a few, and talk with people. My mother did not care but usually didn't want to go herself. We lived near the center of town.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You said the whole family went to clam feeds and things like that. Did you mean your nuclear family?

**Mr. Bailey:** The four of us.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Then how about the large family on your mother's side. How did they get along together?

**Mr. Bailey:** We always got along fine. My two uncles had no children, one of my aunts had six, and one three. On Christmas we almost always got together; sometimes on Thanksgiving. It would usually be at my grandmother's or at our house. The others did not always have houses large enough.

I remember great times just getting together. I don't remember specifically the things we did, but it was always lots of fun, and we looked forward to the next time around.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What was your mother's role in that family?

**Mr. Bailey:** If it was at our house, Mom would be in charge to get the meals. I suppose the other women helped her. If it was at my grandmother's, she would do it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How often did your mother or her sisters or nieces or nephews talk to her about how they were getting along, ask advice, or things like that?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know. If it was done it was very personal and they didn't do it in front of us.

While we would get together at Christmas almost every year, my grandmother would come to visit other times during the year for a few days. I am sure she did so with her other children, too. Also during the summer we would visit at her house and the various aunts, cousins, and others would spend a few days of vacation with us. The family always had good communication between them, but, except for the holidays, we did not hold big reunions or picnics as many do now.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Do you think your mother--only nineteen or twenty at the time--would ask your grandmother's advice when she visited?

**Mr. Bailey:** I would imagine that my grandmother helped her in every way possible without interfering. That was her nature. She probably helped with all of her recipes. I think my grandmother would have helped without being asked. The communication between them was always great.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Can you explain the way that your mother thought a big family ought to get along?

**Mr. Bailey:** No. It just seems like it was something that came natural to her. Without set rules or regulations, she took care of things as they came along.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Do you remember disagreements among your aunts and uncles, or your grandmother and your cousins?

**Mr. Bailey:** Not really. I can't remember one thing of any consequence that would be worth remembering. It just seemed like they lived far enough away that each ran their own affairs, and just near enough that they were kept informed, too.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did your father fit into all of this?

**Mr. Bailey:** He came from a family that wasn't very big--usually just himself and his mother. He kept a little diary which I found and read after he died. He seemed to get a kick out of my mother having the whole family to dinner on a holiday. I think he liked it, probably because he never had any of that type of get-together himself.

Later, he did not care to go out much but really liked it when the family affairs were held at his house.

**Ms. Bridgman:** At Christmas times and Thanksgivings, do you remember him sitting with your uncles, or whomever?

**Mr. Bailey:** Certainly. The men were always talking together. My grandmother's husband of several years was also a part of it, like any member of the family. The men all seemed to have a good time and the women gathered in the kitchen. I don't recall arguments or disagreements at those times.

**Ms. Bridgman:** As a son, did you sit with the men and listen?

**Mr. Bailey:** Not that I recall. We always had all of our cousins with us, several of them about my age, so we always had plenty to do having a good time.

**Ms. Bridgman:** After reading your father's diary would you say how much his ideas about the way families are and ought to be and the way yours became were derived from your mother's larger family and his participation in it?

**Mr. Bailey:** The diary was mostly a matter of dollars and cents--how much he made, saved, and things like that. It was interesting to read to find out the wages at that time, where he had worked, and other things.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The diary was written before he came to Raymond?

**Mr. Bailey:** Mostly after he came to Raymond and at times when they lived in Olympia. He kept at it for a time after he was married, but discontinued it when he went to work for the *South Bend Journal*.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What kind of Christmases did you have? Were they centered around meals, exchanging gifts, or what?

**Mr. Bailey:** I know we always had a big Christmas meal, but I really recall the Christmas trees on Christmas Eve at my grandmother's house. We would light up all the candles on the tree on Christmas Eve. The holders were clamped to the limbs of the

tree and you didn't dare leave them very long for fear of fire. You didn't usually light them except on Christmas Eve. I wish I had a few of those holders now. They are valuable antiques.

With only a few exceptions we had our tree on Christmas Eve. If one was available, Santa Claus would be present, otherwise we would do without him.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What kind of gifts were given you and Lorraine?

**Mr. Bailey:** I can just think they were mostly toys. She got her share of dolls and I usually got games, cars, or whatever boys played with then. They were inexpensive, but we were always happy with what we got. Every child received gifts as well as bags of candy. We were all happy.

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

**Ms. Bridgman:** We were talking about your extended family--your cousins, uncles and aunts. Who among those adults and children was particularly influential or close to you?

**Mr. Bailey:** That's a hard question to answer since we gathered only a few times a year. I do remember, however, my mother's oldest brother, Robert Shambley. I was born when he was in Europe in World War I. He had not been heard of for about eighteen months and was presumed missing in action. I was named after him. He later returned home--just hadn't bothered to write! He went on to Bellingham Normal School and became a teacher, married a teacher from a family very close to that of my mother. They both taught school for many years. He went to night and summer school for many years and graduated from the University of Washington. He served as school principal and assistant superintendent of Centralia schools before retiring.

He was always interested in anything I did at school and would always want to read it or check it over. In many ways he encouraged me in many ways and always pushed me to go on to the University of Washington. While I intended to do so, I never made it.

I also think that my grandfather Shambley was very influential on my thinking. He used to talk with me for hours and took a lot of interest in things I was doing.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Were any of your cousins particularly important in your early life?

**Mr. Bailey:** Not of our immediate family. I was the oldest and probably never sought their advice!

**Ms. Bridgman:** You mentioned that you thought you had one of the first automobiles in Raymond?

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes. At least for people of our income. I can't remember this, but my dad was one of the first commercial auto drivers in Raymond. He ran a mercantile delivery for local merchants, delivering their orders to the homes about town. I do not know whether they bought the cars, but I do know that they financed him. When this became not too profitable, he got out of the business and went back to the mills, but his interest was always in cars.

After we moved out into the rural suburb of Garden Tracts, he bought a new Model T Ford. As I recall it cost about $600, which of necessity would have to be over a period of time. Probably many other people had them, but not many of our limited income. It was not long before the Model T Ford found its way into many, many houses in America. We were never without a car after that. At that time we could least afford it, but we had to have it!

**Ms. Bridgman:** What kind of difference did it make in your life, other than your father's business?

**Mr. Bailey:** I suppose it added to all of our pleasure. He was no longer in the mercantile business but could use the car going to and from work and for pleasure trips. We would visit my aunt in Chehalis, sixty miles away. It would take about three hours and a half. It takes less than an hour now. The highway was one lane mostly, with turnouts. When you saw a car coming up ahead, you pulled over to a turnout if you reached one first. The other car acted accordingly. You would not see many cars going to and from Chehalis.

**Ms. Bridgman:** This was in the late twenties?

**Mr. Bailey:** Probably the late twenties, perhaps up until 1931.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What other kinds of effects did technological changes have on your parents' lives or your family life?

**Mr. Bailey:** My dad always had a deep interest in radio. I can remember him building his first crystal set. It had a limit of about thirty miles. Later when we got our first radio, which we really couldn't afford either, it took a separate speaker and had three dials, all of which had to be tuned in perfectly in order to have clear reception. In those days before network radio as it is now, it was quite a pastime to list all of the faraway stations we could receive from time to time. It was something to say, "I got Salt Lake City last night. I have Hollywood on now."

Just to advance a few years, when my folks and I were in the Raymond paper, one of the TV advertisers owed us a lot of money. He had invested heavily in a new thing called "cable" and could not pay us. My dad went to see him to collect and came back not with

money but a television set. And my mother was mad, I'll tell you!

We were among the first on the new cable--an experiment--then being installed and many times when all three of us would work late at the paper we would go home to South Bend and find our front room full of adults and young people watching television. If no other way, they would climb through a window.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Other things like phones, plumbing, heat, electricity, any of these make dramatic differences?

**Mr. Bailey:** I am sure they did. They had profound effects on everyone and their standards of living.

I remember the phones and the many party lines. You always had to wind the handle to ring the bell and when I was small I would wait until the folks were not watching and crank the phone up. We had a "central" named Effie Bell who used to respond with "Bobbie Bailey, you hang that phone up right now!" After I was running for county office she used to laugh and remind me of it. Those operators could locate almost anyone at any time. They had an uncanny oversight of the whereabouts of everyone in town.

My dad always had a telephone. In the early days it was a luxury. In later years when he was a member of the South Bend volunteer fire department it was a necessity, as it was by phone that firemen found where a fire was. He always had an interest in new technology, and I think that many times Mom had to cringe a little bit thinking about other things she might do with the money.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How many people lived in Raymond at that time?

**Mr. Bailey:** I would think that there could have been about five thousand. It was quite a busy place, with quite a number of fair-sized mills. Now it is down to one mill and probably near three thousand people. Of course, many now live in the suburbs.

It is difficult to tell. There were a lot of millworkers that came to Raymond and moved into boarding houses. Most of these would be large houses which rented out their bedrooms and furnished meals.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What did people do for fun? You have talked about family holidays.

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know. You must remember there were not as many cars as there are now. They didn't go very fast and weren't all that dependable. There were many lodge and fraternal activities. The folks would go to one of the rural dance halls once in awhile and hire us a baby-sitter. We never felt deprived of having something to do. Every time I see a teenager bemoaning the fact that "there's nothing for us to do in this town," I have to think that they have a lot more than we ever had, but they want a lot more, too.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Were there any theaters or movies?

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes, both in South Bend and Raymond. We seldom, if ever, went to the theater in Raymond in the early days. After moving to South Bend, it was quite common for my mother, sister, and myself to go out picking Evergreen blackberries--they grew all around our house--and cash in a dollar or so and all go to the movies that night. We lived near the theater. My dad worked quite a few nights at the print shop, but he would also go with us on many occasions.

**Ms. Bridgman:** If your family was one of the first with cars and there were few cars, how did people get around?

**Mr. Bailey:** The streetcar ran between South Bend and Raymond on frequent schedule. Later an intercity bus took over. The Milwaukee road ran at least two passenger trains daily from Chehalis to Raymond, and the Northern Pacific ran at least two daily passenger trains from Chehalis as far as South Bend.

Each town was more or less sufficient unto itself, and it was into the thirties before much integration seemed to take place. Now it is a common thing for the people there to go thirty miles north to Aberdeen to shop, or even further.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What do you know about the government in Raymond--I mean the town government?

**Mr. Bailey:** Not too much. My first impressions were of the law enforcement officers and thinking they were someone we should run and hide from. This probably came from the fact that their chief duty in those years was in snooping and arresting people violating the eighteenth amendment. Possession was a crime and even having a bottle of beer was good for jail time and fines.

It was nothing to laugh at, and in my memory they did not always get proper search warrants until later ordered to do so by courts.

My father, while we were in Raymond, got a printing job at the *South Bend Journal*. He was later foreman there for many years. The paper was run by an elderly gentleman, F. A. Hazeltine, and his son, Ezra. To distinguish the two, without being derisive, we always called F. A. "the old man." I think the whole town referred to him like that. He was a very fine person.

A pillar in the Methodist Church, he was a lifelong proponent of Prohibition. And when the law went into effect the "Old Man" was named chief enforcement agent for everything west of the Rocky Mountains. He left the management of the paper to his son and returned only now and then to put his finger back in the newspaper pie--and usually while around would conduct a raid or two in the area.

At one time a scow loaded with full gunnysacks came into the Harbor. South Bend had two or three Coast Guard cutters, we called them "rumrunners," to keep track of bootleg activities, and things like that. Someone notified Hazeltine that the barge contained booze and he boarded it. They discovered a very costly and valuable load of expensive scotch, liqueurs, brandy, and everything, and took the shipment into custody.

It was towed up to Raymond to one of the sloughs near a shingle mill for destruction of its cargo.

Mr. Hazeltine had very poor eyesight and had to wear thick glasses. Even then he would have to hold a paper within inches of his eyes in order to read. He needed help as soon as possible and hired a large number of bystanders--shingle weavers, of all people--to break the bottles up. They were given sledge hammers.

It was not long until they discovered that by one swing of the sledge they could throw the whole sack overboard, and probably break very few bottles.

You cannot imagine the swimming and diving party that went on in Raymond that night. There were stories in Seattle daily newspapers on the following days about Raymond children on the street selling booze.

We were living in the Garden Tracts area at the time and my Dad had just gone to work at the *Journal* for the Hazeltines. When he came home that night and unloaded, his "catch of the day" covered our big round dining room table--scotch, Three-Star Hennessey, Benedictine--things we never heard of before.

My dad had planned to take it, hide it, and take care of it afterward, but one of his cousins appeared on the scene and said, "Art, do you know that Mr. Hazeltine and the feds are moving up the neighborhood, searching houses and arresting people and putting them in jail?"

My dad could ill afford to lose his job, let alone go to jail, so his benefactor-cousin said, "I'll tell you what I'll do. Help me get this out of here. I'll ditch it and when the scare is over I'll bring it back." That was the last we ever saw of the liquor, and we didn't see the cousin for quite a long time. Incidentally, Mr. Hazeltine never showed up either, and my dad always said that his cousin was probably the only dry fisherman in Raymond that night, but with a good "catch."

**Ms. Bridgman:** Raymond was a thriving town at that time in the twenties. What distinctions were there between people of different professions or ancestry?

**Mr. Bailey:** Much of this was before my time, but there had been some very tense feelings between the people and some of the Greek railroad and millworkers in the community. Many Finns were also involved. Some of it came about because some of those groups, certainly not all, were active in the radical IWW union at that time. About 1912 a strike was called and the millowners managed to fire up the citizens to round up the Greek workers, herd them into box cars, later because of railroad objections, into passenger cars, and run them out of Raymond.

The incident was international. The Greek government protested. The Greek consul met the workers at Chehalis and returned with them to Raymond. The train was intercepted, but finally got through to Raymond, where the citizens refused to let them unload, but when they did, herded them up the road into a corral where they spent the night and were sent off again to Chehalis. About 150 Greeks were involved. At the same time fifty Finns were deported by boat to Nahcotta, and thence by train to the Columbia River, en route to Astoria.

The feelings in Raymond were very high against the Greek people and have continued over many years. Many of them became leading citizens of the town and most of them were good citizens, but the hurt and hard feelings lasted many years and even into recent times.

Ilwaco had troubles with the Finnish radicals, for which all Finns paid, and Aberdeen had major troubles in early years with the Finns--not unlike that experienced in Raymond with the Greeks.

There is no doubt that the furor was whipped up by the mill operators. Later, Raymond became a very unionized and union-supporting town. Most people that are aware of the events and others that followed would like to erase and forget them. Unfortunately, it was not easy to do so.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You don't remember a great difference between people who had money and people who did not?

**Mr. Bailey:** Not really. In Raymond at that time, the well-to-do and merchants usually lived in an area like the Island. The workers and their families ordinarily lived in the tide flats and other areas of town. I don't remember any feelings between the areas at all. When we started school we had moved to a rural suburb, the Garden Tracts, and there was

absolutely no distinction. When I joined the Boy Scouts later at South Bend, the Raymond and South Bend Scouts from all sectors went to the same camps, courts of honor, and other events and there was no class distinction. Everyone went to the public schools and the same friendliness and lack of any distinction was the same.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You talked of starting school and refusing to stay until they finally decided to put you in the second grade with your cousin, and that you learned to read before you went to school. What kinds of things were you reading by the time you left Raymond?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't remember that, but I read every kid book available in the school library and at home. I was in the fourth grade when we left Raymond. My mother was ill and required an operation at Centralia, so we went to Chehalis and stayed with an aunt for several weeks and attended school there.

When she finished there, we went on to Malone, Washington, to stay with my grandfolks and go to school. After a few weeks there we went to South Bend.

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

**Ms. Bridgman:** What do you remember when you were still in school in Raymond as to teachings about American history and Washington history?

**Mr. Bailey:** I would not think at that early grade at that time we had anything on Washington history. I suppose we received a very basic education in American history, a little bit at a time. We also opened every day with the flag salute. In my first school weeks, when my teacher was busy saluting the flag--that was when I would slip away and run home.

Really, I don't remember anything other than the basic, patriotic type of history. Some of the patriotic stories about Washington, Lincoln, and things of that sort of a simple nature. These all add together and make us very conscious of our country in an indirect way.

**Ms. Bridgman:** When were you first aware that you were an American?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think I ever thought I was anything else. I suppose it was when you stand and salute a flag every morning, later be told what it stands for, things like that.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Can you describe what you thought your country was, geographically, politically--anything like this while you were in Raymond?

**Mr. Bailey:** I doubt it. I think those things would come on later.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What is the first national holiday that you remember?

**Mr. Bailey:** Probably the Fourth of July. Raymond usually had a big parade sponsored usually by one of the local lodges. South Bend also had celebrations, but we never attended until we moved there.

I remember going to South Bend several times--maybe every other year--to see the big Ringling Brothers Circus. Raymond could not--it was told me later--accommodate the circus because most of its downtown streets were on "stilts," that is, were built over sloughs, which ebbed and flowed with the tide, and were planks sitting on pilings. I was always told that the heavy circus wagons, elephants, and other heavy equipment made too heavy a load on the plank streets and it was feared they would break through.

At any rate, the circus train would unload in the east end of South Bend and there would always be the circus parade--elephants, horses, caged animals, going down the street, ending up at the big top. I don't remember going to the tent show, but we did love the parade.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Can you remember how you thought the Fourth of July was associated with your country?

**Mr. Bailey:** I am sure that we were aware of Independence Day at a very early age. At that time, though, it was a time for firecrackers and fireworks and I don't think I was jumping up and down waving a flag.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How about the political events of those years you were in Raymond? You have mentioned Prohibition, which is a political occurrence of the time. You've mentioned your family's reaction and attitude towards it. What other?

**Mr. Bailey:** I can't recall too much. My first national election of memory was of Herbert Hoover and Al Smith. I remember my dad laughing when I hung up pictures of Hoover and Curtis in my bedroom. I am sure he was for Smith. I remember also that was the "wet and dry" campaign. I am sure my dad was "wet." I also remember the strong Catholic issues raised by Smith's religion, and I remember a few crosses being burned in town on the hillsides. We used to laugh about them, really, because everyone thought they were set by the local town inebriates for the fun of it. They probably voted for Smith, too.

**Ms. Bridgman:** So Prohibition was probably your political initiation?

**Mr. Bailey:** In my memory, yes. We never had any troubles at our house, but it is deep in my memory the stories of neighbor houses being entered and

searched, stool pigeons (neighbors giving authorities tips about their neighbors), and things of that sort. Usually without warrant. Later this was changed and slowed down a bit. The crime was not drinking, it was possession.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I would like to know a little more about your third and fourth grades in Raymond before you moved to South Bend. Did you have favorite teachers?

**Mr. Bailey:** Of course. I think one remembers their first teachers very well. My third and fourth grade teacher was an elderly lady. She kept track of me for many years until her death, and we corresponded frequently. Later, one of her daughters lived near us in South Bend and I would hear from her more frequently. She was a very considerate person who treated each student as an individual and tried to help each one in a personal way.

I was not a great hand to get out and play all the time. I liked to play but also read and do other things. I remember one of her cards on which she had written, "Still water runs deep but almost too still." It was several years before I understood what she meant.

I was still like that until I joined the Boy Scouts and started getting out and around a lot more. In high school they couldn't drag me in front of the student body. I was very shy. Later, when I was running for political office, one of my high school classmates who was helping me told a group: "We couldn't get him to say hardly anything in school. Now we can't shut him up."

**Ms. Bridgman:** Did you have many close friends you remember in Raymond?

**Mr. Bailey:** We did not have many close friends except for our cousins, who lived nearby. I remember most of the students in school with me at that time, and while we were friends, I did not consider them close.

**Ms. Bridgman:** This was your cousin, Merritt Taylor?

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes. Merritt was my second cousin, and after we moved to South Bend he would come over and stay a few days, and I would go to their place at Raymond and do the same. My sister and his sister were about the same age and also were pretty close in the same way.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Who was the leader in this type of visiting? How did you settle misunderstandings?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think either one of us considered ourselves the leader. I don't recall misunderstandings.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You talked about your mother's recovery and that your father was already working in the newspaper at South Bend when you moved there . . .

**Mr. Bailey:** We were at my grandmother's house and my mother was getting anxious to go home. My father was waiting for the upper story of the newspaper building to become vacant, but she didn't want to wait, so he was able to get us a very small apartment in what was known as the Dewey House. I can remember that another occupant was one of the town drunks, and he loved to talk to us. My sister and I would run down the hallway as fast as possible to get by his door.

Eventually, the elder Hazeltines finished their new home and moved out of their quarters above the newspaper office. It was on the second story, facing the river. The back of the building was at ground level, so we had our own lawn, garden, and yard. We never considered it an apartment and lived there until about 1948.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How was South Bend different from Raymond? Population?

**Mr. Bailey:** The population of South Bend was about three thousand at one time, and I suspect that Raymond had about five thousand at tops. South Bend dropped back to about seventeen hundred, and Raymond probably has about twenty-five hundred. Of course many people now live in the suburbs.

South Bend was the oldest town. It was a little more diversified. It had the county courthouse and a pretty good business district, with two weekly newspapers and several fairly large mills. It also had a large number of people, many Norwegians, engaged in gillnet fishing. In the thirties it became the center of the Pacific oyster industry. The port at South Bend was much more accessible than that at Raymond, although during most of the twenties and thirties a large amount of lumber was shipped out by ocean-going freighters from both South Bend and Raymond. Unlike the diversification at South Bend, which helped a lot, Raymond depended almost solely on its mills.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You mentioned the oyster business getting started in the thirties. What other changes in the thirties and the economics were there in South Bend?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, South Bend was a fairly active little town, as was Raymond, until after World War II. All of the mills closed down for a long period of time during the Great Depression. During and after the war they began consolidating, closing and otherwise disappearing to the point that the Weyerhaeuser mill is the only one in Raymond now, and South Bend has a small alder mill.

I suppose it was improvements in transportation, but the two towns started to become pretty integrated. The business area in South Bend shriveled first; that of Raymond also went down. People now even go casually to Aberdeen and further to do much of their shopping. The two newspapers in Raymond and the two in South Bend have now gone down to just one for the entire area.

**Ms. Bridgman:** There were different lodges, theaters, and other organizations then?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh yes. South Bend and Raymond each had their own theaters. Both towns had Masonic lodges (now consolidated). The Kiwanis Club operates in both towns as does the American Legion and a few others. The Elks also drew from both towns but were only in Raymond. Each town has its own Eagles Lodge, and there are many others, but not as numerous as in years past and with the tendency to operate one organization based in both towns.

South Bend, in particular, always had a host of churches. It is said that in the boom town development days the developers found it profitable to give lots to church groups who would build. Prospective buyers thought churches gave stability. Besides the Catholic, Episcopal, Methodist Episcopal, Baptist, Presbyterian, Congregational, and Lutheran, the mainline churches, the town had not only a few but many variances. The basic Norwegian Lutheran was augmented by Swedish Lutheran, Danish Lutheran, and English Lutheran. There were also English Methodist and Norwegian and Swedish Baptist, to name a few. Due to dying out of the original immigrants who supported these, they have all disappeared and only the mainline churches, so-called, remain.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What was town government like in South Bend and were there any changes in the thirties?

**Mr. Bailey:** The town government I remember was very quiet and mostly run by the local businessmen. There did not seem to be as much interest as now, except for an occasional issue arising from time to time. It seems to me that the people as a whole began taking more interest after World War II. Mayors of those days were not inclined to stir up issues. Weekly newspapers of those days were not as confronting as they are now. No one wanted to disturb an advertiser.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How about distinctions in South Bend between people of different economic backgrounds?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't recall any social distinctions. I don't really recall any problems like that. I think that we were lucky that Raymond and South Bend had relatively few problems in this area.

There was a tendency in South Bend for people of Norwegian ancestry to live in one area. It was of their own choosing and they were in no way isolated but a very important part of the community. The area, Eklund Park, was known as Snoose Peak, and among other things, housed several relatives of the future US Senator Henry M. Jackson, who spent many summers there. Of course, many Norwegians also lived about town.

Raymond also had its Riverdale section where a good many Finns seemed to band together. In no case, however, was it an isolation of people because of different backgrounds, and I am not aware of any distinctions being drawn because of it.

We also had a few origin-based lodges. Raymond had its Order of Ahepa for Greek people; South Bend had its Sons of Norway and the Order of Runeberg, the latter for Finns.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What were the schools in South Bend like? And how many were there? Did they change in the thirties?

**Mr. Bailey:** When we went to South Bend there were two grade schools, the Broadway School and the A Street School. Sixth graders at the latter attended class in the basement of South Bend High School. Entering junior high, the seventh grade, saw all students of South Bend in the same grade at the same time. Junior and senior high schools were in the same building. The town now has one central grade school and the one junior-senior high.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did you perceive your family's participation in the community?

**Mr. Bailey:** My dad had been active in Raymond lodge work off and on and later joined the South Bend Volunteer Fire Department, serving many years as secretary, later as chief, and even later as a city councilman. My mother, who was not always in good health, took part in supporting things like the PTA and anything my sister and I were involved in. She had no interest in becoming an official or anything like that, but was always available for her baking, or whatever.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Can you tell us more about your parents and yourself as a growing young man? Their attitudes and yours? I'm interested in how things might have been affected by the Depression, even though you surprised me by saying that South Bend was not as affected as I would have thought.

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, it was severely affected. I think my comments were that at that time South Bend still had quite a little center of retail business. That did not mean that each of them was not struggling. The mills were all down. My dad was lucky to have a steady job at that time. Many times a butcher, or other merchant, would run an ad in the paper and the boss would come to my dad and ask him to take a few dollars of his wages out in trade. The boss would do so himself. Lacking money to exchange, it was the only way the paper could get advertising, and it was the only way the advertiser could afford to advertise.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You mentioned your mother supported PTA and that sort of thing. What did she regard as the right kind of conduct for neighbors and citizens of the town?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't recall having any neighborhood problems. We lived our own lives, ran our own houses, and let them do so. People were not as inclined to interfere in every personal matter of other people as they are now.

[End of Tape 2, Side 2]

## 2

# YOUNG ADULTHOOD

**Ms. Bridgman:** We were discussing your parents' life and your own after you moved to South Bend in 1927. We'll talk about activities and attitudes and try to identify the similarities and differences between your parents and yourself through the time you left for the military in 1941.

First, you noted on our questionnaire that you're an Episcopalian. What were the most important aspects of religion to your parents?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't recall that they were religious at all as far as denominational membership was concerned. Our family always held that church membership was not necessary to be a good Christian. In that sense they were fundamentally religious. My mother in her own way and from her training. My father always claimed he was an Episcopalian, which he was. Sometimes I think it was because there were no regular Episcopal services in South Bend, and he didn't have to worry about going to other churches.

We lived next door to the Methodist Church, and they had an active Sunday school. Our employers and their families were active supporters of the Methodist Church, and each year my sister and I would start out the season by going to Sunday school. Usually, a little later in the year, we would opt for sleeping in on Sundays and drop out. We were never forced to go, but my mother encouraged it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Would you describe then the ways in which your mother's religion influenced her everyday conduct or everyday life other than encouraging you and your sister to go?

**Mr. Bailey:** She was basically a religious person. Her mother had been active in the Methodist Church for years until she died, but she, too, was not one that just had to go to church every Sunday. Both of them lived their religion. My dad could use a few choice words, but my mother would never tolerate us cursing or using the Lord's name in vain. She was brought up that way, and she did not depart from her training. She later became an Episcopalian.

**Ms. Bridgman:** After she joined, did she participate in church organizations or events?

**Mr. Bailey:** She did not join until our son was baptized and she wanted to be baptized with him. The folks had already moved to Tacoma and consequently she was never active in church affairs even though she was a member.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What kind of religious doctrine was there in your home?

**Mr. Bailey:** None. I do remember we were careful not to make many religious comments. One reason was that my grandfather was Catholic, and we respected his views. My grandmother was not, of course. I think that if this had been allowed to be an issue in my grandfolks' family it would have blown apart many years before.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What kind of questions and thought processes did you have about Christian doctrine as you went to the Methodist Church?

**Mr. Bailey:** That would be hard to tell. When we went to the Methodist Church it was to Sunday school which had many of the basic Biblical stories and things of that sort. I suppose it gave us a background of some sort.

My dad always claimed he was an Episcopalian and they were few and far between around our area. When Bishop Bayne visited the South Bend Episcopal Church in the late 1940s, he said, "You know it takes a sense of humor to be an Episcopalian west of the Mississippi River." That is not true anymore. The Methodist and Episcopal churches came from a common source, the Church of England, and as far as doctrine goes, they are greatly similar, the Methodists leaning more heavily on evangelism.

My wife changed from Presbyterian to the Episcopal Church and was very active in guild work and other activities. I served on the vestry from time to time.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Who did you talk over religious questions with?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't recall discussing this with anyone except the minister. I went to the Methodist Church a few times, to the Baptist, too. A doctor and his wife took me to a couple of the occasional Episcopal services. I think my choice was probably because my dad had been a member. Doctrine was not an issue as to choice.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In your scrapbooks you saved a church program from Christmas, 1939, and an Easter program at a later date. What significance did these have?

**Mr. Bailey:** They had significance because I set them up and printed them myself. I had access to the typesetting, press work, and also an architect's

drawing of the church. I wanted to pay for it, but my boss said if I wanted to do the work it would be good experience and he did not charge me for it.

There was probably another one from St. Andrew's Cathedral in Honolulu. One of the times our ship was in Pearl Harbor a group of us went to church there. I saved the program.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Would anything in your background explain why Washington State has been evaluated as the least religious state?

**Mr. Bailey:** I wouldn't know.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You mentioned one notable circumstance of various ethnic groups and the variety of churches in your community--English Baptist, Norwegian Lutheran--

**Mr. Bailey:** --And the Norwegian Baptist, and the Norwegian Methodist--

**Ms. Bridgman:** --and on and on.

**Mr. Bailey:** It goes on forever.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How many friends did your parents have among the Norwegians or Finns or the various national groups?

**Mr. Bailey:** My folks were not greatly into social activities except for a few dances or lodge activities. They generally were friendly to everyone and ethnic background never played a role. My dad met many people downtown in the taverns, when legalized, at fire meetings, and things like that where they would adjourn and go to the tavern to have a beer, play pool, or whatever. The question of ethnic background never rose that I remember. He was very friendly to the Greek people in Raymond and always felt they had been dealt a great injustice.

My mother seldom went out except to a few dances and lodge events. She was a very good friend to all the neighbors and when they were sick, she would often spend many days nursing them, cooking their food, and things like that.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What characteristics did they attribute to specific national groups?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think this ever entered into the considerations. I do remember one thing, though. My father had made many friends in a Chinese family in Olympia when he was a boy there in 1912. Later, when he went back to Raymond, the same family took over a restaurant in South Bend and this friendship continued. The South Bend Chinese were a welcome part of the community, but seldom mixed. In addition to family emphasis, I also thought they probably did not have time. Everyone worked in the business and they worked at it twenty-four hours a day. My father never went into the restaurant unless he went back to the kitchen to talk with them. I remember his simplified summary of the matter: "When a Chinaman gives his word, he never goes back on it. If he's your friend, he's always your friend." This is probably the only ethnic remark I remember from him.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What were your parents' opinions about immigration, and how soon did you become aware of different national groups in your community, either in Raymond or South Bend?

**Mr. Bailey:** These were not issues our family dwelt on. In Raymond, I was too young to remember things like that. In South Bend, at school, we would sometimes call a Norwegian a Swede, or vice versa, just to get their reaction. lt was all in jest. I suppose it was like my sister and I wearing orange on St. Patrick's Day to get a retort from my grandfather.

I never remember a black of our age in South Bend at that time. There was one elderly fellow, a black, who drove the old car to the depot several times a day to meet the passengers, take them downtown or to the hotel. I knew of him but didn't know him personally. He was generally accepted everywhere and was a well-respected part of the community.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How many members of other immigrant groups did you get to know well as you were growing up?

**Mr. Bailey:** It would have to have been the Scandinavians. Most of the parents had come over from the old country and those that I associated with would mainly have been the second generation. We didn't give it a second thought.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Would you describe any ways your views were different from your parents?

**Mr. Bailey:** My folks never imposed their views on any of us, but I suppose we unconsciously accepted and adopted many of their own for ourselves. My father's employers were strong Methodists. They never imposed their religion on us, but I would often go to the elder Mr. Hazeltine's Sunday school class, probably because he often gave away free theater tickets!

They were also very strong Republicans, but they never talked politics with us. In return, of course, we never thought it proper to argue with them on our views.

As I said before, I think my dad supported Al Smith in 1928, but he didn't talk about it. He thought it very funny when I clipped the Seattle Times rotogravure section and hung up pictures of Herbert Hoover and Charles Curtis in my bedroom. Later I embellished it by hanging an American flag over them.

Later I became quite enamored with Franklin D. Roosevelt and became an ardent collector of things relating to him. I did not remain quite so mum. By that time the younger Mr. Hazeltine was in charge,

and I was informed that my politics were no concern of his.

**Ms. Bridgman:** On your questionnaire you noted that both parents finished grade school. How did they feel about education in general?

**Mr. Bailey:** They were very supportive of my sister and myself to get a good education. They figured, as I did, that I would go on to the university. I have no doubt I would have to pay my own way, but with a union printer's card it would not have been too difficult. I put it off to complete my apprenticeship and then World War II intervened.

My sister did not have such interests but did go to Tacoma and attended a business college.

While the folks were supportive and interested, they did not push either of us beyond a certain point, and the decision was for us to make.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What kind of interest did they take in your lessons and what you were learning--homework and that sort of thing?

**Mr. Bailey:** They gave us a lot of help. We never seemed to have any trouble in school through grade or junior high school. I was always on top of the class at that time, but when I got into high school I did not adapt too well to the different method of studying. I received good grades compared with most of them, but just didn't warm up to homework. If I could not finish my assignment in the study hall at school, I didn't take it home. While I didn't do too bad, I could have done much better.

Some subjects that I now wished I had paid more attention to show my lack of interest: algebra, geometry, manual training, chemistry--even English. I did take literature, journalism, typing, and even shorthand.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did your parents think education would help in your life?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't remember them expressing any opinion, although I know they truly regarded a good education as the way to success.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Who were influential teachers through this time? You have mentioned one before.

**Mr. Bailey:** I think one would have been Neil Bailey (no relation) in junior high school. He was excellent in American history. Another would be Don Reed, then the principal, and also my first scoutmaster.

Both teachers were very helpful. Of course, I remember many others. I really don't remember a bad teacher. I had a terrific typing teacher for my first year of typing. She is now eighty-nine and lives in Honolulu. We visit her each year and write and phone her quite regularly. Each of them, in their own way and on their own subjects, were very good.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What were other methods of instruction, other than personal attention, that you found particularly effective?

**Mr. Bailey:** That is hard to tell. In those days there was not as much emphasis on extracurricular activities such as sports. We had six periods of one hour each, every day.

**Ms. Bridgman:** There are fifteen poems in the first scrapbook of personal memories that you lent me, dated 1931. How did you begin writing them?

[End of Tape 3, Side 1]

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know. I had forgotten about them. They were not poems, they were jingles. I think one of the first was a result of an American history class. Mr. Bailey's grandfather was one of the last surviving Civil War veterans and he would come to school from time to time and tell us stories about the Civil War. Mr. Bailey was an excellent history teacher, and when his English class instructed us to write a poem, I wrote "On to Richmond," about the battle of Bull Run. It would never win a Pulitzer, but Mr. Bailey put it in the school paper.

Later when I put out a councilwide Scout newspaper for Scouting, I wrote a column of jingles, nothing notable, but fun. I think I got the idea from a columnist in a Seattle newspaper, Carleton Fiske, who wrote all of his newsy columns in rhyme.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How many of your classmates wrote poems?

**Mr. Bailey:** I imagine everyone had to if assigned to do it. I remember one in particular when my ditty was put in the school newspaper. He showed me one he had written, and it turned out to be Tennyson's "Crossing the Bar." I really think he had memorized that poem years before and actually got to thinking it was his idea.

Again, I have since taken courses in high school and from the University of Washington, but I think my junior high course by Mr. Bailey was the best foundation of all for a person interested in history.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What year was that?

**Mr. Bailey:** 1930.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What were you taught about Washington State history?

**Mr. Bailey:** Very little at that time. Once in awhile a pioneer citizen would come in and tell us stories, but as I recall, I was in high school before courses in Washington State history were offered, and that was only a one-semester course.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What kind of things were you reading, both in school and out of school, through junior and senior high school? You mentioned the *Seattle Times.*

**Mr. Bailey:** I was an avid reader of newspapers, among other things. In our town the morning papers were split between the *Seattle P-I* and the *Portland Oregonian*, with the latter having the edge. The evening papers were the *Seattle Times* and the *Tacoma News Tribune*. I had the combined paper routes of both the *Times* and *Tribune* before going to work in the print shop.

When the new highway opened to Aberdeen, the *Daily World* began taking over the evening paper field and eventually dominated that field.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What other sorts of things do you remember reading in junior and senior high?

**Mr. Bailey:** I was always at the library taking out books. I liked biographies, stories about American figures such as Andrew Jackson, William Jennings Bryan, Theodore Roosevelt, and anything I could get ahold of. I don't think I read many classics unless I had to do so.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Is there anything you remember that particularly affected your ideas about human conditions or politics?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think it was probably the news about the advent of FDR. He really got me hooked on politics. He was such an upbeat figure after so many years of depression and despair. He offered hope.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Being a writer of poems, did you have favorite poets?

**Mr. Bailey:** I would not call myself a poet in any way and did not care too much for poetry, except for an occasional one. I do remember once when the *Literary Digest* offered a ten-volume set of the world's one thousand best poems. They offered the installment plan. They probably cost ten or fifteen dollars, payable one dollar or so at a time. It was my first venture into installment buying and my mother used to snicker when I started sorting nickels and pennies to make my next payment. Incidentally, they were not the world's best.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Did you have any thoughts of being a novelist?

**Mr. Bailey:** I suppose everyone does. I often thought I would take some of my extensive historic scrapbooks and write something on local history, but I get so involved in collecting and indexing the data I never get around to it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What school-sponsored activities did you take part in?

**Mr. Bailey:** Very few. I really didn't care for sports, and they were not as integral a part of schools as they are now. Only a few times did a coach put pressure on me to turn out--to no avail. I was one of the tall ones in our class and the basketball coach was perturbed with my refusal. The football coach also tried but failed.

I am still not the sports fan the rest of my family are. Oh, I watch the Mariners, Sonics, and World Series--sometimes. One exception was when our son was in high school and playing on a championship team. I did not miss many games.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I note your school poem was published in the school newspaper. Is that significant?

**Mr. Bailey:** No. The junior high paper was largely a product of the faculty, with some of the contributions of the pupils printed therein. I am sure Mr. Bailey submitted my contribution. Later, when I was in high school I was editor of a mimeographed newspaper which came out about once a month. It was part of our journalism class, and we were usually excused from class to work on the paper.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did all of you get along working on the high-school paper?

**Mr. Bailey:** We got along fine. Four or five of us, boys and girls--we would get contributions from others, and we would edit their efforts. I suppose the instructor had the right to limit our selections and efforts, too, although I do not recall any lack of agreement between the teacher and ourselves.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How were you chosen editor?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know. Either the teacher made the assignment or I got it because I was always there when the work was to be done. I had the same experience in Scouting. When I consistently turned out to every work party and event, it was not long before they were assigning me jobs to do and take charge. I think I was just handed the job.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What kind of different ideas among the students working on the paper do you remember?

**Mr. Bailey:** In those days the student body was not militant. The paper was one that mainly wrote news of the activities at the school. The school board and the faculty ran the district policies and there was no effort by the students to take control or offer advice.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did you feel when on the school paper about other students who didn't participate?

**Mr. Bailey:** The three or four of us who were working on the paper were all steady. Occasionally we would have a new face, but everyone always did their part. In fact, they were probably all picked because they were dependable and the teacher felt that practical part would help them as much as more bookwork in class. One time after we spent a day

horsing around, I received a note from the teacher saying, "A closed mouth maketh for a full stick."

**Ms. Bridgman:** Would you describe your part in the activities centered around graduation from South Bend High School in 1935?

**Mr. Bailey:** I suppose you are talking about senior "sneak day"?

**Ms. Bridgman:** Yes, among other things.

**Mr. Bailey:** South Bend seniors had always had a "sneak day" at the end of their senior year. This would be planned and plotted in great secrecy, and on a given day all seniors would sneak away for places unknown and be absent from school.

The superintendent and faculty always feared some disaster in such unsupervised activity and opposed it. Of course, this added to the fascination to sneak. A couple of our active members organized the day and passed the word to everyone not to show up at school.

I was not greatly attracted to a picnic or other activity, but would not go to school either. My boss told me that he had lots of work and if I wanted I could work all day that day and earn some extra money. Most days I only got in two or three hours.

The superintendent was furious and so just a few days before graduation all members of the class of 1935 were expelled.

My boss offered to write a letter saying I had been working, but then I found that the two planners had obtained letters from their employers stating the same and I decided I did not want to desert the class. So I did not ask for the excuse.

After much negotiation, the parents and the school administration reached an agreement where we were all reinstated but had to go to school an extra week.

I was prepared to go to the National Scout Jamboree in Washington D.C. in July 1935 and had to have typhoid shots before going. One of our local doctors also served the ROTC camp at Fort Lewis and told several of us if we would come down at that time he would give us free shots.

I had a terrible reaction on my first one and was assured I would not have any on my second, insofar as only one shot usually reacted. I went for my second shot the day before graduation.

On graduation day I was so sick I couldn't get out of bed and my mother called the doctor to see if there was anything I could take to let me go down there. I remember his response was "it won't hurt him to miss it."

This got me up and about and I forced myself to go. I remember leaning heavily on the girl I walked in the processional with, and I felt sorry for her. Later, the doctor informed me that Fort Lewis had called him and had them cut the dosage in half because most of the ROTC candidates were getting very ill. I never got typhoid.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Do you remember your class motto?

**Mr. Bailey:** No, I do not. I don't remember it at all.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In your scrapbook it's in various places. It was "Meet Hardship With a Smile." Do you remember anything about that?

**Mr. Bailey:** Not a thing. I don't even know who suggested it. I know I didn't. We were sort of a hardship class. We lost a great number of our members during high school because they could not afford to continue. Some others married. When we hold reunions now we usually invite those people just as though they graduated with us. As I said before, only a few of us had jobs to go to after school.

I would go home at night and work two or three hours. I think I started at twenty cents an hour. I remember two others in my class with jobs--one with a grocery store, another worked with his dad who owned the bakery.

When I graduated my boss connected me with a friend of his to get work at the *University District Herald* if I went to school at Seattle. The draft came up and I was unable to make any steady plans. It was also better that I finish my apprenticeship as it would be almost certain I could get a job. My uncertainty went on for a couple of years until I finally decided to join the Navy and signed up about a month before Pearl Harbor.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The class prophecy that you wrote for your high school class--

**Mr. Bailey:** Did I write that?

**Ms. Bridgman:** Yes, you did. Can you describe some of the various future occupations you chose for your classmates?

**Mr. Bailey:** No. I suppose we had suggestions from many sources.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Do you remember what you chose for yourself?

**Mr. Bailey:** No.

**Ms. Bridgman:** It was editor of the *Chicago Daily News*.

**Mr. Bailey:** No kidding.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How realistic do you recall trying to be in those predictions?

**Mr. Bailey:** It was all in jest. We used these on what was known as class day which preceded graduation. All of the school assembled. The seniors vacated their seats and went up on the platform; the juniors moved up to the senior seats, and so on. The seniors then would read their class will, prophecy,

history, and other things. There was no attempt at realism. It was all in fun.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did you feel about your education when you graduated?

**Mr. Bailey:** I had no regrets about my schooling or the school system. I thought I had a very fine education as far as I went.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What was your greatest satisfaction or greatest accomplishment or reward?

**Mr. Bailey:** I was quite anxious to move on. That was before the war in Europe. I was very active in Scout work and was anxious to spend more time on my job so I could earn a little more money. Saturday had been the only day I could work all day and that was not a busy day at the newspaper. I was anxious to earn a little more money and at the same time to finish my apprenticeship.

During my work as an apprentice I had to complete a very thorough course with the International Typographical Union. At the same time, I had received a free scholarship with International Correspondence Schools in advertising. Much of it was old hat to me, but I did learn a lot about ad layouts, type faces, and writing of advertising, which helped me very much later.

Little did I know that a little old war would upset my plans.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Do you recall your worst disappointment about your education?

**Mr. Bailey:** Not really. Looking back I sometimes wished I had gone on to the U, but things worked out well without it.

After graduation, because of my Scout work and probably because of my fascination with things political, I resolved to go to the National Scout Jamboree in Washington D.C. in the summer of 1935. That was later cancelled, but we went on the trip anyway. I did go again when the jamboree was rescheduled in 1937.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What ways at the time did you feel that your education would have value in your future life?

**Mr. Bailey:** I never had a doubt that a good education was desirable. You keep speaking though as if I had a plan worked out in detail at that time. This is not so. Anything I did in jobs, politics, or whatever, came one by one without plan. It seemed that one opportunity presented itself and another would follow eventually. I had no plan.

[End of Tape 3, Side 2]

**Ms. Bridgman:** Let's talk about your occupation as a printer. You've referred to the difficulty of young people graduating finding work, and of the mills being shut down. Can you give us impressions you remember from those times?

**Mr. Bailey:** To begin with, the mills were totally shut down for a year or more, not only on Willapa Harbor, but on Grays Harbor. It was a great and pleasant thing when the mill whistles started to blow again.

Our family was fortunate that we were not hit by the general unemployment. Most of our high-school class did not have any resources, nor places to get jobs. My dad's job in the printing office went on despite closure of the mills.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Do you remember the dates?

**Mr. Bailey:** Probably not accurately, but it was during the 1932-1933 to 1935 time, I believe. Then, when the mills did open up, it seemed like there was never a year that we didn't have a prolonged strike for better wages, or something. It was not until World War II that we had a better job market and economy on the Harbor.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Were those who went on strike members of the unions?

**Mr. Bailey:** Certainly. I have not heard of many strikes by other than unions. They were very well organized and spoke for 100 percent of the workers. The closed shop of that time probably made everyone a member. At any rate, ninety to ninety-five percent would be members anyway.

A union endorsement for political candidates in those days would almost guarantee a block of a few thousand votes. Areas that had been redistricted for the Republicans a few years before became the strongest Democratic strongholds. A large portion of the labor vote looked only as far as the word "Democrat" and cast their ballot. Later, when I was engaged in redistricting in the Legislature I often thought that it was folly to discuss "strong Republican" or "strong Democratic" areas. The people tomorrow will determine that situation and with a great deal of independence.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Are you speaking of union, or unions--the plural?

**Mr. Bailey:** The unions, in the early days of the New Deal, were united. All labor usually gave the Democratic Party its full support. Later, the industrial unions, CIO, with John L. Lewis, broke away from the American Federation of Labor and its craft unions, led by William Green. On our Harbor the big union was the International Woodworkers Union, CIO, which represented the loggers and millworkers. The Central Labor Council, AFL, was made up of craft unions, printers, waiters, cooks, carpenters, and so on. The longshoremen were quite active, but usually

independent of both. At that time the Harbor had a great deal of shipping of lumber out of its port.

I suppose the unions leaned Democratic because of some of the issues of the time, closed shops, the right of labor to bargain, old-age pensions, unemployment compensation. Most Democrats supported, most Republicans opposed these moves.

When I first went to the Legislature in 1951, a big issue was the state old-age pension. Social Security has since replaced it, but in those days it was strictly a partisan issue.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did people feel about unemployment? Do you recall . . .

**Mr. Bailey:** I think they were in deep despair. Many were destitute. There were no welfare programs of any sort by the state or federal government until the New Deal set them up. Help was rendered by neighbors, churches, and other charities.

I remember my Boy Scout troop going out and collecting old shoes for the Red Cross for people who had none. One time I remember taking Scout funds raised by paper drives and buying shoes for two children in a family so they could go to school. In later years these boys joined our troop and in later years the whole family contributed very much to our community.

I remember one time when as a Scout I was asked to help an American Legion Auxiliary member distribute things at Christmas. They were boxes of surplus apples picked off of trees, and while they were welcome, I will never forget the little kids coming out to meet us, and we didn't have any toys or anything for them. It was heartbreaking.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did the population change? Did many people leave?

**Mr. Bailey:** Not too many. There really wasn't anywhere for most of them to go. Conditions were bad all over. It was amazing, though, later, when some of these people could not remember having had "hard times."

A state senator who served before me, Clyde Tisdale, was a colorful talker and had received solid support of the unions in early days. As times improved and his support drooped a little, he gave this explanation: "A man's memory is measured by the distance between his belly button and his back bone. When he has plenty to eat, the distance is there and he forgets; when he is hungry, the distance is short, he remembers."

**Ms. Bridgman:** Back to your family now. You talked a lot about your father's trade as a printer. How did he get into it--do you know?

**Mr. Bailey:** As far as I know, when he was in Olympia, about 1912, he worked as a newsboy and printer in the *Daily Recorder*. Where he got his time in as an apprentice I do not know. As I have said, sometimes the mills paid better wages and he went to them, but they were up and down with the market or labor conditions. Ultimately he went into printing as a lifework, and I am sure he was very satisfied with it. You know that every profession has to have its craftsmen to back it up. Our family were always firm believers in vocational training as well as professional degrees.

He was a longtime member of the union and at that time a journeyman printer in the International Typographical Union was assured of fair treatment and a fair wage.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You already told me it took five years to become a journeyman printer. What is your earliest memory of wanting to be a printer?

**Mr. Bailey:** I suppose I was exposed to it for many years, but I also often thought of perhaps owning a small newspaper someday, and in those small shops, to exist, the owners must also know how to do almost everything.

Living upstairs from the shop, they often called me to spend a few hours on odd jobs, sweeping the floor, assembling books, stitching books, any number of things.

I think it was just assumed that I was at the top of the list whenever the printer's devil job opened. When the devil didn't show up to work and he got into an argument with the boss, he told them: "Tell Bobbie Bailey to come down and go to work, the job is his. I'm quitting." The fellow, Eddie Miller, had finished high school and was really wanting a better paying job. Of all things, he had one lined up at the shingle mill.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What was your father's role in this as you became interested?

**Mr. Bailey:** My father considered it a good job and was pleased, but I think that the deal between the boss and myself was without his help, and my dad would have considered that as interference.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The earliest example of your interest in newspapers is in your scrapbook, the *Willapa Harbor Post*, which you created in 1928, and in which you endorsed Herbert Hoover, a Republican, and Bullitt, a Democrat, for governor. Do you remember doing that paper?

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes, in a way, chiefly because I wrote a story about the death of one of my mother's aunts at that time. When I was in the fourth grade my grandmother bought me a typewriter and I started typing. I just loved to type and was usually creating

something. In the summer I would set up a desk in the garage and type things--recipes for my mother, letters for my grandfather. The folks bought me a rubber printing set. It was strictly play, but fun. I think it was the one and only issue of that paper and my dad took it down to show his bosses. They used to kid me about it quite a bit.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The examples you saved are the Scout papers you'd produced from 1931 to 1936. How did you get started doing that?

**Mr. Bailey:** Scouting was a great thing for me. I was hesitant about joining at first, but when I did, I took part in everything. If there was a paper drive, I was there. If there was a work party, I was there. Pretty soon, if you spend a little time on things, they start depending on you and push you along.

We had started a new troop sponsored by the Kiwanis Club and I thought it would be a good idea to put out a monthly paper, the *Kiwanis Scout*, and keep Kiwanians informed as to what their troop was doing. That was the reason for doing it, not to mention the fact that I enjoyed doing it.

A few years later I started a mimeographed area council newspaper. It covered Pacific and Grays Harbor counties and had about two-thousand circulation. I had a couple of good helpers to mail and things like that, but basically, it was up to me to collect the news from the various troop reporters and put the paper together. I met a lot of friends in the two-county area over those six or eight editions.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What did those papers have to do with your continuing interest in journalism?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think my interest in journalism was already there, but being able to do something in that line was pleasant and interesting to me.

When I finished my apprenticeship in 1939, there was a possibility of an opening in the front office, writing and bookkeeping. The draft was breathing down my neck and I didn't want to go to school and have that interrupted, so I stayed around, working three or four days a week. The opening never came, but the war did.

My interest in newspapers seemed always to be there. When I was still a teenager and active in Scouting, I would attend district committee meetings, made up mostly of businessmen active in promoting Scouting. Inevitably, I would be put in charge of publicity, and I saw to it that stories on every activity were reported and published in the local newspapers. This gave me much experience and, based on having worked in a printing office, became very valuable when I later went into politics and also when I worked for Congresswoman Julia Butler Hansen and was in charge of her local press releases.

When I was county clerk, my former employer called me and said he wanted me to edit the *Journal* when he went on vacation. I would go down nights after the courthouse closed, cover city council and other meetings, edit the copy, and help get out the paper. Prior to going into service, the competing *Willapa Harbor Pilot* lost its printer and the editor-publisher was ill. My boss told me to go down and help them get the paper out, so for that week, with a little help from the sick editor, who would creep downstairs for a few minutes at a time, we came out a little late, but at least it came out, such as it was.

Even later, the *Raymond Herald* editor called me at the courthouse and said he was going on vacation. Would I edit his paper for a week or so. I did this as I did for the *Journal*--at nights. When my dad and I acquired the *Raymond Advertiser* in the late forties, it meant that at one time or another I had edited all four of the local papers. No great feat, but they are history now.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You say you were just a printer. Can you describe exactly what tasks you performed as a printer?

**Mr. Bailey:** First, as a printing apprentice, or printer's devil, you did everything from dumping wastebaskets to sweeping the floor. It was kind of what they call a "gofer" job nowadays. The union started you out at minimum wage. Every six months you would get a pay increase and learn and do new things, so at the end of your five, sometimes six, years you would be a qualified printer and making the printer's wage. That training included operating the Linotype, presses, making up the paper, proofreading, ad setting, and just about everything a journeyman printer had to know. A small town shop was ideal to learn the trade as you got a good general background. City shops tended to specialize and you could come out knowing only one specific job.

Many years later when I went to work at the *Aberdeen World*, I had the choice of working in the front office as a reporter or in the printing shop. I chose the latter as a Linotype operator because the union had definite hours, good pay, and good overtime provisions. The front office often required night attendance at meetings to be covered and things like that. I took the Linotype.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did you come to join the union?

**Mr. Bailey:** The ITU already had contracts with the various weeklies on the Harbor. An apprentice had no choice, nor vote. You joined the union when the time came or you didn't get a job. My memory tells me that they did not charge dues to apprentices--at least only minimal ones, if at all.

The union was our protector, too. The contract signed with the employers set the hourly wage to be paid. Our local, with only one or two-man shops, also let employers, if they were printers, be members. They could not vote on wages and things like that, but it was a good thing to have both employers and employees get together on a peaceable basis every now and then.

We had very little union strife. One time a printer came to one of the papers and started raising many problems. Everyone got involved and we had quite a problem. Before it was settled, the printer departed for other parts of the country and I was told later that he had only come in to agitate.

**Ms. Bridgman:** So the only other job you had when you were growing up was a delivery person for the *Seattle Times*?

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes. When one of my friends quit his paper route, he turned it over to me. I knew the route because I would go with him quite often. He had a *Seattle Times* route combined with a *Tacoma News Tribune* route and between the two it hit most of the houses in our section of town. After awhile the *Times* started consolidating routes and put a man in Raymond over me. On Sunday mornings I would find my paper bundle open and several papers missing, and I would have to go to the local stores I peddled to and buy back my own papers, thus losing profit on my whole route. My new superior was taking my papers for his route in Raymond.

After several weeks of this I wrote a letter to the circulation manager of the *Times* and complained. I remember my father was very upset and said that I was "presuming too much." A few days later a man came down from Seattle and put me in charge of three or four routes in South Bend and confined the other man to his routes in Raymond. I was on this only a month or so before my printing job opened up.

Incidentally, the man from the *Times* spent a few days in Raymond, met a lady there that he eventually married, and for many years we used to see him often. We always laughed about the circumstances that brought him to Raymond.

From 1939 on, my name was constantly high in the draft and I usually checked at least twice a week to see if a new call had come in. Sometimes even the lady in charge of the draft office would voluntarily call me to keep me informed. Several times I was in the top ten and would then be pushed down due to enrollment of a new group of eighteen-year-olds or several volunteers who would help fill the quota.

[End of Tape 4, Side 1]

**Mr. Bailey:** At that time Selective Service had no clear policy about people going to school and there wasn't much sense to try to put things together in Seattle and then be called up for service in a few weeks. The suspense was getting to me, and I went to Portland one time and tried to enlist in the Marines. I was not considered because I was too tall. I decided to try the Navy. I signed up sometime in late October, 1941, and made arrangements to report for my physical on the first Monday in December, which turned out to be the day after Pearl Harbor.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How had you planned to pursue your profession when the war was over?

**Mr. Bailey:** I suppose I intended to pursue further education, but nothing was planned. I had signed up as a printer--on advice of the Navy recruiter. Most large ships had printers, but there were few vacancies. Because of my typing and limited shorthand I ended up as a yeoman, third class. I was a chief yeoman when I left the service in 1946.

At first I was assigned to a shore station at Bremerton and then Seattle. Eventually I was assigned to a ship and worked with the executive officer in handling personnel matters and records for five to seven hundred of our crew, as well as correspondence connected with that office.

This job made it possible for me to fairly well know everyone on board. We were on an attack transport in the amphibious forces. Besides our own crew we carried many landing craft and had a boat crew to man them. We also had a group called the "beach party" so we could make our own landings in a limited way. Our chief job was carrying thousands of troops to and from battlefronts on the various atolls and islands.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Can you summarize then the planning for your future?

**Mr. Bailey:** Here we go again thinking that the future is one big plan. I did not plan at all. I knew some of the things I wanted to do--if you came home, that is. I had no plan, but just took advantage of the opportunities as they opened up.

When I got out, the current county clerk could not run again because of a two-term limit. Even my old boss, a Republican, and knowing my Democratic feelings, suggested to a few people that this would be a good job for me. It also presented opportunities to study and read law under the judge, and at some time later, with further education, perhaps pass the bar.

When I was elected clerk, it turned out to be a full-time job. I only had one deputy and we had to split noon hours and things like that. The judge was very cooperative and very busy, too, and we never attempted to even discuss such study. I did learn a lot

of law, though, in the course of daily events. I had to sit through every courtroom case, civil and criminal. It was very interesting.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You talked about the Boy Scouts, joining them, and that they made a great difference in your social life. Will you tell us how you got started?

**Mr. Bailey:** It just seemed that I had the normal desire of a twelve-year-old to join in 1931. My interest grew and I pursued every activity they had. I never became an Eagle Scout because I never was able to pass the lifesaving merit badge. I didn't like to swim, I don't now, and I am a poor swimmer.

At any rate, I began turning out for activities, eventually becoming a patrol leader and on up to scoutmaster when I was old enough. A little later we had a scoutmaster who could not always attend meetings. I would just take over and run things for him. Another man volunteered to serve as a cubmaster, but said he could not give it the time and I would have to do the work. It was hard turning down forty young boys, so I also served in that job. Later I would serve as Sea Scout skipper and even now serve on adult committees. I had been offered the job as camp director at the council camp on Lake Quinault, but just a few months before I was to take it, I got my job at the printing office.

Needless to say, I spent much of my spare time in Scout work. I was glad to be able to join and become a part of a group. My first scoutmaster was also my school teacher. I remember that shortly after joining, our troop was granted a day off to go to Lake Quinault and plant trees. A couple of years ago I read in the *Aberdeen World* where those trees had matured and were being logged.

School activities were mostly during school hours in those days, so Scout meeting nights had little opposition and turnouts were good. Our troop was an excellent one and we won just about every award in both counties.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Would you tell us about the time you and two others got lost and spent the night in the woods?

**Mr. Bailey:** That was probably the incident that hooked me into Scouting, or at least connected my name up with the Scouts because it came out in every paper, "Three Scouts Spend Night in Woods," or something like that.

It was Thanksgiving vacation and while it was dry, it was very cold. Our scoutmaster had planned a trip down the bay for a Sunday where we would visit a pioneer gentleman who had a great collection of Indian artifacts. I had only been a Scout for a brief time and the three of us decided to go out on a Friday, the day after Thanksgiving, and make a preliminary trip in that direction to look things over. We cut across country all day to pick up the grade of a new highway being built, and after fighting twelve-foot salal all day, we hit the muddy road grade in the evening. Unfortunately we were between two rivers and the bridges had not been built, so we saw an old cabin out near the bay and went toward it thinking that someone lived there.

On the way to the cabin we found an axe left by a highway crew, but my hands got so cold I threw it out into the slough. When we reached the cabin we found no one lived there, but there was a stove. We had one match and managed to light a little fire, but we darned near froze to death that night.

In the meantime the Coast Guard, the sheriff's staff, search parties, and our parents were out all night looking for us. They feared that if we were on the bay shore that certain cliffs would make it impossible for us to escape if the tide came in.

The next morning we found a dugout canoe and were starting to paddle across the river when one of the boy's father, a county road engineer, spotted us and we hiked another two or three miles to his car and home. Needless to say, "Boy Scouts Get Lost" was given great publicity. Also, our scoutmaster, after searching all Friday night, decided to cancel the outing on Sunday.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In your views of taking on responsibilities of others in various leadership roles, what kinds of procedures and tasks did you change so that things were done differently?

**Mr. Bailey:** Not really anything. When I took over because someone was unable to attend, it was not to modify or change things, it was to keep things going and probably would be conducted in the same way the other person would do it.

To make a good showing in Scout advancement our family house would probably have a boy or two almost every night of the week getting individual help on the requirements. I have always maintained that in the leadership of kids it is not your ability, but the amount of time you will spend which will make it successful. I have seen many leaders that were well qualified, but if they did not give it sufficient time, would not even rate average. This is true also when a person, not as well qualified, can give the boys lots of time and come out great.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did you and the other leaders get along, some of those from whom you took over?

**Mr. Bailey:** You assume it was done in a confronting way, my method against theirs. We never had any trouble. Most of the time they were grateful to have a relief worker and were waiting for me to be

old enough to take over a job for which they did not have time.

**Ms. Bridgman:** One last question on Scouting. How did those Scouts who did not excel get along?

**Mr. Bailey:** We always helped them individually if they had the interest. They always came through. The ones that did not have enough interest usually dropped out in a year or even less.

Our Scout troop was outstanding. They are all grown now and in various jobs and professions, and every time I see one of them we start recalling old times and happenings and talking about reunions.

**Ms. Bridgman:** One other last question about Scouting. Looking back, what did this mean in your life since? How did it affect you?

**Mr. Bailey:** It probably brought me out of my shell. As I said before, I was not too outgoing. You first work up to a patrol leader with four or six boys, then to other jobs, and soon find yourself emceeing parents nights or talking to the Kiwanis. I think it was a tremendous experience and I particularly enjoy it now when I find that my former Scouts did, too.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Now you also belong to the Eagles and Elks?

**Mr. Bailey:** I never was too active in them. I joined the Eagles when I was in the service and mainly for the social privileges of their Bremerton club rooms. It is a good organization and does much more than social activities. I was active in the Elks for a time, editing and getting out their monthly bulletin for several years. The real job was keeping the mailing list up-to-date with more than a thousand names. I think everyone moved every other month! The secretary was not always on time with his birthday list and things like that, and sometimes a month was almost gone before I got the records and could get the bulletin out.

Not only do I belong to the Eagles and Elks, but to the Masonic Lodge, Scottish Rite, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, and had been a member of Kiwanis. I never go to any meetings.

Many of these I joined during and after the war since I was only twenty-one in 1939, and was not eligible to join until just about the time I enlisted. Besides, I doubt if I could have afforded it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I want to at least get started on politics in the 1930s. You described yourself as a Roosevelt supporter. You said that in 1928 you were for Hoover. What do you remember about the crash of 1929?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't really remember the crash as such, but the aftermath. Those things always seem to reach the West Coast a little later. I think I have adequately described some of the effects of the Depression on our people. They were desperate and looking for an uplift. They needed the encouragement and hope that Roosevelt gave them.

I was a real enthusiast for FDR and started collecting everything I could about him. Frankly, my interest in things like the president and national affairs was one reason I really wanted to attend the Scout jamborees in Washington, D.C.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What else do you remember about the election of 1932?

**Mr. Bailey:** I remember I was home, not of voting age, but hoping for an FDR victory, as well as that of Democratic candidate Clarence D. Martin for governor.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You said you were enthused about Roosevelt's early policies. Would you like to go further?

**Mr. Bailey:** History speaks for itself. At least the people got action--the bank holiday and opening of banks on a sound basis. I think of two great things--if Ronald Reagan had not had FDR's federal bank deposit insurance and unemployment compensation during his depression, we would have had a terrible collapse. All the time the nation was using it, Reagan was decrying the governmental interference aspects.

Many businessmen in our area, most of them, were against the government relief policies and unemployment programs, yet it was where the recipients spent all of their checks and the cash registers started ringing in the very places that hated and opposed the programs.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How do these relate to this state and your community?

**Mr. Bailey:** I remember a widow lady with three children. She was living on a widow's pension, it was called, and was granted through the county commissioners. She had to appear regularly before the board to keep this going and it was always printed in the newspaper accounts of the county business. It was very little and very belittling.

Our old people had only to turn to a program like that if they had minor children or turn into the county poor farm which were more or less unregulated and a disgrace and it was considered a disgrace to have someone there. Most people chose not to look that way when they passed by.

One thought I have about the Great Depression. Adults had their Hoovervilles in cardboard box shelters, and things like that, but I never did see mothers with young babies in the streets begging by day, and then trying to find a place to sleep at night. These are things you see daily in the big cities in the 1990s.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In 1935 you wrote an essay on William Jennings Bryan which won honorable mention at commencement. Can you comment on that?

**Mr. Bailey:** This came out of my interest in American history. A local dentist chose a subject every year and gave a prize to the one he deemed best. He had heard Bryan at a Chautauqua Camp and was very enthused with his oratory.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You wrote a Huey Long poem and you had a prediction in your class prophecy about him? Could you describe how you felt about him?

**Mr. Bailey:** I really don't know. He was a colorful personage and a rabble-rouser of the day, and I did not like him because of his attacks on Roosevelt. I did subscribe to his newspaper, *Every Man A King*, and also to another paper, the *Wisconsin Progressive*, published by Bob LaFollette of the Progressive Party. Those movements rapidly disappeared, but were quite prevalent when I was in high school.

You are reminding me of things I have completely forgotten.

[End of Tape 4, Side 2]

## 3

# MILITARY SERVICE

**Ms. Bridgman:** As a Roosevelt and New Deal supporter in 1936, how did you respond to the national domestic politics between 1937 and the start of the war?

**Mr. Bailey:** I was usually very supportive of New Deal measures. I just followed every angle of national politics and couldn't read enough about them. I remember the polls showing that FDR would not be re-elected in 1936, but the press ignored the very heavy Democratic vote being cast in states with presidential primaries. Our family was all pro-Roosevelt, but none of us were flamboyant about it in 1936. Our Republican employers respected our right to do as we saw fit, and we thought it called for good judgment on our part, too.

Probably the nearest thing to work on a campaign publicly was when I decided to do what I could to help elect Senator Clarence Dill governor in 1940. My sister and I mailed out literature to every voter in our precinct and the election was so close it was threatened it would be challenged. Dill was eventually defeated by Arthur B. Langlie by a very narrow margin.

Our precinct was one that some Dill people wanted to challenge and wanted me to do it. By law and practice the three precinct workers on election day were filled by the county auditor on recommendation of the political committees. The party carrying the last presidential election was entitled to the inspector and one judge. The minority party was represented by one judge. In our case, the county auditor, a Republican, reversed the order, apparently to give a couple of friends a job. I refused to be the lead party to a suit and even though the board was not made up properly, there was no evidence any fraud had been committed. Eventually Langlie was declared the winner.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You were in charge of publicity and getting out the vote in your precinct for Dill?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't recall that, but I do recall working on it with my sister. She had been unemployed for some time and in return for the work she would do, the Dill people promised that she would be considered for state employment if Dill were elected. There was no merit system at that time.

While I did work behind the scenes, I stayed away from getting my own name out. My employer, Mr. Hazeltine, was the Republican precinct committeeman from our precinct and I thought it would be in poor taste to advance my name on the Democratic side and pit ourselves against each other. He was aware of my activity but very tolerant, and I tried to use some horse sense.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did you become involved in this?

**Mr. Bailey:** I suppose that as I attended all the Democratic meetings where the candidates appeared, that I was asked to do the job. I remember my father saying that he thought it unwise and that I would probably lose my job. If I had been militant, I would have expected to, but Mr. Hazeltine made it a point to inform me that politics and religion were my own business.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You explained earlier that your mother couldn't vote because she had married your father, a Canadian citizen at the time. Perhaps you can explain that.

**Mr. Bailey:** My mother was born in the state of Washington in 1901 and had never gone outside its borders. She married my father in 1917 and since he was a Canadian she lost her citizenship and had to assume his. This was before the Constitution was changed giving women the right to vote.

The United States deemed her a Canadian citizen; the Canadian government did not accept that. One time when she went to a lodge convention in British Columbia, she had trouble getting back. By that time, my father had taken out his US citizenship.

Mom contended that she was not a "foreigner" and refused to go to the courthouse and start work on her papers. She went on this way until just prior to the war when all aliens had to make an annual trip to their post offices and register as aliens. She had to do this and we used to tease her a lot. She was very embarrassed.

This situation came about before women's suffrage took effect in 1922, and many women were in that position. After a certain date in 1922, women had equal citizenship rights and did not lose them by marriage, but it left a lot of women, like my mother, in limbo.

Eventually, a New Deal-sponsored bit of legislation passed whereby women in this category

could go the nearest place provided, sign an affidavit, take an oath of allegiance, and become citizens. Mom became a citizen.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What were some of the issues in those days?

**Mr. Bailey:** They were very partisan. The lines were pretty well drawn on major issues. Big issues included the state old-age pension, later Social Security, unemployment compensation and many social matters. Generally, the Democrats promoted them, the Republicans, except for a few mavericks, against. These divisions were that way not only in Congress but the state Legislature.

**Ms. Bridgman:** After doing canvassing and sending out sample ballots and other things, would you do things differently now?

**Mr. Bailey:** Probably not. In 1940, the overwhelming issue on the national scene was the third term and the war in Europe, too. I was dangling high in the draft and could be called at any time, so it wasn't a time to make many plans, political or otherwise. Frankly, I had no plans anyway.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I'd like to get back to some of the national issues that were important in FDR's terms. How about the problems with the Supreme Court between Roosevelt and the Congress? Do you recall?

**Mr. Bailey:** I certainly do. I thought at that time that those "nine old men" should have their wings clipped. I listened to part of the Senate debate on the court when I was back in Washington. Ultimately, the president lost. I always felt that some deals had been made because shortly afterwards the judges began retiring anyway.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You talked a little about the awareness that war was approaching. How did you feel about the naval expansion and money for military defense that the president was requesting?

**Mr. Bailey:** I would guess I was in complete support. I felt they knew more about those things than I did. You will recall that the Selective Service Act passed by just one vote. Wouldn't we have been in fine shape after Pearl Harbor if our Army and Navy hadn't been built up? Then there was Lend-Lease and a good many other items.

Many of us were dangling on the Selective Service string, so the thought of war was on our minds. Our friends and neighbors were being called up all the time, so it was hard to forget. Pearl Harbor was a shock to us all and no one ever expected the war to start that way. It certainly ended the uncertainty of the draft for all of us.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What are some of your memories about the war?

**Mr. Bailey:** I can remember Neville Chamberlain with his umbrella returning from the visit with Hitler and promising "peace in our time." It was not long until we were to see Britain and all Europe at war. I remember things like the invasion of Norway, Holland, and France, as well as marching into Poland against Russia. We had radio news at that time and everyone listened, but we really relied greatly on our daily newspapers.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In your notes you mention the Young Democratic Organization. When did you join and under what circumstances?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't really know. I think they signed me up when I was at one of the regular Democratic rallies. They often met on the same nights. Usually their meetings had a dozen or so out, but I imagine their membership was quite large, most members not attending. I think you had to be eighteen to join.

They usually worked with the Democratic committee and helped sponsor rallies and other activities. Usually before an election they would go through the ballot and endorse the Democratic candidates. This seemed silly, but I did see it used from time to time as a tool to pass over a Democrat they did not like and just not endorse him.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You have a card showing you were a "First Voter for Roosevelt" in 1940.

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes, 1940 was my first election where I could vote. I do not remember too much political activity except the governorship mentioned. I was very involved in Scout work a few nights a week and also worked a couple of nights of the week at the paper office.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You said that you were more interested in national politics than in state issues in the 1930s. What do you remember about these state issues?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't really recall much about them, but if you had a specific question I could probably respond.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What did you know about the Washington Commonwealth Federation?

**Mr. Bailey:** (Pause) In my memory the Washington Commonwealth Federation started out as a federation of several liberal Democratic organizations gathered together for political strength and to promote liberal programs. Not the least of these groups was one called the Old-Age Pension Union, ostensibly made up of state pension recipients.

For a time they were quite effective and their endorsement meant a lot, especially in the King County area. I think it can be said they helped elect several legislators, usually Democrats, and some King

County commissioners as well as others. A King County commissioner, "Radio Speaker" John C. Stevenson, enjoyed their support and ran for governor. He was a real threat but did not make it.

Jack Taylor, also a Democratic county commissioner, had their support, which was highly desirable at that time. He was later elected state land commissioner and actually had his name changed to "Progressive Jack Taylor" for the ballot.

Anyway, after being an effective force for a time, the Old-Age Pension Union became the tool for a group of very left-wing figures. Many later turned out to be members of the Communist Party, others were just duped by the few. The Pension Union eventually became the most active part of the Federation and gradually took it over. Slowly, on realizing such things were happening, many members and groups left the WCF and it became of little political consequence.

In a somewhat corresponding way, the left-wingers had really taken over the machinery of the state Democratic committee. During the war, a one-term, very radical congressman from Montana, Jerry O'Connell, was hired to be the executive secretary of the Democrats. He attended all of the important meetings and was against the efforts of Harry Truman to halt the spread of Communism. Our Democratic meetings would be used to storm about calling Truman, the admirals and generals, vicious names, and it reached the point one night as I was leaving a meeting when my county auditor, Verna Jacobson, said, "When I go to these meetings nowadays I almost wish there was a back door I could go out so no one will see me."

Another left-winger active at that time was Hugh DeLacey, a former Seattle city councilman who was elected to Congress for one term. Both DeLacey and O'Connell later left and assumed duties in eastern states as Communist Party organizers.

While we may have disagreed on some of the issues, I doubt if many people, including myself, really realized how radical they were. Everyone on the New Deal side had been used to being called a "red" or "commie" by the conservatives opposed to social change, so much of their activity was brushed off as just more silly talk.

When really uncovered, their numbers were few, but no one knew that at the time. These people were experts at commandeering another organization and using it for their purpose and camouflaging their real purpose from the others.

The WCF put out a very liberal newspaper, the *Washington Commonwealth*, later called the *New Dealer*. It became about the only vocal voice to be heard from WCF in later years as hardly anyone except the few in charge seemed to pay any attention to it.

[End of Tape 5, Side 1]

**Ms. Bridgman:** Do you have any other comments about the Commonwealth Federation?

**Mr. Bailey:** Our little community of South Bend did have a part to play. We had two newspapers, the conservative and Republican *South Bend Journal*, and the much smaller, but Democratic, *Willapa Harbor Pilot*.

The editor and publisher of the *Pilot* got a federal job in Tacoma and left the paper. His sister and co-owner was appointed postmaster at South Bend, so they hired an editor to run the paper.

The first editor was a very good writer named Russell Annabel. He had written a number of printed stories about Alaska, and after a short time decided to go north again and left.

The next editor was a real left-wing crusader by the name of Terry Pettis. He really shook the town. The paper changed overnight and was filled with union-inspired stories, trying to attract the labor people. Pettis immediately became active in the Democratic county committee and certainly instilled it with a new life. He was named a precinct committeeman and later state committeeman. His wife usually held an office, often secretary. He saw to it that all the precincts were filled. He recruited and filed people in almost every precinct. Sometimes it would pit an old-time Democrat, usually more conservative, against one of Terry's liberals in this otherwise oft-forgotten post. Many times the Pettis people won. Even middle-of-the-roaders, not able to attend a meeting, would send their proxies to him. Pettis ran the show.

The precinct committeeman in my precinct was a man I never knew, never saw, and never heard of except in connection with this non-paying, usually neglected, job. I often wondered if his actual residence matched up with his voting district.

About 1938, Terry ran for county commissioner and was defeated by a very small number of votes. When he lost the election, or shortly thereafter, the *Pilot* editor returned temporarily and Terry Pettis left for Seattle to become editor of the *Washington Commonwealth*, later the *New Dealer*.

In our print shop we received weekly exchanges of the paper with our own, and it was quite the thing for Mr. Hazeltine and I to see which one could read it first. I always contended Pettis was not a Communist. Hazeltine was not sure but thought he was.

The straw that changed our minds was Pettis' opposition to aid to Imperialist Britain. Roosevelt was strongly denounced. This was while Russia and Germany were in bed together. The very week that Germany declared war on Russia, the paper reversed itself and called on all America to help Britain. I had to agree that my boss was right. There was no doubt as to the Communist influence.

At a later time I owned the files of the *Willapa Harbor Pilot* and had a visit from the FBI asking for some of my bound copies. I was surprised when they told me the years they wanted, and I was told if I would lend them voluntarily, they would return them to me, but if they had to subpoena the papers, I might never get them out of the court files and returned. I gave them and they returned them.

The files were used in a trial that Terry Pettis and several others had facing them in federal court. They were convicted of violating the Smith Act, which was in essence being disloyal to our government. They were awaiting sentence when a high court declared the Smith Act unconstitutional and they were released.

Terry died a few years ago in Seattle and had become quite a character in that city. At the time of his death he was head of the houseboat owners on Lake Washington, which he had organized himself. I always thought that Terry would find some way to charge someone membership card fees to help him get by.

Pettis was really a brilliant person, a very good writer, but everything was steered into the radical lines. He was very colorful and his death was quite widely noted in the Seattle dailies.

His Washington *New Dealer* was really nothing more than the west coast edition of the *Daily Worker*.

**Ms. Bridgman:** When did you first consider the Federation an unacceptable organization?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think I arrived at that conclusion. The WCF was operating mostly out of Seattle. I don't recall any local units, but there may have been. Most people involved were merely liberal in politics, the actual commies were few in number. They were using these solid people as their front.

**Ms. Bridgman:** We'd gotten to the war, and how you enlisted in the Navy, and coincidentally you had arranged for your physical on what turned out to be the day after Pearl Harbor. Can you supply me with some of the other details, the name of your ship, and other things?

**Mr. Bailey:** I was getting very uncertain about the draft and not being able to make plans, so about October 1941, I volunteered for the navy. The recruiter made the necessary arrangements with the draft board to strike my name from their list, and made an appointment for me to take my physical on Monday, December 8, 1941. I would then get a thirty-day leave until the end of the month, at least, and be able to get in lots of overtime at the paper and spend the holiday at home.

I will never forget that day. We were probably eighteen or so in number, all having arranged this previously. People were popping in the door all day wanting to enlist. They could not do so because we had priority. We all stripped for our physical and then a woman or two would pop through the door with, "Have you heard anything from my son?" or something like that. We spent more time running behind the screen in the big one-room office than we did in actual examination. In addition, the phone was ringing all day and we got attention in between all this.

I think that all of us reported for duty on December 28, 1941. San Diego training station was filled to capacity and we were dispersed about the Northwest. I ended up in Bremerton, just 100 miles from home, where they were setting up a temporary training station to take care of the overload.

As close as it was, I had never been to Bremerton before, and I was there about two years. After going through recruit training, I was assigned to the training school staff. Most of us did not make requests for transfer because we had been assigned to what was called COM13 (Commandant, Thirteenth Naval District) and transfer through them almost always was to Adak or Atu. I was not anxious to go there.

Our school assembled and trained crews for the "baby" aircraft carriers, and later, for the Kaiser-built personnel and supply transports being built in Vancouver and commissioned in Astoria. They were part of the amphibious forces of the Navy.

My ship was the USS *Fond Du Lac* (APA166), an attack transport. We had five to seven hundred people in our crew. We carried various landing craft and part of our crew was called the boat crew, to handle the craft. Another section was known as the beach party, trained to land and establish beachhead if called on to do so. Our chief job, though, was to carry Army and Marine personnel to various battle sites on the islands and atolls of the Pacific.

We really got around the Pacific and the ship seemed to lead a charmed life as battles went. We first made a trip by ourselves from Frisco to Espirito Santos in the New Hebrides, near New Guinea. Besides New Guinea, atolls and islands galore, we occasionally stopped at Honolulu for supplies or repairs.

We went north one time to Leyte Gulf in the Philippines, but got there after the fighting was over

and had no problems except for a few air raids. We carried troops into Okinawa on Easter Sunday morning, April 1, 1945. We expected hundreds of planes to fly out as this was the first invasion of the Japanese homeland. There were quite a few, but not what we expected. We dodged a few suicide divers and the sky was just filled with the anti-aircraft of hundreds of Navy ships.

I remember one time that day on our radio we heard a voice saying: "Quit shooting at me. Don't hit me. I'm an American." He was. Luckily we weren't that good a shot.

Anyway, with comparative ease, we dropped thousands of troops onto Okinawa from hundreds of transports and we were ordered to leave immediately for Guam to pick up more troops. About five days later one of the bloodiest battles of the war was fought near Naha on Okinawa. Casualties were high on both sides. We had missed it again.

It was an awesome sight when we would start out on a mission. We were a part of the Fifth Fleet and there were hundred of ships of all kinds as far as the eye could see on the ocean. You had the feeling that you wished you were not there but you were going whether you liked it or not.

I often thought we won the war not by strategy or brilliance, but by sheer numbers.

The secrecy with which all these things were done assumed that all enlisted people were security risks or plain dunces. The officers that did know where we were going usually told their wives so that they could be at the next port.

We did not know where we were going when we set out for Okinawa. We were to be told after setting sail. Long before we were told, Tokyo Rose came on the radio. "You Americans. You sailing up your ships and you coming to Okinawa."

After Okinawa we encountered some engine trouble and were ordered to Lake Union in Seattle for repairs. We were there V-J Day.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What do you remember about V-J Day in Seattle?

**Mr. Bailey:** I remember one false alarm, but on the following day President Truman spoke to the nation on the radio. The whistles blew and most everyone closed up business and hit the streets. I remember big crowds going up and down, parades of cars honking their horns, people joining hands and serpentining through the streets. One time when I was standing at a corner a convertible full of people drove up, stopped, and a lady jumped out and tipped a bottle of beer up to my mouth and said, "Here, sailor, have a drink." She jumped back in and I watched them go up the street and stop at every corner, doing the same thing. Everyone was deliriously happy.

I never regretted using the atom bomb. It saved millions of lives and our enemies would have used it on us without any excuses.

**Ms. Bridgman:** When you were in Bremerton, did you see the president?

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes, but I had seen President Roosevelt before in Washington, DC. In those days of radio and newspapers it was hard to not think people we read about were supermen. It is nice to see that they are just ordinary humans like all of us.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did you feel about his death?

**Mr. Bailey:** It was a very sad day. People on board ship were openly talking about it and expressing doubts that Truman would have the ability to carry on very well. FDR had been with us so long that many did not remember much about those before him. I had my doubts about Truman, but I never feared that it was the end of our government. He later surprised everyone and becomes one of our greats.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did you respond to the military disciplines and that sort of thing?

**Mr. Bailey:** I was very fearful of officers at first, but found that most of them were there because they were called out of civilian life just like we were. I can think of only a few where their gold braid went to their heads.

I was assigned an old Navy seadog, boatswain, of some thirty-five years service, called back for the duration. He was very strict with me and really went out of his way to be strict. I had a bad six months or more while those with me were treated very leniently. Later, though, I was grateful that I had been taught very strict discipline. I think he realized it was for my best interests. I never again feared officers. I had already had the worst, and things had to get better. I got along fine.

I never had troubles with the officers or men. I handled personnel matters for several hundreds of people and I enjoyed working with them. I knew almost everyone and still have contacts with quite a number.

[End of Tape 5, Side 2]

**Ms. Bridgman:** How specifically did your military service affect your understanding of your fellow citizens?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't recall any influence. Most of the officers and men I served with were there just like me because they had been called to serve. We were all anxious to do the job and get back home. Many had married young, many had young families and

were anxious to get on with their jobs or their education.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How about the effect of military service on your view of your country and particularly of its foreign policy and its government?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think that was any part of our consideration. We were there for the duration and when it was over we wanted to go home.

**Ms. Bridgman:** When you returned home, where did you live?

**Mr. Bailey:** When I returned home I went to my parents' house. The federal law also said that my employer had to return my job to me. I wasn't too interested in that, but when I walked in to say hello at the print shop, an old elderly friend, Fred Mullins, who had worked in my place, was running the press. He stopped right in the middle, took off his apron, and said, "I'm sure glad you're back. Here's your job."

Fred was a retiree who had worked with my dad and myself before the war. He really didn't want full-time work, but liked the one or two days a week he could do and make a little extra money. I truly think he was glad to see me as he was physically not up to full-time work. I was not ready to take it on, either.

Up until the time I returned, there had been no candidate for county clerk. I had thought about filing. In fact, my mother had written and said that my former employer had told someone that he thought this would be a good job for me. In those days you could only hold a county job for two terms and the incumbent had to run for something else. It was the custom then to serve two terms in one office, use your name familiarity, and run for another for two terms in another office, and then return to the first, or even go on to another.

When I returned a woman had filed on the Republican ticket and had made a public statement that if a veteran returned and filed she would withdraw. Of course, she did not. Another young lady filed on the Democratic ticket, and on the last hour of the last day I filed for the Democratic nomination for county clerk.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Who were the other people who had encouraged you to run?

**Mr. Bailey:** The decision was entirely mine, and except for the family, I do not remember discussing it with anyone else. In fact, it was only at the last minute that I made up my mind. After I filed I began to gather a great deal of support.

I remember that the Democratic chairman who had filed my opposition in the primaries called me to ask if he could visit and if I would promise to hire the young lady already filed, she would withdraw. Since the clerk only had one deputy and the job was very technical, plus the fact that the lady there was very competent and I had known her for years, I told him not to bother, I would not deal, so I went through the primaries without his support.

Until I filed, I doubt if many of my friends realized I was that interested. After that they really rallied around to my support.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Were there other career opportunities open to you at that time?

**Mr. Bailey:** I had only been home a couple of weeks, so there was not much time to look around. I had really thought about going to school, but the opportunity for a political office was appealing. At one time the superior court judge discussed the opportunity for me to read law under him while serving as clerk, later taking the necessary college courses and being eligible for the bar. We decided to forget it until after the election. Both of us became so busy that we never discussed it again.

Our office only had two full-time people, myself and my deputy. We did not have the copy machines and things that are common today and had to do a great deal of typing. I sat in on courtroom trials, took the court minutes, and also covered the activities in the judge's chambers, which was many times daily. I would then type the minutes, which were very lengthy. My deputy typed copies of the wills, judgments, and other records in their respective books, and we both tried to take care of the lawyers who were examining files, filing cases, and other papers. We were very busy.

Before my election, during the campaign, the naval officer over me at Bremerton had asked me to come to work for him, forget politics, and make some money. He had married and assumed control of his new wife's business, and had assembled many former members of his staff. He was a very amiable person, but ran the business like the Navy. He was soon broke and had to turn everything over to his wife's sons. I was glad that I decided not to go.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You mentioned once that you had remarked while in the Navy that you wanted to return home, get into politics, and if not an office, at least to be at a place where policy was made.

**Mr. Bailey:** That probably was facetious, but turned out nearer the truth than I ever seriously thought. I had always been the political voice in our chief petty officer quarters, and I think everyone expected me to do something in politics. I don't know what they expected because I didn't know either.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You had remarked to me one time that you just drifted into politics, that you took advantage of the opportunities that came your way. What can you tell me about that?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I guess you are asking questions concerning my plan or modus operandi in politics. I didn't have any. You don't run and do stupid things unless you have a chance to win. I doubt I thought much about any plans when I was still in the Navy. When I returned home and found the office of county clerk was open, no incumbent, I saw an opportunity. Later, interesting as it was, I did not want to spend all my days filing papers in the clerk's office and saw an opportunity in the Legislature where I was sure one of our incumbents was in trouble. Even later, when the Republican state senator appeared vulnerable, I saw the opportunity and defeated him. No future planning for anything, just an opportune time.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What would you describe as currents in the stream that guided you into politics?

**Mr. Bailey:** I suppose I was interested in social legislation that was being advanced by the Democratic Party, but there was no compelling interest in issues that I recall. I had always liked to work with people, and once I got started, I did like to campaign on a one-on-one basis. When I was in personnel work in the Navy, I also greatly enjoyed the personal friendships made with everyone.

Washington State is noted for its open primary, but the open primary also breeds lack of responsibility toward party platforms. The candidate has no responsibility to party platforms. The candidate files for election. It is not a party decision, strictly a personal one, all they need is a filing fee. Later, another group meets in state convention and adopts a party platform. There is no relationship between the candidate and the party except those either of the two care to establish. While Washington voters like their independence in this fashion and are not about to change it, it is not responsible insofar as party programs and principles go as connected with their candidate.

I was disenchanted with the House. I never cared much for it. Perhaps it was too big. I had contemplated not running again, but when I saw the opportunity, I challenged a Senate incumbent and was elected. A little later, I ran for Congress and was defeated. An opportunity opened for manager of the Port of Willapa Harbor. I applied and received it, keeping my Senate seat at the same time.

Quite unexpectedly and without request of any sort from me, Governor Ray tapped me for chairman of the state Utilities and Transportation Commission.

You see it comes about one step at a time.

You seem to build momentum if people support you. Even in defeat for the Congress, it was great when I received eighty to ninety percent of the vote from my own county. It made me feel good.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Did you think about the effects of becoming county clerk and what it would have on your interest in newspaper work?

**Mr. Bailey:** Heavens, no. I might have liked newspaper work, but it was not my lifetime devotion. Acquiring your own newspaper would take a great deal of money, and they were not always available. Once, while in the service, I heard that the one paper in South Bend was folding. I contacted several Democratic leaders to go see what could be done about acquiring it. It had been sold when they got there. I found later that my old boss had engineered the sale of the equipment to stop any future opposition. Of course he never knew about our inquiry. It was a good business deal for him to eliminate some future opposition.

Today you need very little equipment to set up an offset newspaper. In those days the costs of Linotypes, presses, and other equipment were prohibitive.

In the middle of my term as county clerk the editor-publisher of the *Raymond Advertiser* became very ill and my father and I decided to take it over. I had planned to resign at the courthouse, but the old judge was engaged in a battle with attorneys and asked me to stay on for awhile, at least. He subsequently resigned. The new judge said it would be helpful if I stayed on for awhile. So I served out my term, running for the Legislature at the next election instead of clerk.

Our newspaper and job shop had plenty of work, but our equipment was in such bad shape that it took us two or three times as long to do things, making it much less profitable. Repairs would cost many thousands of dollars, which we did not have.

This also caused us to work day and night. I would work at the courthouse days, at the paper at night. I used to tell people that when we went into the business I had black hair. When I washed the ink out of it, it was white.

**Ms. Bridgman:** About your campaign for county clerk. Your campaign literature does not describe issues, either in the primary or general election. What were these?

**Mr. Bailey:** The office of county clerk is an administrative one. Primarily, the clerk serves as recorder for many legal documents connected with the court, but principally as clerk of the superior court, thus keeping court records and working very closely with the judge. It is not one in which "issues" would be a big factor. You could not overlook that year, though, the high favor of a returned service man

facing the public. Also many of my county-wide friends in Scouting welcomed me with open arms and gave me support I could never have imagined. People in my town would tell people in other towns and areas of the county, and it was not unusual to go to another community and have someone tell me that they were already for me because they had received word from their relatives or friend in South Bend.

I did have a hard time getting started to pass out cards, and things of that sort, but once I started, I really enjoyed it and never ran into a curt or impolite rebuff. I loved to meet people.

We had an old Englishman who worked for the county and had always been a friend of mine since I was his paper boy. He pushed me into going to the little town of Naselle on my first trip out. We timed it so we would get there when the morning mail came in and the whole town was at the post office, and we could meet as many as possible. I was really having a hard time getting started when he told me if I didn't get out he was going to do it for me.

I got out and handed my first card to a lady who let out a shriek and everyone came running. I had handed my first card to a Mrs. Robert Bailey. I later went to their place and met her husband and became fairly well acquainted with the family. That was one reason I always campaigned as Robert "C."

A few years later when we were in the Raymond paper, the Raymond Chamber of Commerce sponsored its annual chicken-raising contest for 4-H members. Each merchant would sponsor purchase of some chicks and finance a 4-H member to raise them. At the end of the period a show would be held and the winner of the biggest and best flock would receive a prize; the sponsor, the chickens. They had a field day when they assigned this Robert Bailey to sponsor Robert Bailey, Jr., and since I was single, I was the subject of much publicity--all in fun. Well, the Baileys won the contest and I turned chicken. I couldn't eat the birds and turned them over to "junior."

**Ms. Bridgman:** What else did you do in campaigning except to pass out cards?

**Mr. Bailey:** I went everywhere. I'd spend a couple of days at the beach. One strategy which evolved was going to the barber shops where I made great friends of the barbers, and it paid dividends. They certainly helped me. When people came in and commented on my sign or something, I always had a good supporter presenting my case. Name familiarity is something you have to build and cannot ignore. I also made it a point to seek out people I knew would talk a lot and be listened to. I never just shook hands and walked on. I spent time with those people.

I don't think I ever asked any person, "Will you vote for me?" I always found this abrasive when they asked me, and it either called for a lie or a challenge. I would say, "If you can remember me next Tuesday, I would appreciate it."

**Ms. Bridgman:** Any other thoughts?

**Mr. Bailey:** I always visited every Democratic precinct committee person in the area. Many times they had been taken for granted and just not been consulted by any candidate. I would even seek a Republican committee person to let them know who I was and just introduce myself.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did you monitor those efforts, your newspaper ads, and how did they evolve into this strategy?

**Mr. Bailey:** We had no polls at that time. Your problem was to make your name known. We had worked with a printer who was a Finn. On leaving South Bend he went to Astoria and took over a Finnish language paper. I found that several communities were heavy subscribers and I had him write up ads in Finnish. I still am not sure what they said, but they must have been effective.

Sometimes these ethnic groups would have a spokesman in their midst with whom they would consult in matters such as candidates. They listened to him quite a lot and I had several on my list.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How much money did you spend on your campaign?

**Mr. Bailey:** Probably an outlay of about five hundred dollars. This does not count time or effort. The county clerk job only paid $2,700 a year, but at that time it was pretty good pay.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How much did you receive in contributions?

**Mr. Bailey:** For county clerk, nothing. After I won the nomination for the Legislature it is probable that the county Democratic committee would have made some contribution in advertising and things like that along with others on the ticket. No personal contributions, though. I think I was running for the Senate when I first received a contribution, through the mail. I did not know whether to take it or not, but finally did. Later, when talking to my Republican opponent, he told me he had received the same thing, the same amount. The donors were not taking any chances.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In your scrapbook there was something like a voters pamphlet--

**Mr. Bailey:** That was printed by my former boss as a money-maker. Each candidate paid to have his picture and data sheet in it. I remember one candidate for prosecuting attorney who was not included. He did not have the money to invest. I think the amount

was something like twenty-five dollars and it was mailed to every registered voter in the county.

[End of Tape 6, Side 1]

**Ms. Bridgman:** You mentioned the judge. Was he one of your political mentors?

**Mr. Bailey:** I couldn't say that, but we became very good friends. I had talked to him a couple of times before the election, but not extensively, mainly to get to know him and maybe to get his tacit support.

His name was John I. O'Phelan, and he had served many years as a prosecuting attorney and other things before becoming judge. His background was Republican. He was very patriotic and was particularly proud that, even though not a veteran, he was an honorary member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I remember one time when I was running for clerk that one of our Legion members told me he had heard a rumor that I was in with the left-wing "commie" circle. I talked it over with the VFW friends I had, and they were willing to run ads of support. I went to seek the judge's advice and he asked me who told me, how many people heard this, and things like that. His advice was hard to do, but very sage. "Do not answer, keep your mouth shut. Perhaps only one or two have heard this and if you answer YOU will have spread the word yourself." I followed his advice, swallowed my tongue, and it worked. I also have followed that advice in politics in the years that followed. It may be hard to do, but it works.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Did you have political advisors in your campaign?

**Mr. Bailey:** I ran my own campaign. I did have different people help and go with me at times. Many times this would boomerang as the people we would visit would later ask me just what connection I had with the person that accompanied me. I found out that you had to do things for yourself, and could not carry the burden of other people on your shoulders. Much later in other campaigns I always found it not possible to campaign with other candidates even though there was always one or two that would approach me and want to go with me.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You mentioned the opposition in your campaign for clerk, one Democrat, one Republican?

**Mr. Bailey:** The Democrat was a young lady filed by the county chairman. I am sure he thought at that time that no Democrat would file and it was his job to see the ticket filled. He took her around a bit, but I don't think he gained her much support because most of the party people he knew were for me. She was a very fine person, but not having much political savvy and depending on the chairman to pull her through. I always felt he did a disservice to her by not helping her more. Perhaps he didn't know how.

The Republican lady was one we had known for years. She was middle-aged and had raised her family. She, too, had not been active in politics, but got around quite a bit. It was a clean campaign and I don't remember any personal comments between any of us, about any of us.

How times change! I have to chuckle when I look back at some of my old ads and cards. Running against two women, I said, "The Man for the Job!" Imagine using that slogan now!

**Ms. Bridgman:** Can you tell me by how many votes you won?

**Mr. Bailey:** I won handily in both primary and general, but would have to look it up. I remember a very popular county commissioner who was very proud of having the most votes cast for any candidate two years before. He asked me if I realized that I was the top vote-getter on the ballot. I had not thought about it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You have talked about the judge. What about other county officials you worked with?

**Mr. Bailey:** They were all equally important, and we worked well together in a nonpartisan way. Each official had his own legal duties and took care of them. The county auditor was usually thought of as the senior official because of the myriad of duties that office was charged with performing. Actually, the auditor had no control over other offices. I remember one time when daylight savings time was optional and the auditor posted notices on all doors as to our working hours. I challenged her and posted my own schedule and the judge advised me that I had a legal right to do so. Some of the others in the courthouse really enjoyed my challenge and followed suit.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What kind of political careers did these people have later on?

**Mr. Bailey:** Most of them continued in courthouse careers until retirement, usually because of age, but sometimes by the voters. The sheriff's job was always a hot one and sometimes changed frequently. County commissioners came and went, but they, too, had the advantage of name familiarity when seeking re-election.

I suppose I was more directly involved in partisan political matters than most of the others, unless it would have been a county commissioner who had been very active in unions, and also in politics. The Republican officials, the few we had, were not always in the forefront in partisan politics, and I suspect they figured they would rely on nonpartisan friendships

and name familiarity to get themselves re-elected and forego the unnecessary partisan squabbles.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You were a delegate to the state convention in 1946. How did you get that post?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know how the Republicans operated, but our party always held a county convention and elected delegates to the state. It was usually difficult to find enough people willing to spend the money and time to go. Frequently they would ask elected officials if they could attend. Many times the wives would also be named delegates or alternates because they would also be there.

Later when we got into presidential primary battles, like between George McGovern and Senator Henry Jackson, we really fought out the delegate makeup and usually based it on who you supported. This group would then go on to a congressional district caucus and again try to get control for their candidate. The winners, of course, would control the state convention and thus the delegates to the national convention, if they had the votes.

I don't recall any burning issues in the 1946 convention in Olympia.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You mentioned some of the duties of clerk. What were some others?

**Mr. Bailey:** The clerk was not only the county clerk, keeping certain county records, but also "ex-officio clerk of the superior court," keeping court records and working closely with the judge. One of the interesting duties was compiling the voter list, and with the judge present, drawing names for the jury panel. Jury terms were usually held twice a year. The clerk sat in the courtroom during the trials, swore the jurors, and took care of the exhibits offered, as well as taking the minutes.

Our judge was very proper and would not allow attorneys in his chambers unless the clerk or deputy was along. If the case was contested or the matter had two sides, he insisted that both attorneys and the clerk be present. This took a great deal of time, but it was a very proper way of conduct.

The judge was a very quiet, more or less lonely, person. If he asked, we helped him in his correspondence. He usually had a court reporter to assist, but since the reporter was not full-time, he was not always around. People don't realize that a high percentage of court work, papers and orders, are signed in the judge's chambers, not in the courtroom. The clerk would have to be present and make minutes, which would later show up as activities the judge had engaged in during a day, just as if in open court. This went on practically every day.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What kind of reforms did you want to see put in the office?

**Mr. Bailey:** I had no great crusade. The former clerk had started, and I finished, banning outsiders from going into the records vault without someone from the office. We demanded that they ask us for a file and it would be brought out into the outer office to look at. Many clerk's offices, and some of our predecessors, allowed everyone to go in the vault without supervision, and even allowed attorneys to take files to their offices if they needed them. We stopped this practice. Eventually the attorneys liked it too, because they knew that the complete file was there and it saved them a lot of time.

I also started streamlining some of the old files in the vaults. They were folded up in clumsy fashion and took a lot of space. I am happy to say that the current clerk has done much in this way now, using microfilm, computers, and copying machines--things we didn't have at that time.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Do you recall other incidents in the clerk's office while you were there?

**Mr. Bailey:** Generally, all of us, attorneys, staff, judge, got along fine. Once in awhile we would have a problem. We had one attorney who could not seem to do anything right, even filing a probate case. My deputy and I actually gave him legal advice to keep him straight. He was very appreciative and was genuinely grateful.

On another occasion we had a criminal trial in which the defendant was found guilty. His case was appealed and they had thirty days to file their arguments before the Supreme Court. About the 25th day I noted nothing had happened and reminded the attorney. Of course, I was told that he knew what he was doing.

A week or so later, too late to file, I noted the pile of legal briefs on my desk. He stormed in and started on me for not having mailed them in on time. I argued that I never had them to mail. He called me to one side and told me that if the defendant knew how he botched up, "He'd kill me."

Of course I did not like that and argued back, but when he appealed to the court he swore that the clerk had been negligent in filing the papers in timely fashion and got a new trial. I don't think the court ever found the clerk negligent, but it usually leans in favor of the accused in criminal cases and, as I recall, the briefs were accepted.

Later, this same lawyer brought a client in to look over a family will which he was contesting--his client had been left out or didn't get enough. When they left, or probably the next day, we found the will was missing. Since my deputy had copied the will into the Book of Wills, much to the disgust of the lawyer and

his client, our judge ordered the copy to be admitted instead of the original one.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You saved copies of the state county clerks' conventions, 1947-1949. How important were these conventions?

**Mr. Bailey:** They were a great help. Most counties do things by different methods. It was helpful to get together and talk over mutual problems, sometimes solving some of our own or getting new ideas. We also drew up proposed legislation or opposed legislation which would impact our offices. Almost all offices have these associations and they serve a very good purpose.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Before we discuss your participation in local and state Democratic politics, what was your attitude to President Truman and politics after the war?

**Mr. Bailey:** I didn't come out of the service until the spring of 1946. I really didn't know too much about Harry Truman, but I supported his foreign policy to contain communism. He was generally thought to be very vulnerable. I remember early in the game, probably 1947, someone came and asked me to chair the county Kefauver for President Committee. I accepted and received a dose of publicity as well as holy hades from a few of our active party members. Kefauver folded early, though, and was not even an issue a few months later.

The county Democrats, along with the state, were facing a challenge from the left-wingers in the party. They were deserting to support Henry Wallace on a third-party, extremely left-wing ticket.

[End of Tape 6, Side 2]

## 4

## COUNTY CLERK

**Ms. Bridgman:** Senator Bailey, you remarked earlier that, in your words, you were a little doubtful about the Truman Doctrine at first. Will you please explain how your initial opinion changed?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I guess I made that comment because at that time I was not a great follower of Harry Truman. There had been very little advance selling of the idea, but it developed later that it was a necessary thing to keep the European countries from going into the communist hands. It wasn't opposition, it was probably a lack of interest on my part.

I thought it was well presented later when, I remember, the Italians held their first elections. There was a possibility of Italy going communist, and as a member of the Naval Reserve, I received notices that I could be called up into active duty if the election did not go against the reds. I suppose about the time those things happened, my attitude shifted and I became a lot more interested.

**Ms. Bridgman:** So, it was information you learned from the newspaper, or the radio, and that sort of thing that changed your mind?

**Mr. Bailey:** It would be strictly the current events, the radio, and in the newspaper. That was all we had. It wasn't anything of great philosophy, it just evolved, and I think people of the country reacted the same way. It resulted in strong support for the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, and whatever else that they might have proposed.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did you feel about the continuation of the draft, and about NATO as part of Truman's foreign policy?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't remember very much about that. I think we put more emphasis on the United Nations that had met and organized in San Francisco in 1945. NATO and SEATO in Southeast Asia and others were all more or less diplomatic agreements being negotiated by the secretary of state.

I don't really remember great emphasis on those pacts at that time. I think we were all interested in seeing that we didn't have a communist takeover, or a case of where we allowed the defeated countries to build up too rapidly and defeat what we had fought a war for.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did you become convinced that that was indeed a threat?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, as I said, I think that probably the first time I realized it was a threat was when we returned from service. We had great visions of the United States and Russia and everyone getting along pretty well. We had suspicions, of course, but we were so glad the war was over that we didn't make a great issue out of it. I think maybe my first realization of what could happen in the world was the Italian elections and possible call back to service.

By that time I was in the courthouse. I do remember that we watched that election with a great deal of interest because, when it gets down to taking you back to active duty, you start taking an interest. I think from then on probably the so-called "communist menace" would receive more interest than it did before.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How much did the other people in the courthouse agree with this?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't recall ever discussing it with them. I was probably the most political of the people in the courthouse. Most of them were Democrats, but I think probably I had more interest in active politics than the rest of the people in the courthouse at that time. I don't think their interest is politics was as active as mine.

**Ms. Bridgman:** With which other organizations or people did you discuss these matters?

**Mr. Bailey:** I probably didn't discuss them politically with very many people. We ran into quite a few discussions in the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion. Those were mainly semi-patriotic defense type of conversations, between veterans. We weren't anxious to go to war with Russia, but would not like to allow them to take over everything that we had won. Maybe that was the extent of it.

It wasn't the greatest issue or anything in our local Democratic politics. Incidentally, the county party only met maybe three or four times a year, so it was not a regular organization where you went and discussed day-to-day occurrences.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What about Truman's domestic policy? What was your reaction to that?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I was quite a strong supporter of Truman's domestic policy. I probably had fears, at that time, because I was such a fan of Roosevelt's that I didn't think Truman had the ability to get anything going--because he did not seem as strong as FDR. At the same time though, he carried on the Roosevelt

principles of the New Deal in helping on a lot of social issues. He did a good job and beyond my expectations.

I found out later, of course, that Truman was very persuasive and very capable. He had his own way of getting things done, and he accomplished a lot. My first support of Truman was more in the domestic field, and later, to realize that he had done some very great things on the international level.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What was your particular response to his initiation of loyalty oaths for federal employees and the investigations that were begun under his administration?

**Mr. Bailey:** My memory is that any loyalty oaths that Truman asked of people were far less radical than the loyalty oaths that Eisenhower asked later, when he demanded that every federal officeholder take an oath of allegiance--not only an oath of allegiance, an investigation into every phase of their personal lives, into every statement they ever have made and even if they had lived in the same town with known Communists.

The FBI was extremely busy in those years carrying out the Eisenhower purge. I do recall attention given to patriotism, not wanting people in our government that were selling us out, but I do not recall that the loyalty oath was as big an issue as it was later under Eisenhower.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you describe the political situation in Washington State during these years of 1946 and 1947?

**Mr. Bailey:** When I came back from service I ran as a Democrat. I was elected as a Democrat. We had forty or more precincts in our county and each precinct had a Democratic precinct committeeman. When the party met, it was quite customary that there would be very little party business to transact, unless you were going to a state convention and they would elect delegates. In that case, they would also adopt a platform.

Each precinct committeeman had one vote, and it was not unusual for only five or six people to show up at the courthouse to attend the meeting. They would call the roll, and usually one of the officers would stand and say "Mr. Chairman" or "Madam Chairman, I have here twenty proxies which I will deposit with you, which allow me to vote their twenty votes." Automatically that meant that the person holding the proxies pretty well controlled the meeting. The other people attending, the audience, were certainly outvoted and there was little incentive for many to attend.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Thank you. We have, since we last met, found the missing 1946 Democratic convention delegate ribbon that you had saved. That convention was in Olympia. I'd like to know what you remember about that convention, and what you thought about the 1946 election in the state.

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, in the first place, when you asked me the other day, I could not recall that convention so it is apparent I did not remember much about it. I do remember now that in 1946 the primary elections were held in July and this occurred in September.

I remember being elected a delegate, which is not a great feat because many times--not a presidential year--the county had trouble getting enough people that were willing to serve as delegates and attend. Without a doubt I was elected because I had received good votes in the July primary and was the Democratic candidate for county clerk. I was attending meetings regularly.

I also remember I was anxious to go because for the first time after I returned from the service I would be getting into state-level politics, not with the idea of running for any office, but with the idea of meeting some of the people that were on the state level, and also those from other counties.

To me, the highlight of the convention was getting out and meeting party officials, particularly the secretary of state, Earl Coe, at that time. He was a state party leader. It was just a great experience. It was an off year, and there was not great controversy going on at that time.

I do remember that Henry Jackson was a convention star. Scoop Jackson was running for re-election to the United States House of Representatives. After the Republican sweep of 1946, he was the only Democratic member of the United States House from Washington State.

In 1947, Scoop Jackson, as congressman from the Second District, Everett, came down into Willapa Harbor to campaign for Charles Savage, running for a vacancy in Congress. He came to South Bend because he had spent summer vacations there visiting members of his parents' family that lived in the area. He knew and drew many people. I would say half of the audience was related to him. It was my first experience with a big-name politician.

Charlie Savage was having extreme troubles that year, trying to prove that he was not pro-Communist. He had refused to turn down support from the extreme wing of the party, and it became a great disenchantment for middle-of-the-road Democratic voters. He lost the election, largely due to the fact that he refused to disallow the support of the Washington Commonwealth Federation.

Scoop ran in 1952 for the Senate and I remember taking him around South Bend and Raymond at the time. He was a good campaigner for Charlie Savage in 1947, and he was looking ahead for his own run in 1952. He was a great fellow.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In the 1946 election Senator Harry Cain and other Republicans campaigned against "Communist-controlled Democrats." You've just mentioned the Washington Commonwealth Federation, but what do you recall about those accusations in that campaign?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, if Harry Cain told me white was white, I wouldn't believe it was white because I'd have to check it out and get a new pair of glasses, probably. I looked at charges like this with a great deal of cynicism because at that time they made those wild accusations against anybody that wasn't with them.

The state Democrats, during the war, had brought in a militant organizer, Jerry O'Connell, who had been a very liberal, radical, one-term member of Congress from Montana. He was hired as executive secretary of the state Democratic Party.

I remember going to a Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in 1947 where Jerry O'Connell was the main speaker. He spent his whole time denouncing Harry Truman, General Marshall, and most Democratic leaders of the day. He openly resented any defensive policies aimed at stopping Russian expansion.

I remember my county auditor, Verna Jacobson, coming out the door. And I hadn't thought too much about it, but was rather irate and didn't think it a very good Democratic speech. I remember Verna saying, "You know, sometimes I'm getting almost ashamed to come to these meetings. I feel like I ought to sneak out the side door so nobody sees me."

Well, I think the rank and file had reactions like Verna's and myself, but everyone waited for someone else to take it on.

I've explained how people voted proxies at county committee meetings. Several members of the county committee had been recruited and organized by a great organizer, Terry Pettis. He had moved on to Seattle many years before, but the remnants of Terry Pettis, and the way he operated with proxy and little attendance was a heritage. It was still the way business was carried on.

Out of six Democratic county committee officials, probably four were very, very left wing. I do not say that they were Communists at all, but they were really very radical.

It got so that most of us did not want to be associated with the group on decisions. I was positive that the Longshore Union in Raymond was part of it. I was positive that the IWA Union of the Timberworkers was part of it, and their spokesman was elected a county commissioner--a man by the name of Arlie Thompson. I just didn't know how far or deep it went.

Most of us were just kind of going on very cautious and easy. We never had any votes in the county meeting, but there were not too many county meetings.

Henry Wallace decided that he was going to run on a third-party ticket. It was the Progressive ticket if I recall, and he had gathered all these left-wing people around. I do not yet believe that Henry Wallace was Communist, but he certainly gathered them around. It doesn't take much to attract these people, and they love to take over worthy causes and steer them.

Our county chairman was one of the very left-wing leaning members of the county committee. He had announced that he was organizing a Wallace for President Club and was also calling a county Democratic convention.

I met him downtown one Saturday shortly after this announcement, and he asked if I would mind giving him a ride home as he lived a short distance out of town. When we got there he told me that he had letters ready to go out to all members of the county Democratic committee--every precinct, and asked if I would mail them for him. He also gave me my copy, which I read on reaching home.

He was very honest in his letter to the precinct committeemen, saying he was in support of Henry Wallace but asking that he be re-elected Democratic county chairman--that if they could not attend would they please send him their proxy.

I delayed mailing the letters in order to confer with a conservative Democratic businessman, Fluornoy Lavinder, who shared my concerns over the left-wing shenanigans.

Since it was a Saturday, I proposed to Lavinder that I write a letter, some of which he would sign, some for my own signature, telling these people we did not agree that our chairman should be supporting another party, and "PLEASE, DO NOT SEND PROXIES IF YOU CANNOT ATTEND YOURSELF."

We received tremendous response. When the night came, the courtroom was filled with people--not one proxy, but probably for the first time in history *every* member of the Democratic county committee was in attendance. We had the sheriff's people standing guard because we thought they might be violent. The morning before the meeting the officers wrote their resignations and laid them on my desk and

gave a story to the *Seattle P-I* at the same time. Everyone in question resigned.

The *P-I* ran a story headed by "Pacific County Democratic Chicken Molts Its Red Wings," or something like that.

Anyway, we had tremendous support from all the people. The funny thing was, as I walked out of the courthouse that night, Arlie Thompson looked at me and said, "Bob, I'm sure proud of you. I thought you were one of them."

And I said, "Arlie, I thought you were one of them."

You can't believe it--but we found there were only three or four that were extremists, and the rest had been led down a path of granting proxies and giving away our heritage, you might say without thinking. No one realized how bad it was.

This had nothing to do with Washington's Canwell or any McCarthy-type purge or anything like that. This was truly a local encounter. I found out later the IWA, the union I had suspected, had gone through the same battle, and had one terrible time running these people out of union offices.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In your opinion, how likely was it that the Wallace supporters would have taken over had you not written your letters?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think they would have taken over. They were few in number and dominated because too many of us were not alert.

I still say that our chairman, Kenneth Leach, was a man of high principle. There was no reason for me to think he was Communist. He was like a lot of the rest of those people; he was being used. All of us were duped for so many years, we didn't realize what was happening.

At the well-attended meeting that night, new officers were named, and I was elected state committeeman from Pacific County. Shortly after that O'Connell was ousted from the state committee. It was not just a Pacific County movement but one coming from all parts of the state.

Mr. O'Connell went back East, and it is my understanding that in either Ohio or Illinois he became the state director of the Communist Party. There was then no doubt about him. He was one of few that I would say really was a card-carrying member.

Many people in the timber industry were in the unemployed ranks back in the Depression and doubtlessly carried Communist cards because they didn't have any other hope at that time. Most of them did not stay long. But the shadow ever remained with them when the Canwells and the McCarthys got front stage.

Mostly it was not that they were Communists. They were what were called "fellow travelers." They happened to be in the same room or on the same committee or something else with some of these people who did not hesitate to use them for their purposes.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you describe to us what you did at the 1947 dinner when Jerry O'Connell denounced Truman and the Truman Doctrine and the Navy?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I don't recall doing anything. Some of us left very upset, I'll tell you that. I'm not sure--I was really quite exercised about what he was saying about our armed services. I'd just came out of the Navy and that's what probably got to me more than criticism of President Truman and others.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You've kept a letter in your scrapbook, which you wrote to Earl Coe describing the situation. Does that bring back more memories?

**Mr. Bailey:** Earl Coe was our state chairman and Washington's secretary of state. He was feeling the same way we were.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The dinner was in April 1947?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I think so.

After writing to Earl Coe, I remember Mr. Lavinder and I made a trip up to Olympia to ask him. I remember how nervous I was because here I was going to meet the secretary of state. I was shaking all over. Coe was very friendly and we discussed with him what we could do. He was working on the same problem in other areas of the state.

**Ms. Bridgman:** After the dinner meeting?

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes, the dinner stirred us to action. The convention was much later in the 1948 campaign.

**Ms. Bridgman:** There is also a letter from Coe to you, in reply to your letter. Can you describe the contents?

**Mr. Bailey:** It was the result of the dinner meeting and my letter to him protesting O'Connell. He was very supportive.

From that time on Earl Coe and I worked very closely. When I was in the Legislature later, he was really one of my very close friends. He'd been a former legislator himself, and had been appointed secretary of state to fill a vacancy and later was elected.

Mr. Lavinder and I did go up and confer with him on our own, over the heads of our county chairmen, because we just couldn't tolerate the situation anymore. I can't recall the sequence, but anyway, Mr. Lavinder and I became sort of the spokesmen for the anti-factors and soon discovered that almost all of our Democrats and courthouse officials were on the same side of the fence.

[End of Tape 7, Side 1]

**Ms. Bridgman:** Let's talk more then about the letters that you wrote asking that people not send proxies, but turn out for the meeting. You decided to do this the very evening that you were given the letters by Kenneth Leach?

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes. There had been a little story in the *South Bend Journal* to the effect that Kenneth Leach, the Democratic county chairman, was going to support Henry Wallace. In the same paper there was a notice that he was going to call a special meeting of the Democratic county committee.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What other course of action did you consider at that point?

**Mr. Bailey:** There wasn't much you can do when a person is elected for two years, and this wasn't an election year. He had another year. He was just calling a meeting, probably to discuss his dual role.

I wasn't an official in the party, but the officers submitted their resignations to me, probably because I had signed the letters.

I first learned of the resignations when I picked up the *Seattle P-I*. The story was there about their resignations. They had taken this story to Seattle and it must have come out of the very radical headquarters there, that some of them were contacting all the time. I don't say all of those people that resigned had that contact, but a couple did, and they had contacts in Seattle that were sort of directing their little show.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Who wrote that resolution demanding their resignation?

**Mr. Bailey:** I wrote the resolution.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You wrote the letters and the resolution?

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes. It seemed that when I was around nobody ever wrote anything. They always said, "You write it and we'll support it." So I wrote the resolution. And I think if you can see that original resolution, you will see the original words were changed after the resignations and rather than demanding resignations said, "accepts the resignations."

The old officers didn't even show up. There wasn't any sign of them around the courthouse. Most of these people were not radicals, and later on they supported the Democratic Party wholeheartedly. We never had any further problems. I wouldn't say any one of them was a Communist, but perhaps lent themselves to different issues without realizing they were being used.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How many people actually came to the meeting after your letters?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I would say out of forty precincts, we had thirty-eight people out. There were always a few precincts that didn't have any committeemen. Everybody was there. People we had listed on the rolls and elected by the people for years had never come to a meeting. They just sent their proxy. They were there that night.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In your letter to Jack Petit of Ilwaco on this subject, you wrote that a handful had been able to control things in the past. Those are your words. What specifically did that refer to?

**Mr. Bailey:** Jack Petit was a former state representative and he was noted as being a fairly conservative person. In fact, he was too conservative for the real liberalism of the unions when he was in the Legislature, and he didn't last terribly long. Jack was a merchant at Ilwaco, very well-respected, a very strong supporter of mine.

The handful referred to those one or two that could get five to twenty proxies and go in meetings and control the meetings. That's what it referred to. We didn't know at that time whether or not we'd go into our meeting and have perhaps a majority of the proxies against us or not.

It turned out everybody was on our side and nobody was on the other side, since they had all resigned. It was quite a jubilant occasion, although we kind of resented not having a hell of a good fight.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In your scrapbook there's also a newspaper clipping about Kenneth Leach calling an organizational meeting of the Wallace for President committee in Pacific County and Raymond at the China Clipper Cafe. What were the results of that?

**Mr. Bailey:** I wouldn't know. I don't think Leach had any ulterior motive. He just had very sincere ideas. If I recall right, as I just explained, there were two stories in the same paper: that he was going to support Wallace, and called a meeting of the Wallace people; then, down on the same page he called a meeting of the county Democratic committee. I don't think Leach saw that as any great problem, having split loyalties. Politically it was naive and not very sound thinking.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Looking back, can you add anything to your analysis or explanation of this phenomenon of Wallace's Progressive Party? What do you think their motives were?

**Mr. Bailey:** Wallace attracted a lot of liberals. Truman was viewed as a conservative, and compared to FDR attracted a lot of conservatives and middle-of-the-road people. Roosevelt dumped Wallace in 1944, and there was an enmity carrying over into 1948.

Wallace thought that he was going to come in with a whole new New Deal and implement a lot of very

liberal things with the help FDR had always enjoyed. In the meantime though, I think he became captive to these people that were extreme liberals. They just gathered around him, and more or less held him captive.

I think I have a good example of what they do. One time, after I was in the state House of Representatives and I was in the Raymond paper, I took aim at a guy by the name of Roderick Olzendam, who was a Weyerhaeuser executive appointed by Governor Langlie to head the Welfare Department. He had a famous newsletter called *I Find* issued every once in awhile. It was always critical of welfare programs, old-age assistance, and always trying to cut grants--very conservative.

I wrote a couple of editorials criticizing administration of the old-age pension and the way it was being run by Olzendam. Later I was brought a welfare case of a couple, both working, the husband as an accountant for a medical clinic. When she needed surgery, she had been certified as needing an operation by the doctor running the clinic, and welfare paid for the operation.

I got the documents and I ran the information in our paper, even using warrant numbers. I started criticizing the Welfare Department. Immediately local Republicans were up in arms and called it a dirty trick, but they started sending Olzendam and other people down to investigate. After a long period of time they ended up with absolutely nothing.

We almost got into lawsuits over the stories by the doctor involved and the couple who received aid.

The day after I had written this editorial criticizing Olzendam about these actions I went to our newspaper office at Raymond and found leaders of the Washington Commonwealth Federation Old-Age Pension Union in the office. By that time most of them had been tarred with being actual Communists. They were there to meet me to give me some further information. I turned them down as I did not want to get bogged down and become an outlet for them. Shades of our old Democratic committee!

I wrote another editorial. They were there again on the morning following issue. What I'm trying to point out is that they would move on with anything and try to take it over. I went over to Raymond a couple of times on mornings after the papers came out, and I could see them in the office. So, I would drive around the block and wouldn't even go into the office until they had gone.

Finally I just told them, "I'm not buying this stuff that you're peddling. I don't want to be in the same bed with you. I've got a criticism against the Welfare Department and the Langlie administration. I don't want to be in the same bed with you, and from here on, I'm not even gonna write a damned story on the thing." That was the end of the visits and my story. I never referred to it anymore.

It really should have been pursued into costing some administrator his job, but not with these people on board.

That's what the extremists did to our county committee, and that's what they did to Henry Wallace. They just ganged up on people and used them.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How would you explain their zeal?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, it's hard to answer that. They were a very zealous outfit. I don't think any of their top leadership ever did a day's work in their lives. All they did was set around and stir up some kind of trouble someplace. They loved public protests. That's the way it struck me.

A few of these people had been in the Legislature from the Puget Sound area principally.

Terry Pettis' father was an active left-winger and a legislator. Several were from the Seattle area in the 1930s. Most of them were investigated by the Canwell committee. Some justifiably so, and they'd probably asked for it. This, however, didn't justify Canwell's unfairness and investigating the patriotism and loyalty of everyone disagreeing with him.

This group seemed to be in its glory stirring up something. It makes you stop and think sometimes how today a little demonstration about fighting for or against some cause results in similar action over the United States and all the world. Who was getting that message out?

These people had to have connections someplace. The old Commonwealth Federation eventually degenerated into nothing but a handful.

**Ms. Bridgman:** And you're talking 1947, 1948--

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes. And 1949, 1950. It took quite awhile to get rid of them, at least out of places of influence in our party.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I'd like to know a little more about your reaction to state events at that time. What did you know about the caucus of Republicans and Democrats--a coalition--held before the 1947 Legislative Session to discuss investigation of Communist infiltration into the Democratic Party?

**Mr. Bailey:** I knew nothing about that at all. The only thing I knew about that and the subsequent Canwell committee, was that I read the newspaper and also the printed records on the Canwell hearings. Otherwise I couldn't tell you very much about it.

I think conditions of that time justified looking into some of these loyalty matters because everyone was concerned. However, there was no excuse for the Red

hunt conducted by Al Canwell--and McCarthy--at the expense of individual constitutional rights.

There was a lot of resentment over the tactics of the Canwell committee, and the fact that the Canwell committee was made up of extremely slanted members with a very conservative persuasion, no one of the middle-of-the-road. Most could wrap the flag around themselves, and then declare they were patriots while destroying constitutional rights and freedoms.

Sometimes I took great exception to some of the Canwell stuff, not only because it was so unfair in spots, but that he seemed to have just one thing in mind--to build Canwell to some future state elective job.

He was supposed to have all of these fantastic files, and he was going to open them up and expose everyone someday. He kept saying, "I will at a certain time"--"I will at a certain time." Always a threat. When I was in the Legislature someone got the keys to the vault where the Canwell records were kept, and with great publicity opened them up. There wasn't a thing in the vault and Canwell had been bragging about it all these years.

If there were any files, Canwell must have taken them home with the idea that sooner or later he would publish those files and make a little money on it. Or perhaps he had no files at all.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I have heard of that story too.

**Mr. Bailey:** It turned out to be quite a joke. It was almost like opening Al Capone's safe.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Do you remember your response then, to the establishment of the Canwell committee?

**Mr. Bailey:** No, I don't. I don't really. It was done by the 1947 Legislature. I was not there.

It was done by the 1947 Legislature which was a Republican Legislature. The 1946 election saw election of a Republican Legislature.

**Ms. Bridgman:** That was the year that the Senate had twenty-three Republicans and twenty-three Democrats and there was a coalition of Republicans and eight conservative Democrats. Democrats out of the coalition were called the "futile fifteen." Did you have reaction to that?

**Mr. Bailey:** No. You see, Governor Wallgren was our United States senator and ran for governor in 1944. Nobody thought he had a chance, but he was elected and appointed Hugh Mitchell to the Senate to take his place. And that was a presidential year, Roosevelt was elected to his fourth term.

In 1946, there was a swing back to the right--kind of a postwar reaction where people turn toward the conservative side. I do remember that it was quite a conservative Legislature. The House was Republican for the first time in the many years [71-28] and they tied the Senate [23-23].

Looking back I feel there was a concern of the average person about some of the radical elements. The Cold War had come on rapidly and people were getting concerned that Russia might take over Europe completely.

There was a real concern. And believe it or not, these radical people in our party didn't think that there was any danger. They resented our activities in trying to hold Russia back. They painted the United States as being the bad guy. It was this position, I feel, that turned a large number away from the Democrats in 1946.

Canwell in a way was a reaction--as was McCarthy. They represented a reaction that was coming one way or the other and had broad support when the movement started. Unfortunately they did far more damage than they ever did good. And only later did public opinion change.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you describe your recollections of the individual members of the Canwell committee?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't remember any of them. I could if I read the record, but knew little or nothing of them personally until I went to the Legislature. I can't even remember any members of the committee right off hand.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I was particularly wondering about the Democrat, Thomas Bienz, who introduced the Canwell/Stevens measure in the Senate, and I had wondered what your memories about him were.

**Mr. Bailey:** With the problem that we had in 1947, I would say that it would be awfully hard for members of the Legislature to vote against looking into the Communist infiltration, without being accused of being a Communist themselves. The times have changed. The resolution passing the committee probably passed by a fairly large vote. It was not wholly an unpopular proposal. It was the operations of the committee later, that really got people upset.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I'm glad you brought that up. It was my next question: What is your opinion of the committee's practices and procedures?

**Mr. Bailey:** Again, I don't recall details, but I do remember that I thought that he just grabbed at anything from anyone who didn't believe exactly as he did. The committee tried to destroy political disagreements into casting aspersions on a person's loyalty. They might have been on the trail of something sometimes, but in so many cases it was just a wild goose chase trying to make spectacular headlines. I think that's all it was--or that's what it

resulted in, anyway. He did hurt the reputation of many innocent people.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did you feel about the committee's justification on not allowing cross-examination of witnesses because it was a fact-finding committee?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I don't remember that much, except that I do remember that a lot of us considered the tactics were very high-handed. It wasn't the fact that cross-examination should take place in all legislative committees, but in this case he was destroying the careers of a great number of people. He destroyed university professors and many good agencies. He was destroying their careers and not giving them any chance to respond. I think that was the thing that a lot of us felt was unfair, and it was the way he ran his meetings. It became a one-man committee, as I recall, very few of the others had hardly anything to say or at least were not heard from.

**Ms. Bridgman:** And you said "we," or "a number of us," you're referring to rank and file Democrats?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I would say the people that I was talking to at that time probably would be union leaders, or Democrats. I don't remember great discussions on it, but, I do remember that most of us considered it a political committee--it was a Republican political committee. As it went along later, Canwell made it even more personal, and I think the rank and file Republicans didn't seem to be a part of it anymore.

He came from Spokane, and Spokane was an ultra-conservative area and still is in that category. It was, to us Democrats in the Legislature, much like the Democrats from the solid South in Congress. We needed their conservative votes, and we liked to have Democrats elected--even though they were more conservative than most Republicans in Seattle. We liked them because if we had more Democrats than Republicans, we had control of the committees and the Legislature. Coalitions were the exception, not the rule.

A liberal couldn't get elected in Spokane, and in those days everyone needed the blessing of the Washington Water Power Company. They had to have that. I'm positive they paid their campaign expenses by one method or the other. And if you disagreed with Washington Water Power you weren't going anyplace politically. I have many good friends at WWP, and this type of thing, we hope, is now covered by public disclosure laws. In the old days it was a company town. They ran it. They ran Spokane and there was no way around it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What's your feeling about Canwell's accusations against the Washington Pension Union in early 1948?

**Mr. Bailey:** Now I can say, with hindsight--he might have had reason to say this. As it developed later, Terry Pettis and some of those that I really think were active members, or former ones, led the Washington Pension Union. The Washington Pension Union started out as a perfectly good organization to help senior citizens get a proper pension. That was before Social Security.

These extremists moved in on the group and took it over. Gradually there were not too many pensioners in the Washington Pension Union anymore, and that became one of the key organizations for the left-wing leadership of the Washington Commonwealth Federation. Social Security soon made old-age pensions more of a federal problem than state and hastened the demise of the Washington Pension Union.

The old people at that time needed an organization. Later, after the war, I doubt if there was an old person in the Union that was really fighting for a pension. They were replaced by people advocating left-wing causes. The Old-Age Pension Union was taken over by the Hugh DeLacys, the Terry Pettises, and two or three others. Later most of these people were convicted in federal court under the Smith Act. That act was declared unconstitutional, so they never served any time.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How much discussion in your own community was there about all this?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I think that South Bend and Raymond were just as middle America as any other place. They had no use for anybody like that. But they were very tolerant. They had gone along with Terry Pettis, when he edited the South Bend paper, and they had gone along with some of the other things that we had heard. And most accusations were ascribed to political motives generated for political purposes against their opponents. The average person on the Harbor would not support anyone too far out, either way.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You've described your feeling that Canwell was out to enhance his own reputation. How would you analyze the motives of his supporters? I'm thinking now, not of his immediate entourage on the committee or in the Republican Party, but his supporters at large?

**Mr. Bailey:** Times haven't changed, and 1990 is here now and we're having the same baloney. But, I would say this: that Canwell seized control of that committee. It was no longer a Senate or legislative committee, it was the Canwell committee. He seized

control of that vehicle and made it a one-man show. The staff that presented the cases probably only reported to Canwell.

He put on his shows, and he built such a name familiarity that I think that he thought that he could file on the Republican ticket, and there were enough people on his side that he would sail into office. I think that he thought that he was going to become the figurehead and idol that represented this type of reactionary philosophy sweeping the country.

**Ms. Bridgman:** And so his supporters, can you characterize them for me?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know any supporters. Later on it became kind of a joke. I think at that time that anti-Communist investigations were very popular. McCarthy started out on a popular issue, you know, but it was his tactics that ruined him.

Canwell also started out on a popular issue and went the same course, from public approval to disapproval.

[End of Tape 7, Side 2]

**Ms. Bridgman:** What's your interpretation of the effects on the Washington Democratic Party of these events. That is, the separation of the Wallace supporters from the Democratic Party, and the Canwell hearings?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think that the Canwell hearings did anything but unite the Democratic Party.

The Wallace separation seemed to be a temporary one. Everybody envisioned that maybe the Democrats would do so poorly in the state that they'd be split apart and the Republicans would stomp in.

When it boiled right down to it, Wallace was fairly isolated, and my recollection was that he did not make great gains in the state. And my recollection is that in the 1948 elections we did pretty well--the Democrats. So anything contemplated by the pessimists did not greatly affect the state Democrats in 1948.

We had our battles, but like Harry Truman once said when asked how he could get all those warring factions together. He said: "Well did you hear those cats out in the alley last night? They're all howling, and fighting. You know what that means? More cats!"

**Ms. Bridgman:** I see. That's very "Trumanesque." How about liberals in more general terms--that is not only Democrats, or not only party members? What were their options during this time, when things were so uncertain?

**Mr. Bailey:** I was in county politics. I read state politics. There was always great argument over the old-age pension system in the state, and how to improve it. Some of the very conservatives did not believe in any pension. There were also arguments over relative responsibility. If an old person had relatives, were all the relatives responsible and not the state for their expenses and care? There have been times in the past when relatives had to assume all the support--the state would not give support if a relative was available.

These were liberal against conservative values. Unemployment compensation, workers' insurance, industrial insurance. I don't think that this was a matter of argument in our party at that time. We were mainly concerned and united in supporting these measures, and the Republicans were not. Since that time, of course, they've come around to support a lot of social issues. But at that time it was clearly a Republican versus a Democratic program.

You mentioned liberalism, progressivism--I think maybe Henry Wallace destroyed the word "progressive" for awhile when this anti-red, or red-baiting wave shook the country.

I remember when I ran for county clerk, and was active helping other candidates put up signs and things. We used red ink for attention. It really stood out. After Wallace got through, there was probably a period of four to six years when no candidate of either party would tolerate a bit of red ink in any of their signs. That was how ridiculous the thing became.

The word "progressive" was struck from our signs and literature. I think some of us took the "L" word of Mr. Bush's 1988 campaign. We started using "liberal" instead of "progressive." The word progressive became tainted and connected with the Wallace party.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What do you remember about the Washington Committee for Academic Freedom, which lobbied the University of Washington Regents and the Legislature at the time of the Canwell committees, and had among its members some prominent liberals, such as Stim Bullitt and Benjamin Kizer?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well you mean they were against Canwell?

**Ms. Bridgman:** Yes, they were.

**Mr. Bailey:** I can remember it as an organization I had no proximity to. I can remember an organization coming out of the University of Washington as an answer to the disgust felt by many for the treatment of some of the university professors by Canwell and his committee.

Many came to the defense of Dr. Costigan, and some of those people that were really outstanding faculty were unbelievably treated in the public hearings. They had exercised their right to express their opinion on things, and were just chastised by Canwell to the point of trying to drive them off

campus. I think some of them may have lost their jobs. If they didn't, they were black-balled and it was a kind of a disaster. It was a disaster for the academic freedom of our college people.

I can remember eventually there was a great backlash. I cannot remember if it was effective or if it was just a forerunner that the average person felt eventually that dumped both the Canwells and the McCarthys from influence.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Washington politics has been characterized as closely tied to forestry, shipping, farming, fishing. Those occupations or industries have been evaluated as having always had small groups of extremists on either the right or left. The analysis goes further by explaining that in periods, like 1947, 1948, 1949, which were regarded as stressful, that these more extreme elements emerge. What is your reaction to that kind of analysis of the situation?

**Mr. Bailey:** Washington was always more liberal or progressive than Oregon. Oregon was usually very conservative. In 1990 it's changed around somewhat. I think Washington's progressivism and independence goes back to the turn of the century when it elected a Populist governor, John Rogers. People ignored both parties and elected a grass-roots candidate. The state has always been sort of a renegade in its independent voters.

That leads me to the comment that we have the open primary, and really we have no party discipline in the state. A Democrat can be ultra-liberal or ultra-conservative, and the same for a Republican. Dan Evans was a middle-of-the-roader that got support from people on both sides. The reason is that in the open primary you can file for office and at that time you don't have a party platform or anything. The party people adopt that later, and they had absolutely nothing to do with your filing for office. It would be ridiculous to file as a Democrat and then six months later, when they adopt the platform, say "I will promise to support the platform one-hundred percent." You don't even know what it's going to be at the time you filed.

There's not coordination of candidates and issues, so therefore we don't have party discipline of any type in this state. It does give rise to a more populist type of politics and independence, as Democrats or Republicans can run on their own, with their own platform. It becomes a personal, not party selection. One tends to support their own party, and when you get to Olympia you have to choose and have some loyalty or the Legislature could not organize.

I think it was Jim Farley that said we have forty-seven states and the "Soviet of Washington." That goes back into something populist I guess, when in the early thirties our state was condemning private power companies and establishing public utility districts, the cities of Seattle and Tacoma already had their city systems. A lot of the smaller towns had city systems, and were followed by county public utilities districts, as Grand Coulee and other dams came on line, we pretty well took over private power in most of the state.

That's where I think that Farley referred to our state. It was probably very liberal to him, to think that we were going for public power in this state, by a vote of the people, and driving out private utilities. Our independence and liberalism goes way back to the 1930s and wasn't just in the 1947s and later.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I'd like now to talk about some of your other political activities in 1948. What did you do in the 1948 election?

**Mr. Bailey:** I had a terrific interest, I know that. I don't recall really working a lot on any of the elections. I had been appointed by the state County Clerks Association, and my county treasurer, Ross Neilson, a Republican, had been appointed by the state Treasurers Association to head up a committee in our county to eliminate the two-term limitation for county officials.

At that time, by the state constitution, no county official could run for more than two terms. So, it became a game of checkers, you jumped from one job to the other, served your two terms and swapped jobs. Your name became familiar, and people usually voted and kept you in for life anyway.

It was rather ridiculous to have to retrain somebody every eight years for another elective job, and so I led our county campaign to repeal the limitation. We worked hard on the campaign. It was successful and people of the state saw the wisdom of not continuing the two-term limit. That probably was my biggest effort and kept me pretty busy during the 1948 campaign. I was very much for Harry Truman and I remember limited, but not great, work on other candidates.

I went to the state Democratic convention that year, and took part in it by serving on a couple of the committees. Otherwise, I was quite busy in the courthouse. We didn't have much help and had to do our share of the work.

And it wasn't too long after that, in 1949, that I went into the newspaper business with my dad.

That was after the election. But, up until that time, it just seemed like I had all I wanted to do, and working at it all the time. Quite frequently someone would need a printer, or an editor in one of the local papers and they'd call on me. I would go down at

nights and work to fill in and it was interesting to me for a change. I was also very active at that time in the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Can you summarize your feelings about the Democratic Party nationally, as well as in this state after the 1948 election?

**Mr. Bailey:** I thought the Democratic Party was our white hope. It was doing pretty well. Harry Truman had grabbed the reigns and was doing much better than I ever thought he would. And by that time we were adjusting to not having Roosevelt with us and we survived the Henry Wallace challenge. I think the party was fairly unified at that time.

The Democrats had social prosperity. A national health-care plan was proposed in Congress, favored by Democrats. It wasn't even considered, but eventually the idea became the basis of Medicare. It was a great step forward.

There were efforts of Truman to do things like create the Columbia Valley Authority. The private power people and the conservative Republicans in our area were just so afraid that it would take the control of the Columbia River power out of their hands and back to Washington, where it was anyway. They were really afraid of public power expanding further and taking over their last bastion of private utilities in this state.

There were quite a number of issues then that separated the two parties. Of course, I'm sure that the Democrats were always on the right side! At least we thought we were.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You talked about the Democrats and their continuing commitment to human services and social legislation. How would you characterize the Democratic Party's core beliefs about the nature of the political world? I'm thinking about in 1948.

**Mr. Bailey:** By 1948 it became quite apparent that we were in the Cold War. And I don't think it became a Republican or Democrat issue to see that we really had problems in facing Russia, and the spread of their domination. We had to counteract and counterplay everything they manipulated. I don't think that was a big partisan political issue. I don't recall great partisanship over the Marshall Plan, Truman Plan, or the so-called Marshall and Truman Doctrine. It did become an issue that was grabbed by the extreme left-wingers in our party who seemed to think anything against Russia was really wrong.

If anything, the Democratic Party under Harry Truman had a wider range of concern over worldwide affairs than the Republican Party of that time. It's really hard to say because the Democrats were in control, and they were the ones that had to lead on the domestic and international fronts.

I don't recall many close votes in Congress on these international issues. Once the Cold War was started it seemed to be a nonpartisan effort.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Let me rephrase what I asked a little bit. Can you describe your opinions about how Democrats thought politics worked--that is how things were really accomplished in the Congress, or the United States Senate, or any given state legislature?

**Mr. Bailey:** No, I really can't. Looking at Reagan and Bush and even Carter, I think sometimes that Roosevelt and Truman were truly leaders. They sometimes came out with forward-looking ideas, with ideas that the public hadn't even been considering. They were out front of public opinion. Given a little time the public caught up on many things Roosevelt proposed. I thought some were outlandish. Then, two or three months later, the public would start coming along, and then you'd find out it was a good idea. Nowadays they conduct a poll and change their minds every time the public changes its mind. I thought there was true leadership in those days.

Eisenhower was a contrast, but it wasn't lack of leadership; it was the fact that his method was not one of great showmanship or increasing many government programs. His comparative quietness was not a lack of leadership but his style. He was in the position where the public wanted him to respond that way, at that time.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I have then, a few remaining questions abut state politics before your own campaign for state representative in 1950.

You've mentioned the American Legion. You've kept pictures of yourself at the 1949 American Legion Convention in Seattle. How did your membership in that organization affect your political career?

**Mr. Bailey:** I had an outright contempt for their previous politics and meddling in so many partisan nonveteran, antilabor affairs. I remembered the American Legion in the 1930s when they were nothing but a Republican echo, and at times in the Depression, when they actually became strike breakers. After World War II, the American Legion took on a new look. They no longer pursued the politics and things that they had previously. They are a very effective veterans organization.

In fact, the Legion was so nonpolitical, supposedly, that in their national bylaws, a person like myself, holding an elective office, could not hold any office in the local American Legion. Nonpolitical as they were outwardly, underneath they were the most political bunch of skullduggerers that you ever saw in your life.

After World War II this changed. To attract World War II veterans they decided to go out working for

veterans programs and things like that. Before that, I thought they were a contemptible bunch of Republicans that should have been--

**Ms. Bridgman:** Elsewhere?

**Mr. Bailey:** I guess so.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars were a little different. They were a much more liberal organization. We never discussed partisan politics at any time. It has only been in the last few years that they have received the right to endorse political candidates. And frankly, I don't agree with that.

Their big issue now sometimes is protecting the American flag. They could do a lot better by going out and protecting and improving the lot of the American veteran. It bothers me when a Colonel North or someone wraps the flag around themselves and commits errors in the name of patriotism. I do resent any organization I belong to getting into politics and saying they speak for me when they do not.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You've talked about your membership in the Democratic central committee and about the decentralization of Washington State politics. But, could you tell us specifically now, how things were decided when you served on the state central committee? In 1948 you went to Yakima in order to participate in this central committee's election of a chairman and vice chairman.

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think that I remember any great decisions except election of officers. I remember I had to get to Yakima, and I finally ended up getting on a train as it was very essential that I get over, to be sure our common sense state officers not lose the votes to the radical faction. Our main job was voting new state party officers and each county had two votes. We needed our votes out if we were going to drive the extreme left wing out of the party and keep them out. We were always concerned they would try to come back, especially if we relaxed our vigilance.

And that's the only situation I remember at that time. As far as adopting policy, I don't remember the state committee being involved much when I was on it. I never sought re-election to the committee, so I was only on for a few months.

The state party always had the problem of not having money to pay the person we hired. That person had to go out and beg money from people, the party faithful. It was demeaning and the state committee sometimes spent more time trying to raise money to keep their offices open than discussing issue matters.

Issues usually came up in the state conventions. Each county would adopt a platform and send it to the state. The state convention platform committee would adopt a platform, usually based on those from the counties, and then take it to the convention floor and have it adopted, becoming that year's Democratic platform.

The state committee would try to carry out the platform adopted by the convention, don't get me wrong. Establishing new policy was usually one of their jobs.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well, will you explain, please, a little more about how the state convention decides things? Policy?

**Mr. Bailey:** Each county would hold its county convention. At that county convention we would adopt resolutions for our county platform. We would then send these resolutions to the state convention platform committee. This committee usually would be made up of at least one person from each county. They would meet the day before, and probably all night the night before the convention, and consider all the county resolutions and other matters and put them to a vote--up or down. Many of these were for local-interest projects--roads, etc.. And weren't really policy, but they were of interest to someone.

They would consider them all and then come out the next day to the convention with the proposed state platform, which the delegates, usually several hundred people, would vote on, and that would be the state platform. As I've said before there was no coordination or connection with the candidates and the platform. In fact, most candidates would avoid controversial planks and pick and choose others.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How were things decided when they had to choose between one proposal and another?

**Mr. Bailey:** It would depend on what it was. It was like a legislative body, some on one side, some on another. Eastern Washington might be on one side, Western Washington on another, depending on the issue. It was a fairly balanced committee geographically. Each county designated one of their delegates to serve on the platform committee.

[End of Tape 8, Side 1]

**Ms. Bridgman:** In 1950, you decided to run for state representative in the Nineteenth District. That was Pacific County and part of Grays Harbor County.

**Mr. Bailey:** Southern and eastern Grays Harbor County.

There were two reasons I decided to run for the Legislature. During 1949, one of the Raymond publishers became very ill, and he had to shut his newspaper down for two or three weeks. My dad and I were both printers. He wanted us to take over his newspaper. It sounded like a pretty good deal.

My dad quit his job at the South Bend paper and my dad and I and my mother went into publishing the *Raymond Advertiser*, a weekly paper. It was terribly run down, but we had always wanted to do something like this and we wanted to try.

After I got into that, it was day and night work. I was county clerk and I intended to resign. Our judge at that time was having terrific difficulties with lawyers. His name was Judge O'Phelan. All the lawyers were taking changes of venue against him because they said he was too old and indecisive. It wasn't that, but he had publicly chastised a couple of lawyers for neglect in their cases.

The county lawyers got together and signed a petition, which I still have, demanding that he resign and if not, that they would all ask for an outside judge. He asked me to stay on at least until the problem was settled.

Finally the old judge, on advice of some friends, resigned. The lawyers, while dumping the judge because of age, recommended a man that was older than the judge be appointed. Each thought they would be the next elected judge and by putting an older man on the bench they would run themselves at the next election.

One of the signers was an attorney, John J. Langenbach, of Raymond. He was a very active Republican and a good friend of Governor Langlie. He had signed the petition for resignation and appointment of the other fellow, but went to Olympia one night and called on the governor. The next thing known was when it was announced John Langenbach was appointed judge. The rest of the bar was in shock. The new judge, too, suggested I not resign immediately, and I decided to stay for him the year-and-a-half, until my term was up.

I worked daytimes at the courthouse. We were open Saturdays at that time and each of us were entitled to one day off, so I started taking my day off on Thursday, our paper day. I wouldn't go to the courthouse on that day but to the shop. Most were days at the courthouse and the print shop at night.

I didn't want to get out of politics and am glad now I didn't resign. We had one Democrat on our state House delegation I thought was going to be defeated anyway, and decided I would run for the Legislature as it was very much part-time at that time.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Oh, it was the Democrat that you thought was vulnerable.

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes, I thought he was very vulnerable. Everyone voted for two House members and I never had to challenge him as an individual. He and I remained good friends until his death. He really didn't tend to his public too well at that time. And I got remarkable support from the people in his hometown, as well as all over the district. The newspaper in his town supported me, even without my asking. At that time the Legislature was only a sixty-day job every two years. That's one of the reasons I ran. I saw the opportunity to win, and I felt the party was going to lose that seat if something wasn't done. On such a part-time job I could stay in politics and the newspaper too.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I misunderstood your comment on an earlier tape. I thought that it was a Republican you challenged.

**Mr. Bailey:** It is confusing. After the primary, Representative King and I were opposed by one Republican, Ted Wilson. He was defeated, but two years later was elected to the state Senate. In 1956, I ran against the same Ted Wilson for the Senate and defeated him when he ran for re-election.

The thing was that I did run and was elected. It was a matter of opportunity opening at that time and the fact that I definitely would not have run for county clerk again. I had considered quitting and going full-time with the newspaper.

I sometimes feel bad because I know that I put so much effort in our newspaper that sometimes I don't think that my mind was on the clerk's job at all.

The clerk's office was a place where you could go through the same duties day in and day out. The longer you stayed on the job, the longer you were going to stay. It's like playing a character role in movies--or on the TV. Play it too long you can't go to anything else because no one remembers you, except in your old role.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Who advised you to run?

**Mr. Bailey:** I didn't ask any advice. I did it based on my own analysis of the chances. I analyzed my own problems.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Your newspaper ads list the things you hoped to accomplish. For instance, common sense conservation of seafoods and natural resources, good roads, and you supported legislation for veterans, for schools and for labor.

The Republican candidate was Ted Wilson and his ads list these same issues. He also would support schools, roads and fishing, lumbering and farming. What then, were the differences between the two of you? And what were other issues not referred to in the memorabilia you have saved?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think that the main issues between us would have been--in the first place that the Republican Party did not support those things that Wilson said he supported. They did not support those except in campaigns, but not in the Legislature.

It was a matter of record. Earlier we had one Republican state senator named Agnes Gehrman. She defeated our Democratic senator, Tom Bloomer. She served one four-year term in the Senate and was defeated.

She had been head of the state Order of Eastern Star, and thought that put her in great stead throughout the state, running for statewide office. Her defeat was totally distressing and she soon moved to Seattle.

In 1946 the Republicans took over the House. Agnes ran for the House of Representatives from a Seattle district and was elected. She was named chairperson of the Social Security Committee of the House at that time, and it was a hot state issue.

She proceeded to vote straight Republican to kill every bill favorable to education and other social issues. Democrats in the House were not exactly stupid, and they would stand up and make a motion on the floor to bring this or that bill out, knowing they didn't have the votes. Then they'd call for a role call and every Republican was on record voting against these social measures.

Agnes was defeated the next time around and the whole Legislature went Democrat two years later. Their recovery was based on the record that these Democrats in the House had made, especially the opposition records of the Republican members.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Now, how perennial were these issues in your district?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I wouldn't want to say it was always an issue-oriented campaign. Once you establish a reputation in a smaller county the large woodworkers union might give you an endorsement, which was good for a thousand votes at one time. We didn't have too many Teamsters in our area, but the AF of L groups, carpenters, clerks, and other trade unions, might give you an endorsement, good for another four or five hundred votes. If you had these you would start out at a terrific advantage over those that didn't get those endorsements.

Nowadays the union endorses but they don't always produce the votes. In those days the people listened, they took the advice more seriously and knew that you'd either been for them or against them, and they followed your record pretty close. It was a big issue to get those endorsements, and the Democrats had the corner on these in my area.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In the *Aberdeen World* in an ad you advocated, and here I'm quoting, "a common sense give-and-take approach."

**Mr. Bailey:** To what?

**Ms. Bridgman:** To balance the budget, pay off the deficit and yet retain some gains. Why did you decide to use this expression of philosophy?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, it had to be all mine because I never sought advice from anybody on things like that.

An initiative was passed by people of the state of Washington which was very liberal for health care and welfare programs. It was very generous and cost millions. People seemed to favor it when it passed, and since we had a surplus, a hundred million dollars or so cost didn't seem to worry them. Two years later by the time I got to Olympia in 1951, we were one hundred million dollars in the red. This was the reason I advocated compromise as some wanted to cut back all such programs completely.

The first legislative vote I ever cast in Olympia was for a bill which came through to pick up twenty million dollars or so in the deficit the state had faced, due to the initiative. Another bill came through for about fifty million dollars, and one after that; all three amounting to over a hundred million dollars to put us back in the black.

The Republicans were actually trying to cut social programs way back because of this over-expenditure, and there was a need to balance the good things against the bad things. That was what I was talking about.

In 1951 we had to raise taxes to make up for the loss. That's where I asked in my campaign for balance and common sense.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well, how closely does this expression of common sense and a give-and-take approach reflect your view for the way politics really works?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think politics ever works when you go in and want to take everything and give nothing. You are soon isolated and you have no support. It is a teamwork effort. It doesn't mean that you have to give everything either, but the best legislation passed is usually legislation that has had give-and-take in it, where you've tried to correct some of the injustices and concerns of other people, and at the same time preserve what you want done. Usually a better law comes out of it.

That's one of the problems with initiatives. There is no give-and-take. They're thrown at you, and you take them or reject them as they are presented; you don't even know who wrote it. I'm not against initiatives, but I'm just saying that they have a weakness, too.

**Ms. Bridgman:** All right. Thank you. I'd like to go on to your campaign finances in this first campaign for state representative. You said earlier that you'd had no financial contributions to campaigns before you ran for the Senate. So, I'm assuming then, that as before, when you ran for county clerk that you financed this yourself? How much did this cost?

**Mr. Bailey:** I actually do not recall anybody being interested enough in my campaign to give me any money when I ran for the House. I ran on my own. I didn't ask anybody if I should or shouldn't. I paid for the whole thing.

There could be a conceivable contribution when the party runs ads supporting the whole ticket, and it's conceivable that maybe some of the unions could have given a small amount in advertising their endorsements. I do not ever remember them giving direct donations, however.

At that time campaign financing was something entirely different than it is now. I would say that my last campaign for the state Senate cost me about three thousand dollars. That was in 1976. So, you see that I had pretty good support down there without high expenditures.

I covered my political bases and public connections, and most people knew me, and I knew most people. I never let it wear off between elections either, but worked at it the year around. Nowadays it isn't just raising money, it's the high cost of advertising, printing, and television; and a candidate has to have it.

The tragedy is that people will say, "you're spending too much," and then turn right around, and in the same breath say, "You don't have as many billboards that so and so has." People don't stop to think that those things cost money and they begrudge it to you if you haven't spent it, they begrudge it to you if you spend it. So, I guess you just have to join the stream and get in there and do your damnedest. But I didn't need anything then.

**Ms. Bridgman:** If I remember correctly, you said your county clerk campaign cost three hundred dollars, perhaps.

**Mr. Bailey:** Probably. This would not include my time.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How many other state representative candidates got financial help from their party or from interest groups?

**Mr. Bailey:** I was running on my own, and I have no way of knowing what the others got. In those days you didn't have to report it. There would be no place to go to get the records that I know of.

The job as county clerk paid me twenty-seven hundred dollars a year. I thought I was in moola. That was great for the time. And twenty-seven hundred dollars then went a lot further than sixteen or twenty thousand did ten years later.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Now, you've spoken about knowing your opponents, Ted Wilson, the Republican; and Chet King, the Democrat; and Ralph Smith, the other Democrat. In what ways did you think that you could do a better job than your opponents?

**Mr. Bailey:** I never professed to be much better. I just knew that Ralph Smith was having problems. Ask me what they are now, and I can't really recall. One thing he did not keep his fences mended. He came from the Long Beach area and was well known there but did little if anything to become known in South Bend or Raymond.

Ted Wilson, the Republican, was well known and liked. He was a very quiet person. He wasn't too effective as a legislator because he never expressed himself very well. He was well thought of, and came from a popular pioneer family and had support from a large portion of our county.

I didn't have to declare against anybody. I just ran for the Legislature. If Ralph had won, then Chet would have been out. Chet had all the union support. It made for a strong base. Ralph didn't run a very strong race.

I think Wilson ran meaning to defeat Smith, but when I ran and beat Smith, Wilson was up against a different situation. He wasn't running against a guy from Long Beach area with support in the upper county. He was running against me and I had support from both areas, because I had been on the ballot recently. I think that's what happened to Ted.

The thing is that when the opportunity knocks you have to size it up and take a gamble, and you might make it. I thought that in 1950 and a legislative race offered this opportunity.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Who were your allies in this campaign?

**Mr. Bailey:** My running mate, Chet King, I suppose. Chet always had a habit of leisurely campaigning, and if he decided to go hunting in the middle of election, he'd go hunting, and just remained confident he was going to make it anyway. Often after an election we'd have to wait for the absentee ballots to come in before we'd know whether Chet had gotten nominated or elected, or not. While we worked, he would be hunting. Chet and I were friendly, but we did not campaign much together except at rallies and other events.

I don't think Chet paid much attention to me at that time. I don't think that even though he was friendly, that Senator Tisdale paid much attention to me either, except they knew that I had gotten a tremendous vote in the county clerk's race and I hadn't done anything to hurt myself since then. In fact, I think they realized that I was building a good head of steam, politically, because of our problems in the party and publicity as county clerk.

After the primary election they were all with me. From that time on I never had any problem with them, and they were very cooperative.

In defense of Chet, I must say Chet was on the hot seat, too. His seatmate was Ralph Smith and it wasn't easy for him to help me or Smith. People never asked me who I was running against. They just told me they were going to vote for me and I never picked out a single opponent.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Did you have any other advisors from the state Democratic Party?

**Mr. Bailey:** No, the state Democratic Party never offered any help. I think I had a lot of support from Earl Coe and some of those people. If they might come into an event and mention your name and things like that, they had no money to support anybody, only a personal endorsement.

They never, ever, came in to help me campaign or tell me how to do it. Later, when I was in the Senate, we used to try to organize campaigns for members and they wanted to run mine. Some of the Seattle people would just tell me, "We're sending some people down to work for you and get your campaign organized."

I said, "Look! I have run my own all these years. Keep your people and use them where you want to, but don't send them into my district." I never did take any help in telling me how to run my legislative campaign.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well, you said you had no staff for your county clerk campaign. Who helped to staff in this legislative campaign?

**Mr. Bailey:** No one. I ran it from the seat of my pants, and my typewriter, I guess.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You've described your method in the county clerk election as consisting of handing out cards, talking to selected barbers in various towns, and visiting, as you said, everybody from lists you'd compiled with the help of the Democratic precinct committeeman. And being helped by editors. Oh, and running newspaper ads, even in Finnish. What new techniques did you add to this campaign?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know. It was just a personal campaign, and I leaned heavily on my previous campaign friendships. I'd go to places like Long Beach and start out in the morning on my own, meet somebody I knew. It was really fun down there because they would refer me to someone else, then across the street to someone else. This would go on all day, and when the day was over you hadn't wasted one minute. You were busy all day.

I don't remember many campaign meetings where the candidates got up and spoke. They weren't organized that way much at that time--very little.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You can't recall a certain--how many debates there were, how many meetings or--

**Mr. Bailey:** There were no debates. Wilson would have run for cover, and I probably would have, too.

**Ms. Bridgman:** We don't have Lincoln and Douglas here?

**Mr. Bailey:** No.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did you come to be endorsed by the railroad labor organization and the Grays Harbor Central Labor Council?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't even remember going to Aberdeen to get that endorsement. I think I got it because the Willapa Harbor Labor Council had endorsed me and they had some unions that had membership in both councils, and I was running from a part of Grays Harbor County.

Later on, I was a member of the Grays Harbor Central Labor Council for about eight years representing the Typographical Union. I don't remember being there before the time I became a member of the Labor Council, many years later. I went before it many times, afterwards, as a candidate for the Senate.

There were threats of passing a new Taft-Hartley law in the state and the labor unions were uptight. I was very much against Taft-Hartley and a little later I was very active in opposing right-to-work initiatives which would ban closed shops. The unions were very supportive of my work on these. Both initiatives, presented in different years, were soundly defeated.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In the primary you led the Democrats. You got 2,679 votes, Chet King got 2,033 and Ralph Smith, 1,062. Ted Wilson had 1,992. In the general you again led the pack with 4,687 votes, Chet King with 3,532, and Ted Wilson 2,727.

**Mr. Bailey:** That was one of Chet's clean victories. We used to kid him about it. We usually had to wait for the absentees to come in before we knew whether Chet had made it or not.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Why did you win by such an enviable margin?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I think it was the result of hard work, not just in 1950, but from 1946 on. I never believed in doing all my politicking before election. I politicked the whole year around. Everybody knew me, and I just got on a roll, I guess. I knew everybody. I could call most of them by name and most of them remembered me. They even write me now on some of their problems, wanting to know if I can help them.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I see. What had you learned new about politics during this campaign?

**Mr. Bailey:** Nothing except what everyone already knew. You need to have more votes than the other fellow to win.

[End of Tape 8, Side 2]

5

# STATE REPRESENTATIVE: 1951

**Ms. Bridgman:** Senator Bailey, there are some things you wanted to establish before we talk about your first term as state representative.

First, concerning the sequence of events surrounding the separation of the Wallace supporters from the Democratic Party in Pacific County in 1946 and 1948. You wish to specify Earl Coe's offices. Let's begin then in 1947 at the time of the Jefferson Day dinner.

**Mr. Bailey:** My problem is that I remembered the events right, but in several cases got the timing mixed up. I said I had sought support of the precinct committeemen to run the radicals out of our county party in the April 1948 campaign. I now have to go back and say that copies of my letters show that immediately after the Jerry O'Connell speech at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in the spring of 1947, I wrote a letter to our state Democratic chairman, Earl Coe, about this and also about the Commonwealth Federation support for our candidate for Congress in a special election. So I was actually engaged in this project for a year at least. I did not remember it that way at first.

Earl Coe was a state senator in 1947 and was elected state Democratic chairman. Later, in 1947, he was named secretary of state to fill the vacancy created by the death of Belle Reeves, and he was elected to that office in his own right in 1948.

Just before Earl was elected chairman, the state committee had hired former Congressman Jerry O'Connell as executive secretary. He and Earl never did see eye to eye. As the campaigns rolled around, Earl and I found that we were in a majority who had the same notion that O'Connell and his ilk were too radical to run our party and had to go.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Then Earl Coe was appointed secretary of state in 1948?

**Mr. Bailey:** Either late 1947 or early 1948.

Flournoy Lavinder, a South Bend businessman and one of our precinct committeemen, and I went to Olympia in 1948 to seek his help with formulating a way to get these people out of office. At that time, the option was to file our middle-of-the-roaders in the precinct elections coming up.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In 1952 you were asked to organize a Kefauver for President Committee in Pacific County. Your recollection is that they didn't have enough support or that your position had changed?

**Mr. Bailey:** My recollection is that Kefauver was very popular at the time, fighting the so-called criminal element on a special congressional committee. He was a household word. I do not recall having a meeting on his behalf, or why it was not pursued. His grass roots campaign just didn't take fire, and in those days, those elected as delegates determined the nominee.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What do you think Truman's support of Adlai Stevenson had to do with it?

**Mr. Bailey:** Possibly that is what it was, but, of course, at that time we did not know Adlai Stevenson. He was not a national figure, but developed into one of the most capable candidates the party had ever fielded--both in 1952 and 1956. Later, it was said that Truman hated Kefauver and prevailed on Stevenson to accept the draft, even against his will.

**Ms. Bridgman:** If there was not that much local support for Kefauver, then how do you explain the fact that on the first two ballots in the nominating convention he led Stevenson, and it wasn't until the third ballot that Stevenson got the nomination?

**Mr. Bailey:** I have no recollection of his performance at the convention. I know that he didn't get the nomination. He had campaigned all over the nation and ultimately Stevenson, who did not, was drafted. I do remember quite a flurry with the Daniel Boone (coonskin) hats.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Finally, you were speculating about the date that Scoop Jackson ran for the United States Senate. Do you want to specify that?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think I mistakenly put Scoop back into 1948 and it should have been 1952. Harry Cain, a Republican, was elected in 1946 and held office until 1952 when Scoop defeated him.

My first recollection of Henry Jackson, besides having run into him off and on at political events, was when he would visit his friends and relatives in South Bend and Eklund Park. I had gone to school with several of his cousins, or probably with his cousins' children because Jackson was one of an older generation and was probably about my age, but he was just a real young member of his generation.

He would come down to the Harbor occasionally. We were locally very aware of him because every Norwegian in town--and there were many--knew

Henry Jackson, the congressman from Everett. It is my recollection that in 1946, Henry Jackson was the only Democratic member of the Washington delegation to Congress. 1946 was a Republican year. That was the year Harry Cain was elected, defeating Democrat Hugh Mitchell.

Jackson campaigned a few times on the Harbor on behalf of Democratic candidates and spoke at one of our Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners. He attracted many of his Norwegian friends and relatives and urged them to vote for Charlie Savage for Congress in a special election of 1947, and again, in 1948.

Jackson was not a man who made instant plans, and as I look back I can see that he had looked to the future and trips like this built him strong support when he ran for the Senate in 1952.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Thank you for clearing these dates up. I'd like to begin our discussion of your legislative service by asking you to repeat the last statement you made about your response to your campaign for state representative. The tape ran out and unfortunately it wasn't recorded. You had said that you learned nothing new about politics during the campaign except--and that's were it runs out--can you recall what you finished with?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think the question was a little different than that, maybe. It had to do with what did I learn new running for the Legislature as against running for the county office.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Yes.

**Mr. Bailey:** And to what did I attribute my good support?

**Ms. Bridgman:** Your success.

**Mr. Bailey:** I think my answer was I had to give credit--if you can call it credit--to the people. They have all the power and it is the people that elect you. It had been my thought in running for county clerk to get out and know all of the people and then not let them forget me during those four years. I issued quite a few little news releases out of the office. Many people go into office and only come out for campaigning four years later and people cannot even remember them.

It got to be that people who came into my office would call me by my first name, and sometimes I would have them sign their own before I could remember who they were. Actually, I maintained a very good connection between everyone in the county that I knew. I think that so-called "people power" builds, and so when I ran for the Legislature, it carried over because I went back and just renewed those contacts. I fully believe that is where your power comes from.

Most any criticisms of me at that time would have been challenged by one of my friends because I maintained a very good relationship with my supporters. It carried from county clerk into races for the House of Representatives and later into the Senate.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You said you make an effort to learn their names and made frequent press releases. Was that because you were already thinking of a future in politics beyond county clerk?

**Mr. Bailey:** No, I can't say that I really did. I probably am surprised that I stayed in politics as long as I did. It was fascinating, but it wasn't a very good paying proposition. I did and I do enjoy people. At one time I even tried desperately to get out of the retirement system and withdraw six hundred dollars which I had there. I did need the money and I never dreamed that I would be staying long enough to draw from it. I was told that once I had chosen, as a public official, to enter the system, the only way out was to quit or be defeated. I stayed in.

My interest in keeping public support probably had nothing to do with future planning. If anything, I probably planned on running for re-election as clerk, but I also always wanted to have public support through doing a good job. Probably because I had worked for newspapers and had quite an interest in them. I made it quite a regular thing to be sure that anything we did in our office that would make a good story would be sent to the newspapers. Much of it was my friendship with the various editors and an interest in their business. I had known all of them personally and I felt that it was up to me sometimes to issue statements on the activities of our office. Weekly newspapers crave such items and have limited means to hire staff to dig them out.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Now may we begin with recollections of that first session you served in the Thirty-second Legislature in 1951? You said to me earlier that you regarded your service as a representative as not very outstanding or productive. The evidence I've looked at seems to indicate that you accomplished quite a bit.

So as we go along we'll analyze the evidence in light of your opinion.

First, I'd like an overview. Will you describe your views of the power of state government in 1951? That is, how much did you believe it affected people's lives in Pacific County or in any other county?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, it's probably no different than it has been. The power is in Olympia in state government and the power was particularly there when we were only seeing the first influence of Social Security. An awful lot of our early problems were welfare programs and old-age assistance, which the

state had to bear at that time. Also things like relative responsibility, which was an unpopular program in the liberal circles and popular with conservatives. A large number of issues like that were very important to people, especially laboring people, senior citizens, and those of moderate income.

You have to look back to that time and look back into the fact that we had been in a war and our highway system was in deplorable shape. You couldn't hardly drive from my county seat at South Bend to Ilwaco without having a flat tire because of chuckholes galore. And there weren't any tires available either.

There were so many things that had to be neglected during the war and the state was desperately trying to catch up. There were big deficits due to welfare spending caused by a very liberal initiative passed by the people. We were trying to pay for that and keep a decent state program going at the same time.

The situation pitted the Democrats with a fairly liberal program and social attitude against the Republicans who were mental fiscal agents. They sincerely and truly were against most of these programs. It was quite a clear-cut division on party lines.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you comment please on the relative power or influence of the governor, the elected officials, the agencies, and the Legislature, through your own eyes as a thirty-two-year-old man in 1951?

**Mr. Bailey:** When I went into the House of Representatives, Governor Wallgren, a Democrat, had left in 1948 and Governor Langlie had come in after a four-year vacation given him by the voters in 1944. We were very polarized politically.

We had to face paying off huge deficits and we faced a number of things that eventually ironed themselves out and aren't the big problems today. There was no doubt but what we, the legislators, were a balancing power against the ultra-conservatives in the executive branch.

In the 1950 election, the Democrats carried the Senate by four votes. Seven of these Democrats, conservative, joined a coalition with the Republicans in order to keep the Senate conservative and counterbalance the Democratic House. Conservative Democrats and Republicans took over the Senate committees and their chairmanships. It made our 1951 session very difficult because we were split on many, many issues. In spite of that it was a fairly unifying thing for the Democratic House and we did all we could to protect the loyal Democrats in the Senate.

I have mentioned that I thought my time in the House was fairly uneventful, personally. It wasn't that there were not many things of great importance going on, but in my personal experience I could not get enthused about the workings of the House on the floor. Consequently, I ended up not contributing anything to the floor work.

I think some of this might have been due to my colleague, Chet King, a veteran legislator. He never assisted me in any way in getting bills passed. I did a lot of work in committee. I worked hard on the Roads and Bridges Committee where Julia Butler Hansen was chairman. I also worked hard in the Cities, Towns and Counties Committee. I had a lot of interest in that since I had been a county official and many of them brought their bills to me because I understood their problems.

I would get the bills out of committee and into the House Rules Committee. Most never appeared again. Once a year the Rules Committee would hold a one-day session, behind closed doors, go through the whole calendar and ditch any bills not necessary. This was to clear the calendar before adjournment.

Later, after I left the House, one of my good friends on the Rules Committee asked me, "Bob, why do you always get your bills into Rules and then have them killed?"

My response was that "I have never asked to have them killed."

"Well, your colleague, Chet, comes in and when we reach one of your bills says, 'Bob doesn't want this and would just as soon have it killed.'"

This I discovered many years later. Chet was a good seatmate but he never helped me in any way to understand the inner operations of the process, in fact, usually took over to "help" me and not revealing anything I should have been learning. It did not do much to whet my appetite for the House, but on looking back, it was entirely my fault for becoming so overwhelmed with the process that I did not proceed on my own.

He sometimes would go to visiting delegations and tell them that he would relay the word to me, giving the insinuation that I would do as he said. They then would never come to see me. We soon had this out. In fact, I was inclined to vote *against* any commitment made by someone else without consulting me, too.

I really don't think that there was malice or anything like that, but Chet was very arrogant about his seniority in the House.

Actually, I did a lot of work in committees. They needed my vote of support on the floor, but as far as taking part in debate on the floor, I did not. I just didn't have the interest.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How do you explain your seatmate's saying in the committee that "Bob doesn't want that passed?"

**Mr. Bailey:** Rules Committee was a strictly private, secret deal and no one would tell you what transpired inside the closed doors. I think Chet was irked at times that I would get a much higher vote in the elections than he did. I got a great deal of publicity out of those elections and he usually had trouble squeezing through.

Chet was a good legislator, except for this personal quirk about his seniority. When I got into a few political turmoils outside the Legislature, it would be Chet who stood up and said, "I warn you. Quit picking on my buddy." I also gave him support in similar situations, and in spite of these problems, not then known, we operated as a team for our district.

We just did work closely together in other matters and certainly voted alike at most times, but we moved in just a little different direction.

We agreed that we would take different committee assignments so we could better represent our district. He would go on different committees than I did and in that way we could cover twice as much for our area. None of my bills were very big and the state is probably better off that we didn't pass all of them.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I would like to go back to your remark about the Democratic senators who chose to vote with the Republicans. Can you describe how those senators were persuaded and by whom?

**Mr. Bailey:** No, I cannot. The Democratic senators, as I recall it, were led by very conservative senators from Spokane, which to our state party was like the "solid South" to the New Deal. You got nothing out of them that was Democratic really. The Republicans, of course, were very receptive and could only get legislative clout by a coalition.

There were a few others involved. I remember Senator Jack Rogers, very well respected and smart. This probably harmed his political career at that time more than anything he had ever done. There was a lot of bitterness.

When I look back on it, it seems funny. When I was in the House in 1951, 1953, and 1955, we ate in the House cafeteria. A Democrat never set with a Republican, and vice versa. Times have changed, but when I went to the Senate in 1957, the same separation prevailed.

At one time I was sitting with a friend, a Republican from Aberdeen, and was summoned upstairs to be asked, "What is going on? Are you making some kind of deal?"

One of the first things, one of my first jobs when I was in a leadership position in the Senate was to meet with Senators Marshall Neill and John Ryder on the Republican side and try to mix everyone up. Unless it has changed a lot since I left the Senate in 1977, this partisan condition no longer exists.

[End of Tape 9, Side 1]

**Ms. Bridgman:** We were talking about the Spokane "gang" to which you referred previously.

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I think that's probably some words I just put together myself because I don't recall that being a common accusation. Spokane Democrats were usually very conservative people. The Democrats as a whole were always grateful for them because even though we had to live with them and couldn't count on them for some votes--they represented a conservative constituency dominated by Washington Water Power in those days--we needed them in organizing the Legislature and its committees, and except for an occasional coalition, they stayed with us most of the time in organizing each house.

In 1951, public power was a big issue as were the social spending programs, taxes, highways--everything. The Senate conservatives did not want to turn the power of committee chairmanships over to some of the more liberal elements that would have had control. Joining with the Republican conservatives was a natural move for this group of Democrats at that particular time.

The dissidents eventually came back to the party a little at a time. Some of them may not have been re-elected, but many continued their political careers, probably with years ahead before they were truly trusted by their colleagues.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How much did the relative size of the House as opposed to the Senate have to do with this impersonal quality that you mentioned?

**Mr. Bailey:** The size of the House made it more impersonal and called for more party discipline to get things done. The Senate, one-half the size, was much more personal.

A sort of party discipline is very important in the House. It had to have it. When I say party discipline, I don't mean that a party tells you how to vote, but you have to have a good organization and know when to bring major bills out and put them on the floor. Much of that in the House depends on one person, the Speaker. He can influence a lot and he is also chairman of the Rules Committee.

The Senate is smaller and they pay a lot more attention to the individual. Size has everything to do with it.

When I first went to the Legislature everyone was quite polarized by party. Some of this was an aftermath of the coalition and much bitterness. I don't

know how it is now, but while members of the minority can do some things it is the majority that runs the show and determines the passage of legislation. Without such organization, the sessions would be pure chaos.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Do you recall how many Democrats and Republicans there were in the House in the 1951 session?

**Mr. Bailey:** Fifty-four Democrats, forty-five Republicans.

My first experience in the House was getting into the nitty-gritty of electing a Speaker. I became a fan of Charlie Hodde, Speaker of the House, although I didn't know him at that time.

When we came to Olympia to a Democratic Caucus, we were in a downtown Olympia Hotel and my seatmate, Chet King, had taken me upstairs to meet Hodde. Charlie wasn't there, as I recall it, but I told Chet I was definitely in his camp. He also said he was supporting him.

We went down to the lobby and Representative Floyd Miller, who was running John O'Brien's campaign for Speaker, was there. He went around and asked everyone except me to support O'Brien. He didn't even say hello to me. My colleague might have given some assurance, I don't know, but it seemed to imply that my colleague had said he would control my vote.

As we left there I saw Earl Coe standing in back of the room and I said, "That guy (O'Brien) thinks he's got my vote in the bag. He's crazier than hell."

When I got to where the caucus was held I was called to the phone. They wanted me to go upstairs to a room as John O'Brien wanted to talk to me. I know it was a hasty reaction but my recollection was that, "It won't make a lot of difference as I'm going to vote for Charlie Hodde anyway." I didn't go.

When we got up to the hill during session, John O'Brien wasn't exactly my best friend for a long time. In fact, when he became Speaker in 1955, I was for Julia Butler Hansen. She lost in the caucus by one vote. Hodde was elected Speaker in 1951, and John was our floor leader.

In 1955, after supporting Julia, I certainly didn't get on any decent committees. I probably should have been chairman of the Cities, Towns and Counties Committee, but I had not been a supporter of John O'Brien. That's when I resolved to quit the Legislature.

**Ms. Bridgman:** That was in 1955.

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes. My wife said, "No, you stay here and face it." I did. About this time I decided to run for the Senate in 1956.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You've described a little bit about the caucus. Is this typical of the way things were decided at these presession caucuses?

**Mr. Bailey:** Every officer elected is nominated by his own caucus. So, if we came out of caucus supporting Charlie Hodde, he's usually the only name going to be proposed by the Democrats on the floor.

The same way in the Senate, where I was caucus chairman for many years. I'd get elected in caucus, as would the floor leader and other caucus officers. Secretary of the Senate, sergeant at arms, and other Senate officials would be nominated in the caucus and then the winners' names taken to the floor for a vote of the whole body. They were officers of the whole Senate. Many times these were straight party votes and sometimes they would be elected unanimously.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Your description of solicitation of votes made it sound very casual. What more is there to it than someone's representative going around and asking for votes?

**Mr. Bailey:** It's just like any campaign in any organization, lodge, political party or whatever. If you're running for state committeeman, you go out and find delegates and try to get them to pledge to you. If you get enough you get elected. If you don't, you don't get elected.

I think O'Brien's man was very negligent in this case, although my case would not have made any difference. I was furious to think that as a new member I was taken for granted.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How much of this support is lined up, or how many attempts are made before the caucus to line up support?

**Mr. Bailey:** Most of it is done between the general election and the caucuses held before coming to Olympia. When I ran for caucus chairman I got on the phone and contacted every member of our party asking for support. You don't wait to go to the meeting because that is too late.

O'Brien's campaign work was probably done in Seattle, his home base. He turned out to be an excellent Speaker. He served in that office for several terms. Later, he and I became very good friends. In fact, these events are humorous when I look back on them now.

**Ms. Bridgman:** And then what sorts of benefits are implicit or specified in one's vote?

**Mr. Bailey:** There isn't any really, but I know I would feel that I owed some recognition to those who supported me. The Speaker has a lot of power. The Senate is not quite that clear. Everyone is a senator, and everyone has a vote. While the House is the same, it doesn't boil down to as personal an individual issue as in the Senate. On the other hand, most of the

appointments to committees are not done by the Speaker alone, but by a group of majority members called the Committee on Committees. The Speaker has plenty of influence, however, and his supporters control that committee.

Members make requests and are assigned committees to reflect proper political balance. Democrats never could fill the Public Utilities Committee with private power Democrats, nor could they fill the Labor Committee with representatives of business and keep control of basic party positions in support of publicly owned power. On the other hand, the Republicans wanted to see this imbalance, check public utilities and bottle up union issues in committee. Generally speaking, the Speaker has great power, but it is not good sense for a Speaker to ride roughshod over everybody in the minority either.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I want to go back to your first impressions. Can you describe how what is now called the campus, around the state capitol, looked; what buildings and parking lots and lawns and open spaces there were when you first arrived in 1951?

**Mr. Bailey:** The campus itself hasn't changed much since 1951. The Capitol Building, of course, was there, as was the Temple of Justice, Insurance Building, Highways (O'Brien) and Public Lands (Cherberg) buildings as well as the "temporary" Labor and Industries building. All the others--General Administration and the buildings across Capitol Way came later.

Facilities for members have really changed. As I recall, we got five dollars a day when in session and one hundred dollars a month. Only committee chairmen had a room to meet in. House members had their desks on the floor. I would bring my portable typewriter and go into the chambers, sit at my desk, and write my letters at night. You never got much privacy because every lobbyist who saw you would come down to the floor and talk.

We had a stenographic pool where everyone could go and dictate letters and get them back maybe four or five days later. I wrote all of my own. I don't think I ever went into the pool all of the years I was in the House. I could pound them out easier than I could dictate them.

I also maintained touch with the people at home. I wrote a weekly newsletter to every local paper in my district, a legislative report on activities as they affected our district. It was on my own and didn't come through a public-relations office as nowadays who writes the same thing for everyone, just changing the name.

Members of the House were allowed to use the phone in the members' lounges and to charge the calls. At the end of the week the phone company would come by and we'd have to pay up for that week.

We paid for our own lunches at that time, but I think the House hired and paid the workers in the cafeteria. The House cafeteria wasn't used that much then, and often we would go downtown to eat or have a lobbyist take us to lunch. They didn't do too much of that in 1951 because many of us didn't have too much influence or power to warrant such attention.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What other staff support was there other than the stenographic pool?

**Mr. Bailey:** None, unless you were a committee chairman. If you were a committee chairman you had your own room for meeting and you had a staff. They might serve two or three committees in the same room. There was no staff support for individual members.

The Senate was quite a bit different. Senators had offices on the fourth floor of the main building when I first went there. There were four senators to each room sharing one secretary who also served the committees meeting in that room. Chairmen of the major committees, like in the House, would have a big committee room with quite a staff for research and assistance.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Even as early as 1951?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, yes. For many years most of the staff was hired on loan from the various departments, for session only, and then returned to their regular jobs. On Transportation, many would come from the Highways Department, and so on.

Every committee was about the same way. They would come from some part of state government and come over there as more or less experienced experts. When you think back they also could have had a tremendous influence on some of the legislation as it affected their own agencies.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I was very interested in that and was going to ask you about it.

**Mr. Bailey:** Now the staff is pretty much full time and it's probably better that way.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I'd like you to profile the leaders in the 1951 session, the governor and other important figures who come to mind. Can you start with Governor Langlie, please?

**Mr. Bailey:** Being a newcomer, I had very little, if anything, to do with Governor Langlie. I remember that he had great problems because when he went into office in 1949 the state had a huge surplus of many millions of dollars created by the war. Within two years, when the session met in 1951, we were in debt about the same amount. This was due to a welfare initiative passed by the people and not the fault of the governor.

As I said before, one of my first votes in the House was to take care of the deficit, which I recall amounted to more than one hundred million dollars. That was breathtaking for me even to read about, let alone cast my vote on it.

My name starting with "B," I was the second Democratic name on roll call. Ahead of me was George Adams, an elderly gentleman, very conservative. George was an Indian from near Shelton, and a very colorful personality, but he sometimes strayed from the party line. I had to make up my own mind on the issues, was too stubborn to ask the leadership, and didn't ask anybody. I was amazed at the end of the session that I never had to go back and change my vote. Our side got so they looked when the role was called--Adams, Anderson and then *Bailey* to determine how the party was voting. As I said, I never made an error, but never received instructions either. Although I suspect some of our other members thought I had been prompted.

I do remember that Governor Langlie had government reorganization bills that we didn't like, and he was very irate when they were not passed in the regular session. When we adjourned, he called us back into immediate special session to consider these bills and some others.

I will never forget his appearance at the joint session the next morning. Usually they would announce "the Governor of the State of Washington" and there would be fairly good applause, at least from his own party. This time, when he was announced, everyone stood up as he was escorted down the aisle. Without any previous signal there was not one handclap from either side of the chamber, just deadly silence. Both parties were so distraught with him that the silence really spoke. There were references to the incident in some papers. It was absolutely astonishing and could not have been planned or rehearsed.

I had no connection with Governor Langlie. Vic Meyers was the lieutenant governor and Langlie was always called, nationwide, "the captive governor of Washington" because Vic had vowed that he would call a special session of the Legislature on welfare matters, or pardon some of his friends in prison at Walla Walla if Langlie left the state.

The governor could probably have undone anything Vic might have tried, but Vic was really a well-liked character, and I think he thoroughly enjoyed the publicity he could generate by those threats.

Other people: Charlie Hodde was a very substantial, dedicated person. John O'Brien, as our floor leader, was developing into the capable Speaker of the future. Probably one of my biggest pleasures was in meeting and working with a person I had heard a lot about but had never met--Julia Butler Hansen. She was chairman of the Highways, Roads and Bridges Committee, and also was assistant floor leader to John O'Brien.

Julia lived in an area much like my own. We had terrible roads. Road projects were one thing that could get you re-elected. They were extremely important at that time. Julia also resolved, I think, that being a woman the men were going to look down on her on this job and she set out to prove that a woman could do just as good a job as a man. She did a heck of a lot better than most of the men.

She was very, very dominant in her committee. She was nice to all of us and helped us all. She laid out her program and there was little you would do to oppose it because your own usually would be included, too.

On the other hand she demanded that highway officials be at her beck and call. I don't think it would be unusual for Julia to call up the department heads at midnight or later when she was working late and say "Bill (Bugge) get over here. I want you to take me down to have a bite to eat and talk about some highway legislation." Julia was always working, even in relaxation.

I can remember a lot of the others in my first session, but the Speaker, O'Brien, and Julia stand out. Bob Ford was a leader in our revenue problems, especially as to allocations to local taxing districts, which was a major problem that year.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did Julia Butler Hansen explain her programs to you?

**Mr. Bailey:** It was all done in committee. If there was a proposal, the committee would have the Highways Department, or whoever, testify and then would make a decision. A good portion of the bills in the committee were proposed by the Highways Department. Julia, realizing she needed support, usually took most members into the decision-making process and she always tried to help the individual members with their individual local problems.

The big issue in the Legislature is always appropriations, and the highways appropriations were no exception.

The Highways Committee had lots of power because we not only laid out the programs, but we appropriated the money for it out of dedicated highways funds and not the general fund. The highways budget did not go to the Appropriations Committee for approval, and thus the committee had to lot of clout. In fact, for many years, the highways budget was figured outside of all other budget figures.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How were the choices she had made and the risk factors and rewards explained to you all?

**Mr. Bailey:** What do you mean rewards?

**Ms. Bridgman:** I mean benefits for having such and such a highway or such and such bridge.

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, each one of us had our problems and we had a right to pursue them. Technically, each of us had a vote and we didn't always act at the sufferance of the chairman. Everyone had needs and it just wasn't Julia. It was teamwork. She needed us and we needed her. It wasn't beyond Julia's methodology, though, to say to some member not on the committee--"You want this in the budget but you're not going to get it unless you support me"--on some other bill she might want.

There was always wheeling and dealing. When you have leverage you have to use it sometimes to be effective. She could be pretty stern and a groveling senator would know well that if he didn't cooperate, there would be no help from her side either. She established and maintained a very firm control but she also used rare judgment and made the Highways Committee very, very important.

One odd thing I remember about the Highways Committee. When I first went in the Legislature we couldn't hardly get a person from King County to serve on it. They didn't want it. They had no interest in it. They considered it a committee for rural roads. It was Julia Butler Hansen as chairman of the Highways Committee that put the statewide program on the front burner and planning for the future, which resulted in our modern freeways and other things. Now you have a hard time keeping city legislators from controlling the committee. Heavy traffic patterns and other developments have really changed the demands.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How many different alternatives had she and the people in the Highways Department researched to come up with any particular proposal?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, the proposals could come from any member, from her, or from the Highways Department--anyone. There was no clear-cut way to do that, but the department usually set the tone. The major highways appropriations bill was a conglomerate of everything we had hearings on and that had been heard by the committee and approved as to value and cost.

We couldn't adopt an unbalanced highways budget. It had to be something that could be paid for out of revenues and it was kind of a give-and-take deal.

**Ms. Bridgman:** And then how would you characterize her expectation of her colleagues, particularly her committee? How would she expect you to respond to her programs?

**Mr. Bailey:** She wasn't any different than anyone else. She wanted everyone to respond favorably, I am sure. But she was thoughtful about the minority as well as her own party. She was not a tyrant but a strong, capable legislator. Naturally anyone feels more cooperative with someone who has cooperated with them.

[End of Tape 9, Side 2]

**Ms. Bridgman:** We've been talking about Julia Butler Hansen and her political style, or perhaps more accurately how her political style reflected her political philosophy. That is, what she expected of the political enterprise, how she expected things to be settled and both opponents and allies to behave. Can you continue your reminiscences about that please?

**Mr. Bailey:** Before I knew Julia she had gained a highly publicized victory when she challenged the state Democratic chairman on some issue and he had to back down. I can't remember the details, but I was impressed with her political ability and astuteness. In the years since I went to Olympia in 1951, I worked fairly close to Julia.

I didn't always agree with her, nor she with me, but I will say she probably had the most natural legislative ability of anyone I have ever known.

She wasn't one to say it had to be one way only, but was a person who first tried to work things out, recognizing that legislation is many times a compromise. She would then really do battle for what she offered. And she got results.

Julia was one who knew how to play the legislative piano. She worked with all of the members. She was a strong Democrat, but I don't recall political partisanship in our highways program. Everyone had an interest in highways at that time and under her there was little partisan political maneuvering.

She also used the highway officials effectively. She had the clout, much of which she had established herself by exercising her powers as chairman. I think the department heads were always glad and willing to sit down and talk over mutual problems and yield to some of the things she wanted, knowing that she would promote the program that they needed at the time.

Julia, in her highways program, tried to take care of the needs of the rest of us in the House. It was not a matter of just a personal program, but she knew how to balance and bring things together. She performed that way later in Congress. The way you get clout is not by yourself, but by working with others.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Can you apply this same kind of analysis to those leaders you've already described, Governor Langlie, Victor Meyers and Hodde? What sort of political behavior did they expect or how did they see the political world?

**Mr. Bailey:** I have no recollection of the politics of Langlie. He represented the Republicans, and of course, the first year I was there the Republicans were in the minority except for the coalition in the Senate. He was not someone that us junior members would likely see very often.

A committee chairman like Julia probably would go down and confer with him on highway problems because he had a highways program of his own, too.

Charlie Hodde was the Speaker and provided great leadership. I never saw Hodde abuse his powers as Speaker, but he held things in control with a firm hand, which he should.

John O'Brien, our majority leader, was not as outgoing then as he was later. I think he was concerned a little more for his own views and not always considering those of others. He was from Seattle and he sometimes had different views than we had. He was a good, liberal Democrat, but not too forceful at that time.

John and Julia sat next to each other in the front row, and the back rows would often laugh that "John doesn't know when to stand up unless Julia prods him in the seat of his pants."

Julia was much more energetic and alert than John seemed to be. I just don't think his personality showed as prominently as that of Julia at that time.

That's my remembrance of them in my first session. John turned into a terrifically good Speaker and leader in later years and has established a commendable record in the House.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You've described Julia Butler Hansen as being very well informed and persuasive. And you've described a great deal of consultation that she did. How about Hodde? Did he do a lot of consulting and was he also persuasive and well informed?

**Mr. Bailey:** Charlie Hodde was well informed and certainly consulted with others. He did not run a one-man show. He would have to be in constant contact with Julia and other major committee chairmen because they would control the flow of bills--the important bills. Charlie, like any Speaker, had a steady parade into his office of lobbyists, members that had an interest in a bill, every chairman, heads of departments and a constant input of information about everything that was going on.

Charlie Hodde was not a weak Speaker. The Speaker's office is like a highway in the main corner of town. Everybody has to go to the Speaker's office because if you can get him to go along with you, your bill is probably going to move along, and if you can't you're in trouble.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How would these qualities we've been talking about apply to Secretary of State Earl Coe?

**Mr. Bailey:** Earl Coe was an administrative officer like the auditor, treasurer and others. They're just not as heard as often politically. Earl probably was heard politically because he was, for a time, the Democratic state chairman. He also was more active than some as he was getting ready to run for governor.

But while Earl was active politically, it was not in a meddling sort of way. We could consult with him if we wished. He was always available.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Would you then apply that same characterization to the superintendent of public instruction and the commissioner of public lands, Jack Taylor?

**Mr. Bailey:** I had very little to do with the Commissioner of Public Lands Jack Taylor at that session. I cannot recall any major bill in public lands at that session except the governor's reorganization bill, which we thought gave too much of his powers to the governor, which he and we opposed.

Superintendent of Public Instruction Pearl Wanamaker was different. Pearl was Julia personified in the education field. While Julia had an interest in highways and used it to her advantage, she also was terrifically interested in education and she had quite a record. Pearl and Julia worked pretty closely together on education matters.

Pearl was like Julia in another way. Those women had to fight so hard to get where they were that they had to come on pretty strong or they were going to get trampled on by the men. Pearl, like Julia, was no one to be crossed and she, too, could hold her own.

Pearl was the figure that really put education on the front burner in this state, and she did a wonderful job. People criticized her, but it was her determination and her fighting, almost like Julia did in highways, that did so much for education in this state. She was a strong lady and an outstanding public servant. Before I came to Olympia, Pearl had served in both houses of the Legislature and had many friends there. She led the way on education matters for the state and was good for education.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I'd like to go on and discuss your other committees now. Were the other committees run like the Highways Committee? How did their agenda originate?

**Mr. Bailey:** Every member usually has bills and introduces them when they come to Olympia. If I

happened to have a bill relating to public utilities, it is referred to that committee. That's the way you get your committee agenda, from the bills before it.

The Cities, Towns and Counties Committee used to have just an overwhelming number of bills because it dealt with all bills for local government. That committee had lots of volume, not always major bills, but most were very important to someone.

The chairman of a committee didn't have to go out and work to get an agenda. He had bundles of bills dumped on him and they had to have hearings and be disposed of one way or the other.

A chairman of Cities, Town and Counties would be working closely with the Association of Washington Cities and the Association of Counties, as well as other groups that would have an interest in a particular proposal.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How about Public Utilities, and Judiciary, and Forestry, and State Lands and Buildings, which you were on? Were they all similar in the way they functioned?

**Mr. Bailey:** Absolutely. Forest and State Lands would probably work closely with the state land commissioner and his staff, who had an interest in most of the bills, as well as the state forester, forest board and others.

Each department each session has certain things that they need and they draw up their own bills and submit them to the members to sponsor. Most of these bills probably were not very controversial. They were housekeeping bills but were important to departmental operation.

On Buildings there was, and is, always some request for a new building. In those days (1951) a lot of the money came out of what we call capital grant funds. In our state constitution the founding fathers set aside certain areas of the Olympic peninsula as capital grant lands. The money derived from sales of the timber on those lands could only be used for the construction of buildings in the state capital. They also set aside similar parcels for institutions, education, and other things. Educational land ended up not being able to support education from land sales alone, so they had to go to the general fund for most of their support.

Major politically charged bills are the exception and get the headlines. Most bills were not too controversial and came from the departments as departmental requests, or even from the governor as executive request bills if he saw something he felt he really needed. "Request" bills carried a little weight when you'd look in the parentheses alongside your name as sponsor and it would say "by departmental request." It gave the bill a little prestige to know that someone other than the member was supporting the legislation.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Who were the other significant leaders in these committees in your first session?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't remember anyone particularly outstanding. These were committees that met maybe once a week, depending on the number of bills before them. Highways, Roads and Bridges, a major committee, met three or four times a week, and the Appropriations Committee would do the same. Smaller committees met less often and when necessary.

**Ms. Bridgman:** If you don't remember any other particularly influential leaders, do you remember other influential or just notable members of those committees from this session?

**Mr. Bailey:** If I saw a list I would remember every name, I'm sure. I was in the Legislature so long and on so many different committees that it's difficult for me to tell what year and with whom I served. I can remember the individuals, but whether or not I was on a particular committee with them, or whether I just knew them well, I can't recall.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Let's move on to bills that you sponsored during this first session. What can you tell me about them?

**Mr. Bailey:** I can tell you just enough to know that they must not have been very important because I don't remember. I do remember some of our biggest battles at that time were on highways. A lot of time was spent on highways and trying to devise ways of getting our district projects included. If we couldn't get the whole thing, we tried our darndest to get a part of it this session, and a part of it the next time, finally getting it done.

Another of the big issues at that time was the public utility issue. I came from public utility districts both in Grays Harbor and Pacific Counties. The PUDs were in constant battle with the private utilities. Ken Billington was head of the lobby for the Washington Public Power people and spent all of his time in Olympia protecting their interests, trying to keep anti-public power bills from passing.

As a longtime Granger and farmer, Charlie Hodde was firmly in the public utilities camp. I know you'd see Ken go into Charlie's office quite a bit. They were good friends. Ken was a friend and helpful to all of us--on his side.

Nowadays, it is hard to imagine the way the private and public utilities got along. It is fantastic when you think back to the situation and how they can now sit at the same table and work on common problems.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Were there bills that you remember that you opposed at this particular session?

**Mr. Bailey:** Again I am having a hard time telling which session was which. It seems to me one of the bills in 1951 (only the year is in doubt) was the Highway Commission bill--Julia's bill. As I say, I am not sure of the year, but fairly positive this was 1951.

We had terrible post-war highways problems. About the time we would convince the state highways director--a political appointee by the governor, that one of our projects was needed, or even just needed repair, he would usually resign or be dismissed and we'd have another new director.

It was always a political appointment, you see, and there was no continuity in program. Julia's commission bill was something I thought would solve the situation. I remember obtaining several votes for her and we passed it.

Another bill I do remember opposing (I voted the first time for it) was one that gave public school buses the right to carry parochial students to parochial schools. I guess I was naive and pure of thought at that time. I succeeded in getting several votes for Julia's Highway Commission bill, I think maybe five or six, in return for my vote and Julia's on this school bus bill.

I got the votes, and Julia and I both voted for it. After I voted for it and it passed the House, I heard two Spokane members sitting behind me and they wanted to know if the archbishop had got in touch with the Senate members yet, and if he had told them that he wanted an amendment to the bill and wanted it passed the next day. When I heard that they were going to the hierarchy of the church to get orders how to vote, I resolved that I was going to vote against it.

So, when it came back to the House with the changes, I led off the chorus of roll call by voting against it. I thought three or four members would break down desks in order to get to me and believe it or not, about ten names later, Julia Butler Hansen also voted against it and we hadn't even talked it over.

When I got home and was confronted by a fellow Mason, he asked me if I thought I had covered my tracks, voting for it once, against it later. I had to try to explain what I did and said, "I don't think you're ever going to see me in that position again." I never had tried to mix church and state and can't remember ever facing the issue later.

Another time I remember a bill allowing chiropractors to receive state industrial-insurance funds. I leaned back in my seat and asked Representative Elmer Huhta, Grays Harbor, a chiropractor, if he was telling me that they could cure cancer, and things like that.

"No. Good chiropractors refer people like that to doctors."

I voted for the bill and went out that night with the head of the chiropractic association, a Doctor Albert Adams (later a state representative). He started telling about how he just didn't see anybody voting against the bill. He said they could cure measles, chicken pox and mumps, and the conversation, in my mind, got sillier and sillier.

Another man, his friend, kept saying, "Allie, you so and so, you're dumb." And Dr. Adams kept on going. "Allie, why don't you shut up?" Finally he turned around and said, "You know if I was a new member of the Legislature and heard that stuff, I'd never vote for them again."

I went in the next morning and asked Representative Huhta about these contagious diseases. "Elmer, I thought you told me you didn't do those things."

He said, "Oh, I didn't say we didn't do them. I just said we don't cure them, but we never have these diseases in our families, we don't have cancer or anything because we practice chiropractic before it happens."

My response was, "You'll never get another vote out of me." And they never did. At a later time, although disagreeing, Elmer Huhta and Dr. Adams (then a state representative) and I, became very good friends. They represented two different branches of chiropractic but later got together and presented a united front. Their profession has come a long way and I have no feelings against them anymore.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How about in those days when they stopped the clock so the Legislature could settle things that were not finished?

**Mr. Bailey:** They'd been doing that for a long time. You must remember if we stopped the clock we were still in the same last day, and one time we went eighteen actual days on ten dollars. We didn't get paid for it because we couldn't recognize on the record that the clock was stopped, and it was recognized only as the activities of that last day.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well, in the Thirty-second Legislature, when that happened, you were on a conference committee which was established to set up an un-American activities committee. And in the newspaper article written by you, you said the outcome was unclear. Can you tell us now what the outcome was?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think Charlie Hodde appointed me because I was probably the least argumentative and neutral member named and I had not got involved in all of the partisan fights on the floor but still was an opponent of legislative witch hunting.

To get into conference, each house has to appoint two members voting with the majority and one with the minority, the six being sent into conference to resolve the differences.

[End of Tape 10, Side 1]

**Mr. Bailey:** I was against the witch-hunting as exploited by Representative Canwell in the preceding years before 1951. A Senate Republican, Senator Kimball from Seattle, was dead set on starting another "Canwell" committee. Incidentally, later on he ran for the Senate as a Democrat and was elected, and was one of our most liberal members

Senator Kimball was intent on passage of the bill, and Representative Perry Woodall, Republican leader in the House, was carrying the ball on the House side. We had to have a majority of each house on the conference committee before they could get it out of conference. We kept meeting and meeting, endless times. When it looked like everyone was going to be there, I would disappear, and they couldn't find me. The Republicans hoped they would have my vote. In fact, they had to have it.

I remember Perry Woodall getting up on the floor and accusing the other House member, Representative Slim Rasmussen, of refusing to even try to work an agreement. He accused everyone opposing him but added, "I have the highest respect for Representative Bailey and I know he's totally honest in his convictions. I'm sure he's going to sign it." Little did he know.

He moved for dismissal of the committee and appointment of a new one, hoping to get rid of Rasmussen. It failed by a straight party vote and the charade continued for a day or longer.

When the motion was made again, a new committee was formed and Julia Butler Hansen took my place. When the session adjourned a few nights later the staff was still typing up volumes of amendments proposed by Mrs. Hansen, and time just ran out.

Stopping the clock was something that had been going on a long time because the state constitution limited the sessions to sixty days. When they were not quite finished with the budget or some major item, they would hang a flag over the clock and both parties were very meticulous in never asking what time it was. It never went on the record. As far as the record was concerned, you were still meeting in that last day.

In 1951 we went overtime for eighteen days, without any additional compensation, and then, unable to complete our work, were called into a special session.

During that time we solicited the lobbyists to put on a smorgasbord for us in our caucus room. The Republicans followed suit.

During the party, John O'Brien said, "Do you know that Governor Langlie is next door at the Republicans' lunch?" Someone else said, "We ought to invite the so-and-so over."

Chet King, my seatmate, stood up and said, "Let's go, Bob," and we walked over into the Republican Caucus room where we were greeted with applause. We said, "Governor, we want you to come over and visit the Democratic Caucus," and one of us on each arm, we trotted him over to our room where everyone clapped and he ate a sandwich or two, and made a few pleasant remarks.

He did not stay long, but after he left about four or five Republicans came in. They said, "You guys are having a heck of a good time, better than we are, and we thought we would join you." They were having a very conservative little tea party over there. I'll never forget that, but the fact that we had a keg of beer probably made a difference. Democratic parties were always less formal than those of the GOP, and more fun.

Stopping the clock was a ridiculous way to do business. It was only later when members questioned the hour on the record that it had to be stopped. The court had said that it would not look behind the record. To protect the legitimacy of the laws passed in times like that, the Legislature stopped the practice.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I was interested in the conference committee on setting up the Un-American Activities Committee because in Charlie Hodde's transcript he had recorded his views about the postwar period and I'll quote: "Communism was really a big issue... it influenced the way people lined up under the questions." How true do you think this was in the 1951 session?

**Mr. Bailey:** The issue was fading in 1951. Charlie is right, though, and I think I have said it all along. It was such an issue we would not even use red ink on our signs, little things like that. You didn't know how far it permeated or influenced your neighbor or friends. No one was really objecting to these inquiries on a wide scale until the public reaction began to set in.

The 1951 closing session seemed to be the last gasp of this sort of thing on the state level.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Some other bills which you referred to in your newspaper articles describing the tumultuous end of this session are the Spokane power bill and having provided two hundred fifty dollars for raises in teacher salaries. Can you elaborate on these?

**Mr. Bailey:** I cannot remember the Spokane power bill, but if it had the word Spokane in it, and it was a power bill, it had to be something we were violently opposed to, and undoubtedly was an effort of private power to restrict and hamper public power districts. Charlie Hodde, then and later, was involved in a terrific battle which attempted to liquidate public utility districts and turn them back to private ownership. I can't put this particular bill into timely context.

**Ms. Bridgman:** And then about the teachers?

**Mr. Bailey:** Let me say this. In 1951 there were highways, the social programs, and education. I'd probably say that highways and education were the two top issues. Pearl Wanamaker would always come in with a tremendous school budget and everyone would grunt and groan. She was very smart and asked for more than she got because if she had asked for less, she would have gotten less.

The education bill and how much we allowed teachers, how much we allowed for equalization and things of that sort, were always major items. Sometimes it became just a partisan issue, Democrats against Republicans. Sometimes the small school districts that had Republican members were very supportive of more state aid.

Generally speaking it sometimes broke right around party lines, due to fiscal problems. It wasn't that the Republicans were against education, but the fiscal problem created by new state expenditures.

Education was a big issue and I think probably was one of the big finales to the session. I can't remember how the other side voted, but, well, even when I left the Senate in 1977, it was still a big issue--and it still is. It would not be unusual that I would write that one of the big things coming out of the session was education and a teacher pay increase.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You've referred several times today to lobbyists and special interest groups. Can we go into that a little more? Will you name some of them that you remember from the 1951 session, both those operating inside your district and outside?

**Mr. Bailey:** I had very few professional lobbyists in my own district, but they represented people and groups from my district. We came from a rural area. Even the Aberdeen area nearby had few professional lobbyists.

Probably in highways, the biggest lobbyists would be for the Good Roads Association, which basically was made up of the paving--asphalt paving--industry and other highway user groups. They also had as members the chambers of commerce, labor unions and many others interested in good roads, all very active and composing the Good Roads Association.

They were a very potent force in highways programs at that time. They were active in laying out an overall state highways program. I guess they are not as powerful now as they once were.

The Granges were a part of the Good Roads group and had their other programs, too. Theirs was a statewide program.

The Public Utility District Association always had Ken Billington when I was in the Legislature. He was very effective as a lobbyist. The Association of Washington Cities had Chester Biesen, also a very effective lobbyist. He represented every big and little city in the state, would present their desires, testify for the bills and would keep in touch with local officials who, in turn, would contact us to give support to specific items.

There was a county association I remember represented by Dick Watts, who later went to Alaska. Each of these associations were quite prominent in talking to each of us about their problems and especially how they affected our districts and area.

I don't ever remember a representative of private power talking to me. To illustrate the big rift I must tell you that when I was named to the state Utilities Commission in 1977, the Washington Water Power lobbyist came to me and said that his boss, Mr. Satre, had asked that he drop in and say hello and extend (Satre's) best wishes.

"I am embarrassed," he said, "because in all the twenty years that we've been around Olympia, I have never gone into your office or ever talked with you. I knew what side you were on."

I told him to go back and tell Satre that the mission was accomplished and thank him for the best wishes.

But that was the way it was. Private power and public power people were engaged in battle and did not confer. It was extremely polarized and you were either on one side or the other.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You've talked about lobbyists in some cases helping to draft legislation, but what other things did they do? What proportion of their activities were social or otherwise?

**Ms. Bridgman:** As to lobbyists, I speak more about the associations now than I do of personally hired lobbyists. The associations they represented sometimes had a program and wanted certain bills passed to allow certain activities.

Usually they would come to you and ask you to sponsor a suggested bill. Many of the bills sponsored were at the request of other people, groups or departments, and usually those requesting the legislation would have to do the work of arranging hearings, testimony, and things like that.

A representative or senator never drew his own bill and put it into the hopper. All had to come out of the bill-drafting room where the hired lawyers drew the bills to keep them properly written and codified. A lawyer-member couldn't even draw his own bill, but had to go down to the bill drafter.

If it was a public utility bill, Ken Billington would probably have drafted it, or would have reviewed it at any rate. If it was another bill for the private power side, I imagine that one of the members had it drawn at the request of and with approval of Washington Water Power or some other private power company.

I guess that's the reason issues before the Cities, Towns and Counties Committee are a little more difficult for me to remember. They were general bills that helped local government as a rule and were not too partisan. There were many of them.

I can remember one or two issues, like public housing, that came before the committee one time and we had bitter battles because some of the people felt that public housing was socialism, and "places for those Communists to be put in Seattle with cheap rent." It's accepted practice now by both parties.

Public utilities were not partisan. It was the battle by publicly owned utilities against privately owned utilities. We had many people on our public power side who were Republicans and for publicly owned utilities. You'd also have some Democrats, especially in the Spokane area, for private utilities. It can't exactly be said to be completely a Republican verses Democratic issue, although the Democratic platform always supported publicly owned power.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You mentioned the lobbyists providing a smorgasbord when the session was extended. What other kinds of social activities did the lobbyists or special interest groups take part in?

**Mr. Bailey:** I was wined and dined more as a senator probably than ever in the House because I had more of an influential position. In the House, in those days, and I think in the Senate, too, most of the social activities were things like for a whole committee--like the Cities Association, who might put on a dinner for the members of that committee.

Members of the Highways Committee were always guests at a couple of parties each session. One would be by the Good Roads Association for every member of the Legislature, one of the biggest parties of the year. It'd be just a big banquet and so crowded you couldn't sit down to eat or really enjoy it. It was something everyone went to for a free meal.

Maybe other associations would put on some event, that's sort of the way it went. I never remember a Utilities dinner. Could have been that the die was so cast in those cases that it just wasn't necessary.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well, that brings us to the social life of a neophyte representative in 1951. You've saved invitations to the governor's ball and the legislative dance. How important were those functions and how important was the social life in general?

**Mr. Bailey:** They're just souvenirs. I was invited to all of them. I kept them for souvenirs. I think my wife and I went to one inaugural ball. It was when Rosellini was governor and it was at the armory in Olympia. It was snowing outside, it was blowing rain and snow inside when it got so hot they had to open the doors.

It got so cold in there we finally decided to leave. It really wasn't any fun. I don't dance and she doesn't like to, and we just about froze to death in that place with the wind, rain and snow beating through the open doors. Every time we drive past the armory we think about that. We never went to any of these social events as a rule.

I refuse to wear a tux. I did once at my son's wedding because my daughter-in-law told me I had to. One time when President Eisenhower came to Seattle I had an invitation. I would not go because it was formal. Judge John Langenbach, our local superior court judge, called me in his office and offered to lend me his tux, telling me that I had to go.

I told the judge I wouldn't put a tux on for anyone and I didn't go. I probably regretted it after that.

Ironically, and surprising to me through the years is that when the conservative Republicans were in power, you only had to have a black tie, or just come fairly decent. When the liberal Democrats got in they usually demanded formal wear, a paradox I could never figure out. But, they didn't get me to many of those things very often, no matter what you wore.

We did go a few times to receptions at the mansion under Governors Langlie, Rosellini, and Evans. We weren't much on social life and there wasn't much anyway.

The first couple of years I was in the Legislature, before I was married, Representative Frank Connor (later Senator) and I would go out, eat and drink beer together. Quite frequently, without lobbyists around, we would meet Senator Jack Rogers and sit and have a few.

I remember Senator Rogers because at that time he was a weekly newspaperman and worked at times in the Olympia radio station. Frank and I would duck around the corner so no lobbyists could find us, and Jack would come down from the radio station and we'd sit and have a pretty good time. That was probably the social life of two freshmen representatives in 1951.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You've saved some cards, including an Ulcer Gulch and Journeymen Lobbyist card. This and what you have just related indicates that politics isn't serious all of the time. Would you like to speculate on this kind of humor and the place it serves in a serious enterprise?

**Mr. Bailey:** In the first place, the lobbyists, even those I have mentioned from the associations, used to gather in the gallery between the House and Senate floors which became know as Ulcer Gulch. It was also called the "third house." There was one lobbyist, Joel Gould, who represented the Seattle First National Bank. He had been in the Raymond branch and knew both Chet King and I pretty well, so we were very friendly.

Joel would come by and visit and kept his eyes on things that affected banking. He never bothered us, but he also was our banker. Sometimes we'd have to borrow twenty dollars until Saturday, if we were broke. And then Joel would come by with his little black book at the end of the week and we would fork over what we owed. He never lost any money, and it rendered us a good service many times.

He was a typical lobbyist--a good friend to everyone. He had a terrific sense of humor and could be serious at the same time. I think Joel was probably responsible for most of the Ulcer Gulch activity, which still carries on.

I must say that it was a poor legislator that didn't go out into the Gulch and ask for an opinion once in awhile. You could be working on a banking bill and when you asked Joel, "What would this do to our people at home?" --you might find a perfect-sounding bill might have disastrous effects on your local institutions.

Frequently, I would ask Chester Biesen about cities legislation. You couldn't call home all the time on every bill. These people provided tremendous expert input--and still do. There was nothing sinister about it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** So they served an informational purpose?

**Mr. Bailey:** Certainly, and they do yet. There are only a few that you have to watch. They are the ones so busy promoting something for themselves and for the people who hire them that they have lost their values. Generally good lobbyists serve a very good purpose in the legislative process.

When you talk about limiting lobbyists, you would also have to limit the person that writes from home, for instance, the citizen, that says he would like to have you support this bill or that. That's lobbying, too, in a certain way. It's freedom of speech, and if an elected official doesn't have sense enough to sort it out, then he's a poor elected official. I think there is room for lobbyists and certainly no one should be curtailed from telling a legislator what they think.

The cards from Ulcer Gulch you mention were put out at a time when everybody else had calling cards. They issued their own and Joel made it a point to see that I got a couple, which I've always kept.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What was a typical day like in the 1951 session?

**Mr. Bailey:** I would imagine that a typical day started out with a caucus, but we didn't caucus every day like we did later in the Senate. The leadership took care of a lot of the details and being new, it was probably one of the reasons I wasn't too close to House operations. Some committees met in the morning. We would go into session at ten or eleven o'clock, and as the session went on we would meet earlier and stay later. Before and after the floor sessions we would have a busy round of committee meetings, many times at night. Toward the end of the session we would meet on the floor for many long hours and sometimes late into the night, sometimes three or four o'clock in the morning. Early in the session we would adjourn early on Friday and not come back until Monday noon.

**Ms. Bridgman:** We're coming close to the end of the tape. I want to get you to reflect and evaluate this very first session. At least we can start. Maybe we'll start with an evaluation of your fellow politicians. You've characterized some politicians as opportunists, others as misled, others as having high principles. How would you describe your views of the character and intentions of most of the members of the state government after that first session?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I don't think I came out of that first session with anything but a higher regard for the members than I had when I went in. Everybody had a job they wanted to do, and as far as I am concerned were sincerely trying to do it. I cannot really think that many members had any hidden or ulterior motives. If they did, they didn't stay in the Legislature very long.

[End of Tape 10, Side 2]

## PRINTER AND POLITICIAN

**Mr. Bailey:** If I said I thought any of these people were misled, it isn't that they were in any way ignorant or things of that sort. Those that went along with some of the very liberal people, I'm sure, were very liberal in their own minds. I felt I was, too.

But, I also know that the radicals we later ran out of the party were very adept at using people. The people being used (most of us) didn't always realize they were being used. Most of us were not aware of their really radical agenda until later. Most of us fought the extreme witch-hunting of the Canwell committee and the McCarthy committee in Congress, but for basic constitutional reasons and not necessarily endorsing the ideas of some of the extremists on either side.

I came out of my first session with a high regard for the general attitude and devotion to duty of all of the members of the House. You find an occasional one that has very shallow motives, but I think you can take ninety-nine people anyplace and you're going to find a great variety of people. You just don't have one mold, and that's probably what makes the House of Representatives truly representative.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Senator Bailey, will you please look back again to the end of that first session as state representative in 1951. You talked about your eagerness to meet the state politicians at the 1946 state convention, and said when you were county clerk you were probably the person in the courthouse most interested in politics.

You've described the decentralized Washington party organization as populist, by specifying the lack of connection between a candidate's campaign and the party platform, which is devised later and by others. You've also observed how absolutely necessary party discipline is, once a politician gains office in Olympia. So, will you recall, please, your first impressions of this party organization?

**Mr. Bailey:** In the first place I think that I did not say I was the only one with political interest in the courthouse. I didn't mean it that way. I think I was probably the one that had the most interest in staying involved in party politics in the courthouse. Maybe that was true. But, we had a number of good Republicans and good Democrats active in both parties. I probably was more active in political things beyond the call of my office.

In party discipline, I don't know, I really didn't think that would go over into other state offices. I meant discipline more in the organization of the Legislature where the party must move as a body, and not as an individual. Otherwise you would have ninety-nine programs in the House and forty-nine in the Senate. From that standpoint it's quite necessary that the members elected from a party get together in caucus and adopt some kind of a program for the state and proceed on that program or the session would be utter chaos. That's the discipline I was talking about.

When I first went to Olympia I was impressed with our House leadership. A good portion of the basic political drive was done not in caucus by all the individual members, but by the leadership. We did caucus occasionally on major items, but, a good portion of this was run by the floor leader, John O'Brien, the assistant, Mrs. Hansen, and whoever else was active on the floor, like Bob Ford on revenue matters as well as others.

Of course, the big driver in the House would be the Speaker, at that time Charlie Hodde. These people would pretty well set the format for the program before the House at different times during the session. They certainly were going to seek action as to party stands on certain issues and things of that sort.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did this differ with what you expected or how was it similar to what you expected?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, it didn't really differ from anything I expected. It is a whole new experience going into a place like the House of Representatives. I don't know of any place anywhere, even now, that is organized anything like it, except perhaps the Congress, and they have their own peculiar methods, too.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did you see your role evolve within this organization during that first session?

**Mr. Bailey:** I was not a chairman of a committee, just a new member, and I'd say the role of the average member was felt when the roll was called and you cast your vote. I didn't feel particularly that most of us had any great role to play in the arrangements because it was pretty well organized and by very capable people, like Speaker Hodde, who saw to it that our principles or program got on to the agenda and each of us tried to give it our support. I just don't see that I was disappointed, but well-pleased with the result.

There wasn't too much individual input as I recall it from the level of a new member in the House. It was more of a leadership program. I have no idea when they met and how they worked these things out.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you please compare the Democratic and Republican party organizations at that time?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, it would be awfully difficult to remember that. The Democrats in the 1951 session were caught up with the un-American activities, but, as I say, were not willing to start another Canwell committee. I think everyone was a little concerned about the pro-Soviet problem that was coming up in Europe after the war.

The Republicans, generally speaking, were very conservative to the point of where they opposed many liberal points in the old-age pension program, supported the relative-responsibility acts, and different types of social-spending curbs, while the Democrats usually were supportive. Generally speaking, most Republicans were anti-organized labor. It's an awfully hard thing to draw straight party lines because you had liberal Republicans and you had conservative Democrats, too.

The big differences in the parties would be the differences between the party of Roosevelt and Hoover, I suppose, if you wanted to look back nationally. But, it was quite pointed in spots. Governor Langlie was the titular head of the Republican Party in the state. Therefore, they were pretty well led by their governor. I remember in the 1951 session when he wanted certain articles of reorganization of state government. The Democrats opposed him because they felt it put too much power directly under the governor.

Many of those things since have been adopted in other forms. Reorganization did come ultimately, but not in that form. We formed party lines and usually voted right down to the last person party-wise in the House on matters like this.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The philosophies then were different as you described. But how different were the day-to-day procedures of the different parties?

**Mr. Bailey:** I wouldn't know that because the only procedures we had were right on the House floor or in committee. And if the Republicans had a different procedure it would be in the caucus, behind closed doors and I wouldn't know. I think that they were much more formal. It's like the difference between the Elks Lodge and the Eagles Lodge probably–more tuxes in the Elks Lodge, but the Eagles would be less formal. But the GOP was, generally speaking, very conservative in those days.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did writing the weekly columns for the Pacific County papers affect your evaluation of politics at Olympia?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think it affected any political thing. I think it was because I had a newspaper background. I wanted to see to it that I got my own story out. If I can recall, I think it was Senator Fred Norman, long before my time in my district (he later went to Congress) who sent weekly columns home. Coming from a weekly newspaper, I tried to send down things of interest to the local area. And I also realized that that contact with people was the thing that helps you build supporters. People that lose elections usually have forgotten to contact their supporters. I found out that my columns were very eagerly received by the local newspapers.

I didn't discuss many issues as far as partisan political issues went. It was mainly, as much as possible, things that affected the local area. I figured that the big issues would be discussed by the daily newspapers in the area concerned. Once in awhile I might hit on how Representative King or Senator Tisdale and I supported or didn't support some issue.

An issue of utmost importance in those days was education, as it still is. In those days, as I recall, it was a big issue as to whether the state would take over a bigger burden in education or thrust it all onto the local level. The tendency of the conservatives was to let the local level do it. With Pearl Wanamaker from Public Instruction prodding you in the rear end, and Julia and a few of those other women, we Democrats usually tried to do something on the state level. We believed in it, of course, but these two were certainly an impelling power that pushed it forward. Education was always a big issue, and a big difference between parties in those days.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did writing the column give you a different overview or attitude from that of your fellow neophyte representatives?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think that ever entered into it. I just sat down at my portable typewriter at my desk on the floor of the House and pounded away. I was happy if I could think of enough things to write about to fill a column, and get it in the mail, so they could get it in the weekly paper. I tried to make it a newsy thing rather than a political thing, and I think that's the way it was accepted. If I had gotten into politics, you know, an argument one side or the other, I think that I would have found that some of the papers wouldn't have used it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Yes, yes I see. We're talking about April 1951 approximately, immediately after the session ended. How were you feeling at that time about the Korean War, and Harry Truman's role in it when MacArthur was recalled and replaced by Matthew Ridgway?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I remember writing an editorial in my paper about it. I thought it was the best thing that had ever happened when they fired MacArthur. Truman proved that he was commander in chief. I know I wasn't against MacArthur, but I thought he was a great showman. He was a good actor, and I'm sure that when he walked onto the beach at Leyte Gulf, that he probably was sure that all the cameras were there before he ever got his feet wet. I thought that the president was right.

I don't remember too much about the Korean War. We were all hoping that it would be over with and I always begrudge the fact that while Truman actually ended it, Eisenhower got the credit. When he was elected, it was pretty well over with. We were all glad to have it end. I don't remember the emotional strain in the Korean War that we had later in the Vietnam War. I don't remember the people getting as exercised.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Do you remember MacArthur's farewell?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, certainly. Certainly I thought it was a very emotional, maybe high point, in history. It didn't change my mind any.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Your family's four-year ownership of the *Raymond Advertiser* ended in 1952. Will you please explain that decision and your part in it all?

**Mr. Bailey:** South Bend had had two newspapers and during the war one of those went under. The surviving *South Bend Journal* was a very good newspaper. My dad and I worked for it for many years, and even it was not really prospering, as far as making money was concerned. The people that owned the paper also had large interests in timber lands and other income. They had paid off all their debt and were able to do very well.

In Raymond there were two newspapers. One, the *Raymond Herald*, was very well-organized, and the *Raymond Advertiser*, not so. When the publisher of the *Advertiser* became sick, my dad and I thought this would be an opportunity to try our hands, and we took it over. Consequently we found that the machinery and everything was in such terrible shape that it would cost us so much money to repair or get new machinery, that we just couldn't afford it. We had lots of business, but we fought our machinery so hard that we were losing ground because we spent so much time turning out just anything we did. We would break down on press day, or the night before press day. Just one thing after another.

When I found the *Raymond Herald* was for sale I went to Seattle, to the University of Washington where the newspaper publishers were officed to see if we couldn't buy the *Raymond Herald* and consolidate the two, because it was quite apparent that the two papers were just too much for the small town. I got there twenty minutes after another person had come from Arizona and made an earnest money payment on the *Raymond Herald*. So, that was out, and we were not happy. We were not happy with our product. We were just fighting machinery so hard we couldn't even put out a good paper. We knew that, but we were stuck with it.

Consequently, we did have an offer from the new owner of the other paper. We decided it would be good to consolidate, but we couldn't really sell the paper without permission of the people that we were buying from. So, we made a deal with them and we had them sell the paper while we maintained the print shop. My dad was very, very busy in the print shop and negotiated a new contract with the owners. Again it was a matter of bad machinery, but plenty of work. He couldn't keep up with the work because the machinery was so bad. I had an opportunity to go to Aberdeen, to the *Aberdeen Daily World*, and I decided to go. My dad stayed in the shop.

The time had come for one or the other papers to fold, and as I say, twenty minutes earlier it might have been a different story, but maybe it's a better story this way than if we'd got both of them.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did all this affect your father later on?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, my dad, of course, was getting up in years, older than you should be when you want to get a new job, I guess. In 1953, he would have been almost sixty years old. He wanted to stay there and it looked like it was a very good proposition, but we had assembled quite a few debts and, outbalancing those debts, of course, was a lot of money owed us that people didn't pay. So while we never ended up in the red, we ended up with a lot of dead figures on our books. Things became pretty tight and money was just not coming in.

I left there in early 1953 after the session was over. I got a job with the *Aberdeen Daily World*. I had a chance to go in either the printing in the back, running a Linotype, or at that time there was an opening in the front office, too, for a reporter. I chose the printing be-

cause you worked regular hours and the union was very good at overtime. On the other hand I was living on Willapa Harbor thirty miles away, and I probably would have to go to night meetings at Aberdeen, city council, clubs, or whatever they assigned to you. The hours would be longer and the pay a lot less. I took the print job. I was never sorry for that.

In the meantime we negotiated with our creditors and paid off all the debts that we owed, over a period of time. At a later time my dad did declare personal bankruptcy, but we paid off all of our mutual debts, and people were very cooperative. They weren't very large debts, but a number of small ones. We had to wait sometimes until some of the people that owed us paid, and that didn't come in very quick. Sometimes they could only pay a few dollars a month. We eventually came out of it. It was an experience where your books showed a profit, but you weren't making any money, and you were working awfully hard.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did your dad come through all this?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, eventually with the help of some of the newspaper publishers that he knew and the union representatives, he obtained a little work here and there. I remember he was working in Tacoma when our son was born in June of 1954. He had obtained a job at the *Tacoma News Tribune*. And he worked there until he retired when he began losing his eyesight.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I see. Thank you. You attended a state Democratic convention in Spokane in May of 1952. What was significant about that convention?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I don't remember all those conventions. I've been to so many political district caucuses, and congressional district caucuses, and state caucuses and things that I just don't remember the details. I remember going to Spokane because my uncle lived there and I stayed with them for three or four days. I remember seeing people like ex-Governor Mon Wallgren, and also, I believe, Clarence D. Martin, former governor, and people like that that made it rather interesting for me. But issue-wise I don't really remember too much about it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Do you remember the mood and what was the spirit there?

**Mr. Bailey:** No, I don't.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You don't remember. Okay, why did you decide to run again for state representative in 1952?

**Mr. Bailey:** I was quite interested and had never lost my interest in politics. In 1952 I would say I was quite ready to run again. In 1951, I had to hire someone to take my place in the newspaper. It wasn't too satisfactory because I also was doing a lot of the printing work, too, on weekends and whenever possible. It left a heavy load on my dad because there was not a lot of experienced labor available on the Harbor. It wasn't too satisfactory because the person we hired didn't have time to go out and develop news or things like that. He was working, too.

I don't think there was ever any question but that I would run in 1952. The Legislature then, you have to remember, had very few special sessions. You met every two years for sixty days with a possible overtime. But, it wasn't that big a deal. You didn't have to worry about going to committee meetings every weekend or every other weekend, as they do now.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In your campaign advertisements in 1952 you emphasized that you had, in the former session, worked for all your constituents, and throughout the term, not only during the session. What kinds of things did you do outside the session?

**Mr. Bailey:** There were few representatives or senators working as close to the people as some of us in rural areas were. I say that because in a rural area you are very close to the people. In the Seattle area if you'd ask the average person who their representative was, they probably couldn't tell you because in the daily papers they're carrying the names from ten or twelve districts. Down in our area we were the only one or two.

Consequently you become an ombudsman for everything and all people. A new business wants a liquor license for their new cafe–you'd go to the Liquor Board. You want a highway stop sign someplace–you're at the Highways Department. It was just one thing or another. I think that if a person could divide their time they'd find out that there's a lot more time in the Legislature spent by the members doing personal favors for people in their district, at their request, than actually is done in legislating.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I see. This time you had this campaign you had endorsements from the Washington Machinists Council, the Washington State Federation of Labor, and the Joint Council of Teamsters. How do you interpret this?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, don't forget I was a member of organized labor. I was a member of the Printers Union and we've always been a strong supporter of labor.

Certainly my county was a strong labor county, and I'd always had support of the AFL-CIO, and consequently that transferred over when I ran for the Legislature into parts of Grays Harbor County. I don't recall having gone to them at that time, but I think they endorsed me because my home county labor council had done so.

We had a few Teamsters down there, and I was a very good friend of people like Smith Troy, former attorney general, and some of those representing Teamsters in Olympia.

Generally labor groups had separate organizations but they hung together. When they had someone supportive they didn't ask you to get on your hands and knees and beg. And I also don't recall if I ever received, at that time, any contributions from them. I may have. I can't tell you that because I can't remember and I was still supporting my expenses with my own money.

[End of Tape 11, Side 1]

**Ms. Bridgman:** I'm interested in the contrast in the endorsements of local labor organizations in Pacific and Grays Harbor counties, when you ran for the Legislature the first time, and the fact that they are statewide organizations the second time.

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't remember that procedure. It's possible they changed their procedure because my recollection is that when we first started out it was local participation. Later the state groups became very active in endorsing. I don't think that had anything to do with me necessarily. I think it might have been a change in the method that they had of endorsements.

Now, I don't think the state Labor Council usually endorses on a state level unless the local level sends it up to them. That's the way it was about ten years ago. But I don't know what it was back in 1952.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What was different about this campaign and the one preceding?

**Mr. Bailey:** There were one or two people running in the primary as I recall it, but they were gunning for my colleague, and quite openly so.

In those days we did not run by position, but the two high vote-getters in each party were nominated and elected so it was easy to claim you were running against the other fellow.

In the primaries and general election it didn't seem to me like it was a very hard-fought contest in my case. I remember C. D. Davis, a Republican who ran two or three times and barely eked out a loss to Chet King. In 1952, we had to wait for the absentees to come in before you could tell who won. We used to kid Chet about it because instead of waiting for the count he'd decide to go hunting and find out when he got back. Davis was probably one of the stronger candidates the Republicans could put up. He'd been county and city superintendent of schools and very active and very well-thought-of.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Your other 1952 Republican opponent was Mark McCorkle. What do you remember about him?

**Mr. Bailey:** Mark McCorkle was certainly out to get me. I know that even though they denied it. He was put up by industry and was a very conservative Republican. He and his brother, in a logging company, were having trouble with Labor and Industries in paying their industrial insurance to people who were injured, and things of that sort. This did not help him in a labor campaign. It wasn't Mark McCorkle, it was the Republican Party that was determined they were going to get behind and give me a big push out. I remember the big full-page ads and everything for McCorkle. But he didn't run a terrific race, vote-wise, at least.

When it was all over with, he was tarred–probably unjustly by something that his brother or someone had done in their firm about trying to hold out on payments to an injured workman in their logging firm. Later on Mark McCorkle was working for Boeing and when I worked for Mrs. Hansen it became my lot to get together with him several times. We became pretty good friends.

It was an all-out effort in the general election to get a Republican elected to the Legislature.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Yes, I've seen one of those ads that was very large and prominent.

**Mr. Bailey:** McCorkle came from a pioneer family. They played that up all the time. His family came from down around Longview, though, and not too many people in Raymond knew him.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I see. Again you led the field in both the primary and the general. In the general you had 5,266 votes and closest behind was Chet King with 4,456. Your district was Democratic in a Republican year except for Ted Wilson's victory over state Senator Tisdale. How do you account for that?

**Mr. Bailey:** Clyde Tisdale was a wonderful person and character–and he was a character. He was kind of the Will Rogers of the Senate, I guess. He had a very limited education, but a great ability and a terrific, humorous way of spelling it out. When Tizzy would talk on

lotteries and things like that, even the House would adjourn and come to the Senate to listen to Tisdale. He was just a dear friend. I think that he would say the same thing, and I think that his family would agree with me, that his was a bottle problem.

His wife had died and he married again, divorced her, and then he married another woman and quit drinking. You know it's like so many other cases, it takes a couple years sometimes for your reputation to catch up with you at home. And when Wilson ran, I think we all felt Clyde was in deep trouble. Actually he got tarred with something he wasn't doing anymore. And he went down to defeat that year.

Wilson was not a strong candidate. Wilson was a good candidate in the fact that he was a very nice person–not very forceful, but very well-liked and from an old, old family in the area. But Tizzy had just got too many stories out about him. Tragically they came out later, two years later, after he had changed himself for the better.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well, how much do you attribute to the Republican national victory that year?

**Mr. Bailey:** That probably had something to do with it. Although we had gone back and forth in the Senate in my district. When Tom Bloomer was our Democratic senator, Agnes Gehrman, a Republican, beat him in a very close vote. Four years later Tisdale came back and beat Agnes Gehrman, again very close, and so it had gone back and forth. While the county was Democratically inclined, actually, it was so close to the candidate involved that it was fairly independent, too, voting for the individual, not the party.

But, I think that Tizzy's drinking record just caught up with him. He had been an excellent senator, but he had problems and he'd be the first one to tell you about it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What was your interpretation of the results of the national election?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think that we all expected that. Eisenhower was the war hero and I don't think anyone was surprised when he was elected.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What was your assessment that year of the strength of the Democratic Party–the labor-liberal alliance put together by FDR?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think I could answer that really. I don't think we felt it that much anymore. I think Truman had put his imprint on the party by that time, to the point of where we weren't any longer leaning on the New Deal, exactly. Maybe Henry Wallace was the last great effort at that. Henry Wallace was no Communist, but he was used by those real radical forces. I think Henry Wallace truly was probably the last of the real New Dealers. You can only be in style so long and then become out-of-date. I think that by that time, the New Deal had worn out, because Truman had come into his own.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Then how would you have described the alliances and coalitions and combinations which went up to make the national Democratic Party, and how would you have–

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know, I couldn't possibly describe that or anything, no.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You don't recall–

**Mr. Bailey:** We worked on our own, and what came out back East wasn't always what we wanted, or maybe sometimes it was what we wanted. I couldn't think of any big issue at that time. I think most Democrats were real enthused about Adlai Stevenson. He was a brilliant person, most of us never heard of him until Truman put the finger on him at the convention. I think he came through as one of the brightest of candidates, both in 1952 and four years later. He certainly didn't demean himself or the party. He was up against Eisenhower, a person that we couldn't really criticize. Ike was a neutral, more or less, and attracted people of both parties.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Can you describe then, the state results that year? Legislature and also the elected officials?

**Mr. Bailey:** In 1952 the House went Republican. I don't think it was any Democratic scandal, or any radical insinuations, or anything that year. I think it was the national sweep. Langlie was re-elected governor that year.

Charlie Hodde ran for governor and I supported him, but unfortunately, as Charlie says in his own memoirs, outside of his district they didn't know him that well. But he would have been an excellent governor.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What about the Senate in the 1952 election?

**Mr. Bailey:** Wilson was elected and the Senate went Republican as did the House. We were sorry to lose Tisdale, but we'd had to deal with the Senate coalition leaders before, and the Senate had not been able to produce anything for us anyway.

In 1951 Tisdale and King and I would meet frequently and discuss things. Tisdale was actually in the minority in the Senate and he couldn't do a thing. When Ted Wilson came on, I don't think we ever had a meeting. It wasn't enmity or anything, it was just that everybody gets busy in their own side, and you don't always do these things that you'd like to do. You don't have the time to do them.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The Democrats were then, as you said, in a minority. What was the minority-party caucus like that year?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, a minority caucus we were. I had never been in the minority, I'd only been in the session before–but we were very unified. We were very tightly organized. We had a lot more caucuses that year, and of course, what else did we have to do?

I remember in my first year I learned how to bowl because on the days when we had an overtime session, and the flag was hanging over the clock, the members that were not on the Ways and Means Committee and working on the budget just sat around on call. Some of us would go downtown and bowl, come back and check in, and then go back and bowl some more, or do just about anything to keep busy. We didn't have anything to discuss even, there were no bills before us.

You see, in those times you couldn't consider anything but the appropriations bill and the tax bill, and that would be all. So, it was a long, long, dull several days that we always called one day. The clocks were stopped.

The Democrats in the House that year were much better and closely organized. We were on the defensive then, and there wasn't much else we could do. We had a publicity committee. Representative Ray Olsen and I were put on it. I cannot recall who was on it from the Senate.

We issued regular statements and wrote a sort of newspaper-type release called *The Minority Report*. We issued it regularly and put them out for members of the House and the Senate. As I recall, we gave each Democratic member so many copies to mail out to whomever they wished. We did have extremely good cooperation with the Senate Democrats and the House Democrats. Ray and I did a lot of work on it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What was the precedent for that *Minority Report*?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know that there was any! I think it might have been the brainchild of Ray Olsen. He had had some experience. And the fact that I had come from a weekly newspaper was also the reason I got on it, I presume. They knew that I wrote my news columns home all the time. Ray and I worked on that quite awhile, and even a little after the adjournment of the session, as I recall it, we were putting out one or two issues recapping the session.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What was the response, not only of the Democrats who received it to give to their constituents, but of those constituents themselves?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I don't remember how it was received because the majority party runs the show, and the minority party at some place has to have a way to express themselves on things that don't come on the floor. There's a lot of things that happen that just don't show up on the floor for a vote. It was very well received and helped give us a voice, kind of a little unity, I guess.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Do you remember any Republican response?

**Mr. Bailey:** No, I would never have had any way to find that out. There were no GOP members in my district, and I'm not even too sure that I even sent a *Minority Report* to my local newspapers, because, you see, that would have been a Democratic viewpoint. My legislative news always tried to be strictly nonpartisan, from the standpoint of telling what was before us. I might tell how we voted on something, but it wasn't because we were Democrats or Republicans. Otherwise, I don't think that they would have accepted it as a public-service column.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Now who did the actual writing for *The Minority Report*?

**Mr. Bailey:** My recollection is in the House that I did most of the writing. Ray and I worked very closely on this, so it's probably a little thin line. He had people around the Seattle area who would help him get it printed, and with a minimal cost. In those days you didn't have the Xeroxing, or the easy copying machines that you have now.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Who then wrote the portion describing the Senate?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, that's what I can't recall. I think it was Senator Vaughn Brown from the Bellingham area.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I am asking because the word "vicious" was used to describe the Republicans. And it

didn't strike me that it was the sort of word that you would ever use.

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, it doesn't?

**Ms. Bridgman:** I'd like to get back to the elected officials–those who were new elected officials that year who were Republicans. Will you describe any that you remember?

**Mr. Bailey:** Newly elected officials?

**Ms. Bridgman:** Newly elected state officials, other than the governor. There were four–

**Mr. Bailey:** No, I can't really recall. I can't remember unless you can remind me.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How about Otto Case who was commissioner of public lands?

**Mr. Bailey:** Okay. He took Jack Taylor's place. Otto Case had been working in several offices, and I cannot name them. It seems to me that he at one time was state treasurer. But, anyway, Otto Case was getting pretty well up in years. When I first came to Olympia in 1951, Jack Taylor was there. He was quite an on-the-spot, hands-on type of an operator because he loved politics. And he'd had a long career in different offices in King County–and as a county commissioner.

Otto Case had also been around quite a bit. I think he came out of the Seattle City Council. He was getting pretty old at that time. He had a deputy by the name of Frank Sether who had been in the department since shortly after World War I. Frank knew the department upside down and backwards. Consequently we dealt more with Frank Sether than anyone. If we ever had a question on state lands, Frank could usually describe the lot number, the parcel number, the tax number, and everything without looking it up. He could probably quote down to the penny on how much money they received on a bid. He just knew everything about it.

One time I remember Otto Case coming across the street to appear at a committee and forgot his shoes. He was getting up in years and very forgetful. I think that those four years were the last term in office that Otto served. He had been a colorful political character and served in various capacities for many years.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How about R. Mort Frayn, Speaker of the House in 1953?

**Mr. Bailey:** Mort Frayn was a very fair Speaker. He was an elected Speaker by the Republicans, of course. He was just a wonderful guy, and I think that the Democrats would all join in saying the same thing. He had his political pride, but never took advantage of us. He had the respect of both sides of the House. We'd have liked to have had our own Speaker, but since we didn't, I don't think we could've done better than have Mort Frayn.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Then can you describe how the committees ran that year with Republican chairmen and the former Democratic chairmen being members?

**Mr. Bailey:** Committees, on big issues, are political animals. They usually have a party stance, a minority and a majority program. Most committee work, though, maybe nine bills out of ten have nothing to do with the partisan politics. Very seldom are they strictly political issues. In these cases in 1953 they were run by Republicans with Republican staffs.

Just like when Democrats controlled, probably ninety percent of them received almost unanimous support, out of committee, unless it was something highly controversial, and even then some of those were not politically divided. It was not always a political division. It was sometimes just plain differences of opinion. The big issues, I would say, budget and education and a few other major things, were usually sent out by the majority party to the floor for argument. Things didn't operate much different, except that we were in the minority and didn't have the say that we would have had in calling up the agenda.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Do you remember other issues of this association not associated with committees on which you served?

**Mr. Bailey:** No, I don't. I probably would recall a lot if I read up on them, but I really don't readily remember. We had no great cooperation with the Republicans. Nor they with us. That doesn't mean that we brought everything to a standstill, but at the same time there was not much of an effort to have high-level meetings or get together on anything. There was not the impetus to do so. Probably education and the budget were the big ones again because the budget was a constant problem and education was always so.

[End of Tape 11, Side 2]

**Ms. Bridgman:** Before we begin talking we were discussing the income-tax resolution introduced in the 1953 session of the Legislature. And Senator Bailey, you were commenting on there having been so many of them in the various sessions in which you served.

**Mr. Bailey:** The income tax has had a long, endless discussion in legislative circles. Generally speaking, the Democrats favored the income tax because it was based on ability to pay, where the sales tax was a burden, a regressive tax, on people that spend, which is not only the rich people. But, at every session I've been in between 1951 and 1977, I'm positive there have been proposals for a state income tax, either by myself, or by others, or with others. Some of them have actually gone to the ballot. The thing is that it's just a never-ending battle, and I can't separate one year from the next as relates to the income-tax proposals.

**Ms. Bridgman:** At the end of the session you received a number of thank-you letters, more than from sessions before. Your committee chairmen thanked you, which I presume is expected. But, also, the various special-interest groups, such as the Washington Public Utility District (that was signed by Ken Billington), the Washington Forest Fire Association, and the Western Conference of Teamsters, and local associations as well; your own Pacific County Public Utility District, and the King County coroner, and the Washington Federation of State Employees.

I was interested in these because they offer to help you, should you need any help. The thank-you letters you received after the first session were not so numerous, nor did they particularly offer help. Is this a typical thing to happen to a second-term legislator?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know. It's possible that it's entirely a new method that the lobbyists or the associations were using to promote their causes. They change tactics every once in awhile. I would listen to any of them. Probably as to the King County coroner, there was probably a bill in there someplace in the Cities, Towns, and Counties that the Coroners Association wanted, and probably it was a very nonpartisan, non-argumentative bill. When you help somebody most people will write you a letter of appreciation.

I think I supported most organized-labor bills. Some of the groups probably decided the way to keep supporters is to give them thanks. It's a good philosophy. I don't think it indicates any great change. Maybe because I was a little more active in some things in my second term than I was in the first–I really don't know.

I think we're talking about the 1953 session. When you get right down to it, issues like labor would be argued more intensely because we were in the minority, and labor recognized the fact that we supported them, even when we were on the losing side.

Some of those others would be routine bills, as for the PUD and Public Utility District Association, Lord knows, they ought to support me: I came from a Public Utility District, I believe in publicly owned utilities, and I don't know any reason why they shouldn't have thanked me. If they didn't write me a letter the first time, they should have.

That pledge of support probably means that in the future they won't forget because there are other elections coming up and they wouldn't want us to be in the minority all the time.

**Ms. Bridgman:** All right. Thank you. Now, not too long after the session ended, on July 3, 1953, you were married to Lena.

**Mr. Bailey:** The session didn't end on July 3rd. I was married on July 3rd.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I misspoke. After three months, March, April, May, you were married. Anyway, how did you meet your wife?

**Mr. Bailey:** She came to Raymond to work. She had been around Bremerton during the war, and she had worked in Keyport. Her brother came down to Raymond to take a job as a bartender, and later she came down from Seattle and got a job in the laundry and dry cleaning place that was alongside of where our print shop was. That's the way I happened to meet her.

I think I met her, probably, about the first part of 1953, I don't know. We were married in July of 1953.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I'd appreciate knowing what you particularly valued about her.

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I guess I was just attracted to her, and I still am.

The funny thing was, that my old boss at the *South Bend Journal* kept saying, "I hear you're going to get married. I hear you're going to get married. You let me know."

And I said, "When I want to let you know, I'll let you know." So, the next week in the paper, on the society page, was my picture. And it said that our local Solon was going to get married, announced his engagement, or some darn thing. He wrote this thing up in kind of a humorous way, because ordinarily this space was reserved for the brides, or the brides to be!

**Ms. Bridgman:** Where was this?

**Mr. Bailey:** In the *South Bend Journal*. He did that just for the fun of it. I think he chuckled all the way to the post office. It was kind of humorous, but kind of embarrassing at the time, because I didn't give him any news so he wrote it anyway.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Yes. Well, was that close to July?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, it probably was in June.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I see. I see. Well, when did you–had you decided to marry?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I don't know that. It wasn't too long before that. I know we–I made arrangements with the justice of the peace. I didn't want to go through a bunch of malarkey. I made arrangements with a justice of the peace out on the Aberdeen highway that I used to see everyday when I'd stop by there and get a milk shake or something when I was going back from work.

The Methodist minister lived right next-door to my folks' house, and he came by and he said, "I just think it's a crime that you're not going to ask me to marry you."

So, I said, "Fred, I'll tell you. I wouldn't mind having you marry me, but I don't want to sit around and have to listen to an hour or two lecture on married life from you or anybody else."

He said, "I'll forgo that."

So at the last minute, Lee and I got married at my dad's house with my dad and mother standing up for us, with the neighbor minister marrying us. We always laughed about that. His wife was a full-fledged minister, too. Later, when we got out on the highway on the way to Canada for a wedding trip, we had to go past the house of the JP that was waiting for us!

**Ms. Bridgman:** Did you stop?

**Mr. Bailey:** No, I made a phone call, as I recall it, to the milk shake shop across the highway and told them. And she said, "Oh, my heavens! The poor guy's got the whole house decorated!"

**Ms. Bridgman:** Oh, no!

**Mr. Bailey:** I never saw him again.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Oh, dear! You went to Canada for your honeymoon?

**Mr. Bailey:** We went to Vancouver and Victoria.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Do you happen to recall the–on your honeymoon–the Korean Armistice being signed?

**Mr. Bailey:** I probably didn't.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Good answer!

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't really remember when it was–

**Ms. Bridgman:** It was July 27th, and when I noticed the juxtaposition of the dates, I couldn't resist asking. You were, of course, already a politician. How did the two of you plan your marriage, taking your professional responsibilities into account?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I don't think she got me in politics–I was there already. That's the way she found me, and she never tried to change me. I think she just accepted that. I think she rather enjoyed parts of it. Sometimes it was–lots of times I'd be away from home, a lot–but like I used to tell her, "Well, I could be a traveling salesman and never be home–except once a month or something like that."

Actually, eventually she got fairly active with the Democratic women, when she would come to Olympia. She didn't always come to Olympia with me because sometimes it was easier to stay home with the boy than it was to bring him and change schools and things like that. She got used to it. She had to! She says the thing she learned to do most was to wait in the car.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Where did you live then?

**Mr. Bailey:** In South Bend. About the time we were married my dad got a job in Tacoma. We ended up moving into his house, so that we could make the payments and get that expense off of him. We lived there until we built our own house.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Now, your son, Michael Arthur, was born June 18, 1954. What were your expectations about being a father?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I don't know. We were all enthused and pleased.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Did you consider the kinds of tasks and responsibilities that you would have?

**Mr. Bailey:** No. No.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What things did you consider then, especially important in child raising–to teach a child, or to help them grow into independent adults?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I don't know. We just raised an average child, in the average way, I think. And Lee was very, very attentive. And of course, he didn't suffer any neglect, I'll tell you, when we did go on a trip or something, like in 1957, I went back to Washington D.C., or a couple of times back to visit her folks in

Montana. My mother would usually take Mike and we took him with us sometimes, but sometimes it was a little bit strenuous for him. My mother would take him and be tickled to death to have him for three or four days or a week. We usually took him with us, when we could. And he learned a great deal.

I remember one time, when Mike was very small and Henry Jackson was speaking at Westport. Mike crawled off his mother's lap somehow, and got down underneath the table and up onto the piano. Just about the time Senator Jackson started to speak, he was pounding the piano. But, generally speaking, he learned to behave pretty well.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How old was he when this piano playing happened?

**Mr. Bailey:** He wasn't playing. He was pounding! Well, he was young enough that he was crawling underneath the piano to get there.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What do you remember about the day he was born?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I remember that I had the week off. We were building our house, and I was digging, trying to locate a sewer pipe that went right underneath our property somewhere. I was having a heck of a time. I took Lee to the hospital, where they were going to induce labor. They told me to go on home, forget it for a couple of hours. So, I was down home poking and prodding, trying to find that sewer pipe.

I finally went up to the hospital and stayed with her for awhile. And then they told me to get out. So, I went out and went up the corridor and like any good politician, I stopped at everybody's room and talked to them. I knew most of them. Finally, the doctor came by and said, "Well, it's over with."

And I said, "What did you–what is it?"

And he said, "Well, it's gonna cost you ten dollars more for the circumcision!" That was the way the doctor told me. I went down and she was fine, the baby was fine, and no problems.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What did he look like?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, he looked like any other baby. They all look alike!

**Ms. Bridgman:** I wonder if your wife would give the same response.

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I wouldn't be surprised. She's heard me say it before.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well! Did I understand you correctly that at that point you were building a new home in South Bend?

**Mr. Bailey:** We had been renting, and I wasn't much of a carpenter. I saw they were selling out some of those wartime public-housing units, and you put it together yourself again. So, we decided we would like to go and try that, and make our own house, because we had some property at South Bend to put it on. So we did.

It was by guess and by gosh. We finally got it built and added on to it. It was a pretty nice looking house by the time we got through. But, there were lots of things, not being a carpenter–I didn't know how and had to do the hard way. Later, when I bought a house at Olympia, built by carpenters, and I saw what they did, I'm very proud of my efforts because mine was substantial and theirs was pretty bad when you got beyond the paint.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I see. Now, in the 1954 primary you were unopposed. What did that mean to you?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, it kind of meant, I think, that I'd established myself as I went along with a good vote-getting ability, and people don't run against you if you're strong. They run against you if you're weak. Another way to get people to run against you is to hesitate and say, "I don't know if I'm going to run again." Soon your best friend is running, and then he says, "Well if I would've known you were going to file, I wouldn't have done it." Anyway, I think that's what happened there.

I don't recall any particularly busy campaign that year. And it's hard to say because I was working at the *Aberdeen World*, and I was not on the circuit like you get in campaigns now. I would stay at Aberdeen after work if I had meetings at Westport or somewhere in the area. I would change my clothes at work and go from there. Meetings were fairly limited in those days, and when you did have them, they were pretty well set in a campaign schedule. On my days off I would get out and try to meet as many people as I could. I would lay out a calendar, get out and hit certain communities on certain days. I tried not to lose the contacts that I'd made in my very first election. And it paid off. They were very good supportive people.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Since your son was born in June, how much was your wife able to participate in the campaigning?

**Mr. Bailey:** I was working then at the *Aberdeen World* and my recollection is, she probably didn't go to many meetings with me that year, maybe to the Democratic meetings in the county. We'd probably get a baby-sitter when needed. My sister lived there, and when he was real small she'd take him. I don't think there were that many meetings, and he was not left that way often.

If the meetings were in the other harbor, I probably just stayed at work and changed my clothes there. My grandmother lived a short distance away, and I could go up there and change my clothes at her house at Elma. Once in awhile I'd stay there overnight and then drive back to Aberdeen the next day for work. Lee usually went with me locally and whenever possible.

**Ms. Bridgman:** There is reference to Julia Butler Hansen, who was caucus chairman then, asking all Democrats to contribute to something she referred to as a "Democratic Story" to send to constituents before the election, so that the constituents would understand how the party had functioned as a minority. Was this ever completed, and how did it help you in your campaign?

**Mr. Bailey:** This was in the campaign, though, for the 1955 session. Actually, Julia was running for Speaker, and this was the real reason for the letter. A chance for her to contact members. If you'll note on one of those lists, it even has me as chairman of Cities, Towns, and Counties. And that was probably her commitment to me, of what I would get if she was elected. It was unspoken in the letter, but she was trying to find an excuse, and it was a good political gesture to contact every Democratic member of the Legislature. I don't recall if there was ever anything ever put out by her. It turned into a rather bitter Democratic contest for Speaker when we finally did win the majority.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Before we get to that, I want to specify the results of the election that year. You got 4,975 votes in an off-year, which is very close to your 5,266 in 1952, the presidential year. How did you feel about that?

**Mr. Bailey:** I was getting more interested, in a way, because I was a strong supporter of Julia Butler Hansen, and she was running quite a hard campaign for House Speaker. Of course, when the election was over we only held fifty out of ninety-nine seats, so it was a very, very tight House control, really. But, I think I got a little more interested because she counted me as one of her supporters. She gave me an assignment of getting in touch with certain members and trying to get them to support her in the caucus. John O'Brien was her chief opponent.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What were the issues in this competition for Speaker?

**Mr. Bailey:** Personality, probably. Julia was very aggressive. John was smart, and John was a good member, but he wasn't as outgoing, as pressing as Julia was, in her fighting for what she thought was right. John was just a different personality.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What were the various kinds of efforts made to convince Democrats to give their support to one or the other?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, it's the same kind that's used, always, I believe. If you see somebody that's interested in a certain committee, and you make a commitment that you'd do everything you can to see they get on that committee, or something of that sort. I think in John's case, he'd been there long enough that his friends around the Seattle area were supportive without commitments because they had common interests. I think in Julia's case it was the same thing. Some of us were not always enamored with the Seattle approach, I guess that would be a good way to say it.

It wasn't too tight a commitment, however, because whoever was elected Speaker had to pull those two factions together. They just couldn't take one faction and expect to run the House with it, you know. There was a lot of give-and-take. It was a campaign run by individuals, and individual personalities, more or less. I would look back at that one as being very much that way.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What exactly did you do?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I didn't do very much. I was working every day and I just couldn't do a lot. But, I think there was a letter in my scrapbook from Julia telling me the members that she'd like me to contact. She had contacted most of them, but she'd also like me to contact certain ones and try to reaffirm it, or firm it up. I probably did that. There were some of them I knew better than others. None of these people she mentioned were really tied in with John O'Brien. Actually, there might have been a few that probably went to O'Brien. She lost it by one vote in the caucus, and they had to bring in a member on a stretcher to cast the winning vote.

That's probably the only time I saw Julia cry, but, she did. It was a tense campaign.

I wasn't too happy with the result because John O'Brien never made an overture to me, to want my support. I sat there and when the day came to vote in

the House, on the opening day, they needed my vote, fifty to forty-nine, and I had never committed myself to vote for O'Brien, which I, caucus-wise, should not have questioned. But because they had treated me just like I was a dirty shirt, I just decided, I'm going to stay independent. And I was secretly considering just shouting "Julia Butler Hansen" when they came to me–one of the first on the roll call. That would have left the thing tied forty-nine to forty-nine. I knew that would embarrass Julia, but Julia came to me and asked that I support O'Brien. John never came to me at all.

Si Holcomb, chief clerk of the House and numerous others asked me, "What are you going to do? What are you going to do?"

I said, "I haven't made up my mind." And I never told them.

Consequently, a few years later, I found out that since they didn't know what I was going to do, they had to go to the Republican side and get three Republican votes, in case I didn't vote with John O'Brien the first time and they would stand up and switch their votes to O'Brien, so the House would not have to go through the election all over again. If I had done it, I know it would have embarrassed Julia, but I was stubborn enough I wouldn't tell them. They never knew until I finally said, "O'Brien" when the vote came. But, it made an interesting start of a session for me.

As you can see by the chairmanships, I was dealt no chairmanship because I supported the wrong horse at the wrong time. I almost quit the Legislature because they just pushed me around so much at that time. Julia kept me my seat on midfloor instead of putting me back by the spittoons.

I was disgusted and went home and told my wife I was going to quit.

She said, "No, you are not going to quit. You're going to see this one through."

So I went back. Instead of spending my time working in the House so much, I had little to do so I started using my time running for the Senate, two years later. I wrote an awful lot of letters and things all on House business, but designed to be sure that my name was floating around in the next year, you know. And it paid dividends.

**Ms. Bridgman:** So, it was from this unhappy beginning of the session that you decided to quit?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, it was just because I was on my third term, and they had put people junior to me on chairmanships because they supported O'Brien. That was the name of the game, and I wouldn't have supported him at that time if they sat me out in the hallway.

[End of Tape 12, Side 1]

**Mr. Bailey:** I might say that the fifty to forty-nine vote margin that we had made us hang together better than any group I have ever seen. We just stayed tight as a unit and cast our votes, and I think we really had a good session. John O'Brien and I later became very good friends. I think he's an outstanding legislator and is going to go down on legislative annals as such.

In 1953, when we were in the minority, though, every time the Republicans would propose something that we thought was good political fodder, Julia would stand up on the floor and demand a roll-call vote. So, instead of just shouting, "yea" and "nay," and saying, "motion lost," (by voice vote) we forced every member on record. I don't know how many roll-call votes we had, but every important issue that came up was recorded by roll call. If they didn't have an issue we could make a motion and then call for a roll-call vote, and watch the Republicans vote against welfare, vote against old-age pensions, against the teachers and labor, just everything.

By the time they came to the 1955 session, we were in pretty good shape and it reversed largely due to these roll-call votes putting everyone on record. We forced them on the record so often that the minority really spoke, and largely due to O'Brien and Julia.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In the contest for Speaker, which way did the conservative Democrats from Spokane vote? That is, who did they support?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I can't really recall that, but I do remember there was a strong Catholic Church support for John O'Brien. I don't mean that influenced everyone who was for or against O'Brien, but I do remember there was a strong support based on this.

During session, we had real tough times holding our fifty to forty-nine, but we held very well. But, we were real proud of our sessions. I've seen Democrats in the Senate control two to one, and they're all over the board, but when you get down to where you've only got one or two, they hang together. The bigger the majority the more difficult it is to manage.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You were on three of your former committees that year, and one new one–the Constitution, Elections, and Apportionment Committee. What do you remember as being notable about committee personalities, decisions, actions, issues?

**Mr. Bailey:** The highways battle was going on. And we were getting a program pretty well started. Of course, I was not on Appropriations in the House, but I

was on Cities, Towns, and Counties. Sometimes I was used as a spokesman, not always a sponsor, but a spokesman for some of their bills because I had been in county office. They'd come to me, and I would help them out a little bit. Most of their bills were nonpartisan–but needed.

On Constitution and Elections and Apportionment–my recollection was that I was put on there largely because I came from a rural county, which had a small population. We were a tiny district with two representatives and one senator. The effort then of the Grange, and our party (and I think probably the Republican Party, too) was to be sure that those rural areas were not wiped out completely, and put into the Seattle–King County domain. I believe that's the reason I was put on there, a balance between city and rural.

It was the forerunner to the redistricting that was starting to take place, and which took place either that year or the following year. I believe it took place that year because when I ran for the Senate I know I was party to a lawsuit in 1956 trying to stop the redistricting initiative because we didn't think it was done properly. The movement was starting for redistricting in 1955, and our effort was to preserve the rural district from just being eliminated by the cities.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How about the Public Utilities Committee that year–anything memorable?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, public utilities is a little bit like income tax. That battle went on, and on, and it was always bitter. We were always trying to keep the private-power companies from making the PUDs inoperative. And it was just a constant bitter battle–one that called for attention all the time, and supporters to stay alert all the time. It's hard for me to remember exactly what particular thing went on at that time. But, up until the late 1960s, it was a real battle. Later, it took up almost one whole session of the House, on just public utilities alone. Since the power shortages in the last few years, they're all in a big pool now, and they seem to get along. That's not like it was. It's hard to believe how bitter it was in those days

**Ms. Bridgman:** Then there was Forestry, State Lands, and Parks. Are there memorable bills or actions or arguments that you associate with that session?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, Forestry and State Lands, and Parks was involved in that time, probably coming from the so-called Little Hoover Commission of Langlie in 1951, in a plan to reorganize the Lands Department and consolidate all activities relating to forestry and lands.

At that session, as I recall it, there was a bill to reform and put all forestry matters into a Department of Natural Resources under the state lands commissioner. It did not pass, but it was a very important deal and forerunner of things to come. The reason I was on Forestry and State Lands was because we had so much forest land in our county.

When I did go to the Senate, in 1957, I was chairman of Forestry and State Lands in my very first session. We passed the bill based on the 1955 session that revised and created the Department of Natural Resources.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You mentioned reapportionment–were there other legislative issues that you particularly associate with that session?

**Mr. Bailey:** No, I can't remember. Constitution and Elections and Apportionment always had a multitude of issues, and sometimes even things like the income tax. A constitutional amendment could come under that committee, but other times it would go to Revenue and Taxation. Anything proposed to change the constitution, or anything proposed to change election laws, would always be in that committee, so there was quite a number of them.

The one other subject would be apportionment, and it was becoming one of the big issues. An initiative back in the early thirties had been the last time the Legislature had been reapportioned. The act of reapportionment in the state was done by initiative by the League of Women Voters, in 1932.

We never faced apportionment problems until about 1955. The cities started kicking about that time. Then came the decision of the Supreme Court, "one man, one vote." The pressures were on to redistrict.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How about the perennial issue of kindergarten? That appeared each year that you were in the House of Representatives.

**Mr. Bailey:** Kindergarten was probably one of the most hard-fought battles of education. There might have been Republicans for kindergartens, but my recollection was that it was a very partisan issue. The Democrats favored; Republicans didn't favor, and if so, that they should be paid for on the local level, with no state support.

Pearl Wanamaker favored them, as did most educators. Kindergarten went through many phases. We didn't always have the money to support them, and we ended up, sometimes, on the local level (as when my South Bend School District would vote kindergarten, Raymond would vote against it or vice versa) and it

would call for special levies. The kids from one area would be bused to the other area, and pay a fee, of course, to take part in it. One year, we only gave an appropriation so it would only be a half a day from state funds. Kindergarten had strong partisan support in the Democratic Party, and minimal support from the Republicans at that time. It was quite an issue. I don't know if it was because they were against it as much as it was they didn't think that was a good way to spend the money.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Since you were elected to the state Senate in 1956, I'd like you now to reflect on all three terms in the House. By the end of the third term, did you still hold the same high regard for those in state government, which you had after your first session?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think that there's no doubt that I had the same high opinion of them–that they were a group of sincere people trying to do a good job. Personalities differ, of course. Some of them had more interest in promoting their local projects, and some of them didn't. They might not agree with me, nor I with them, but that's part of the process. I think that there were few, if any, that I ever met that I thought were really out with ulterior motives. They were a dedicated bunch and they worked hard. Some of them might have played hard, too, but they worked hard.

If you took a group of church people over a weekend to a church convention–one hundred fifty of them–as soon as the prayers were over with in the evening, you're going to find some of them in a bar. Some would be chasing some woman down the street, or others not doing anything, probably because they're afraid they'd get caught. You're bound to have differences with that many people around, and pretty well confined for sixty days or more.

My regard for the average legislator is real high. In a legislature you have to work with people or you don't get anything. Members that played by themselves as a solo team, and did what they wanted to the detriment of everyone else, just didn't usually get re-elected because they couldn't get a bill passed if they wanted to.

I just can't say enough on behalf of the Legislature, especially in those days when there was no great monetary gain by it–you had to like it, or you wouldn't be there! It probably cost me my business in the newspaper, when I should have stayed home running these things myself.

**Ms. Bridgman:** We just now talked about the Republicans and their opposition to kindergarten being a matter of money. Another time you referred to their fiscal mentality, and at the beginning of the last tape you talked about the difference in Democratic and Republican party philosophy. Do you have anything to add to that, retrospectively?

**Mr. Bailey:** Not looking back on it. Of course, I was naive and new, I guess it's the same thing. I think maybe my impression of the partisanship was sharper than it would be now. I remember one time later when I was in the Senate that the Republican Caucus invited Senator Mike Gallagher and myself to go out to one of their parties.

I asked Mike, the strongest Democrat I've ever known, what was going on.

He said, "Well, they just said you and I have always treated them fairly and they'd like to have us come out."

So, we went out and had a whale of a good time, no political commitments or anything, just good fellowship. You wouldn't have heard of that in the fifties.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How do you explain this greater polarization?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know. I think it had to be cultivated. I know I was a great foe of segregation like that. I know that Lieutenant Governor John Cherberg was. I know that Marshall Neill, John Ryder and Frank Atwood, Republican leaders–all of us just were against the social polarization. We mixed in a social way, but we didn't discuss politics or even talk about it when we were socializing. It would be useless and tactless. They just changed over the years, and for the better.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In the fifties, in the time we're talking about, how did Republicans and Democrats, respectively, view the process of politics?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know the answer to that question. I think Democrats were seeking the same thing–control and being able to push their programs. The Republicans were hoping to do the same. Republicans had been out of power for so long, when they did come back briefly a couple of times they didn't quite know how to handle the majority, and they didn't stay very long. However, you might have to say the Democrats were in so long that they forgot how to handle it, too. So, I don't know. That's an iffy question.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did the actual methods vary?

**Mr. Bailey:** Between parties?

**Ms. Bridgman:** Yes.

**Mr. Bailey:** I would say that in those days we never told our caucus how to vote. But, I am aware of several times in those days when the Republican Party said, "This is our stand, and this is the way you're voting." They had a very much stronger discipline, I think, than we had. I think our members would not stand still for such dictation.

Our method was not to bring anything out onto the floor until we had the votes to pass it. If you pledged yourself, and then voted the other way, you would have had problems, I am sure. Our members kept their word and we never had anybody break their word that I can remember. I had several come to me and ask me to allow them to change because they didn't like what they promised when they were under pressure. One time I gave permission for it, but in return for it he had to get me three Republican votes. He did.

**Ms. Bridgman:** And you're speaking now of the Republicans or of the Democrats?

**Mr. Bailey:** Both sides–the leadership's got to be careful. They can't force you into something that's going to cost you your next election just to hold you to a discipline. They have to use good judgment. Usually it didn't come to that. There was a stricter demand for supporting the party stand in the Republican Party in those days. I don't know how it is now.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you explain how that strictness is associated with their philosophy?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know that. I don't know that I could. They were very conservative to begin with, and in the olden days, Hoover days and so forth, and the Roosevelt years, you would hardly ever find a businessmen who was not a Republican, and proud of it. In fact, I often thought that when a Democrat started a business, nine out of ten of them thought to be stylish, keep their wives up with the entertainment set at the country club, they'd have to join the Republican Party. I think they looked on it as a very distinctive emblem of success.

And while the Democrats were Democrats, they were a bunch of people going every direction. The Democrats were very informal about organization, where the Republicans, I think, were very formal and rigid. That's oversimplifying.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Yes. You said you believed that government is give-and-take. Will you expand on that by explaining how you think that give-and-take worked in the House of Representatives?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, you don't have to expand on that at all because if one person is going to tell everybody how they're going to vote, and not give a little, they're presuming that everybody is going to agree with them. It would be a very rare situation. I frankly don't think that a legislator is ever a good one if he's just going to demand for himself. I don't mean he surrenders principle, but I do mean that in the details of things there are ways to work with people, and there are ways to meet them halfway and get something, instead of getting nothing.

If you come out, just with one program that just says that, "This is the way–this is the way I want it, and I'm going to have it this way," you're going to be a loner in that outfit, and you're not going to get anything done. Legislation is the art of compromise. There is just no way of getting around it. Very rarely would you ever find all of the Senate and all of the House going with one person's version of anything.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well then, will you comment on the relative roles of compromise, bargaining, negotiation, and reciprocity?

**Mr. Bailey:** It'd be awful hard to do. It would depend on the issue. There's some issues you couldn't compromise on. They are black and white. It would depend on the issue, and that's the whole purpose of conference committees in the Senate and the House–to iron out the differences. It's not meant to say the one house is going to tell the other the way it's going to be. If that's the way it's going to be, the other house isn't going to accept it. And there's not going to be anything done at all.

It would depend entirely on the issue involved. If there's an issue that's just a deep-down principle that you can't desert, you're not going to compromise on it. If it's something where you get half a loaf, rather than nothing, and you're not doing any harm, there's nothing wrong with a compromise. You please both sides, and maybe the next time you'll get the other half. Sometimes it takes two or three steps.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you then name some of these issues that are not subject to compromise?

**Mr. Bailey:** It would be awfully hard to do. Of later years I wouldn't compromise the abortion issue.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How about the early fifties?

**Mr. Bailey:** I never heard of the word abortion in the early fifties.

**Ms. Bridgman:** But I mean, how about–

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, you mean issues. Well, I don't know. I would not have compromised the general principle of the income tax. And that was never subject to compromising at that time, except for some of the details. You were for it, or against it. And there are just some things that you can't do. I'm talking major legislative achievements. There would be educational programs, budgetary appropriations for those programs, or social programs, or labor programs, university budgets, or some things like that. You can compromise those, to the extent that you don't get all you want–but you get what you can.

And if you're going to hold out and say, "I'll have no kindergartens whatsoever," and the other side says, "We're going to have kindergartens," you're going to end up with none. So, you might end up giving a reduced appropriation or giving a smaller appropriation to a district, better than nothing at all. Again, legislation is the art of compromise. That's the only way you can look at it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How would you say these issues, which you mentioned you would not compromise on, have affected the political history of Washington State, or other issues that others wouldn't compromise on?

**Mr. Bailey:** I have no idea of what it would be–teasing myself mentally to try to figure it out. Abortion, I'd say, came later of course. But, the principle I would not negotiate. But we did negotiate in the bill that Senator Pritchard and Senator Holman and I sponsored. We did negotiate the fact that we'd present it to the people and let them vote on it. And in doing that, we were able to get it passed. Otherwise, it would never have been passed. And the people voted and approved it. Now that is a compromise of a sort which did not sell the principle down the road. It probably enabled it to live. So in a way, even that yielded to a compromise of a type. I just couldn't answer that question. It would vary with every bill.

[End of Tape 12, Side 2]

## LEGISLATIVE ISSUES: LATE 1950s

**Mr. Bailey:** To put the influence on the Legislature of lobbyists and/or departments and/or people into context would be pretty hard, because it depends a lot on the individual member; how much a member depends on people for their opinions. Back in the 1950s when I never had any contributions, I never had any such influence because of their contributions.

I never felt that I had undue influence after I started receiving contributions. I have never yet had a lobbyist come to me and say, "Hey, I gave money to your campaign, and I want to have your vote." I think I would have thrown them out. They would be very crude, indeed, if they did that.

When I first was running for the Senate, Senator Rosellini ran for governor and was elected. He had been the Democratic floor leader in the Senate. Senator Greive had been the caucus chairman, and he wanted to be the floor leader.

He had what they called the Greive fund, which is one of the first times I received contributions. Greive would, say, get a hundred dollars from an association and divide it up. He'd take out the cost of his making out the checks, and divide the balance among ten or twenty candidates. He would always say, "I hope that you'll see fit in the future to support me, although I'm not asking for it now." And sometimes we'd get a check for twenty-three cents or something, but he'd always end up saying, "These people do not ask for special favors, but they would like the courtesy of being heard." It was never an obligation, and it was so small, but it added up to quite a bit over a period of time.

I think that was the main thing. People want to be heard. I don't care if it is a lobbyist or an individual voter. I think a public official has a duty to listen to people and it doesn't mean you're influenced by listening, but you should listen. Sometimes they have good points, too.

A lot of times when we had a banking bill it was customary to call on Joel Gould, who represented Seattle First and also the other bankers and ask them, "What does this do to our banks?"

Sometimes there were little innocent things in a bill that were very harmful to our own local bank. Sometimes we'd get information from a banker about banks, from a printer about printing, a county official about county work. Many, many of the big lobbies are not just big lobbies that just dump money into your campaign. They represent the school teachers in your district. They represent the labor unions in your district, and they represent groups of people that really are just plain voters in your district and elsewhere. They're not just lobbyists throwing money around. I never had any trouble listening to a lobbyist. I can't remember any undue influence ever being put on me by them.

I know some people, though, might have leaned heavier on the lobbyists than maybe they should have. It was an individual choice, and you have ninety-nine individuals in the House, and you have ninety-nine different approaches. The only thing is that when you talk about lobbyists, you have to remember that any person who writes a legislator is a lobbyist.

It's totally undemocratic to ban lobbyists, because you'd be isolating a group of people in Olympia from the people themselves. All they would know would be what they read in the paper, and Lord knows that could be devastating if the reporters were running the lobby. They manipulate too much public opinion as it is.

It wasn't infrequent, though, that we'd go ask the publisher of a newspaper, "What does this do to you?"

I was quite a focal point from my first day in Olympia for publishers, because I had and was publishing a weekly newspaper at the time that I first came. I also was a focal point for a number of county officials, because I had been a county clerk. Those were people who had their organizations come in to talk to me. Sometimes, later I would submit the bills they had interests in, but they knew that I understood their problem and would listen to them.

I don't remember turning any of them down, but I had times when I wouldn't agree with some of the things they were doing. Usually they were bills correcting little errors here, and improvements there. Later, after I left the paper, member publishers would come to me to put in bills to increase legal-advertising fees, because I didn't have a newspaper, and they didn't want to do it because it looked too much like a conflict of interest.

The word "lobbyist" is always in its worst connotation, but actually without it you'd have one heck of a time isolating a whole group of people to act for the people without knowing what the people really wanted. That ban could even forbid reading newspapers or watching television.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How much public misunderstanding of this association and mutual dependence do you think

there was in the early 1950s? The time we're talking about.

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think there was as much as there is in the 1990s. Because the cost of campaigning has gone up so terrifically, and they've got it down into a fine science where the big lobbies–and I say they're not all bad either–but the big lobbies put out big money. And when people see big money, they automatically think that someone's being bought off.

I'm an ex-newspaper publisher, and consider myself a printer-publisher in retirement even, but I just cannot add the results of the press and the TV or other media criticizing the high costs of campaigning when they are the reason for the high cost.

If there is a bill to go through to curtail campaigning expenses, I think you'll find that there'll be a sudden withdrawal of a great interest by the printers and publishers, as it would really restrict their incomes. On the other hand they can't oppose it because it's a popular thing. But they are the reason for the increased costs. TV would like to see the newspapers nipped. Newspapers would like to see TV nipped. We could buy a whole-page ad in a weekly for fifty dollars back in the fifties. It would take many hundreds now. You couldn't afford it hardly. That's where the increased costs of campaigning come in. TV is sky-high.

**Ms. Bridgman:** We had not formerly discussed the role of the media in politics. How much do you think the kind of publicity given lobbying by the media has influenced public opinion?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think that the media would like to say that they are trying to control campaigning costs. As I said before, they are the reason for rising costs.

I do think, however, that it isn't the media that is responsible for this emphasis. It's the new laws now on financial disclosure which make you list everything you get from a certain area. It's a real newsy article to pick up and read who gave who what. It's not all the media's fault. It does make good reading. And it draws emphasis, though perhaps more than it should, but actually I prefer to have it out in the open. I notice that the people that get accused of being bought off are the ones that get elected. If you get the money, you get elected. Even the most critical voters are influenced by TV, radio, ads, and signs.

People will say, "Why are you spending all that money?" And then they'll turn around and say, "I counted fifteen big signs for your opponent on the way up, and you've only got one. What are you going to do about that?" "Heard him on television. You weren't on television." You know, they vote for the one that they hear the most, because the average person does not know the individual. A good publicity campaign is the thing that really gets to the voters.

They say now that a congressman never quits because he's in there for life. There's a lot of truth to that, but that's the people's fault, it's not anyone else's. They have the power to change the pasture at any election. In county offices it's the fact that your name becomes known and that makes you hard to beat. Name familiarity is your biggest asset and no amount of money can destroy it, unless you do so yourself. All things equal, when you're better known you're going to get a better vote, if you've earned it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** So, it isn't then distortion, but rather–you view the public as voting for those with whom they're familiar?

**Mr. Bailey:** A voter goes to the polls and he's faced with a dozen names. He probably knows none of them except by hearsay or by reading it in the paper. I think that if "John Jones" has had his name in the paper fifteen or twenty times as being your congressman, or your representative, or whatever, he's going to get a large number of the votes of the people that don't know his opponent nor him either, but they've heard of him enough that they vote for him.

That's just common sense–it's good advertising. You buy Palmolive soap because you read it in the paper so often. If they are the same price, you'll buy the one that you've heard of the most.

That isn't true when you get into really controversial issues, and issues rise above the personality, but it is true in some of the rural areas where people are more inclined to be personal. I know in our district, very Democratic, we elected a Republican representative quite frequently because he was well-known. He'd quit, and then he'd come back, and quit, and come back. Name familiarity was a good portion of it. He was a nice fellow and people liked him. I think that's true of any big offices, too, when you get unknowns running. Name familiarity is the biggest asset you can have, although I suppose sometimes it can hurt too.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Yes. Thinking about your own constituents, as well as the rest of the Washington State public and the United States public in 1955, at the end of your terms in the House, how would you describe American views of their state government?

**Mr. Bailey:** I really can't pinpoint any high points at that time. Looking back, generally, I'd think that we had low-key interest in the state and federal government about that time. We had issues, it's true, but I think

President Eisenhower was kind of a transitional president that filled in after an aggressive Roosevelt and an aggressive Truman. People had been pushed around by the war to the point of where I think they were wanting a little breathing spell and it was just a natural thing. When I look back I know there were many issues, but I think that probably we were taking a little breathing spell in partisan politics and not getting too excited.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How about the more general attitudes or mood or spirit of Americans in the middle-1950s, as compared with what you remembered. You remember something of the late 1920s, and remember a lot of the 1930s and 1940s, of course. How did the moods differ?

**Mr. Bailey:** At that time we were getting into the Korean conflict. Patriotism was riding a modest wave, but it wasn't all flag-waving and all one way or the other. There weren't the protests and things that we had later.

I remember health care being an issue in the Congress in the early 1950s. I do remember that we, the Democrats, supported the plan wholeheartedly, and then of course we had a Republican Congress. A few years later it finally ended up in the Medicare and Medicaid acts of the Johnson administration. Otherwise politically it was fairly calm, compared with other periods.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did you personally feel about the past, and the future of your country at this time?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think I had any different feelings than I ever had. The country was here and secure, and I never had to worry about it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What else do you recall about national events at this time that were discussed or of concern to you and your friends?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think this was also the years of the McCarthy hearings, and also when Truman dumped MacArthur. Some of those things are high spots in my memory. We had lots of things we worked on in the Legislature and things that–and none of it was of great statewide debate that I can recall right offhand.

The Democrats were very anxious to get control of the Legislature in 1956. Governor Langlie did not run again, and Lieutenant Governor Emmett Anderson was the Republican candidate. He defeated Vic Meyers four years before for lieutenant governor. Senator Rosellini was elected governor. The Senate went Democratic, sufficiently to not have a coalition. I think there were eighteen of us who went from the House to the Senate that year.

**Ms. Bridgman:** When do you remember first hearing about the accelerated civil-rights efforts in the South?

**Mr. Bailey:** That's hard for me to put into a specific year. I really followed it closely, but we had very little trouble in this state right at that time–and it was not something we had really to face. I remember back about that time when Senator Ribicoff from Connecticut, later a member of the Cabinet, who was Jewish, and couldn't even stay in most hotels in Washington D.C. It wasn't just confined to black people. We have come a long way.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You just said that several of you decided on your own to run for the Senate. You announced your decision in June 1956. You've earlier expressed your dissatisfaction with the House. Will you elaborate on your reasons for choosing to try for the Senate this time?

**Mr. Bailey:** I saw the possibility of running for the Senate, because Senator Wilson, while a very nice person, was not a strong political candidate. He had been actually elected on an anti-incumbent vote because of the personal problems of our previous senator.

It looked to me like it was shaping up that the previous senator would be running again, and with a group of church people against a person who had had a drinking problem and a few things like that. I felt it was going to result in the same thing all over again, even though I didn't think Wilson was a strong candidate.

When I decided to file, my neighbor came over to tell me it was the worst thing that I could have done. He said, "You're just going down the tube taking on Ted." Instead of that, I had many more votes than he did in the primary, and increased it in the general. I saw the opportunity and I saw that we were going to lose the seat if we didn't do something about it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** At this point in your life, did you think of yourself as a career politician?

**Mr. Bailey:** I doubt it. I probably, at least up until that time, never ever thought I would stay in the Legislature long enough to establish even a modest pension. In fact I tried to cash it in a couple of times and wasn't able to do it. I'm glad I didn't now, but the only thing was I had never ever thought I was going to stay that long. You go from one election to the other. It was interesting. It was very interesting. I wouldn't change it if I had it to do over again.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The campaign advertisements that you and your opponent, Ted Wilson, ran in the various newspapers are very, very similar. You both emphasize your support of highways, schools, labor, senior citizens, the Astoria bridge. And each of you was endorsed by a person well-known in state government. Julia Butler Hansen wrote for you: "I have never known a more able, conscientious, or effective worker." And a Senator Raugust wrote about Ted Wilson: "He did more and worked harder than any senator." Those are both quotes. So, looking at all the evidence historians seek out, it's difficult to understand this.

**Mr. Bailey:** Not at all–because that's what your colleagues would do for you. Senator Raugust was chairman of the Highways Committee, and Senator Wilson was a member of the Highways Committee. Julia Butler Hansen was a member and chairman of the House Highways Committee, and I was a member of the House Highways Committee. It was a natural thing. I also remember that, at that time, Julia Butler Hansen was not a household word–nor was Senator Raugust.

It was an effort, I think, to show that other people worked with you and you had support of colleagues. That testimony is much more impressive than having some of your own statistics.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I'd like to reformulate or add to my question. What I didn't understand, reading the advertisements and articles written about the two of you, was how the voters would make a decision, because the written material makes you seem so similar. So I'm asking you to comment on the reason why you won.

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, there's several reasons. I had built a real head of political steam, I think looking back on it, when I was state representative in my various election campaigns. I never ran a bad or close election.

The district was basically Democratic. The unions were very strong in our district; there was more than a little reticence about labor taking a very active part in my opponent's campaign because the Republicans had been noted as a party that was trying to put limitations on unions. So I had that support.

Basically though, we're in a small district where people know you. I think both Wilson and I did an awful lot of personal contact. I think that was the big factor.

It wasn't the ads. The ads don't give you much room to discuss issues. The ads are just something to get your face and name in front of the public. You let them know that you're working for the job.

I remember, one time, they were going to bypass a little town called Lebam. The Highways Department wanted to swing the highway over a couple of blocks, missing the town and going right through the middle of the leading Republican's house. They got in touch with Senator Wilson, they never contacted me, but I read about the problem in the paper. Wilson had written the department a letter, but I proceeded to get the Highway Department down to look at the town, and opposed the relocation.

**Ms. Bridgman:** This was when you were in the House of Representatives?

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes, I was in the House and I was running for the Senate. They agreed the relocation was foolish and abandoned their plans. I wrote a letter to the Republican and told him that I was working hard on this–that I'd keep him informed, which I did, and he was very happy when we announced the decision to abandon the changes. I kept him informed of every detail and I remember his comment to a friend of mine in Lebam, "You know, I don't think Bailey knows that I've been a Republican all my life." He always supported me after that.

[End of Tape 13, Side 1]

**Mr. Bailey:** I doubt if Senator Wilson ever knew what happened in Lebam that year, except of course, I'd also have to say that Lebam was one of our heavily Democratic precincts in Pacific County, but it went heavier than that for me after that.

If you tend to your knitting, people remember you. You have to do just a little more than just write a letter to show an interest in what their problem is.

I had a similar problem there with some old people who lived on what we called "poverty row." They had their own well-water systems and the state would not come in and help those people–almost all on welfare–get established on a good system of their own. So, finally, I went to Olympia to the Department of Health to explain their problem. By the time I got home, Olympia called me up to say the state had agreed to give them the money for building their own water system. Those people were forever my friends. They just never forgot you. They didn't have the money and were going to have to leave their homes because the state wouldn't clear the wells that they were using at that time, as they did not meet sanitary standards.

**Ms. Bridgman:** One of your friends wrote to you in congratulating you on choosing to run and said that Ted Wilson had "no more influence here or in Olympia than one of his oysters."

**Mr. Bailey:** That's unfair, really.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The incidents you've related, explain, don't you think, why that kind of statement would be made?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, you'd have to know Ted. As I say, he was a great guy, but he did not put out a lot of personality. He was a very quiet person. I think that's probably what they were referring to. I probably saved that because some of those things were funny.

I do remember one of his radio ads that–and maybe a newspaper ad–when it ended up saying, "If you want honesty, vote for Ted Wilson." So, the longshoremen in Raymond started calling me on the phone and asking, "Is this 'Honest Bob'?" Anywhere around the Longshore Union hall I was "Honest Bob," and I got it because of an insinuation by my opponent. He was probably saying a positive thing about himself and caused a reaction.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Yes! I'd like you to discuss your financial contributions routed to you from Bob Greive a little more. These were the first financial contributions to a campaign you had, so you've said. How did this come about, this initial arrangement?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, at least they're the first in my memory. I don't recall receiving any help from anybody up until the time I ran for the Senate.

Bob Greive, of course, was running for the Senate Democratic floor leader, and he wanted to get as many senators behind him as he could. He also wanted to see a Democratic majority in the Senate, because otherwise he wouldn't be majority floor leader, but the minority leader. He started hitting up lobbyists and groups–and individuals, in many cases. They would give, and he would divide it up equally among different candidates. He would send us a letter in complete detail. In fact, Bob never hid any of his contributions. I think the papers could have picked them up at any time if they had wished.

I really can't tell you whether I received other contributions or not–I don't recall, but I think most of it came from the Greive fund. My own personal files show that I spent something like six hundred dollars on the campaign. And I think that must have been my personal money, for things like filing fees, cards, and signs. In those days we did not figure things like mileage, or traveling around, or anything. We didn't have to account.

I didn't get that much cash actually, when it was all told, because four of us Senate candidates decided to file a lawsuit challenging the League of Women Voters redistricting initiative. Bob hired a very well-known attorney in Seattle, Lyle Iverson, to represent us. All four of us were from rural districts and had the backing of the state Grange and a large number of the rural organizations. The suit probably had a lot to do with getting some of the Democrats in eastern Washington, too. The cost of hiring Iverson was deducted from our campaign allocations. In that respect my contributions from the Greive fund were much lower than some.

Ironically, I didn't vote for Bob Greive at the caucus later. He only won by one vote.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Your papers in the state archives show that forty dollars of the money Bob Greive collected for you was given to the attorney.

**Mr. Bailey:** That's probably not all. That's probably only one bill. I have a hunch there are others in there. Or perhaps it was deducted before Greive gave it to us.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Do you remember then, approximately how much you got from Greive?

**Mr. Bailey:** I do not remember that at all. It was a rather funny thing. Sometimes we'd get a few pennies from a person, other times it'd be up as high as twenty dollars or more. It was always subdivided amongst the candidates. And as I said, he took out the costs–his postage and his bookkeeping. I think he hired a bookkeeper in his law office. Sometimes it was rather funny to get a whole envelope full of checks, most of them very small. He kept scrupulously open and accurate books.

It was not received well by the press later when the press got into writing about the so-called Greive fund. But there were other people opposing Greive too, and so it was a political challenge Greive had to face. And he did.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How many of these contributors did you know personally?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I'd have to look at the list, but I would imagine that quite a few of them I would know. Perhaps the Hospital Association and others. I don't know whether bankers ever gave then or not. Ordinarily, the bankers then were inclined to give to the Republicans.

I don't think that the labor unions gave through the Greive fund. They may have, in a limited way, but most of the labor unions would give direct to those they endorsed, at their conventions. I doubt that they gave direct to the Greive fund.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In the letters with the checks, you mentioned a statement that Bob Greive wrote. I'll read it in its entirety. "It's understood that these contributions are no way an attempt to influence your vote, or on any particular issue. However, these individuals feel that you represent the type of person who would lend an impartial ear and decide their case on its merits, if and when a matter affecting their interests does arise." How usual is a statement like that?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think Greive was a very astute politician. He had a lot of enemies, and I oftentimes voted against him, but I'll tell you, I often voted with him, too. Greive was not to be underestimated, and this was prior to public accounting for campaigning. Greive was just a step ahead of his time. He put everything in writing. He didn't attempt to hide it. If anybody had asked him he'd take them right over and show them everything.

And I think his statement was so that no one could come back and say, "Hey, I gave you twenty dollars and I have a bill there I want you to support." In a very nice fashion he relieved recipients of obligation, and he also probably relieved the donors of insinuation they were doing something wrong. I think he was a forerunner of what you would expect for an honest contribution.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did you use the money in this campaign?

**Mr. Bailey:** It was strictly for advertising signs and cards. I think I used the radio a little that year–Raymond, South Bend, Astoria. The latter because Astoria would reach the Ilwaco area. I think it was mainly advertising. You must have cards to hand out to people and signs to post. Many expenditures are necessary.

**Ms. Bridgman:** And did you have other people helping in this campaign?

**Mr. Bailey:** Not that I can recall. Oh, people helped me and they were very enthusiastic; they helped me all the time. But, as far as having a campaign committee, I never ever dreamed of that. I just ran my own campaign.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Campaign headquarters, staff, office?

**Mr. Bailey:** No, no. Although, when I ran for the Legislature, usually we'd give a contribution to the Pacific County Democrats and they would open a campaign headquarters for everyone in Raymond. They usually paid for that as their contribution to your campaign. In Grays Harbor County we usually had to give a fifty-dollar donation or something, to pay the rent on the county headquarters and use its facilities. In that respect we had workers in the campaign, but they were working for everybody on the ticket.

**Ms. Bridgman:** All right. Thank you. For the record, I'd like to specify that in the primary the vote for you was 4,245 and for Wilson 2,458. In the general, for you 5,838 and for Wilson, 3,3421. So, another dramatic victory.

You've commented earlier that the party platforms were written after one filed and might have no relation to the issues he or she would emphasize in a campaign. What do you remember about the platform of 1956?

**Mr. Bailey:** Absolutely nothing. There probably were some outstanding things that we worked on as a team, but right offhand, I can't remember. My memory is one of personalities. Rosellini versus Emmett Anderson, and myself against Wilson. That year we had an active campaign against the Republican Congressman, Russell Mack, and in that we didn't have much chance. Party platform-wise I just don't recall it, although, probably if I had took a glance at some of the platform I might remember the issues.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Most of it I found to be traditional Democratic support for labor, and agriculture, and highways, and income tax, that sort of thing. But there were some interesting points. Under foreign affairs, they advocated that the UN supervise complete world disarmament. Under national defense they supported a highly trained reserve and development of missiles. Do you remember anything about that? Or, what do you remember about the discussion about that?
**Mr. Bailey:** No, I don't. As a rule, the legislative candidate seldom, if ever, discussed national issues.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What was your personal opinion about international affairs in these Cold War years?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know. I think the country was pretty unified in the fact that we had to maintain a close alliance in NATO and support the Truman and Marshall doctrines. It just seems like those were things that were going along pretty well. The emphasis then got down into discussions in Eisenhower's years with the settlement at Korea–but that was early in the fifties.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I see. You remarked earlier that the FDR liberal-labor coalition, as I described it, had seemed to you to have been superseded or perhaps, added onto. And later you remarked that the Democrats were a collection of groups without the strict kind of

discipline that characterized the Republicans. Thinking about your party in 1956, will you reflect more on the principles that characterized it and united you all?

**Mr. Bailey:** Statewide we were still deeply involved in social problems. My recollection is that we still had substantial ways to go in aid to dependent children, and education appropriations. There were a number of additional issues like kindergarten, a really big issue for a long time whereas, the Republicans were very conservative.

Many veterans had gone to college when they returned and they were coming out of school, and we had a couple of nice little recessions in there on top of it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How would you explain the Democratic victories in 1956, both in the Congress and here in the state, where you had notable majorities in the House and Senate, and the elected officials were all Democrats, except the superintendent of public instruction, who of course was nonpartisan.

**Mr. Bailey:** I think I just put my finger on it a minute ago. Eisenhower was a war hero, and was respected by both sides, in fact, both sides had wanted him to run on their ticket. He was never deeply involved in most issues although quite conservative. He was a name that people respected, and I think it was an individual tribute that he won, because of the high esteem that people held for him after the war.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How much had you supported the candidacy of Al Rosellini for governor?

**Mr. Bailey:** I didn't know Al Rosellini at that time. That was the year that Earl Coe ran for governor and was defeated by Al in the primaries. I had supported Coe in the primary.

But I remember that we had heated debates in our county about Rosellini. Our county had supported Earl Coe. Rosellini started making his statewide reputation on the Rosellini Committee Against Crime, and got around the state and he pulled many things that McCarthy would be proud of, except on a different issue–crime. He got his name before the public and was fairly well-known.

We had a couple of people in our county that were poor primary losers and accused Rosellini of being a member of the Mafia. A lot of us came to Al's defense because there was absolutely no evidence of that connection and there never has been. Rosellini had a very political administration–but I'll say this, they never caught anybody with their fingers in the cookie jar, either. Of all the things that had been said, and as political as his administration was, I'm not aware of any terrific scandal that came out of the Rosellini administration. He was a good governor.

But, he did meet a lot of opposition at that time, from a bunch of racial and religious bigots. I do remember after he was elected they tried to get control of the patronage in the county by naming a committee to recommend local patronage to Rosellini, a committee dominated by his enemies. I got in touch with Rosellini and asked him to name his own committee, which he did. We did one battle down at a meeting one night as our chairman was anti-Rosellini and had named his committee, but it never functioned as it was not recognized at the state level.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you please define what you mean by a "very political administration"?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, Rosellini wasn't like some governors I've known in the sense that they pretended that they're going to have a very nonpartisan administration. He was point-blank a Democrat and he appointed Democrats, and to the best of my knowledge, that's the way it was. Some of these people get elected on a partisan ticket and immediately claim they're nonpartisan.

Rosellini exercised the privilege of political appointments in a fine fashion. It was probably the last great effort in this because in a short time the state merit system started going into effect.

**Ms. Bridgman:** With whom did he consult?

**Mr. Bailey:** I wouldn't know that. I was never very close to Al Rosellini. I got to know Al very well later. He had quite a collection of his former Senate colleagues around him and they would be the ones close to him.

**Ms. Bridgman:** And how did he supply himself with information in order to make decisions?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I think that came from staff. He had a very good staff, and the fact that he had been in the Legislature and he knew the issues himself. How he would deal with them is a different matter. But he was well-up on them.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did he get along with people?

**Mr. Bailey:** Excellent. He had a great rapport with people, and he was friendly to everybody. Al Rosellini just gushed friendship with people. Sometimes when he was *so* friendly, people would leave thinking that they had a commitment to something and then a little

later would find he was just being very courteous and friendly to them.

Normally he didn't break his word, but you had to push him a little for a firm commitment.

He was amiable and much more accessible than most other governors. My recollection was when he first went into office he was not going to let anybody answer the phone other than himself. He soon found out in a short time that he wasn't getting anything else done and that was the end of that. Generally speaking, he tried to keep a hands-on personal supervision of the office, and I think he did a pretty good job.

He was noted for taking notes. In talking to him he would say, "Oh, well, I'll look that up when I go back" and take a note and shove it into his pocket. The joke was we never knew where the notes in his pockets went because he probably had such a big pocketful he probably had to empty it every two or three hours, and then whatever happened to them we never knew. But, he was very responsive.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What had your opinion of the Rosellini for Governor clubs been?

[End of Tape 13, Side 2]

**Mr. Bailey:** You asked about the Rosellini for Governor Committee. That committee was organized more intensely than a lot of others had been, but in this case the primary opposition was quite strong. There were many supporters of Earl Coe who were against Rosellini and had pretty well taken over many of the county central committees.

When their candidate failed, the Rosellini for Governor Committee was a direct effort to bypass these officials and go out and work for Rosellini. Because there were bitter statements, bigots–religious, racial, and things of that sort, it became bitter. After the primary, the very people who unfairly portrayed Rosellini sought to control his organization and there was a need to get around these people so the Rosellini for Governor committees took quite a step to isolate them and get direct support for Rosellini, who already had practically been elected.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How would you explain Rosellini's political philosophy, that is beyond those principles and supportive issues having to do with his being a Democrat?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, when Rosellini was Senate floor leader of the party, he was a very capable, quick-witted member of the Senate, and he was always a leader in the mainstream of the Democratic Party and was the leader of the Democratic effort, at least in the Senate.

He was truly a liberal Democrat, but he also had a philosophy of political existence. He was a good politician and he did everything he could to improve himself and stay in office. This is political, but you have to do it in order to exist. Rosellini knew how, knew politics, and knew how to get people behind him.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did he view opponents?

**Mr. Bailey:** He was a very aggressive governor as far as political viewpoints were concerned. That is not a bad statement against him. In fact, he was very honorable in that way. I would think that he viewed about anybody as a potential opponent. I think he was on the alert at all times, to be sure that he could keep command of any situation that might arise. He was an excellent politician and many people didn't like him because he was a politician. At the same time they were practicing the same thing, but not doing as well.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I see. Will you give some descriptions of others of these newly elected Democrats. For example, Commissioner of Public Lands Bert Cole?

**Mr. Bailey:** Bert Cole came on as commissioner of public lands. He was kind of a surprise candidate because Frank Sether, who had worked in the department for years and years and really knew the department upside down, was the heads-on favorite to win the nomination.

Unfortunately, during the campaign it was discovered that Sether had signed a petition for the anti-labor initiative of right-to-work. Labor made a big ado about it, and because he was seeking labor support, Frank was on the spot. Frank first denied it and then he had to admit that he had done so. Finally he went to get his name taken off the petitions but he could not. The damage had been done and Bert Cole won the nomination.

Bert had a good reputation as a county commissioner in Clallam County. He knew quite a bit about forestry and related problems. My first experience with Bert was the first year that I was in the Senate and his first year as land commissioner. I was named chairman of the Forestry and State Lands Committee, and consolidation of those forest-oriented departments into one working unit became one of the major bills of the session. I don't recall it as being terribly partisan at that time either.

One of Langlie's requests a few years before was to reorganize government, and reorganize the state Department of Public Lands, but his bills gave the gover-

nor more of the power and that caused the opposition of the Democrats. Senator Washington, two years before I came into the Senate, had been working on his version of this reorganization and actually most of the details had been worked out in a previous session.

When I came on as chairman, Senator Washington was one of my committee members. We reintroduced the bill, and a similar bill we put through passed the House and the Senate. It was one of the major bills of that session, consolidating all forestry activity. Bert did a terrific job in giving support. A lot of people criticized him at that time. There were very many small departments, like the Department of Forestry, and many others all over the state that had been operating independently prior to this time. They resented terribly having somebody take them over. Eventually, after several years, Bert put together a very good department.

The Department of Natural Resources is headed by the elected state lands commissioner, as set up in the constitution. The Board of Natural Resources has a couple of professors from the universities and also the lands commissioner, the governor and I believe–the superintendent of public instruction, because of the school lands that were involved.

It has worked out very well. It was long overdue, but Bert was there at the helm to take over. He eventually treated everyone very fairly and won them over, but it didn't smooth the battlegrounds in the Legislature that year.

**Ms. Bridgman:** And how did you become convinced that this was a good idea?

**Mr. Bailey:** It was a move for efficiency in government. I had thought it was a good thing for a long time. Incidentally, I was very close to Frank Sether, but Frank resisted change, but because of his opposition to Bert Cole was on his way out.

Another issue that I have not discussed was in 1956, the anti-union, right-to-work initiative. It was on the ballot, and brought out Democratic and pro-union voters like you've never seen them. I was very active in the anti-198 battle.

I got to know many labor leaders because I was secretary of the county committee against the initiative, and we were busy all of the time raising money and organizing. I was at that time working in Aberdeen and was a member of the Printers Union. Consequently, I gave probably more of my time to the pro-labor people working against the initiative than I probably did in actual campaigning for the Senate. It was a hot issue. Every labor member came out and voted that election. And that had a lot to do with totals in the state.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Can we go back and finish up a few details about the establishment of the Department of Natural Resources? It passed the Senate forty-four to nothing, and earlier it passed the House eighty-eight to nothing. Would you like to comment on that?

**Mr. Bailey:** Pearl Wanamaker, the superintendent of public instruction, opposed earlier bills because she could foresee putting school lands under the governor's control, but these things had been ironed out and both sides were in support. Even with differences, I think everybody recognized the need to get all these related activities under one department. This is another instance of compromising as we talked about awhile back. It was not a partisan deal at all. It was a matter of doing it. Bert Cole was there and testifying for it. It would have been more difficult if the lands commissioner was opposing it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Could you describe any principles involved here? You've said that people who feared losing jobs and/or autonomy were against it.

**Mr. Bailey:** I think that most people–and the vote reflected it–realized that it was a matter of efficiency that these units should be under one department.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you please describe the new lieutenant governor, John Cherberg?

**Mr. Bailey:** John Cherberg came into the Senate at the same time I did (1956). That was the first time I had ever met John Cherberg. In later years I came to know him very well and he certainly was something special that you don't find in public offices very often.

He stayed longer than anyone ever did in the lieutenant governorship. He was a very gracious presiding officer and as time went on the parties on both sides recognized his fairness. I never remember him utilizing his chair to promote a partisan activity. He was always trying to be on the fair side, and I think it earned the Senate a great distinction and prestige and earned him a great reputation.

John would stand up and fight for principles. If it was his one vote that was going to help the Democratic cause against the other side, he was with us. I'm not aware of any time anyone appealed a decision of the chair, which is a right of any member, but both sides considered him fair. He didn't surrender any principles but at the same time everybody knew that even though they were way out, they had a right to get up and express their opinion and be received. He established a very firm Senate decorum.

I remember one time–at least it's the way Governor Booth Gardner tells it–John requested that I, as caucus chairman, tell then-Senator Gardner that he wasn't dressed appropriately (sports clothes) and he should go change his clothes. The governor has reminded me of that every once in awhile when I go to the governor's office. But, he left and he changed.

This was really not any great problem with John, but we never took our ties off in the Senate unless someone got up on the floor, on a hot day, and made a motion to allow us all to do so. Cherberg tried to maintain a certain Senate dignity.

The decorum was very good and John Cherberg was the one responsible for getting that thing just going along in a very smooth fashion and establishing a great tradition. He held firm. He was probably the greatest public servant I've ever served with as far as fairness, dignity, and for just doing an all-around good job was concerned. The constitution says the lieutenant governor names committees, but he doesn't. The majority caucus hands him the committee lists and he reads them as presented. Otherwise, as with Emmett Anderson, a Republican could name a Republican-controlled committee in a Democratic Senate. It doesn't work that way.

The lieutenant governor has very limited power as far as the law goes, but he has a lot of influence, and when it's used properly–and John used it many times–he has a terrific influence. He is not a member of the Senate. Some people say he can vote on a tie vote, but he can't vote on a tie vote except under special circumstances. The constitution says the lieutenant governor can break a tie, but it also says a little later that any laws that pass must have the majority of the duly elected senators, so there is no tie when you have that. What the tie vote of the lieutenant governor boils down to, basically, is only on procedural votes or amendments, not on final passage.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you recall some of the times that he used his influence with such good effect?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, no. It would be awfully hard to do that because it had to be done with tact, and John always had that. He was pretty well up as to what the public wanted and what the Senate wanted.

He wouldn't have lasted long if he had tried to maneuver the Senate on issues. He never did that and he established for himself a lot of influence. It was within his power to tell his desires, and because he was reasonable, he was usually granted his request. It doesn't mean that he killed any important or vital legislation. He was too smart for that. He knew what the public demanded and he would not have had that influence if he hadn't been respected by the public and listened to them.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Other elected officials that were new that year when you entered the Senate–Vic Meyers?

**Mr. Bailey:** Vic Meyers was elected secretary of state. He was quite a memorable character, but he was smart. Vic was one that could clown, but was nobody's fool. He was a good parliamentarian when he was lieutenant governor. He had a joking way about him, always half on the light side, but he could deceive you. He hired a good staff and as secretary of state let them do their thing. In fact most of them had been there for many years anyway.

If anything got him into trouble, it was because of his allegiance to his family. He had his son and daughter working there, and while they were a very close-knit family, when the stories started hitting the press it didn't sound very good.

Vic was just something that you don't run into in public office very often. After you got to know him you had to respect him. He was nobody's fool although he liked to play the comic role a lot of times. He was friendly to everybody. He was up on the Senate floor quite frequently, in the lobby walking around talking to people.

In spite of his lighter vein, he had a fine reputation as lieutenant governor, not the polished, dignified type of John Cherberg. Vic, of course, always had a big joke out of everything and he hit the papers in a joke most of the time. I have never heard critical comment about anything that Vic did in parliamentary work in the Senate that was not well-handled with a professional decision.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Other than these descriptions of personalities that you've given us–what other first impressions of the Senate that January do you remember?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, my first impression of the Senate was–when we held our caucus and elected our leaders. Bob Greive was elected floor leader, and Howard Bargreen was elected caucus chairman. The effort was to give every Democratic member a chairmanship, and I ended up as chairman of Forestry and State Lands.

The other thing that impressed me terrifically, as compared to the House, was our facilities. In the Senate there were enough rooms for all of us. In my Forestry and State Lands Committee room there was room for four, so four senators were assigned there. Senator Francis Pearson, member of the Rules Committee and a blind senator, Senator Pat Sutherland from Seattle, who is now the prosecuting attorney of Thurston County,

also a member of the Rules Committee, and Senator Ted Peterson, a Republican from Seattle. We shared one secretary, who also served my committee.

It was much more individual and personal, and Senator Pearson and Senator Sutherland taught me, within a couple of days, how to get bills introduced and get them passed. It showed that I had not been getting full cooperation on the House side. They taught me the fine art of getting around and I learned in a hurry because I did have a little background on it anyway by that time. They were very helpful to me, and it just made all the difference in the world. It was so different from the House; it was so personal.

We caucused every morning in the Senate and went through the calendar and were explained every bill, so that we knew what was going on. We knew what we were doing when we went on the floor, and it was a very personal experience as opposed to the impersonal activities in the House. I liked it from the day I went in.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In addition to the secretary you shared with the other senators, what other staff was available?

**Mr. Bailey:** That would about do it. We did have a secretarial pool like we had in the House, for people who were writing lots of letters. In recollection, it was the woman assigned to the four of us who did most of the work. She seemed to be able to handle all of it. I don't think we had the volume of mail we started getting later.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You mentioned earlier in discussing your early career in the House that it was very common for agency employees to be lent to the Legislature to serve as staff. Was that still as frequent?

**Mr. Bailey:** It was quite frequent for several years. Even when I was in the Senate I remember one lady who worked in the Department of Highways who served as secretary to the chairman of the Senate Highways Committee. I remember in the Democratic Caucus room one of the women came from the Washington Public Ports Association.

[End of Tape 14, Side 1]

**Ms. Bridgman:** We were discussing Senate staff. Particularly those who were employees of other agencies. How did they give help? Because of their expertise and these other jobs?

**Mr. Bailey:** I was telling you about one lady that was the chief secretary in the Senate Highways Committee who came from the Highways Department. I would imagine that the procedure probably started way back when the Legislature only met sixty days every two years, and it was quite an advantage to have somebody that knew the department. It was not only a help to the department but to the Legislature.

The Legislature paid on a per diem basis and paid these people a much higher rate than they would make in their own state work. Considering other matters, it probably was a convenient thing for the department to have somebody that knew and could keep them informed as to what was going on, as well as being of great assistance to the legislative process itself, although I do not know this was the actual practice.

At the end of the session those people would go back to work in their own department. I don't know how it affected their pensions or their longevity. They were granted that right and it was the custom for a long time.

The Senate and House had a certain amount of patronage that each member could name. In the Senate we had usually two bits of patronage. The first person we named mandatory patronage and had to be given a job. The second person was hired if they could be worked into some position.

At first I didn't bring anyone with me, but a little later you could always get somebody on as a Senate security guard or a doorman or page. At that time pages were usually for the full session.

In the House you'd be lucky because there were so many members that it would be almost impossible to satisfy everyone, although they tried to let you bring a secretary from home or young person that wanted a job. In the Senate it was much more personal and better organized on an individual basis.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How long had that been going on?

**Mr. Bailey:** That had been going on for a long time in the Senate.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What do you remember about the joint session with the address by Governor Rosellini, his inaugural?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, nothing more than I remember about every other governor that addressed every joint session. It wasn't that outstanding. He was received very enthusiastically by Democratic majorities, of course.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Now your committees. You've mentioned that you were chairman of Resources and Forestry and Public Lands. You were also on Ways and Means in the Appropriations Division and several oth-

ers, many others. Can you recall some of your adventures in these committees? Describe them?

**Mr. Bailey:** No, I don't really. I wasn't on Senate Highways, but at the end of the session I was put on the Joint Interim Committee on Highways as one of the Senate members. Mrs. Hansen asked me what I wanted, and of course she wanted my vote for chairman. We had obtained, over a period of years, one or two studies on the feasibility of building a bridge across the Columbia at Astoria. I told Mrs. Hansen that I wanted more than a study. I wanted a subcommittee on Columbia River bridges. So she immediately created one and put me on as chairman. We kept the issue alive by meeting with Astoria and other groups, and this went along for some time. My committee covered all bridges on the Columbia from Big Rapids to Astoria.

The state got into quite a hassle over the new bridge at Vancouver. Governor Langlie had signed a bill with Oregon creating tolls across the new bridge at Vancouver. The federal government the day before had appropriated lots of money for such projects so it wasn't necessary to have a toll. The bonds had been signed and it called for meeting in Washington with Senators Magnuson and Jackson. I received a letter from Julia Butler Hansen to Senator Robert Bailey, chairman of the *Lower* Columbia Bridge Subcommittee. She wouldn't tolerate anybody but herself going to Washington to talk to the senators, at least not an underling like me, so she had added the word *Lower* to my committee, even though the printed letterhead remained unchanged. I never challenged her, but I was mad at her for quite awhile. This was a typical Julia exploit, but the letterheads were all printed and everything. It was quite a laughing matter with the staff. She would then always introduce or write me as Senator Bailey, the chairman of the *Lower* Columbia River Bridge Subcommittee.

One time I was at a Portland meeting on the Astoria bridge and had called the meeting of my subcommittee, of which she was a member. She said that she thought that she'd attend. She came up from a lunch with a group of highway people, and as I stood up to say something, she slid in and sat down in my seat and took the meeting over.

My local newspaper was furious and asked, "What are you going to do about it?" I said, "I'm going to keep my mouth shut because right now we might get a bridge and without her help we might not." We didn't get the bridge until after she'd gone to Congress, but she gave us much assistance along the way.

But Julia was Julia, and there will never be another one like her.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How and why were you assigned these particular committees?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, in the Senate they give you a form to fill out, and you make your first, second, third choice, and so on. I was told by Senator Pearson of the Committee on Committees that I was to be chairman of Forestry and State Lands. This committee assigned members to their committees and tried to honor their requests. Then you had a chance at one of the big committees, Appropriation, Taxation, and/or Highways. They put you on your share of the little ones, too. For a long time the Senate operated on the theory that every majority member should be chairman of some committee. Later when I was a leader, one of my major reforms was to try to get the number of committees each served on down so we had fewer committees.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I see. You were on ten then. Seems like quite a number of committees.

**Mr. Bailey:** It was. Many years later we got them down to four committees and scheduled them like college classes, because sometimes there'd be three or four committees meeting at the same time on the old system, and you couldn't possibly go to all of them. Senator Greive was a great hand not to want to do anything like that, because that's the way he rewarded his supporters, by committee chairmanships, and his supporters were going slowly nuts themselves because they couldn't keep up with what they were assigned.

Senator August Mardesich supported streamlining and defeated Greive for floor leader based mainly on that issue alone–efficiency.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You've already mentioned Initiative 199 which was the redistricting initiative sponsored by the League of Women Voters. And you mentioned also your attempt with others to prevent its being put on the ballot in November. It finally was allowed on the ballot by the state Supreme Court, but in that legislative session the first time you were in the Senate, you succeeded in retaining your own district boundaries, but with one fewer representative. How was all this accomplished?

**Mr. Bailey:** Redistricting is a painful process. You can't take anything away from anyone easily. At the same time, though, people want to be represented, too. The initiative passed and it took two thirds of both houses to change that initiative, and it was quite a job. Senator Greive was the legislative mastermind of redistricting. In fact, he could ruin more sessions with redistricting than anybody I knew.

He managed to do it by just plain pushing and pulling and hanging up every bill in the session. Senator Raugust was a Republican and member of the Highways Committee and had been in on our lawsuit. With Senator Raugust's vote he got the support of quite a few rural eastern Washington senators, and eventually votes, the two-thirds necessary to change the initiative.

It was a behind-the-scenes battle always bitter and deadlocked. I know at one time, on a later redistricting, I met with Governor Evans and he said, "We want to split your district right down here," pointing to a line he had drawn. I said, "You can't. I won't go for that." And he said, "What do you go for?" I said, "You move that line over so the county seat of Grays Harbor County votes with the city of Aberdeen. I just can't see splitting that county up like that."

He said, "Well, if that's all you want," and he just moved it over. Those were behind-the-scenes negotiations. They had to be. When you pleased one, you displeased another.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well, now who were your opponents in this rewrite of the initiative? You described this as a compromise, that is redistricting, so the districts now reflected population, but you kept the boundaries of your district.

**Mr. Bailey:** They didn't truly represent population, because my senatorial district would be much less than one in Seattle.

**Ms. Bridgman:** So those in the large urban areas were the opponents?

**Mr. Bailey:** We usually had very few opponents and proponents. You had proponents, in this case the League of Women Voters. They had passed the initiative and defended it. We finally came to this compromise, which was the only thing that we could settle on which we could pass and get a two-thirds vote. It lasted only a few years until it was changed again. There really wasn't great opposition in the Legislature to the revision. You didn't have a clear-cut, party-line vote either.

Under Greive and those drawing lines that year, they had to be very careful that they didn't ruin a Republican district, make it Democratic, or take a Democratic district and make it Republican. That's very vital in redistricting, and so they had a real tough job.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You were involved in another political issue having not directly to do with the Senate. In February 1957, you were elected chairman of the Democratic Nine County League, which is the nine counties of the Third Congressional District of southwest Washington. The newspapers seemed very interested in your criticism when, a year later, attempt was made to establish a Third Congressional District Council of Democratic Clubs. The stated purpose was to endorse Democratic candidates before the primary, in order, as their president said, "to fill a gap." You were quoted in newspaper articles as saying this was machine politics, and that you were concerned that this organization had plans of taking over the party. Can you please explain the issues involved here and the outcome?

**Mr. Bailey:** Back in the 1930s the Democrats of southwest Washington didn't feel that they were being represented in the governor's mansion–Governor Martin at that time. They didn't feel that they were being represented properly, and so they organized the Third Congressional District into what they called the Nine County League. In that league each one of the nine counties, their chairman, vice chairman, state committeeman, state committeewoman and treasurer and secretary were all members.

They met frequently and made recommendations for political appointments and became quite effective. This went on for many, many years, and it became one of the few congressional leagues in the state that were operating. It was never intended to supersede or take over a county committee's work, but it was to show cooperation and unity.

This particular year we were developing a little split. In the past, when someone got to be chairman they would use it as a stepping stone to run for Congress. I had no such intentions. Some people enlisted a man by the name of Al Green, from California. He had been an organizer in California, kind of a pro-labor organizer–a troublemaker. When he did organize something there was always a battle. The people with Green wanted to take over and push the Nine County League off to the side and establish the Association of Democratic Clubs, using our league as the base and thus avoiding a lot of work.

They would organize clubs throughout the district and would also hire a full-time, high-paid director who would practically take over patronage and everything, bypassing the elected county representatives and everyone. There were quite a few supporters in Olympia, mostly Rosellini appointees in the Department of Labor and Industries. We could not make pre-primary endorsements, which they planned to do. They started pushing and I started fighting, and I got the governor involved because I was pretty sure that Rosellini had invited Green up to organize a real aggressive club–override county committees and give pre-primary election endorsements. The governor denied knowing anything. "All I know is what I read in the paper." I happen to know that he had had the man in his office

know that he had had the man in his office three or four times and discussions had been held.

I was amazed at the people that came to my support. They considered it was a bunch of California people coming to introduce California-style politics to Washington. We fought and they finally just quit and their man went back to California. That was the last we saw of him.

We later rewrote our league constitution, and we enlarged the Nine County League so that the Democratic Women's Clubs and the Young Democrats had representatives. Generally speaking, we widened the membership quite a bit.

I remember one night, Chet King, my House colleague who had never been a real buddy to me, stood up and said, "You're starting to pick on my buddy by golly–" and came to my defense. He really lit into them. Finally, we started gathering strength and they didn't have much but a lot of loud voices.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How much did you discuss this with Rosellini personally?

**Mr. Bailey:** I didn't. I challenged him in the press, and that's where he was very sensitive. He didn't like that very well. He made a commitment to me that he was not involved, but whenever he started getting into hot water he always started backtracking. Al did not like this type of fight where he would make enemies. I think that he just saw this as an opportunity for a real aggressive election committee and went for it, not realizing it would create a fight.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Then the Third Congressional District Council of Democratic Clubs just ceased to exist?

**Mr. Bailey:** No. It never did exist, really. The Nine County League still exists, but has had to change the name when the district took more counties. I think they call it the Third Congressional District League, or something like that.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What kind of long-term effects would it have had for the Democratic Party in Washington State had it succeeded?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, it probably wouldn't have–if they'd made a go of it here they would have organized the same thing in the other districts, and it probably would have ceased to exist after the next election of Rosellini.

**Ms. Bridgman:** And can you describe then what might have happened to the county Democratic organization?

**Mr. Bailey:** The law sets up the county and state organizations. There's no way around it. These clubs would just have been an additional organization and their duties being done by people other than those elected to do so.

[End of Tape 14, Side 2]

## DEMOCRATIC PARTY POLITICS: EARLY 1960s

**Ms. Bridgman:** We were talking about the attempted takeover of the Nine County League by California organizers. You mentioned Earl Coe and Chet King as your supporters. Who else agreed with you and helped you?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I can recall that Senator Talley of Kelso was a supporter, and I think all of my Senate colleagues from the nine-county area were supportive as well. Every House member in our area that I can recall was on my side, as were most of the officials of the county committees. As I said before, I think that Governor Rosellini may have been the indirect source of organizing support for himself, not realizing it would have opposition and create an argument.

Earl Coe carried my county in the primary, but Rosellini was nominated and most of us then went over to support him for governor.

There were a few people though, in the county committee, who actually had gone far beyond what Earl Coe would approve. They refused to support Rosellini, using bigoted racial and religious slurs. It developed into a big fight in our county. Looking back on it, it is probable that was happening in many of the county central committees over the state, and it would seem logical that Rosellini would look toward organizing clubs that would support him in order to get around the central committee organizations, which at that time had not been too supportive but later they came along to his support in very fine shape.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What kind of leagues were there around the state in addition to the Nine County League?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think the Nine County League was probably for many, many years the only congressional district league in the state that was active. I know of many organizations and associations in Seattle and they probably did the same work and represented several districts, legislative and congressional, but I think our league was the only one, at least for many years.

**Ms. Bridgman:** So, when you said this was replicated in other areas of the state how directly analogous would it be if there weren't other comparable organizations?

**Mr. Bailey:** My theory on the so-called Democratic Clubs Association, or whatever they called it, would be that if it worked at all it would be easier first to take over in southwest Washington where the Nine County League organization was already in existence. If it worked there, they probably would try to do the same thing in the other counties of the state.

When I said the situation in our area was similar to other parts of the state, I meant the situation was of some of the county committees supporting Earl Coe in the primaries and some not supportive of Rosellini in the general. They came around later.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What kinds of plans did you, and those who agreed with you, make to defeat the rebels, as you called them? And when did you make them and how did you make them?

**Mr. Bailey:** I guess I was a key figure on fighting those that were not helping our candidate, but also against the new club as proposed. I do recall a couple of meetings where Senator Bob Charette from Aberdeen and Representative Chet King and I had meetings prior to a Nine County League meeting where we were going to do battle. We had no set plan, and I think that when the new organization was finally aired that it just didn't go over. It was not a tremendous, dramatic defeat, it just didn't go over that big, and slowly disappeared.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Looking back now, do you think they would have succeeded had you and others not made these plans and opposed them?

**Mr. Bailey:** That's difficult to say. They would have had to win over all of the county central committees. I don't think that those central committee chairmen of the nine counties or other officers were about to turn over their control to somebody else. It was probably much ado about nothing, but it made a big splash.

Ultimately, if Rosellini had any part in it, he may have thought again about making an enemy of all these people already in party positions, and probably would have lost his enthusiasm.

Some of the governor's supporters were not really steamed up. They were more for the status quo. We never found any evidence that it was Rosellini supporters against others, but we did think we did. We knew that there had been consultations and encouragement

from the governor's office. We were all pro-Rosellini at that time, so it was not for or against the governor.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Which of Rosellini's close supporters do you believe were not enthusiastic?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I couldn't tell you that. I don't know. I think by that time that most of the Democratic county committees were for Rosellini. The election was over and he was governor. After that it didn't take very long to heal some of the primary squabbles.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I think I didn't make myself clear. I meant which of his supporters were, shall we say, reluctant about the California organizers attempt to–

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't remember any division like that at all. The governor never acknowledged his support, and while some of his supporters were leaders in the movement, we never could really pin it on him and make that the issue.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I see. In May of 1957, you and your wife attended the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington D.C., designated by Governor Rosellini as his delegate. Will you please describe that experience and its significance?

**Mr. Bailey:** The Rivers and Harbors group holds what they call their congress in Washington every year. They are really the "Good Roads Association" of the nation when it came to things like dredging and improvements of rivers and harbors. My interest at that time was to go see what could be done, if anything, in stabilizing the mouth of the Willapa Bay around North Cove and Tokeland.

Senator Al Henry also had an interest up the Columbia River, and we both prepared statements. The governor could not attend, so he designated Al and I to represent him. We went back there and we did visit several congressmen and several senators. This was in 1957.

Our congressman, Russell Mack, and the two senators, Jackson and Magnuson, were quite supportive and showed us around, but it developed that you couldn't get a resolution considered by the Rivers and Harbors Congress unless it had been cleared through about fifteen committees, which acted only if the results of studies showed a satisfactory cost-benefit ratio.

As I recall it, we left our resolutions unread, but in written form, somewhere back there, and made not a bit of headway. At any rate we did learn a great deal about the national bureaucracy and that you might as well butt your head against a concrete wall.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Let's move on now to the 1959 Legislative Session where the Democrats had a greater majority, sixty-six in the House to the Republican thirty-three, and the Senate Democrats thirty-five to the Republicans fourteen. There is much less material retained in your scrapbooks about this session. Can you please characterize it?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, historians that waste their time reading this will probably question my knowledge of it. I cannot really recall big issues at the time. When we left the session in 1957, it was Rosellini's first legislative session while governor. We contended that the budget was out of balance, there was no doubt about that, but he contended that he did not want to raise taxes until he conducted a survey to see how it should be done, and how much actually had to be raised. He did not call a special session in 1957, and we left knowing we had a big deficit.

When we got back in 1959 we faced a considerable deficit, but not as bad as the one under Langlie in 1951. A good portion of that session was spent trying to balance the budget, and with Rosellini's new figures (because he had been governor for two years and now had a fair grasp on the departments and their operations).

It was a hard-working session, and we went into overtime in that session. I also remember that a lot of it was done in conference committees because raising taxes is not something that just comes easy, and the conference committees did a lot of the work.

I also remember our leadership, especially Senator Bargreen, who was our caucus chairman and was also chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. There was some doubt in our minds as to how much control he had over his budget because it did not have smooth sailing on the floor. Some of us in caucus were very critical of him. And I can't remember what he said that caused me to question him one time in caucus, but it resulted in a couple of senators, Fred Dore, (now Justice Dore) and Senator Jack Petrich (also now a judge) coming to me and saying, "We want you to run for caucus chairman next year." I had never thought of such a thing, but before long they had six or seven people lined up and ultimately I ran for caucus chairman and was elected in the 1961 session.

It seemed like Senator Bargreen and some of the old-timers went ahead with our business without consulting some of the rest of us at times, and this created the slight rift, and we ultimately took over.

Senator Greive was the majority floor leader. And he won that year again by one vote.

In our 1961 caucus, as I recall, Senator Andy Hess got seven votes, Senator Bargreen, the incumbent, got

four, and I received more than half. Bargreen was a good senator and it was just the mood of the new class of 1956, added by several more in 1958, that brought change.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you please tell us about your part in getting "Washington My Home" designated as our state song.

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, that is one of the things that sometimes is hard to explain. It's a good song. It's easy to laugh at, but if you have ever heard it I think you would agree that it was an excellent song.

Anyway, a lady by the name of Mrs. Helen Davis at South Bend, a prominent Republican, had written "Washington My Home" for the state Federation of Women's Clubs. They had adopted it and used it from time to time. Mrs. Davis prevailed on a Republican representative, Joe Chytil, who owned station KELA in Centralia-Chehalis and station KAPA, Raymond-South Bend, to run it every morning in opening up their programs. Someone suggested that she should make this the state song. She didn't come to me because I was a Democrat. She went to Joe Chytil.

Chytil came to me and said, "Bob, I've got this song and I think it is worth making our state song, but I haven't got a chance of a snowball in hell of getting a bill passed in the Democratic House." He said, "Would you sponsor it in the Democratic Senate first, and then I'll pick it up in the House?"

I had heard the song and I liked it and decided to sponsor it. It was a challenge to me because here was a Republican lady I had known personally for a long time. Our families were close friends. I had her boys in my Scout troops. Politically we were about as far apart as any two could be, but Helen was one of those people you couldn't keep down and really deserved recognition.

Mrs. Davis told my former boss, who was chairman of the county Republican committee, "Bob's going to introduce the bill in the Legislature." He later told me, jokingly, "I told her, 'Well, I'll tell you, Helen, don't get upset because it's going to end up in Dikes, Drainage and Ditches Committee and you'll never hear from it again.'"

I thought this was really kind of a challenge–somebody just doesn't think that this is going to move, so I'm just going to prove it can. I got it referred to the State Government Committee. We got it out of State Government Committee with a few amendments and the committee report of "do pass" read on the floor of the Senate on Washington's Birthday, February 22nd. Galleries packed for the holiday.

Ward Bowden, our secretary, tipped me off that, "It's never been done that I know of, but we can bring outside people onto the floor of the Senate if we want to." He told me when the report of the committee was read to get up and move the Senate into a committee of the whole to receive further "testimony." We had the piano in the wings and two vocalists.

As I got up I heard Senator Fred Martin behind me say, "Bob, why are you wasting our time for a thing like this." Anyway, I made the motion and no one was paying too much attention. The "testimony" was a vocal duet with a piano accompanist and it was a beautiful rendition. I got up and moved that the bill be advanced to second reading, and read in full and it passed unanimously.

It went over to the House with so much momentum that the House passed it shortly afterwards. It was kind of unbelievable. I never regretted doing it, but we did have a lot of trouble with "Washington My Home" because I then got one thousand dollars put into the tourism department so the state could use it as a revolving fund to print music to send out to high schools and others. The World's Fair in Seattle was on the next year, and Mrs. Davis was trying to get copies so that the high-school bands could play it.

There were two people in Seattle that had written songs for the World's Fair and wanted their own song named the official fair song. When Mrs. Davis arranged for a high-school chorus to sing the state song, they were not allowed to do so. The governor had given orders that the official song was not to be allowed on the fairgrounds. And it developed that they were trying to avoid a selection of the official *fair* song and the official *state* song suffered by misunderstanding.

Anyway, for years she was pushed aside. The state money disappeared to some other person's song. Someone got the money, but not Mrs. Davis, who only wanted copies to distribute. She continued promoting the song by mimeographing and xeroxing her own music and sending it out to people at her own expense. She persisted in many ways and finally rose above the fray a few years ago when a Seattle TV man started the campaign for "Louie, Louie" as state song. She got enough attention and is riding fairly high now.

The only regret I have about this thing is not the song, which is a good one, but that the state withheld and refused to let it go ahead. It would have been very popular if it had been used.

The Davises signed over all rights to the state. They didn't do that with that new second state song by Woody Guthrie, as whatever he makes is his.

The Department of Commerce and Economic Development wouldn't even let people copy the music most of the time. Mrs. Davis had to do it herself. It

was a terrible showing of how stubborn bureaucrats can do anything that they feel like. She finally prevailed and seems to have crowded her adversaries out.

[End of Tape 15, Side 1]

**Ms. Bridgman:** In April 1960, Julia Butler Hansen announced her candidacy for the Congress from the Third Congressional District for what was the seat of Russell Mack who had suddenly died. John Riley also announced, and Charles Savage, later. Will you please recall her reasons for deciding to run, and also her opponents' reasons?

**Mr. Bailey:** Julia had long been mentioned as one of the hot prospects for the congressional seat and she decided to run two years before, but then withdrew, probably realizing that Mack was very firmly entrenched.

Julia didn't have very much financially. She was probably secure in property and things like that, but really was working pretty hard to make a living. She managed a title office in Cathlamet between sessions and had quite a little business. She operated the business under the name of George Hanigan, who had been a friend of hers and had passed away. His son had inherited the business and was attending law school. Julia was able to keep the title business going while George Hanigan Jr. was in law school. While she was not destitute or anything like that, she was not rich and couldn't afford to spend a lot of money in campaigning.

Julia backed out of the race at that time and when Mack died, she announced that she was a candidate. She hesitated for awhile, and we all wondered whether she'd really do it. John Riley, an assistant attorney general, also decided to file and his decision was largely a personal one, not one of big differences in philosophy. Julia had a pretty well-established legislative background and Riley did not. Charlie Savage had been in Congress and had been defeated and chose to run again.

The Riley forces got a little head start because Julia had been hesitant. They were whooping it up with quite a few enthusiastic younger people, many of the same people as those backing the Washington Coalition of Democratic Clubs, which earlier tried to take over the Nine County League.

When Julia decided to file she planned to name Senator Don Talley of Kelso her campaign chairman. Unfortunately Don had a severe stroke and we didn't think he was going to live.

I was at South Bend when Julia came down to speak at the Nine County League meeting. Julia hadn't arrived yet, but some of those supporting John Riley started denouncing Julia for having accepted money two years before and then not running, then not returning it.

I just happened to know she had written checks and returned the money to those people. But her accusers left the insinuations dangling in front of everyone. I jumped up to her defense. Her husband was sitting in the audience and when it was all over, he reported it to Julia who asked me if I would serve as chairman of her campaign committee. I decided to do it knowing it wasn't going to take a lot of time because Julia was a person who ran her own campaign.

She needed somebody to speak for her once in awhile when she couldn't make it, or other small campaign chores. When Julia was running for Congress the first time she was everywhere. I didn't have to get out much and I didn't have the money nor couldn't leave my job enough to run all over southwest Washington.

That's the way I got involved in her campaign then, and all those that came later.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Who had helped her make this decision this time?

**Mr. Bailey:** Julia made her own decisions–and I'm sure that she had a lot of people calling, members of the Legislature for instance. Senator Hallauer told me that he had called her and different people that had worked with Julia called her and asked, "Why don't you run? Here's your chance." Finally she decided to run and I think her hesitancy was due to the anticipated expense. In those days a lot of expense had to be borne by the candidate, and it was probably a hard decision for her to make. Once she was in it though, she gave all.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How big was her staff then?

**Mr. Bailey:** My recollection was she had a local girl traveling around with her and who helped her write letters. That would be her staff, if you can call it that. We were names on the letterheads, but we didn't go with her often. Most of us were doing other things. She had someone from every county on that letterhead, the purpose to show a district-wide support. Actually she went out and did her own campaigning.

Once in awhile she would call me and ask if I could represent her at some meeting. I used to think the worst thing I ever had to do was to stand up in front of a big crowd who came out to see Julia then say, "I am not Julia Butler Hansen, she can't be here tonight." I am sure they were awfully disappointed.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Some others involved were Sid Snyder and Chet King as the heads of the Pacific County campaign. How much were you, Sid, and Chet in-

volved in what was decided about running the campaign?

**Mr. Bailey:** Nothing. Julia ran her own campaign and each of us had worked with her enough in the Legislature. Sid had worked as an employee of the House for years, and we all knew enough about Julia that we knew where she stood on issues. Julia made her own decisions. No one spoke for her.

She came on in great fashion largely with a legislative and political reputation that gave her a big boost in the lower Columbia counties–Clark, Cowlitz, and Wahkiakum, and into Pacific, which was heavily Democratic. The *Longview Daily News* people were supporters of Julia.

One of my jobs was assembling a committee, and to get as many names of influential people from all parts of every county so that it looked like she really was a district-wide candidate.

My former boss, the chairman of our county Republican committee, told me, "I think you picked a good candidate. She came in to talk to me and I'm greatly impressed." Of course, he couldn't vote for a Democrat, but he was really impressed with her.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What were other campaign plans or strategies?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't recall any. It was a matter of getting out and getting to the people, getting your name out everywhere. No one candidate was well enough known to just sit there and get elected. Senator Elway of Hoquiam decided to run on the Republican ticket and Gene Neva, a Democrat representative from Aberdeen, also ran.

Most everyone was thinking that it's not going to go very good for Julia with all these native sons; Gene Neva and Harry Elway were probably going to pick up Grays Harbor County, and that will throw it into Olympia where they thought John Riley was strong. Dale Nordquist was from Lewis County.

I remember Jack Pyle of the *Tacoma News Tribune* asking me what I thought was going to happen, and I laid it out for him as I saw it, county by county. His story quoted "a good source" and what I predicted was going to happen, happened that way. She won rather handily.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I see. And as we all know she not only won the primary, but the general.

**Mr. Bailey:** She won two elections in November. She won the short, unexpired term for a month and the long term for the next two years. She had to be voted for twice. By doing that she took an oath of office thirty to forty-five days before the rest of those elected in 1960, and consequently, that seniority moved her up into chairmanship of a subcommittee on appropriations ahead of the others elected in 1960. Seniority back there meant everything, and that one month really gave her a boost in her future congressional career.

**Ms. Bridgman:** When the *Longview Daily News* endorsed her, the editor praised her independence and referred to her "turning her back" on party leaders during the Wallgren administration when they were wrong; and went on further to say that she turned her back on corruption. To what does this refer?

**Mr. Bailey:** It was before I met Julia. The first time I heard of Julia was when she had a terrific public disagreement with the Democratic state chairman. I cannot recall who it was, but it was under Mon Wallgren as governor. She called him to task and it was proven that she was right. I do not know the details.

It gave her quite an instant name recognition. She stood up to state officials and won. She came to the forefront in a hurry.

The other thing I do remember was that she was quite a hand to take over when the situation called for it. In 1949 the Memorial Day floods did great damage at an island out of Portland. Then the floods moved down river to Puget Island, opposite Cathlamet, and they enlisted people from all over southwest Washington to help sandbag Puget Island. I heard more than one person come home and say, "Boy I'll tell you that woman down there is a real boss, but she's getting things done."

Julia was working in the county engineer's office at the time and the engineer was gone so Julia just took over and did a remarkable job.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Now, in July 1960, Governor Rosellini asked you to meet with Charlie Hodde to learn facts so that Republicans wouldn't distort them. What were these facts?

**Mr. Bailey:** If I recall it right, Governor Rosellini was anxious that before we got into the heat of the campaign that we pick up some of the statements that the Republicans had made and try to bring the facts out that showed our side and make them available to our candidates–sort of a truth squad. It was a matter of trying to create answers to guide our candidates when they were running.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What were the precedents for meetings like this between a governor's aide or governor's staff members and people like you here in Washington?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know as there were any. It's something that any governor can do. Charlie was head of General Administration, and Charlie was always an expert on taxes and political things.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In 1960 you were running with notable people. Your own candidacy that year for the Senate again is rather eclipsed in the mementos you've kept. There is more about Julia Butler Hansen's candidacy than yours, but there are records of the radio ads, and the newspaper ads, and the cards that you distributed during this campaign.

In those, the campaign materials pertaining to education and school, you refer to "the population bulge," and how schools were going to have to be built and staffed and maintained from now on. You also refer to your stance against discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed and sex. So these are new statements, and as we all know, have become very important in our time.

Will you describe what your thinking was on the implications then, of the baby boom and about civil rights. That is then, in 1960?

**Mr. Bailey:** I never had any change in my thoughts on civil rights, ever. I had very few blacks in my district, and religion had never been an issue, although it was mentioned more as Kennedy was running for president. On women's rights I never ever changed my viewpoint.

I remember when Julia Butler Hansen was asked how she felt about some of those equal-rights bills. She said, "I don't need the damn things. I've got those rights now under the Constitution. Nobody can take them away from me. But you've got to fight hard for them."

I also remember one time when she was on the Highways Commission after she left Congress and had been elected chairman. She said, "I don't want anybody calling me a damned chair. I am not a piece of furniture. I'm the chairman of this commission." She had very practical viewpoints on these matters–why haggle over a word when you're losing the means to the end? Every time I hear the word "chair" I think of Julia.

At the same time she always supported women's rights and equal-rights legislation. Her district didn't have many blacks–in fact, very few, and it was not a big issue.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Maybe I didn't make it clear that I was here referring to your own campaign assertions. But, recognizing no difference in your opinion, why did you decide to include references to these things in 1960?

**Mr. Bailey:** Civil-rights matters were moving to the front. Somewhere in here Eisenhower ordered out federal enforcements in Little Rock, and Kennedy's campaign stirred the religion issue in 1960.

The baby boom was based on sheer figures coming out of the educational offices. The children of World War II veterans were coming of school age, in vast numbers. I think that maybe this was just a recognition of those figures where the schools were going to need a lot more money for building not just for running, but to build more buildings.

I do remember some efforts by conservatives against public housing and a few things like that. There were quite a few social programs then. Harry Truman had instigated some of them, and they sort of dropped by the wayside during the Eisenhower administration. They weren't eliminated–but they were not advanced.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I want to put in the record here the results of the general election. You were re-elected with a vote of 6,559 and your Republican opponent Elenora Hillis had 2,112. Of course, the other important election in 1960 was that of John F. Kennedy. What was your initial reaction to him as a candidate say in 1959, 1960 when it was first being talked about?

**Mr. Bailey:** I remember 1956 after the Democratic Convention, the national convention, and he was running for vice president and didn't make it. I went down to the barbershop and one of the town's leading citizens turned to me and said, "Bob, who the devil was that young guy with the rumpled hair that showed up running for vice president?" Of course it was John F. Kennedy, but that shows how little known he was at that time.

[End of Tape 15, Side 2]

**Ms. Bridgman:** We were speaking of John F. Kennedy's candidacy in 1960 and you were telling me about your feelings about him.

**Mr. Bailey:** I think there was no doubt about an enthusiastic response from the Democrats in our area. The battle wasn't here, it was back East.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You've kept much, much more in your scrapbook about this campaign than the other na-

tional campaigns which occurred during your political career. Why is that?

**Mr. Bailey:** Probably because he had more literature out than many of them. I hardly ever threw away political-campaign material. I have given an awful lot of the larger stuff to the state archives. Some of these things that were smaller fitted into the scrapbook, so I kept them.

**Ms. Bridgman:** That has to do with my next question. I was wondering how much the national Democratic organization sent to all of you out here in Washington.

**Mr. Bailey:** I would doubt if we received anything from the national Democratic organization. Maybe one form letter to all legislators or something like that. I think most of my literature came from Democratic headquarters in Grays Harbor County and in Pacific County where each candidate would be sure that there was adequate literature being around for people to pick up.

At the end of the campaign, we always had extra material left over to be thrown away. In Grays Harbor County we always took one or two tracts for each candidate, folded them in sample ballots, and mailed them out to every voter in the district.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You did attend a dinner when he visited Seattle, although you had to eat in a separate hotel. How closely did you see him?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, we saw Kennedy all right. We had no problem with that. But the Democratic committee sold too many tickets and this time there was quite a bit of enthusiasm. We went to Seattle to the Olympic Hotel and they were just overflowed. They didn't have enough seating capacity so we were sent across the street to Victor Rosellini's restaurant on University. We had a big banquet room there and we were able to watch on TV, but we did see Kennedy come into town and he was whisked away up into a suite of rooms that Senator Magnuson had set aside for him and he stayed there. I suppose he saw the state party officials and a few others. We did not get into the room when he was speaking. We had a good time and it was well-handled and we were very enthusiastic. There was quite a crowd in the streets.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What was your opinion of his ability to be a leader?

**Mr. Bailey:** He was our leader and not many of us questioned it. You don't really know until they take over what they are going to do. He was quite aggressive in the campaign, and I think very impressive. His youthful looks in some places might have been a detriment to him, but to an awful lot of people it was a good new fresh look. He was very well-received in the Northwest. Back East in some places it was a little bit different. He was a good candidate.

He gained a lot of stature, however, after his assassination. He had a great charisma, but he hadn't succeeded in passing one bit of major legislation in Congress as I recall it, and it was kind of tragic from that standpoint. He actually had not succeeded legislatively, and I think he was due for a terrible battle for re-election. I'm not too sure if he could have made it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How would you compare your support for him to that for Stevenson or Truman?

**Mr. Bailey:** We were dedicated to Truman because it was actually a re-election campaign. He was already president.

Stevenson was a candidate, and while he was an excellent candidate, I feel that in the back of our minds we probably knew that it was awfully hard to beat Eisenhower. I don't know if that enthusiasm ever got as high for Stevenson as for Kennedy. I doubt it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What do you remember about Kennedy's campaign promises?

**Mr. Bailey:** Not much. I think I was so busy with Julia's campaign, which as I say didn't take a great deal of time, but it took every minute that I did have. Bear in mind I was working all the time, too, every day, and was running for re-election myself. I couldn't have spent much time on Kennedy's campaign, although in Democratic meetings, of course, there was always somebody speaking for him.

None of us were ever fond of Richard Nixon, not in our family anyway.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What would you have said about the chances of success of Nixon and Kennedy after the TV debates?

**Mr. Bailey:** I remember the debates quite well. My recollection was that Kennedy was far on top at least the first time. I'm getting a little confused now. I didn't think the debate was that decisive that year.

Everyone had heard of Nixon because he'd been around for quite awhile and the debates really introduced Kennedy to the nation–that was the important element. In our home we never talked politics with our

little boy who was going to kindergarten. He came home one day and he said, "Dad, I voted for Kennedy."

I said, "You did?" And he said, "Yes, we voted for president, and I voted for Kennedy." And I said, "What was the vote?" He said, "Well, Kennedy won by one vote in the kindergarten," in South Bend.

But, he said, "You know, dad, I would have much rather voted for Nixon." And I said, "Well, why?" He said, "Because I like elephants a lot better than I like donkeys."

I've thought about that so many times. You know that kindergarten called that election almost on the button. Kennedy won by only a very few votes nationwide. Somehow or other he must have heard Lee and I talking about it because he voted for Kennedy, even though he didn't like the donkey.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The voice of the baby boom.

You've saved a brochure put out by the California Christian Citizens Association expressing doubt about Kennedy's ability to be a president because of his Catholicism. You've also saved the Democratic National Committee brochure, which is a series of reprints of numerous statements that Kennedy made about his religion, and how he would uphold the Constitution first of all, and that he was not, and would not respond to ecclesiastical pressure as a free man or an American. To what extent do you consider Kennedy's Catholicism an issue here in Washington?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think when he first started it was a big issue everywhere. It had been the big issue with Al Smith, but passage of years had tempered ideas like that considerably. Maybe the reason I saved those was because when I was in high school I started collecting derogatory statements about presidents of the United States, and I had quite a scrapbook on them–the terrible things people called some of our various presidents in their time.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I had never seen anything like them. How often were you questioned about his Catholicism by constituents or friends?

**Mr. Bailey:** I never recall it being in the campaign out here. You might have heard a few comments here and there, but not many. It never seemed to me like it was a burning issue out here.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You saved in your scrapbook a reprint from a *Life* magazine series in which various people were asked to comment on the national purpose. And this one is Kennedy's essay on that. How well do you remember this essay?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't.

**Ms. Bridgman:** It's very interesting because he refers to the pervasive feeling that national purpose is gone, and I'd like to summarize just a few things which he wrote, as they anticipate his inaugural.

He wrote that the sense of national purpose was gone because of our great prosperity, and because of lack of leadership. That we were in a valley of content, and we had become complacent and comfortable. His remedy is for us to climb out of that valley to the hilltop, and he emphasizes individual responsibility, and quotes Thomas Jefferson as saying the national purpose–when fully realized–is the "full tide of successful experiment." He–Kennedy that is–found it encouraging that we recognize that we were off track.

I've quoted all of this because earlier I asked you to describe the kind of national mood in the middle-1950s, and I'd like you now to comment on how accurate a portrayal these statements of Kennedy's seemed to be of the American mood in 1960.

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, that's probably far beyond me to say. In the Eisenhower years, the people had been through a terrible war, and that meant a terrible burden on the federal government and on the people as they worked toward victory. When they returned from the war, the soldiers and sailors, a lot of whom went to college, many of them went back to their business and jobs and established families. I think that people were generally tired of being pushed and legislated for, and wanted to be left alone.

After a slight recession we got into Korea and that picked up the military again as well as the economy. When people are prosperous they're not asking for lots of changes, so the Eisenhower years probably were a natural result of what people wanted. They didn't want all of this activity anymore.

Kennedy was a sharp contrast in looking to the future. Nixon had little vision. Kennedy's inaugural address was a masterpiece and hasn't been equaled yet. Maybe it ranks right along with Lincoln's Gettysburg Address for brevity and saying a lot.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Then it was a call to action. But you believe that it reflected a recognition on the part of the people in Kennedy's words that there was a desire for renewed national purpose?

**Mr. Bailey:** Kennedy and people like him could get the people to think that, because they needed an inspirational and charismatic leader. They needed somebody

to express those things that millions of people want expressed.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well, how much of this sort of thing did you see in Raymond and South Bend, or Olympia?

**Mr. Bailey:** During campaigns we were never in Olympia. We were in Raymond and at our local communities. I worked in Aberdeen during that time. Those were very Democratic districts, so if any Republican was shouting from the housetops, people put on their earmuffs and let them shout, and voted Democratic in the election. That's being facetious, but the point was that we weren't as apt to hear as much locally as we could read in a national magazine. TV wasn't as dominant as it is now where you pick up your news instantly and then get repercussions on both sides.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well, Julia Butler Hansen won and Kennedy won, and you won. And here in Washington State the Senate had a majority of Democrats of thirty-six to the Republicans thirteen, and Democrats lost strength in the House from a majority of sixty-six to thirty-three down to fifty-nine to forty.

Now it was in this session, that is the session of 1961, that you were chosen caucus chairman. The first record in your scrapbook of that is a letter from Fred Dore, written in August 1960, asking you if you were still interested in the caucus chairmanship. You've described the background of your interest, but I'm wondering how did you make your interest known?

**Mr. Bailey:** Senator Dore, as I recall it, was the first one that talked to me, as did Senator Petrich.

It had never entered my mind before, but when I decided to run for caucus chairman I then contacted every elected Democratic member of the Senate and asked if I could have their support. I got letters back from almost all of them; some had already promised their support to Senator Bargreen. I wrote to Senator Andy Hess who wrote me that he was going to run, too.

Some of them didn't answer, and I knew then, of course, that they probably were stumping for somebody else or playing games. The caucus chairman had control over the Committee on Committees that appoints members to their committees. And there were a lot of people afraid they'd go out for one person, and they might lose, and they might lose something they wanted for themselves. They played coy.

But when the vote came, I was pretty confident that I was going to make it. I felt many of those that didn't answer me voted for me, because the vote was quite evident that I had most of that support.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Some of the letters you kept are not only from Fred Dore, but from John Petrich.

**Mr. Bailey:** He's a judge in the state court of appeals now, in Tacoma.

**Ms. Bridgman:** And James Keefe–who were other prominent supporters?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I don't recall that I really sought them out as prominent supporters. I remember seeking Senator Gissberg, who was a prominent leader. I don't recall whether I ever got an answer back from him or not, but I got some nods of the head that almost indicated to me that he was with me. He'd served a long time with these other people, too, and it's pretty hard to come out and go against someone you sat in the Senate with for years. I just recall me going out and campaigning after what Senator Dore suggested. From then on I went out on my own and did most of it by myself.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You mentioned your opponent, Andy Hess, writing you a friendly letter. In that letter he said that he had made no political promises to anyone to gain support and that the group should decide. Later the two of you worked together to memorialize Congress to repeal Section 14 of Taft-Hartley. Obviously you were good colleagues. So, my question is, how different was your competition for caucus chairman than such competitions had been in the past?

**Mr. Bailey:** I did not run against Andy Hess. I had decided to run, and then Andy decided to run, too. He wrote me the letter, as I know that he had heard that I was going to run.

I just went out and contacted members, never mentioned Senator Bargreen nor Senator Hess, but just asked them if they could support me. And I got very good support.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well then now, how much would you think that this sentence in his letter refers to what you alluded to later, that newcomers were not getting a fair share?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I don't think it was a fair share of anything, but we weren't getting in on the decision making, you see. None of us had ever kicked about our appointments–even the newcomers became chairmen of committees. You couldn't do that in the House because there were too many members. But in the Senate–I think it wasn't we were not getting our fair share of things, it was the fact we thought some of the senior people were making all the decisions and then bringing

them in, and bringing them into us after the decision was made.

We were kept a little bit out of the picture, that was all. And then comes the time with everyone, when you're in so long people start thinking it's time to sweep up a little bit and change horses.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well, then that brings us to the competition in the caucus for Senate floor leader between Senators Bob Greive and Gissberg. Greive had opposed some of Rosellini's ideas, according to newspaper articles, and Gissberg had then come in and supported him. I'd like to know what you remember about the kinds of things that Greive opposed.

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't recall any specific issues. I know that Senator Greive was a very capable person, but he was rather erratic too. He would never cast a vote for or against anything unless he had it tied in with four or five other issues where he could promise somebody a little help on this one, if they'd help him on this one, and help the other thing on this one. It became doggone difficult to follow him. He was always weaving webs. He was a good legislator, and I'm not criticizing him at all, but he also ran his own show, sometimes strictly by himself. We never knew what he was doing half the time.

Senator Gissberg was just absolutely an outstanding senator and thought things out. He never jumped up and did anything strictly partisan, but he was a very good, substantial Democrat, but at the same time he used his head. He presented a real, sensible thinking case where Greive would jump up and rant and rave, actually put on a show without thinking. Greive did a good job as a Senate floor leader and was a master parliamentarian.

[End of Tape 16, Side 1]

**Mr. Bailey:** He did the things that we asked him to do, but we had to be sure that he knew what we wanted him to do. And that's where I came in as caucus chairman.

Senator Greive used to just rant and rave, and get upset about the fact that I would keep the fellows in caucus. "The Senate should have convened at eleven. The galleries are full and we're disappointing all these people in the galleries. They're here and we're not out there." I wouldn't sometimes let the caucus adjourn until we reached decisions. Greive never violated our decisions because the floor leader's job was to carry out the action of the caucus, but he would prefer that we not stay in caucus long enough to give him directions. He wanted a free hand.

The caucus was split on Bob, and at almost every election he only won by one or two votes. Senator Gissberg lost by just one vote. But, anyway, when it came to appointing the Committee on Committees, I sat there and I appointed three people from Greive's group and three people from Gissberg's group and put myself as the chairman.

I remember Senator Greive called me out and just read me up one side and down the other for not giving him control of that committee.

A little later Gissberg called me out and chastised me for not giving him control of the committee. So, I figured we had a pretty darn good committee, and we did a good job of getting the thing organized. There was no feuding in the party between Greive and Gissberg later. Gissberg was a superb senator and probably better off that he wasn't tied down with the nitty-gritty of having to work with the organization.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In that Committee on Committees the members you appointed were Greive, Gissberg, Fred Dore, John Cooney from Spokane, Martin Durkan from Issaquah, and Nat Washington of Ephrata. You've described Greive and Gissberg, and Dore perhaps a little less completely. Could you please describe John Cooney, Martin Durkan, Nat Washington and add something to your recollections of Dore?

**Mr. Bailey:** You see these were not the people necessarily supporting me. They were the people that didn't support Greive or did support Greive. My memory of it was that Nat Washington, Gissberg, and Durkan were on the Gissberg side. Senator Greive, Senator Cooney, and Senator Dore were with Greive.

I had pretty good control over the committee, and we didn't have any mixed battles at all. We tried to take care of everybody. I looked on my role as kind of a pacifier to keep unity in the caucus. It wouldn't be right to have Gissberg take over that committee having been defeated for floor leader. It wouldn't have been fair to Bob Greive, and it wouldn't have been fair to the caucus to let Greive take it over completely and wipe out the Gissberg people either. I remember that both of them were upset that they didn't control it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Martin Durkan was later in the papers a lot, and that sort of thing. What sort of man was he?

**Mr. Bailey:** I had known Senator Durkan in the House. He had been a clerk in the House for one of the committees. He was a very hard worker. He played hard and he worked hard. He was bright. Andy Hess was appointed to the Senate, Durkan was appointed to his

seat in the House and then later Durkan came to the Senate.

Martin Durkan was a very good member. He had a knack for getting along with the press. He could do things that anybody else would get criticized for and he eventually was chairman of Senate Ways and Means, which writes the state budget. He was always on top of issues. His chief clerk and his chief assistant was Mike Lowry, who later became a congressman. Mike was very capable, and they ran a very good show. I was supportive of him and surprised when Durkan didn't get elected or nominated for governor a few years later.

He was an aggressive leader in the Senate. He, too, aspired to one or other of the caucus jobs at one time. He withdrew and I think it was wise. He had much more influence in many ways and on many things by heading the Ways and Means Committee than he would have in those strictly partisan jobs. He was looking toward running for governor. He followed, I think, the right path to get the best support.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What sort of negotiator-compromiser was he?

**Mr. Bailey:** In 1961 the Democrats had both houses that year, and Durkan did not take over as chairman during that session. Later it seemed the House and the Senate always differed, and I think we always came out pretty good with Durkan. He was open to negotiation. The caucus would give him instructions, as to what they might or might not yield to on basic issues. Usually it was the amount of money, it wasn't the programs. Durkan was just as capable as anybody I've ever seen in the negotiations, even when we'd have a Republican House and a Democratic Senate. He was well above average in my viewpoint.

He later became more of a fiscal operator. That's a big job, writing budgets and keeping your hand on everything and at the same time trying to keep going in other fields. I think he did an excellent job. I've never heard any criticism of it, from either side, as far as ability went in handling things.

Bargreen was quite a hand to get up on the floor when they'd say, "Senator, will you tell us about this appropriation," and I always remember his answer was, "Senator, I'm glad you asked me that question," and then he'd start talking about something else and sit down, never having even answered the question. Largely this was because he didn't know the answer.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Then if Martin Durkan knew the answers, in contrast, how did he keep himself that well-informed?

**Mr. Bailey:** He had a good staff. And he worked hard. They didn't just go at it an hour a day. They worked all day and all night.

We were lucky with other Ways and Means chairmen before Durkan. Senator Hallauer was a very bright one. Senator Foley was capable, but he wasn't on long enough to form the opinion of the workings that you did with Durkan. He quit because of health problems.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Now one of the members of the patronage committee was Gordon Sandison. Correct me if I'm wrong, but he was later prominent on the Committee on Higher Education?

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes, Gordon Sandison was very interested in higher education as long as I can remember, even when in the House of Representatives.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Now what was his negotiation style then?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I don't remember his having too much of that. Every person as an individual has his own style. Gordy was on top of every problem as related to higher education. Later he served as chairman of the Western Interstate Group on Higher Education, a committee that has representatives of higher education from ten or eleven western states. Gordy was highly regarded, especially considering that he was not one of the professors himself. He was very well-respected in academia.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Can you tell me more about him?

**Mr. Bailey:** He was just a very amiable person and very cooperative to work with. He was one of my best supporters, and in fact later on I appointed him to handle the people we hired for our sessions. The Senate was rapidly beginning to hire people year-round, and Gordy took over that job and worked with the secretary of the Senate and did an admirable job as a supervisor of people and their problems, and he was always available. Gordon was an excellent senator. He retired when Dixy Lee Ray appointed him director of Fisheries in 1977.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I didn't know that.

**Mr. Bailey:** Not too long after I was appointed to the Utilities Commission and left the Senate, Gordon was elected caucus chairman to take my place. Shortly after that, Governor Ray reached over and took him out to Fisheries. He passed away in 1989.

**Ms. Bridgman:** House caucus issues for the 1961 session were publicized. John O'Brien and Leonard Sawyer and thirty-two younger members were at odds. According to newspaper articles again, Sawyer and his supporters felt that assignments were made for political reasons and not by majority wishes. What is your opinion about that?

**Mr. Bailey:** I probably laughed when I read it, because I don't remember when the House ever did anything different. That was one of the reasons I didn't like the House, because it didn't take into consideration the wishes of other people. A few people met and decided all these things. The Speaker, of course, named who the few people would be and how it was going to happen. I thought that was rather funny. I do think that the Democratic spirit in the Senate seemed to be to try to envelop even the new members, and make them a part. This carried over into the House to the point of where they were feeling rebellious.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Was this effect of the Senate method of operation on the House a recent thing? Had you seen this? How much had you seen this develop since you had first been in the House?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think it was recent, but I don't say that there wasn't a lot of influence. The Senate naturally had a more of an individual attitude, because there were only half as many members, and it wasn't logical that the House was going to be able to take everyone into their consideration on every issue. Not even in the Senate could we do that.

I don't know if that was the influence of the newcomers, but probably because John O'Brien had been Speaker three or four times, which is a long time for Speakers. Maybe John being there emphasized the fact that those in power on the front podium probably pushed the newer people like Len Sawyer into the back more decisively than if a change had taken place every two years, or more like that. The people that come from the House were always happier in the Senate where they did receive these personal attentions and were taken into consideration when decisions were made.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well, how much different would you say the House–or excuse me–the party organization was in 1960 than it had been when you first entered the House?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know. I never went to the House after I left there. I wouldn't know what went on in the House caucus.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In yet another newspaper article which reported that you would preside over the caucus decisions, they described you as being very quiet and methodical. How much do you agree with that description?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I wasn't a great hand for getting up and speaking on the floor every time somebody grunted or groaned. We had a lot of members that would look up into the galleries and if there happened to be someone there to impress they'd get up and speak on anything. Television was also a great hazard to us. When TV was coming in they'd have to turn on spotlights in those days in order to get the proper lighting, and we had senators, great senators, but they loved TV, and if it was just a motion to adjourn they'd stand up and start giving an oration as soon as they saw that red light come on the TV camera. TV did more to disrupt sessions than it ever did to help. Nowadays they take the pictures without any extra lights and you don't even know they are doing so.

I did enjoy presiding over the caucus and keeping law and order, more or less. It was the gang, and it was a great gang. It reminded me of my Boy Scout troop in some respects. The only thing is that in my Boy Scout troop when I'd tell them what to do, they'd do it. Here I'd have to go out and work them over once in awhile personally to see if we couldn't work out something.

We had a fairly united caucus most of the time. There were little things that I'd have to do like tell some senator he wasn't dressed properly for the floor, and go out and ask another one to not use the telephone because his bill was getting too high and things like that. They're kind of humorous now when I think about it. They were always cooperative, but it was always on the q.t., no outward display of problems.

If a member got into trouble with the press, usually I'd go talk to Cherberg, and we'd call the senator and have a personal conversation with him and ask him to change his ways just slightly or somehow ease the problem. There were the little humorous things that came up all the time, but overall I liked the job and I kept it for eighteen years. I don't recall ever having opposition. I was almost like the Scoutmaster to my troop of Democratic senators.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In 1961 because of the rules of the Senate, you chose membership in the Rules Committee instead of chairmanship of another committee. What's the significance of that choice?

**Mr. Bailey:** I really had not sought chairmanship of anything when I started running for chairman of the

caucus. Senator Dore came to me and said that as caucus chairman I should be on Rules.

I told him I had not thought about it but he said it was necessary. I thought it over and he was right because Rules Committee was where you made all of the decisions on what bills were going to go onto the floor, and you had great power in Rules Committee just as a member.

I went on Rules Committee and it was proven to be a smart decision, thanks to Senator Dore.

When I went on Rules, often when I'd make a motion on a bill it became a caucus problem. Our people would usually support me and they looked to me to do that on some caucus-policy matters. It became quite a custom in Rules that the lieutenant governor would preside and the Democratic Caucus leader would sit next to him on one side, and the Republican Caucus chairman on the other side. Maybe that's the way it always was, I don't know.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Oh. Well, thank you. Now about the issues of that 1961 session. You and Andy Hess introduced the bill to memorialize Congress to repeal section 14B of Taft-Hartley. That section allowed nonunion hiring in states with right-to-work laws. What was the result of that resolution?

**Mr. Bailey:** Taft-Hartley was a constant problem. The Congress never repealed it. But it was a big issue with labor for many sessions, for many years. I was a member of the Typographical Union and it was the wish of the labor people, and I agreed with them, so we were glad to do it. It was part of the Democratic platform, and we passed this continually, but it never ever seemed to go anyplace back East.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Now–the Astoria bridge. There had been joint meetings of the highways committees and departments of Washington and Oregon on the Astoria bridge. And you were quoted in an article as saying the next step was that you would meet again with an Oregon state representative. He would introduce the bill in the Oregon Legislature. The article quoted you saying the Astoria bridge was opposed by those who didn't want highway money used for toll projects.

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, in the first place, in the state of Washington every toll project that had ever been built was only after a study showed that it would pay for itself by the tolls imposed. The state Highways Department, after the Legislature authorized it, would issue revenue bonds against that bridge only, and would never touch the highway fund itself. The bonds would finance that.

Every study on the Astoria bridge showed that it would not pay for itself. If we had any bonds out at all they would have to be general-obligation bonds against the credit of the whole state. They would have to be paid for by highway fund moneys as they came in. This was something that had never been done before and the Good Roads Association people were not very enthused about that, and I didn't blame them. Run amuck, this type of finance could ruin the highway fund.

The other thing is that in the state of Washington a general-obligation bond can only be floated by a vote of all the people, and you can't imagine any way that we could ever get twenty-four million dollars in bonds floated by the whole state of Washington for a lower Columbia River bridge. Even Vancouver was opposing it because they thought it was going to cut down on the people traveling the Portland-to-Vancouver bridges. Longview wasn't extremely enthused about it although we received some support there, but they, too, had the bridge across the Columbia at Rainier, Oregon.

People would never go out to the polls from other corners of the state and vote for this bridge bonding. So we were stuck with this dilemma and until we could get a better traffic study that would show that it would pay for itself, there was no way the state of Washington could do this without working it out with Oregon.

Oregon had the right to float general-obligation bonds without the vote of the people. Over a period of time, I guess in the last hundred years, there had been more studies made of trying to bridge the lower Columbia than anything that I can imagine. There seemed no way to get that amount of money and pay for it.

Astoria was having real hard times. They were a dead end as far as the coastal highway went. The state of Oregon had a ferry running across to Megler-Point Ellis, Washington, and so they were losing something like two hundred to five hundred thousand dollars a year on that ferry. Pacific County, Washington, had built the terminal for the ferry and there were people going across, back and forth. There were quite a few tourists, but not anywhere near like a bridge would allow. To take a ferry you had to be there at a certain time and hope that you could find a space, and if the wind and waves were up they didn't even run.

Oregon was seeking a solution, too, and so there were countless studies. In the 1957 session, when it was over and I was first in the Senate, I went on Julia's Interim Highways Committee and I was appointed chairman of a special subcommittee on Columbia River bridges. We also got an appropriation in the highways bill for one hundred thousand dollars from us and matched by Oregon. They would study the feasibility again, and the design and the engineering of the proposed project.

[End of Tape 16, Side 2]

## STATE SENATOR: 1960s

**Ms. Bridgman:** Senator Bailey, will you please continue your explanation of the Astoria Bridge Project?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think I already stated that in 1957 the legislature of each state voted one hundred thousand dollars for engineering, design, and other studies necessary for preliminary work on the Astoria-Megler Bridge. By agreement, the state of Oregon undertook the engineering and design, and the state of Washington undertook a new traffic study to be made and brought up to date. It was felt that with each year, as time went on, the traffic would grow and improve and make the bridge more financially feasible.

When the report came out a year or more later we found out that, contrary to our belief that things would improve, the new report was going to be worse than the old one. As I mentioned before, we had to have revenue bonds in our state, which was the only practical way, and we had to have a study that showed the project was financially feasible and could be paid off with revenue bonds. So this report wasn't too happily received.

When I went to the Interim Highways Committee meeting, which was drawing up recommendations for the next session, I heard that one of the staff had already drawn up a negative report and was going to present it at the conclusion of the committee–killing the bridge project. It was preliminary because we hadn't yet received a written report from the firm hired to make the study. So I asked Mrs. Hansen if we could ignore the adverse report which had not been officially submitted, and substitute words that would say, "Since no report has been received by the committee at this time, it is the recommendation of the committee that the toll-bridge authority be authorized at such time as it is deemed feasible to negotiate and enter into a contract with Oregon for construction of the bridge." This just merely kept it on the affirmative side rather than on the negative side, and, of course, did very little except to keep the project alive.

We had many, many meetings with Oregon legislators and highway officials. Oregon had such a high investment in the ferries and was losing several hundred thousand dollars a year on them. I proposed at one stage that Oregon pick up seventy-five percent of the deficit, and Washington pick up twenty-five percent. Those were just figures out of mind. The *Portland Oregonian* wrote an editorial condemning such an unsound suggestion on my part. It is interesting to note that when it was all over, Washington ended up more like forty percent against sixty percent, so actually it was in this compromise area.

The area of Astoria was a metropolitan area. Our area on the north end of the bridge was scattered, and really wasn't one community, but we decided to introduce a bill in the Legislature. I drew up one that would split the cost fifty-fifty, that Oregon would build the bridge and we'd split the cost of any deficit. This was to get the bill in on time.

Time for passing bills was getting short, so I went down to Astoria on a Sunday to meet with two key Oregon legislators, Representative Bill Holmstrom and Senator Dan Thiel. We went up into a hotel room at the John Jacob Astor, and quite by happenstance took the editor, Fred Andrus, of the *Astoria Budget* with us as well as the manager of the Port of Astoria, Dick Bettendorf. We decided while we were up there that we would not leave the room until we reached an agreement. Each state had to have an almost identical bill or it wasn't going to work. It was a terribly stormy day and a rough ride on the ferry, and my wife and son were stuck in Astoria waiting for us. I don't know how many hours we were in that room, but we finally came out with the bill. I returned to Olympia and the committee adopted the agreements in what was Substitute Senate Bill 431, by the Committee on Highways, and which subsequently passed the Senate.

**Ms. Bridgman:** And this what year?

**Mr. Bailey:** 1961. The bridge bill finally passed the Senate by forty to three. It was opposed by the Highway Department because they did not like to enter into any agreement to use highway funds for a toll project. Every toll project in our state had always been able to pay for itself.

The state of Oregon would pay the first one hundred thousand dollars of any deficit. After that we would share the deficit fifty-fifty, but the state of Washington would never pay more than two hundred thousand dollars a year, no matter how high the deficit got. My county, Pacific, came in and volunteered to build the approach from the north side. That cost one hundred eighty-five thousand dollars. Our county commissioners wanted the bridge so bad that they offered to pay up to forty thousand dollars a year of the two-hundred-thousand-dollars subsidy of the state.

Those two offers ended up in the bill as passed by the Legislature. In the House it passed sixty-seven to twenty-two. Oregon followed suit and started on their bond issue. The bridge was started and opened in 1966.

We had a big celebration one night. I was working at the *Aberdeen World* and I was invited to Astoria. Holmstrom and Thiel were coming home from the Oregon Legislature, and Lee and I went down and waited for them. They had a big downtown parade for all of us and a big banquet followed. We stayed so late we missed the last ferry, and I had to drive up to Longview and Kelso to return home. It was a long trip. I think I got home about fifteen minutes before I had to leave for work. It showed me that I was glad a bridge was going to be built and replace the ferry.

When the bridge was opened the Long Beach Peninsula threw a big wing-ding and reserved motel rooms for every state legislator and held dinners and activities in the Long Beach area. It was quite an event.

As it stands now, the bridge is paying for itself and the deficits were not very big. It turned out to have a much higher traffic count than expected.

About six years later I got an amendment onto a highways bill that got Pacific County out of paying any part of the deficit. The county never paid anything on the deficit, but did build the approach.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Now what kind of repercussions were there with the Highways Department?

**Mr. Bailey:** The Highways Department actually went over to the House and started working against the bill. When I heard this I called Governor Rosellini. Al said, "Well, I can't regulate what they're doing." And I said, "But you appointed Mr. Bugge. I think that you made a promise in the campaign that you were going to support the bridge. If you're not going to keep your promise, let me know and we'll take care of it down here in our county."

He said, "Call me back." Mr. Bugge, the director, may not remember this–but I do. A short time later Mr. Bugge called me and said, "I understand I have a problem with you on the Astoria bridge bill." I told him he would have no problem with me if he would lay off. He told me he was not even going to go to any House committee meetings thereafter, until the bridge bill was dealt with. Bill Bugge was not against the bridge, but was against what the Good Roads people thought was a horrible example, and that was to put out highways money into a toll project that wasn't paying its way. Bill was really one of the best highway administrators we ever had. It was a disagreement over principle.

Another interesting thing was that Dan Evans went to the beach area in my county in preparing to run for governor and told them he was much in favor of the bridge. He was also one of the most ardent supporters of the stand of the Good Roads Association in opposing this type of financing.

It was Sid Snyder and maybe others who visited Dan Evans and told him that if he wanted any votes on the Peninsula he'd better support the bridge. He got up on the floor and went into a diatribe against the bridge and the way it was being financed, and then turned around and voted for it. We thought that was really funny, but we did get the support of both Evans and Rosellini, and, of course, Evans was right up at the forefront clipping the ribbon when it was opened, with Oregon Governor Mark Hatfield.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well, did this then set any precedent for that kind of spending afterwards?

**Mr. Bailey:** No, because it was so tightly bound by limitations the committee had put in the bill. And it was so tightly bound by interstate agreement that it didn't set a precedent.

I always remember Senator Gallagher from Seattle. He and others were off the floor when my bridge bill came up and they had to be rounded up. I knew that Senator Bill Raugust, a Republican, was opposed to it, but he disappeared. I sent someone up to bring those twelve characters, supporters, to the floor. I needed them. The bridge bill passed thirty-seven to three.

Since Senator Raugust was off the floor when we voted and had returned, I decided to ask for a reconsideration and vote again. Many thought I was crazy, but it wasn't so crazy because you can only reconsider a bill once, and that bill could have been held up two or three days otherwise. When Senator Raugust came on the floor and I mentioned to the Senate "that Senator Raugust, I know, is fundamentally opposed to this type of financing and I'd like to give him the chance to vote." When it came out, finally, it was forty to three.

Later we were denounced in the Good Roads Association meeting in Port Angeles that year for this type of financing, but I found out later that Senator Raugust slipped a little mickey into a bill where he got a toll bridge in eastern Washington with a guarantee out of the highway fund, even though smaller than the Astoria commitment. He did the same thing that he was opposed to in my bill.

I will always remember when Senator Mike Gallagher came down to the opening of the bridge and took one look at it and he said, "My God! Bob Bailey's little bridge?" I think many of those in Seattle and other far-flung corners thought I was getting a bridge across some little river somewhere. I consider it one of my big

pieces of legislation in my years in the Legislature. And it's a nice, beautiful bridge.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you explain to me then this kind of financing? Weren't the Evergreen Point Floating Bridge and the Hood Canal Bridge also toll bridges?

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes, but the traffic studies they made before they built those bridges showed that the tolls would pay for them. In some states they have one toll-bridge authority that covers all toll bridges, so a toll stays on even after the bridge is paid for and helps pay for other toll bridges. In this state, once a project is paid for the tolls come off. Each toll project stands on its own.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well then, to continue with the 1961 Legislative Session, you and Senator Ed Riley introduced a bill to bar the importation of strikebreakers during, and prior to, strikes. It was referred to the Labor and Industrial Insurance Committee, and then passed the Senate and later passed both houses and Rosellini signed it. Would you describe the process of getting that passed?

**Mr. Bailey:** In the first place some labor unions were having trouble with people being brought in from the South, nonunion areas, to break strikes. This bill was deemed by labor as one way to limit that type of strikebreaking.

The funny part about it was that Ed Riley had never sponsored or done anything with a labor bill in his life. He came to me and he said, "Bob, you know, I'm having trouble with labor people and I'm not against labor. If you find a good labor bill for me to go onto, I'd like to go on one with you."

This bill just hadn't been introduced yet, but it had stirred up hackles all over the state. The farmers were mad and everyone in industry was upset when it was mentioned, and so they worked out a compromise, which was quite acceptable and which Ed and I were to introduce.

On this Friday, before I left for home, I got the bill and I took it up to Ed who signed it. We put it in the hopper and when we got home the phone started to ring. Riley called me and asked what in the world I got him into. I later wondered if those union people didn't do it on purpose, but they had grabbed the wrong bill, the original bill that even some of the labor people weren't in favor of. By the time we got back to Olympia we also had labor calls telling us we'd got the wrong bill introduced and it wasn't the one that they'd worked out at all.

In the meantime, every farmer in eastern Washington had called their senators, and their senators had called Riley, asking, "What are you doing on this bill, Ed?" He swore he'd never go on a bill with me again, but when we finally got it ironed out he thought it was the funniest experience that had ever happened to him.

We got it out of committee and through the Senate, and later through the House in fairly good shape. There was quite a bit of opposition, but it was a sensible bill. It was the idea to settle our own labor problems and not go to another state to bring in strikebreakers.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Who opposed it in addition to the farmers you mentioned?

**Mr. Bailey:** Any conservative person who was against unions and a closed shop would oppose it. As I recall it, the first bill was so stringent it would have affected farm labor brought in from outside the state, not necessarily unionized.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The typographical unions–both the Seattle chapter and the International Union–wrote you letters of gratitude. The Seattle chapter promised to help you financially in the next election. That's the first letter which you preserved that makes that kind of promise in things for something that you have done specifically. What other financial gratitude did you receive?

**Mr. Bailey:** I didn't receive any actual financial gratitude. I might have got a letter, but I didn't get any money. I don't even recall that part of it. I think it was done with perfect honesty. This was done after the bill was passed and it would be lacking in good judgment to say or write those things before passage, and I never even thought about it. I do know one thing, I never ever received anything from the Typographical Union. They were just very pleased. The letter was something that I saved along with other letters of thanks from many people and groups on many bills.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Exactly right. They also mentioned the praise of the *Seattle Times* for the bill.

**Mr. Bailey:** It wasn't entirely just union people who supported it. It just made good sense in labor negotiations. I don't know if it's still effective or not.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In that session, also, retirement for state employees was increased. And a newspaper article referred to you as the person who got the House bill going when your own bill was in trouble. Can you explain that statement?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't really recall that, except that over a period of years Lloyd Baker, the head of Retirement

Systems, and Mark Winant before him, used to give me the bills that they wanted to improve the system. I would get one or two other sponsors and usually put the bills in for them. They were usually very well-written. They tried to improve the system each year, and so I usually was in the middle of those issues for their department. They did all of the work in getting the bills passed.

This year they were probably having problems over in the House and apparently couldn't get the bill moving, so Lloyd or someone decided that we would move the bill in the Senate, and we did. I can't remember the improvements made in it, but each session there were changes made that improved or made the retirement system better.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I think I should restate my question. The article I was quoting stated that you got the House bill going when it was in trouble, when your own bill was in trouble in the Senate.

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't recall the details at all, but if a bill was having trouble and you really wanted to get it going, you would go over and talk to your friends in the House and very likely they might have a committee more acceptable to move it along. It worked both ways. One time one would come to our side, and one time to the other. It depended. It was a mechanical and timely decision as to which bill should move first, and you want to get it moving early enough so that it's through one house so that the other has time to consider it. The later it goes through the first house, the harder it is to get through the other. And you usually take the shortest route–the one already passed by one house. Usually, the agencies have sponsored similar bills in each house.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Of course. What kind of scrutiny did these bills written by members of agencies and supported by them receive in either the House or the Senate?

**Mr. Bailey:** Scrutiny was the name of the game. Every word in a bill was reviewed in committee. It didn't make a difference who submitted it, it was reviewed and some things are stricken out, some things are added. My Astoria-bridge bill had several things added that never occurred to us, and I imagine there were things that were taken out at the same time.

Most every bill had thorough scrutiny and, of course, if it came by departmental request, they would come over and it would be their job to talk to every member and tell them what they were trying to do. Not only that, but they would give testimony in front of the whole committee, too, and be questioned on every point.

It was to their advantage to do their own lobbying for their own bills, and on a departmental bill the sponsor usually didn't lobby for it. It was the job of the department to do so. You don't have time.

**Ms. Bridgman:** There was a nineteen-day special session in 1961. The House failed to pass a referendum on income tax, and at the end of the special session the Senate passed a resolution commending Governor Rosellini for "sending down his staff and helping them resolve the existing difficulties." That's a quote. How did that come about?

**Mr. Bailey:** That was at the very end of the session?

**Ms. Bridgman:** Yes. Yes, and the commendation was the resolution commending him, specifically mentioning his generosity or farsightedness.

[End of Tape 17, Side 1]

**Mr. Bailey:** Taking that question about why the governor's commendation came at the end of the session, it reminded me of a real interesting story, but probably not to anyone else.

The Senate is faced with the usual deluge of resolutions presented by different people as the session comes to a close. Some of them are for studies during the interim and things like that, but the Republicans introduced a resolution condemning Rosellini.

The clerk was reading one resolution right after another. Somebody would move the adoption of the resolution. The chair always seconds the motions and asks, "All those in favor say 'aye.'" When it came to this anti-Rosellini resolution introduced by the Republican Caucus and they were about halfway through reading it, Bob Greive looked at me and I looked at him and he said, "Oh, let's not make any fuss about it," and we let the resolution go through.

Governor Al was mad. He was so mad at us he demanded that the resolution be withdrawn, the record be expunged, that it be wiped off the record. He would settle for nothing less. It was time to quit and for the Legislature to go home. He said he would call us back to special session if he had to.

The Republicans wouldn't yield an inch and even our Democrats agreed that "expunging the record" would be a bad precedent even if it could be done. Stub Nelson from the *Seattle P-I* who was close to Rosellini came to me and said, "Bob, I've got Al willing to talk to you people and tell you what he wants." Stub himself told the governor that it would be a foolish practice to

try to erase the record and would be a bad precedent to do so. I agreed with him. I said, "I was not going to go along with erasing the record." Greive felt the same way.

Bob Greive and I and Stub Nelson went down to see the governor in his office. He was just plain mad, and of course, it was a little careless on our part to let the resolution go through. The Republicans were adamant they would not let the record be rewritten and both Greive and I held out that it was a very poor practice. Senator Gallagher was with us, too, because he was a very good friend of Rosellini's and was acting as mediator.

That meeting came to naught, but what I finally did was to sit down at my desk and write a resolution praising Rosellini. Greive moved its adoption and we passed the resolution.

That was the last thing we did and Rosellini was still hollering when we left. He didn't like that at all and wanted the original resolution taken out. I think you'll probably find the original resolution in the Senate Journal. It was not anything terrible, but it wasn't praiseworthy either, and it was a battle that lasted all night and threatened to hold up adjournment. No doubt it was careless on the part of Greive and myself.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Why did you specifically include mention of Rosellini's helping you by sending staff people down? Was that a customary practice?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, we often worked with the governor's staff on bills when he was our governor, and every governor is the same. I don't recall any difference then from any other time, except we did get along very well with his staff. He had people like Warren Bishop and people of that sort that were very reliable, especially when it came to fiscal and budget matters and things of that sort.

I have an idea that the reference might have been an effort not to let them get tarred with the partisan criticism stirred up by the original resolution. I'm not sure how many votes passed that resolution, but I wouldn't be surprised if it wasn't shouted through. The Republicans wanted to go home just as bad as we did and were tired of the "midnight hassling" that night.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What specifically had the Republicans been dissatisfied with?

**Mr. Bailey:** An election was coming up and they didn't want to endorse a Democratic governor. Al was partisan. Of course, they're always "nonpartisan" on their other side. Their candidates could always quote from a resolution which passed the Senate.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you please evaluate this 1961 Senate Session?

**Mr. Bailey:** My memory of it is largely because it was my first year as caucus chairman and it was a challenge to me to help and try drawing things together, and to take care of major legislation, and not go home with half of it unpassed, especially things that are very important to the whole state. Of course, I had my bridge bill passed. I had been able to get into some other things. I consider I probably got more major bills passed that session than at any other session. I wasn't always a great hand to introduce a lot of legislation.

The departments usually take their bills to the committees that consider their subject matter, and the chairman of that committee usually either does it himself, or puts other people on it. I just wish I could remember, but one of the big bills that year was a retirement bill. And it was, as I recall it, a change in the way you compute your pensions. I also remember that we established minimums since we had people retiring that were getting only seventy dollars a month and things like that.

It was a departmental bill though, and not a Christmas tree like some of them became. Retirement bills were terrible bills to pass, because everyone has an idea that they want to shove in without any regard to what it does to the system, and what it costs. I think that probably they were the hardest bills to get through because you can end up with everything on them, and they get so heavy that the whole tree breaks down and the bill doesn't pass.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Within the Democratic Party, what kind of intraparty conditions prevailed in that session?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, we had a very harmonious caucus that year. Redistricting was brewing and it wasn't quite on the burner yet. There was a lot of behind-the-scenes work going on, trying to redraw districts that were satisfactory to the members present, because they're the ones that had to vote on it.

It was a good session. One of the things that held us up was balancing the budget. It was one of those times we had to adopt a little tax program or package of small taxes. They weren't biggies, but they were combinations and hard to put together.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What kind of situation existed within the Republican Party?

**Mr. Bailey:** In my memory Marshall Neill, from Pullman, was the caucus chairman of the Republican Party, and a very fine individual. We worked together to keep

things running smoothly, and some of my members would ask why I was talking to Senator Neill, like maybe I'd sold them down the river. But we started a very, very good rapport between the parties. We fought our partisan battles, don't get me wrong, but we also maintained a real good personal relationship between both parties.

We started eating at the same tables down in the cafeteria, and we had a real good operation. I don't mean that we didn't do our part politically, but we did cut out some of the real tense in-house fighting that, which, you know, makes everybody a little disgusted, especially the public, and which slows down the whole operation.

Neill and I were both on the Rules Committee, so we were able then to be called on to go out and sift out important bills and bring them back. The Rules Committee usually gave us that authority before the session was over. I think they still follow that practice of drawing up a consent calendar. We'd see to it that the major bills were considered because somebody has to do it. Everyone is inclined to be concerned about getting their little personal bills through and let the big bills go by the wayside. The Rules Committee gave us that authority. They had to approve our final agreement, bill by bill, anyway, and always did.

In the Senate the lieutenant governor is not a voting member, and he does not set policy. He did not even come to our caucus unless we invited him. He was always welcome, but he was not a member and seldom attended.

It was horrible to walk out of a session and leave statewide issues dangling, just because no one gave it priority in the Rules Committee. The budget always was acted on, if we could reach agreement, and that was usually what caused overtime sessions. But there were things like some of the education bills, and some of the major bills that wouldn't even get out of Rules when they should have.

We tried to bring a little bit of harmony without influencing any votes. We tried to get a little better operation out of it, and I think we did. That was my first session as a caucus leader and I was in a position to try to do something.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you describe the occasion when you and Senator Neill first did this?

**Mr. Bailey:** It had to be in 1961, my first session as caucus chairman. Later it was Senator Atwood and myself. I was Senate caucus chairman from 1961 through 1977, so I was there a long time. Senator Atwood and I used to work on it after Neill went to the state Supreme Court, and then to the federal bench.

**Ms. Bridgman:** And who initiated this alliance?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know. We didn't have to, because we were in the majority, so we probably did. We avoided partisan issues in this process and Greive was very supportive. I don't think that we would have listened hard if the Republicans had suggested it, because that would have been looked on as something that they wanted to squeeze in to promote their own programs. It worked out fine, and we didn't have half the problems with the major bills. Members were glad to have it done, because then they could concentrate on their own bills, important to their districts.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You received a letter from an attorney, Joseph Holleman, praising you and saying that, caucus-wise, the 1961 session had been one of the most productive sessions. And that this was due to your business-like manner.

**Mr. Bailey:** He must have wanted something. I don't recall his name.

**Ms. Bridgman:** To what was he referring when he called the caucus most productive?

**Mr. Bailey:** I really can't tell you. I think that we had a little more harmony than we'd had the last year with Senator Bargreen. I don't really recall any difference. We just seemed to get along and we kept things pretty peaceable. I don't mean by that that there were no differences of opinion, but we seemed to take care of them in the caucus. The gang was very cooperative with me, and it wasn't just me, it was the whole group. You can't tell a senator what to do. He's got to make up his own mind, and you have to try to bring them together as a group.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The Bay of Pigs Invasion was rather soon after the session ended on April 17. What do you remember about that?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't remember a thing about it because it was aborted, or it was an abortion, anyway. When it came about, I don't remember the public was aware of it until after it failed. And when we knew about it, it was all over. So I don't really remember much about it. If it came the day of the closing of the session, we probably didn't have time to turn on the radio. We usually adjourned so late at night that we went home and slept for two or three days.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well, it would not have coincided precisely with the end of the session.

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't remember much about it as far as my colleagues are concerned.

**Mr. Bailey:** What kind of effect did it have on your estimate of the abilities of John Kennedy?

**Mr. Bailey:** I never thought anything about him in this matter, but I thought about the bunch of dunderheads, the generals he had advising him. That's the only thing I ever thought, that I remember. The CIA and the generals had all informed him it would be an easy show, just march in and win, and then they couldn't even get the darn thing underway. It never occurred to me it was anything but bad advice.

**Ms. Bridgman:** 1961 was a year of concern nationally in the US Senate with the John Birch Society, and in Washington State with the ultraright, as well. In one of her letters to you, Julia Butler Hansen asked if there was a John Birch Society developing in the Third District. How did you reply to this?

**Mr. Bailey:** I remember the incident. I don't remember how I replied. I very likely talked to her on the telephone. I wasn't working for her then, so I didn't have phone privileges. But I don't remember having much on the John Birch Society, except during that time it did surface in Lewis County. Some of it is still there. You still see the famous signboard out on the highway of Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Agnew at Chehalis, who had financed more than one Republican conservative for Congress to run against Julia. It was never anything of any great importance, at least in southwest Washington. Probably because of the publicity given, she was interested looking forward to the 1962 election and whether she'd have this opposition or not.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Other than in Lewis County, how prevalent was the John Birch Society and how prevalent was the concern about it?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't recall any great concern. I think it might have been Julia from a distance in Washington D.C. trying to keep her finger on who might be running against her. And you never knew when this would develop into something bigger. I just don't think it was an issue at all. I think I probably quieted her down, because it was not anything developing very rapidly in her district.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you then please discuss the ultraright in another context, in August 1962?

In Okanogan County, the American Legion sponsored a nonpolitical meeting. One of their speakers was Al Canwell, who at that time was a publisher of an ultraright magazine called the *Vigilante* which criticized Representative John Goldmark and his wife for their association with the ACLU, and identified the ACLU as being a Communist-front organization. At this meeting Senator Wilbur Hallauer was ushered off stage when he disagreed with all of this. Can you offer some comments in context, and opinions about this, please?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, Sally and John Goldmark were very good friends of Senator Hallauer, and were liberals. I don't say this in great knowledge, but it seems to me that Sally Goldmark admitted at one time she had been a member of the Communist Party. John was a lawyer who was very liberal in leaning and very intelligent. Both of them are very nice people.

They were constantly harassed about being commies and so forth, and they were very active in ACLU activities. Even in the 1988 presidential election, that was supposed to be a no-no for conservatives. Bush said, "Dukakis is even a card-carrying member of the ACLU," which is a lousy insinuation.

Hallauer was an ACLU member, as I recall it, and a great friend of civil liberties. Hallauer was bright and unswerving in his basic beliefs. He was trying to defend John Goldmark and Sally, in front of a meeting by a hypocrite or a–well, I can't think of a decent word to say–but Al Canwell. Al wasn't one of the nice people, when it came to trying to get something going for himself. I can just see Web Hallauer going down to the meeting where he was outnumbered and going up there and making everybody mad. I thought it was a very good, brave gesture. It had very little meaning, but it certainly showed that Senator Hallauer was no coward.

John Goldmark either at one time, either before or after, was a state representative.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did other Democrats that you knew react to this incident with Hallauer?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think it was a wide issue. I think it was an isolated issue up in the northeastern end of the state, and Hallauer sent me the clippings himself. Al Canwell, without a doubt, preyed on some of the American Legion and others to have a patriotic meeting. He could turn a patriotic meeting into a Republican rally quicker than anybody in the state, and usually for his own advancement. Fortunately people caught onto him and he didn't advance very far.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The *Wenatchee World* came out with an editorial praising the ACLU and criticizing the American Legion, saying the ACLU was definitely not Communist. Did that have any kind of–what kind of repercussions or effect did that have?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't recall that it had any repercussions. I probably saved the notes because I knew Senator Hallauer so well.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well, we'll move now from the radical right to the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders which was held in October 1961 in the state of Nevada, which you attended. What do you remember about that?

**Mr. Bailey:** There had been an association of legislators from the various legislatures in the country before, but it was kind of vague, and as I recall it, they called a meeting in Nevada to make it a more representative group of leaders. The 1961 convention was in Reno and in Las Vegas, part in one city and part in the other. It was composed of the leadership of both houses, and both parties from all fifty legislatures. It was an effort to get the leadership positions to meet and talk over common problems, and we learned quite a bit out of these meetings.

[End of Tape 17, Side 2]

**Ms. Bridgman:** We were just discussing the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders in Nevada in October 1961.

**Mr. Bailey:** We were quite impressed with the new organization because it was the actual leadership of almost all fifty states. We had many common problems. John O'Brien of our state was elected vice president.

We supported him but were kind of disgusted because we were due to go to Hawaii the next year for the convention, and John thought that it would be a good political gesture on his part to get us to Seattle for the World's Fair in 1962, when he would also advance to president. So when the vote came, we had to vote for Seattle, and Seattle won. We had a pretty good convention in Seattle in 1962. We went to Hawaii in 1968, quite a time later.

I think the organization is still operating, although it might be under a different name now. It worked out very successfully for awhile in exchanging ideas among legislative leaders of the states.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What sessions from this convention in Nevada do you remember as being outstanding?

**Mr. Bailey:** I went to almost all of them over a period of ten years. And each one usually had some discussion on the problems of that time. I think the first convention at Nevada dealt a lot with redistricting, which was becoming a national issue because a court decision back East had said, "One man, one vote." We knew that the time was approaching when we'd all have to face redistricting. Our state was out of balance a little, but not anything like some of the other states, and they weren't doing anything about it at all.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In November of 1961, President Kennedy came to Seattle to give the address at the Centennial Convocation at the University of Washington. The twenty-fifth anniversary dinner for Senator Warren Magnuson was given at this same time. Will you please describe these events?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, believe it or not, I can't remember too much about them. I remember seeing John Kennedy. We had gone to the campaign meeting he had in Seattle that you mentioned once before, where we couldn't even get into the same banquet room, but we had seen him from afar. At the university, one of Senator Magnuson's secretaries spotted us and showed us down the aisle and sat us in aisle seats so he said, "You can even touch him." So, we did get a very good view of the academic procession or whatever it was, all marching in caps and gowns.

I remember Julia Butler Hansen and just about every member of the congressional delegation was there. I remember Pearl Wanamaker and other state officials. It was quite a colorful procession. It's really a great experience to see a president.

I don't remember Maggie's dinner, in fact, I don't think I stayed to it. I was working every day then, and it was very difficult for me to get off work. When we'd go one day I'd usually go back home that same night. It was only two and a half hours from Seattle to where we lived on the Harbor. I'd go to work the next day because I couldn't afford to stay off the job. We didn't get paid for things like that.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Then the White House Regional Conference was held on November twentieth–the convocation having been held on November sixteenth. Did you then attend that?

**Mr. Bailey:** No.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In 1962 we had the Seattle World's Fair. You've saved a Silver Pass and many brochures and invitations. And there was a legislators' preview. What memories do you have of the World's Fair?

**Mr. Bailey:** Instead of having our National Legislative Leaders Conference in October, which had been usual, we held it in June so they could be there for the fair, and our legislators and visitors were given a legislative preview in April.

I never had been to a fair like that before, but I was kind of disappointed on how small it was. I also can remember very well that we were advised there was going to be such a traffic jam in the opening weeks, but I think the stands were only half full. Large numbers stayed home and were afraid of the crowded conditions, the same way we were. We went up a little later, took my mother and our family up, and it still wasn't a really busy fair.

On opening day of the legislative leaders meeting when we were due to go to Seattle, we also had the dedication and opening at the Raymond-Tokeland Road in my area. I had to go back and emcee that opening. So, we split our agenda, went home and then went back to Seattle that same night to get back into the leaders conference. I didn't go to the grand opening of the fair, and I wasn't terribly impressed with the fair later.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How would you evaluate the significance of the fair for Washington and Seattle?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think it was a great move and I think it was well-accepted. I think it might be better accepted afterwards than it was at that time. I read stories now that it was a financial success. My memory of it was that it didn't do very well financially, but it was a good tourist attraction and it left Seattle with a nice center which has been well-used and enjoyed.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Indeed. In 1962 Julia Butler Hansen ran again for Congress, and among the things that you've saved is a letter where she lays out her plans for the campaign, including designating you as the chairman. It's a very elaborate plan and specifies that you would file her first on opening day and then it would get publicity, then the committee would be announced, then your chairmanship, then the vice chairmanship, and the county committees would be announced. She said you would work with Alan Thompson, her administrative assistant at that time, for a month before, on preliminaries, and that before the primaries there would be newspaper ads, two in the dailies, one in the weeklies in the Third District, as well as radio spots and personal cards, and that she would send out letters to her mailing list. How closely did the campaign follow this very precise plan?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, it's somewhat like the 1960 campaign when I was the chairman of her committee. Julia, as I said then, was a hands-on candidate. She ran her own campaign. Alan Thompson was back at Washington working with her, so they were in constant communication, and in the same office, and it was logical that they did most of it. I had very little to do with basic planning.

The letter she wrote me laid out what she needed and wanted, largely because it also let us figure out how much money we had to spend, how many ads would run, how many cards we'd have printed. And I think– as I recall it–one of my jobs that year, and in 1964 the same thing, was that we all knew these key Democratic people around willing to help, and I would go out and ask them if they would be willing to serve on her committee. They would get their letter from Julia.

Alan and I had both been in weekly newspapers, and we staggered these publicity items out so that we could make an announcement one week, and then we'd make another announcement another, and keep her name in the news. If we did it all at once, it would be printed and forgotten.

I lined up the local people for her committees, especially in Pacific and Grays Harbor counties, and we used almost the same people we had used two years before. There weren't too many changes. It wasn't any great effort on my part, because I was working every day and I just couldn't afford to run around too much. I did go to quite a few meetings if they were nearby. Julia came out and ran her own campaign.

**Ms. Bridgman:** She asks you in one of these letters if you want to use the labor committees after the primaries, like last time, and goes on to remark that they were marvelous. What was this labor committee?

**Mr. Bailey:** We had various committees. We had Teachers for Hansen, we had Labor Leaders for Hansen, as we did various other special committees. Most of them were for her anyway, but we made it a point to get a little extra committee going and use a special letterhead for each, and mail out hundreds of letters to labor people, veterans, teachers, or whatever in the district. I think the decision in this case was that we didn't have to do that until after the primaries.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Was it effective?

**Mr. Bailey:** The only way you tell how effective it is, is the result of the election, and she got re-elected. It must have been effective.

**Ms. Bridgman:** At one point you were offered the magnificent sum of ninety-five dollars a month as a clerical allowance for your work, and you refused and said that you would rather have just an allowance for expenses. Will you explain that?

**Mr. Bailey:** Julia offered me a small amount of money per month to cover expenses. It would have come out of the campaign fund, but I chose not to do that because I felt that if I took anything I'd be expected to be available at any time on the telephone, and I was working at Aberdeen and I could not afford to have somebody call me to the phone every five minutes or so. I just did not want to get involved that way. I think that my answer there was if I have to travel very much I certainly would not be against having the mileage paid for, or something like that. As I think back on it, I never received anything nor did I ask for it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In September of 1962 the Democratic State Central Committee sponsored a dinner arranged by Rosellini. The donation was one hundred dollars, and those contributions were then to be distributed to legislative nominees by a committee selected by the House and Senate. On that same day was also held a "meeting of all the nominees to discuss strategy"–that last was a quote. You spoke at that meeting. How often had this kind of thing been done before?

**Mr. Bailey:** I can't tell you that, because I don't remember. I think this was an effort of Governor Rosellini to patch up a few differences with legislators. You see, the candidates for governor and Congress usually held big money-raisers. We saw the need for some help to get some of our members and nominees elected. I think this was the whole thing. As I recall it, Rosellini lent his name to it, with sincerity, to help Democratic legislators running because otherwise they had very little chance of raising any money.

There is also a little backlash, too, about this time. Senator Greive had had the so-called Greive fund–and some of the members were very uptight about it because they were not supportive of Bob in the first place. They thought that he was cornering the newcomers and getting the votes out of them for floor leader. The House didn't have any such thing, and there were members that really needed help. For many years we had a big legislative dinner or reception every session where we would raise money. Proceeds would go to the House and Senate caucuses and be distributed among their members. I really think it started when trying to decentralize the Greive fund.

About the same time, Senator Hallauer decided to run for floor leader against Greive, and started raising a little bit of money. As I recall it, he would have the contributor make the contribution directly to the candidate. Either he or somebody dumped the story to the press. The so-called Greive fund and the Hallauer fund became quite a messy item in the press for a time.

Greive was very, very open about everything he did, and who he gave it to, and who it came from. This was before public disclosure, so it wasn't necessary to make a report. Greive always had it figured out and the opposition were those who were opposed to Greive. One of them was Senator Hallauer. So there became a tendency to try to get away from that type of funding and get an overall fund from the caucus to the candidates.

That procedure was followed for a long time and it still may be. The caucus would give equally to each candidate in the primary election. This caused some problem because sometimes a Democrat who was running against an incumbent Senate Democrat would get kind of mad, and say, "Well, you have jumped into the primary and taken part." Our theory was that those incumbents were the ones that raised the money, and it wasn't fair to go out and give it to their opponent.

One of the big issues was that if the caucus raised the money we could give it in the primary election, but most campaign contributors didn't contribute much in a primary in those days. They always waited until the primary was over, then they gave it to you because you had a better chance to win.

Sometimes a person had an awful time raising any money in a primary, and if he ran a poor primary because of lack of money, the publicity he got would almost certainly be a detriment to him in the general election. Rosellini just lent his name to this legislative fund-raising because he was our titular head and he was very cooperative in that way.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Then when you speak of the caucus distributing these funds for many years, do I understand you correctly that it began at this time?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think that was the first time that we had that sort of a big affair. They had held dinners before, but not on an organized basis in which both houses worked together. The money would be distributed by a committee appointed by each of the House and Senate caucuses.

**Ms. Bridgman:** If Rosellini lent his name as titular head, then where did the idea come from?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know, but I suspect that it came–likely came as a result of a group of senators and representatives trying to get away from the Greive fund and

personal obligation. By starting something different, maybe it could remove the need for that effort.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What did you speak about at the meeting on strategy?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I wouldn't remember that. There were efforts to help candidates if they needed help in signs, or in this or that or the other. I mean it would have just been a little help wherever possible.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In September and October of 1962 there were notorious national events. The first being James Meredith, the first black man to enter the University of Mississippi, and two people died in the ensuing riot. He was protected by federal marshals in the federalized Mississippi National Guard. What was your reaction to that?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I don't remember any reaction to that, any more than anybody else.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How important at this time was that kind of thing in Washington?

**Mr. Bailey:** In the state of Washington?

**Ms. Bridgman:** I mean–the response to that sort of nationally publicized incident?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, you'd have to read a newspaper to tell that, because as a legislator we weren't in session or anything. There were no organized legislative comments made that I can recall. I have a hunch we, Democrats, the liberals we were, were pretty supportive of the blacks.

I don't think it was a militant problem once it was handled. Governor Faubus in Arkansas was a national disgrace as far as most of the Democrats were concerned. But we weren't all exercised about it. We weren't organized. We were in all parts of the state. If that'd happen during the session, you might get someone to introduce a resolution. You'd have to read the papers to see how it was received in Washington.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What do you recall about the Cuban Missile Crisis in October?

**Mr. Bailey:** Very little except that I do recall that the night that it looked like we were going to go to war that I met Julia Butler Hansen and her husband coming up on a campaign trip through South Bend. They were a little late because Julia had pulled off the road to listen to Kennedy's speech. I place that easily, because I was wondering what happened to them. And when they finally arrived we met at a restaurant downtown. Within the next day or so it was settled rapidly, but at that time it looked like we were going to go to war, a nuclear war.

We were very relieved when it was over, and I thought that it added a lot to Kennedy's stature. Later we found out he made a lot of concessions, too. They probably have the missiles now anyway.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you recall at this time how you would have compared President Kennedy with the other two Democratic presidents, that is FDR and Harry Truman?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I think President Kennedy was a very attractive public figure. He brought a lot of youthful vigor into the operation, but I wasn't terribly impressed with him. I know that as a member of Congress he didn't have a very good record. He was always doing something besides attending sessions and voting. As a president he didn't get much legislation passed, and I figured when he went to Texas that he was going there with Lyndon Johnson to try to patch things up because I did not think he was going to get re-elected.

He was not the most popular president at that time. But his martyrdom, I guess you'd say, really brought him to the forefront, and later he became much bigger than he was at that time. I think he would have had a hard time getting re-elected because he had just not accomplished very much. It was Johnson that put through the Kennedy program after Kennedy's assassination–and he drove it through in good fashion as a legislative veteran. I was not against Kennedy. I would have been for his re-election, but I thought probably the electorate was not very firmly behind him about that time. He was showing a lot of weaknesses.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Then if he was displaying these weaknesses, then what is your comparison of him with FDR and Truman?

**Mr. Bailey:** Kennedy wasn't president very long, you know. It is pretty hard to compare him. Given another one or two years it might have been an entirely different story because he couldn't change things around overnight. He wasn't elected by a very big mandate. He was well above average as a president. I don't think he measured up to Harry Truman or to Franklin Roosevelt, but he did give a lot of pizzazz and inspiration to the country, and they needed it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Thank you. I want to proceed now to the 1963 session. In the Senate, Democrats were in the

majority thirty-two to seventeen, and in the House only by three votes, fifty-one to forty-eight. In the Senate you cut back committees at this session from twenty-five to twenty, by combining some and making others subcommittees. How did this work out?

**Mr. Bailey:** It had been a kind of a tradition–maybe I could say it was a Greive tradition–to try to make everyone on the majority side a committee chairman. This resulted in so many committees that a person couldn't possibly go to all of the meetings, and consequently it was bad organization. I had seven or nine committees at one time. It was so many you couldn't possibly attend all those meetings. I always advocated cutting back the number of committees, down to a very few so that a person could schedule them like a class in college. If you were in college you couldn't take economics at the same time in the same period that you also had foreign affairs.

[End of Tape 18, Side 1]

**Mr. Bailey:** You can't attend two committee meetings that are held at the same time. There was no real schedule. A committee chairman would have a bill come up and would say, "Well, I'll have a meeting tomorrow at two o'clock." Maybe there were fifteen other committees at two o'clock, and I'd always contended it would be better for all of us if we had fewer committees, and had them on a schedule. Senator Greive didn't like that kind of organization. It was too regular. He liked the irregular. I considered it, that year, quite an achievement when I got four committees lopped off.

A little later I think you'll see where we finally got it down to much less, and got on a schedule of committee meetings.

Before we could get to that, however, we had to get rid of Greive and get Augie Mardesich as floor leader to work with us. He actually was elected by proposing a program like that, and he had my support because I wouldn't support Greive if he wouldn't support reorganization, which he would not.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I see. This is some time later?

**Mr. Bailey:** This was about 1974.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In the 1963 session six Democrats joined with the Republicans in the House to organize it, and they chose Democrat William Day of Spokane as Speaker, over John O'Brien. What was the basis of this disagreement?

**Mr. Bailey:** I wasn't in the House, so I don't really know. But without a doubt, it was an effort to oust O'Brien. He'd been elected Speaker several times, and as we noted in previous sessions, there was opposition building. However, the peculiar part about this was that people that broke with O'Brien and went to the other side were not the ones that were trying to defeat O'Brien in the caucus. They were a different set of people. Also underlying much of this was the yearly pro-public versus pro-private power battle.

From the six deserters "Daddy" Day was elected Speaker, with Republican support. He was a conservative Democrat from Spokane. I don't recall if he was active in the other efforts against O'Brien, but they swung a deal with Republicans where they would get committee chairmanships, the Speakership and other goodies.

**Ms. Bridgman:** And the others of the six?
**Mr. Bailey:** I don't remember all of them. The only one I really remember was my own House colleague, Representative Chet King. He was put in as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. I don't remember the others, but all were rewarded with some appointments and the Republicans took the rest.

Chet King was a very strong Democrat until this came up. He thought he was going to be director of Fisheries under Rosellini–and he was turned down. I don't know why. We supported King for that, but Rosellini had apparently made a commitment to Milo Moore and I don't think Chet ever forgot that. He was very, very bitter against the governor and the governor, by not being forthright, deserved it.

The six were rewarded, as I say, and it really knocked the balances out of power, because those six on basic issues would stand firm with the Republicans. As Democrats, we had very little contact over there unless we dealt with the Democrats, which were a minority and could do little or nothing. Things didn't come to a strained halt in the session, as I recall it, and we did the things we had to do, but it wasn't as smooth as if both houses had been working a little closer.

**Ms. Bridgman:** A writer in the *Tacoma News Tribune* commenting on all this was of the opinion that the House did a good job, but that, as you've just described, that the Senate, having lost their colleagues so to speak, held back. He described the Senate as being "the weakest," "in years." Will you comment on that evaluation?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't recall that. Everybody to their own opinion. If you pass a bill that somebody wants, it's the greatest session that ever happened. If you don't pass a bill that somebody wants, then it's the worst session. It

just depends on what you're looking for. We probably did have an appearance of weakness, but you can't play pingpong with only one end of the table playing. You've got to have somebody to pass the ball back to you. That was where we were having trouble. We just didn't have anyone over there to work with because those six Democrats didn't carry any power. They only enabled the Republicans to move in.

We could have probably met with a strictly Republican House and done a better job than we could with a coalition House, and most of us would not be seen talking to any one of the six. We had to talk to Speaker Day. As far as the six went, they were like poison ivy, and they couldn't give us anything anyway, unless all the Republicans agreed.

It probably made us look weak, but it takes two to tango, and you just can't do it all by yourself. I don't know what the House did that year that was so terrific, unless it passed the budget–but they had to. I didn't think "Daddy" Day's term in the Speaker's office was anything noteworthy.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How about you and Chet King. Did you not speak to him?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I talked to Chet just like I didn't even know what he was doing. I never mentioned it. We never argued about it at all. At home it was a different matter. He was in real trouble with the labor people, and almost everyone. They started a big campaign against him, and we as Democrats did all we could to support another candidate. We didn't support King.

Close association sort of ended about that time between King and myself, but we got along. Chet and I never had any trouble, but we didn't work as well after that. In this case I think it was what he considered a personal insult that caused him to do this. It wasn't like him at all. He did a good job on the budget, but I can't remember anything outstanding about it. I don't remember the budget being any better than any other budget, but it is a hard job under any circumstances. He almost lost his political shirt over it, and he never forgave the party for turning against him, but he turned against the party.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Now in the Senate, Greive was criticized for his fund-collecting, as you just talked about, by his fellow Democratic senator from Tacoma, A.L. Rasmussen. Will you recount that incident?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't remember that. "Slim" Rasmussen was always a very belligerent member. He was a good member and studied every issue. He and Greive never did get along. "Slim" was not a hand to hide his feelings, and he'd dig Bob every once in awhile, and it resulted in redistricting where Greive drew what they call the "stove pipe." They ran a little line from another district and right around Rasmussen's house, and ran Rasmussen out of his own district. Rasmussen moved into the new district and came back later.

There was never any love lost between the two, and Rasmussen was carrying on what Senator Hallauer started a little earlier–-exposing the Greive fund.

I don't recall if I ever voted for Greive, perhaps at one time when he went without opposition. But Rasmussen and Hallauer and I were usually very independent votes. We weren't the only ones, but we usually voted for the opposition, and I didn't get too involved in it because I was usually running for caucus chairman. I don't think I had any opposition after the first election, but Greive did. For Rasmussen, it was just the normal course of two people that bickered all the time, and just didn't get along.

**Ms. Bridgman:** That leads into my next question. Jack Pyle of the *Tacoma News Tribune* wrote that you were the most popular among other senators. How do you explain that?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I don't explain it. It was awfully nice of Jack to say it, but that's about all I can say.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In addition to this coalition and other personnel matters, the 1963 session had been ordered by the court to deal with reapportionment. Will you explain the development of that court order, and then the results of the legislative action, or inaction?

**Mr. Bailey:** Initiative 211, in 1962, would have redistricted the whole state, but it was defeated at the polls. The United States District Court, a month later, ruled that our reapportionment of the legislative seats was discriminatory, and had to be corrected.

In the 1963 session we really labored long and hard over redistricting, but we adjourned after about eighty-three days, without adopting any redistricting. Immediately the district court ordered that all legislative districts in the state were null and void and enjoined the secretary of state from conducting elections from the districts as they were then made up.

That was in May of 1963, but about a month or so later, the secretary of state appealed to the United States Supreme Court for a stay of that order. If it had remained, it would have meant that every legislator running in November of 1964 would have to run at large, and be subject to the election by everyone in the whole state. As you can probably imagine, it would be an impossible situation, maybe hundreds and hundreds of

people running just because they thought they might have a chance to get through. The Supreme Court granted a stay of proceedings, pending an appeal, and in effect that restored the existing districts for the 1964 election.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What were the reasons that you hadn't been able to agree on a redistricting plan?

**Mr. Bailey:** Redistricting is not anything done easily, because you have to take away from some members and give to others. Some of the members didn't want some of the gifts that we would give them, and some of the members didn't want to lose some of the things we'd take away from them. It really is a highly volatile political matter that just almost defies being accomplished by members of the Legislature in dealing with their colleagues and themselves. Voters in their own districts sometimes are very much against the changes that had to be made. It's a very difficult thing, and we labored day and night all through that eighty-three-day session, just doing our best, and we still could not reach an agreement. The Republicans always wanted what they call "swing districts" where they had a chance. The Democrats always wanted the "swing districts" where they had a chance and it was a negotiated deal where neither side would really give enough to reach an agreement.

**Ms. Bridgman:** That 1963 session, too, there was a beach bill, which caused a lot of comment in your district. Will you recall the issues involved? And people involved with that?

**Mr. Bailey:** The ocean beaches were a very, very difficult, complicated bit of real estate, you might say–as to ownership. Many of the issues went back to the English common law, on accreted lands. I ran into it in the Long Beach area when I was county clerk.

The people would have to sue for the property in front of them, where the accreted lands had built up. The accreted lands were the problem. Sometimes people that lived on the oceanfront had as much as a mile in front of their places that had accreted into sand dunes. And the question arose, "Who owns it?" Who owned those lands? Under English common law, ordinarily accreted lands accrue to the upland owner.

Still, there were many places where accreted lands were in front of platted areas, lands where a city street had already been, so, therefore, the upland owner might well be the city or the county. And it would no longer be the person that owned the oceanfront land. All of these owners in the Long Beach Peninsula were very jealous of having someone come out and build a house in front of their house and make them inland owners instead of beach front owners. It was something I thought ought to be settled.

The other big problem, on the other side, was that the beach land, in 1901, had been termed "public highways." That was to preserve it so the public could always use the beaches. The beach lands of 1901 are probably high and dry now in the dunes, but at the same time we have always maintained the right of citizens to travel up and down the beaches–they were public beaches.

There was a great concern over anything that happened. If upland owners got an open book, they could go down, maybe put a fence on the beach. It became a very complicated issue, and a bill I wrote had the beaches declared a public-recreation area to calm some fears.

[End of Tape 18, Side 2]

## 10

# ASSISTANT TO JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

**Ms. Bridgman:** Senator Bailey, let's pick up where we left off on the last tape. You were describing the beach bill and the problem of accreted lands and the prior law enacted in 1901. Can you continue?

**Mr. Bailey:** This may overlap a little, but the problem was largely in the Long Beach area where we had severe accretions in front of the properties. The law of 1901 set the beaches aside as a public highway. That was so that the people could forever use and have access to the beaches. The courts had ruled that the law of 1901 would be effective to the property lines in 1901 only, so, in many cases the so-called public highway would be way up on the beach in the dunes. It became quite a big concern. The Department of Natural Resources claimed ownership of the accreted lands.

I had always maintained that the state did not own the accreted lands, that under common law the accreted lands went to the uplands owner, and in the same way, decretion is a loss to the owner, too. Anyway, the attorneys in my county were having a field day filing quiet title suits for upland owners. Sometimes we found how they'd filed as many as four or five on the same bit of land. It always cost the upland owner a lot of money, but didn't give him very much in return–maybe fifteen or twenty feet or whatever between the law of 1889 when we became a state and the line of 1901 when the public highways were created. The lawsuit did not really give them land out to the ocean as they were led to believe.

The battle then got to be between the private owners for whom I was trying to save big attorney fees. I didn't think it was proper if that was their property anyway, why did they have to sue for it? On the other hand the Department of Natural Resources claimed ownership. About this time the State Parks and Recreation Commission came in and claimed they owned it because this was public area, and it should be a state park. I think most of us wanted to be sure that the rights of the public on the beach itself were not violated, that what was public did remain public property. It was a very complicated issue and in this case we reached a kind of a compromise and agreed to a few things that later would go to court.

A lawyer by the name of Charles Welsh talked to me at some length, and he and I were probably the only two in the whole area that agreed that the accreted lands belonged to the upland owner. He took it to the United States Supreme Court, and won his case. It is no longer an issue. The beach lands are public lands. No owner that I know has ever tried to stop the public on the beaches, but most of the lawsuits have stopped.

It's fairly well settled now–but at that time it was a very complicated issue. Everybody was in it–the city of Long Beach, Ilwaco, Pacific County, the State Parks Commission, and Department of Public Lands were really involved. The latter always figured that it was their property, and even had let oil drilling go on on some of the beaches.

The Long Beach area was the worst problem. The building of the jetties on the Columbia had caused vast accretions. At the same time, in the Tokeland area north of Willapa Harbor, those same jetties had caused the land to wash away to the point of where some little towns like North Cove are now under about eighty feet of water. It goes two ways. This was the issue that we were trying to resolve. Foremost, the city of Long Beach, State Parks, and most of the people did not want to get the public off the beaches. We couldn't take that chance, and mine was an effort to try to resolve it. Bringing it to the fore helped bring a little peace for a few years, until it went to court and finally was adjudicated.

**Ms. Bridgman:** There was a junior-college bill passed in the 1963 session which gave the junior colleges administrative autonomy and state funds. Can you explain and comment on that please?

**Mr. Bailey:** At one time the junior colleges were considered an extension of high school, the thirteenth and fourteenth grades. They were operated out of local school districts. Grays Harbor College for instance was operated by the Aberdeen School District.

This bill was the first in a couple of stages. I remember Senator Marshall Neill was very active in this and demanded we do it in stages, so it wouldn't be too drastic. We didn't exactly know how to separate the community colleges from the school districts, because they had invested money in buildings and other facilities. In the first step we declared them under a state administrator of community colleges, or whatever. Also, they no longer were considered the thirteenth and fourteenth grade, but rather, if anything, the first two years of higher education. A session or so later we

made them completely independent of local school districts.

**Ms. Bridgman:** There was in that session also a pension-reform law passed for the teachers in their retirement system. How important was the change made that session, that is, how significant was the difference?

**Mr. Bailey:** I have a real vivid memory of that Teachers Pension Act. The teachers had long been under an old act that really didn't pay very well. Their annuities and their pensions were two separate things, and they got their pension based on so much a year for every year they taught. It was not very generous. The teachers wanted a newer pension program, much as the state workers had. They also wanted a substantial pay raise that session.

Governor Rosellini did not see that his budget would permit the pay raise, and he didn't see how he could possibly start a new system. I kept going down to see him and I kept saying, "Al, you don't have to worry about the pay raise if we could get these teachers a decent pension system." The new one would be based on what the state employees were having. He was very adamant. He would not agree.

Finally, one day he came up to see me and he said, "You know I think you're right. I think they would be happy if they got their new pension, even if they didn't get their raise." He also said, "I've also found out that for about one hundred eighty thousand dollars in this biennium, we could get this thing started," (which would be, of course, peanuts in the budget).

I put the bill in and had two senators go with me. There was lots of opposition. However, someone got up on the floor and made a motion that all the members of the Democratic Caucus go on as sponsors of the teachers pension bill. I vividly remember Senator Woodall getting up and making a motion that all members of the Republican Caucus go on sponsoring the bill too. That was great–forty-nine sponsors in the Senate. Then I couldn't get the damned thing out of committee because the people who sponsored it weren't really working for it–they wanted all the credit, but they weren't working for it. We finally got it out and passed, and it was a great step forward. It was a very important bill for teachers in this state.

At that time, because it was being rumored that it was based on salary–the higher your salary the higher your pension–some of them called it an administrators bill. In order to get the bill through, I offered an amendment that put a salary limit of ten thousand dollars a year on the pension–high salaries at that time. It was the only way we could get the bill through, but it stopped the argument as being an administrators bill.

The teachers were happy, and at the next session the WEA lobbyist come around and visited everybody but me. Later Senator Greive got up on the floor and moved an amendment to a bill on teachers pensions–that "striking section so and so, and so and so," and sat down and everybody voted for it.

I got up and I said, "Mr. President, was this an amendment that repealed the limitation on administrators drawing big pensions?"

He said, "That was it."

I was furious. I said, "I'll see you later. I'm going to see a WEA lobbyist." I felt that the least that fellow owed me after getting that bill through originally, when he had given up and gone home the session before, was to at least inform me. It was very underhanded.

I could have disagreed with him, but I bet you know that he didn't come into my office for a long time. In fact, he told me one time that he was afraid to come in my office because I had said I'd physically throw him out. They got an unlimited pension system. But it was a very important bill, and of course looking back, a ten-thousand-dollar limitation wouldn't have meant anything in these days and now would be out of date. At that time it was quite a bit and it's better that it came out, except I resented the tactics of the WEA representative at that time–visiting everyone but me because I was the one responsible for getting it passed in the first place.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What had been the basis of Rosellini's objection to it at first?

**Mr. Bailey:** Strictly budget. He was very pleased with the bill. It was just strictly a budget matter. If a governor gives too much here, and too much there, soon his budget is knocked out of shape. He has to hold the line.

**Ms. Bridgman:** But one hundred eighty thousand dollars was not much.

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, that was just peanuts–it was just getting the new system set up and that is about what it amounted to. I don't know how he ever arrived at that figure.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Now that session, too, there was an issue called Save Sunday for the Family. Can you explain the genesis of that, and its implications?

**Mr. Bailey:** I can remember two bills that created highly sensational deals when I was in the Legislature. They probably were not at the same time. The green stamp bill was always something, where the green stamp people came down and lobbied hard. The story

was always that they spent thousands and thousands of dollars and brought in many lobbyists. There were even stories that they brought women down for the members, and all that sort of thing.

They never even got their bill out of committee. I always had a hunch that those lobbyists made more money and had more fun, then reporting to their bosses that how much they were spending on legislators when it was on themselves. It resulted in no influence on the Legislature whatsoever.

A group of independent merchants all over the state had decided to run a campaign of "Save Sunday for the Family." They were very upset with people like Pay 'N' Save, and those who were opening stores on Sunday, which meant they had to stay open on Sunday, too. They started this big campaign to try to close up everything on Sunday and spent lots of money. They didn't get anyplace. It just went down to total defeat, not even considered.

I think one of the biggest merchants in Aberdeen had a full-page ad in the paper: Save Sunday for the Family. And then when he found out how I had voted on it, he sent me a great big hand-written note across the ad in the *Aberdeen World* which says "Thanks a lot Bob." It was a big issue, but it died a glorious death and was never resurrected.

**Ms. Bridgman:** That was a sixty-day regular session and twenty-three days of extra session. How would you sum it all up?

**Mr. Bailey:** We came out with a fair record, budgetwise, educationwise, but it–I think probably the biggest part of it was our struggle over trying to redistrict. At the same time though, we did several things like community colleges and other things that were necessary. The beach bill that we talked about was important in my area, probably of very little importance to the rest of the state. I think my "public recreation area" bill went through unanimously, hardly noted.

**Ms. Bridgman:** On May seventh that year Ed Riley wrote you a letter in which he described you as eloquent and–

**Mr. Bailey:** He wanted something.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well, now, he went on to say your decisions were "logical," and I'm quoting, "but firm, and furthermore you were always a gentleman." I'd like to know, and I'm asking this very seriously, how does a caucus leader achieve a reputation for firmness and gentlemanliness simultaneously?

**Mr. Bailey:** Ed was on the Seattle City Council at that time, if I'm not mistaken. He quit the Senate to join them. But I don't know the answer to the question. I have an idea that my caucus could recall many times when Ed and I were not that peaceable–but we always hammered things out. Many might have left the caucus disappointed. I suppose I did, too, but they didn't leave with any bitterness. We thrashed things out in caucus and no one was ever told how to vote. They voted freely and everybody talked freely, too.

Of course, those things were behind the scenes. We did not, nor were we supposed to, tell outside what went on in the caucus, because a disagreement in the caucus didn't mean you were going to disagree on the floor. Once in awhile we had terrific fights. I never happened to be in the middle of those, but I mean fights with threats and quite a bit of rancor. They usually revolved around redistricting or later maybe someone's disagreement with Senator Greive after they replaced him as floor leader. Actually I thought that we had a very good caucus.

I felt that it was my job to try to let each side be heard, regardless, and even if I didn't agree with them I insisted that they be allowed to speak. It always came to a vote and I don't recall any attempt at being a gentleman–that would be a very difficult role in a Democratic Caucus. Once in awhile you'd find somebody that couldn't keep from being kind of mad at somebody. But that didn't last long.

I've been called many things, too, and usually later they'd come back and apologize for it and it's humorous when I think back on it. I really think that the issue of trying to pull together was something worthwhile, and I think also what I tried to do when I was caucus chairman was not to establish policy, but let the caucus define it.

I don't think that I was much different, except I thought it was my job to see that everyone was heard and everyone had a part in making decisions. I think maybe I learned that from the fact that we were not part of it over in the House, and that's probably one of the reasons I didn't care much for the House. Ed Riley never asked much from me, but he liked to be treated fairly.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you describe the time before you had made these successful efforts so that Democrats and Republicans got along better, with more decorum, shall we say?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't follow your question.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I'm sorry. You've talked other times, as well as this time, about your efforts to make relation-

ships–the relationship between the two parties–one of more gentility. I'd like you to compare some of the effects of that. How was it before, compared to how was it after you did get along better, to eat together in the cafeteria and such?

**Mr. Bailey:** I went to the Senate shortly after the 1951-1953 coalition. Spokane members especially, and one or two others, had joined with the Republicans and formed a coalition in the Senate. There was a great deal of enmity there toward every Democrat who had done that. They were almost ostracized at times, and it was necessary to bring them back into the fold. We could drive them into another coalition. Actually they were good members and probably had reasons for doing what they did.

Anyway, we started with our own people, trying to treat them all equally and make them a part and try to forget the past. This trouble happened before we came there, so it was easy for us to forget, or at least try. At one time you wouldn't even be seen talking to them. But we had pretty well overcome that.

I can remember Senator Woodall, a Republican, probably as disliked as anyone in the Legislature because he was tough and didn't tolerate disagreement, became one of the most beloved senators, before he left the Senate. He still didn't give up his toughness or change much, but he could give a blistering speech at all of us, and we could sit down at the table later and there was no personal enmity whatsoever.

As I have said, if we had something that we were going to do to the Republicans, either Senator Greive or I would go across and usually tell Senator Neill, or someone in charge, as to what we were going to do. It didn't make any difference because it wasn't going to change any votes anyway. They got so that they also came over and told us what they planned. We didn't always do that, don't get me wrong. Sometimes there were real doozies pulled on us, and we on them, but it was usually routine things that we pretty well anticipated and were not personal, but political. We then went down and had lunch together forgetting the problems.

I remember earlier times when a committee was taken out to dinner–and they took the Democrats out one time, and the Republicans another time, because they didn't eat together, they didn't socialize together.

One of the things I remember, though, as a culmination of this better feeling, is one time the Senate Republicans were having a crab feed for their members. They invited Senator Mike Gallagher, one of the strongest Democrats you ever saw and the most politically-minded, and myself out to their crab feed. Mike came to me and said, "My golly, this is a surprise."

And I said, "I don't know what's it all about."

He said, "They told me that you and I stick by what we think, but we've always been pleasant to work with and they'd like to have us come to the feed." So we went out and ate with Governor Evans and Republican members and their wives. It was kind of a pleasant deal to have and at the same time we never discussed politics –we were too busy eating.

**Ms. Bridgman:** As all of us who were alive remember, John Kennedy was killed on November 22, 1963. The Legislature not being in session, there would have been no direct effects, but I'd appreciate your recollections about that event.

**Mr. Bailey:** Kennedy had gone to Texas the same day that we went to Seattle to hold hearings on a Joint Committee on Highways. It was quite a custom in those days to hold some of the committee meetings the day before the annual University of Washington-Washington State University football game. The game was coming up on that Saturday. We had committee meetings Friday, and we were going to hold a Democratic Senate Caucus Friday evening. The tragedy took place Friday morning. We didn't know what to do. Some of our members were en route from Spokane and could not be contacted.

I don't know what the Republicans did, but I do remember that we went ahead with our caucus. We didn't transact any business, but we had our dinner because it had already been set up. It was more like a big wake. I remember it quite vividly, of course. Everybody was terribly upset, and the Washington and Washington State game was canceled. Everybody went their own way after that.

It was quite an emotional time. I think the Republicans also would say the same thing. The whole nation felt the tragedy. We didn't know how to stop our members from coming, as they were on their way when it happened and there wasn't much we could do about it. We didn't want our caucus to look like business as usual, either, so we just quietly went ahead with the dinner.

**Ms. Bridgman:** So, the effects were emotional rather than political.

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, yes. I think everybody was thunderstruck, just absolutely wiped out.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I'd like to go on now and discuss the campaign in 1964. We've talked about Chet King quite a bit, and according to newspaper articles he was having some problems. What were the problems he was having, and what was the result?

**Mr. Bailey:** Chet King was a long-time colleague of mine and a good friend. We didn't always agree, and in this case we certainly did not. But he was one of the crew that deserted the Democrats in the House and went to a coalition in which "Big Daddy" Day, a Spokane Democrat, was elected Speaker. Chet was named chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and that obviously was what he was promised when he joined the coalition. As I said before, I also think there was a lot of rancor between Chet and Rosellini over the fact that Chet was led to think that he was high on the list to become director of Fisheries when Rosellini came in, and he was passed over after being led to believe he had it. It was a blow to his pride. I know he was harboring a lot of bitterness at that time.

Labor people down on the Harbor were very upset with him, and they're the ones that really led the campaign to get rid of him. He had a tough campaign, but he won the primary and he won the general election.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I see. Despite labor's opposition.

**Mr. Bailey:** Many Democrats and labor-union members still supported him and opposition was all based on the coalition. I don't think he ever completely recovered politically from that, but he did a good job that year as chairman of Ways and Means.

[End of Tape 19, Side 1]

**Ms. Bridgman:** To continue with the '64 campaign, Senator Bailey. The Greive fund again became an issue. Can you talk a little about that in the context of this campaign?

**Mr. Bailey:** The Greive fund had been something that Bob Greive had organized and was running when I was first elected to the Senate in '56 and probably before that, and he was still running it during the intervening years between '56 and '64. Various people had tried to do the same thing in order to counteract Greive with the thought that they might become floor leader or, at least, destroy his support. Senator Hallauer had a fund that became known (after Bob Greive released it to the press) as a slush fund. It just became a fact that we were now reaching a stage where each caucus would raise money by dinners and other activities, and decide itself what to do and how to handle and distribute the money. Greive was a pioneer, but his day of one-man control was disappearing.

Rather than go to an individual and start another individual fund, I set up a caucus fund, in which Greive was a member of the committee, and we divided, as equally as possible, the funds that we had raised in the caucus for the re-election of members. At one time it broke into the press that we were having a terrible internal feud and things weren't going so well. Actually, it was an effort to take this from an individual senator-donor and distribute equally to every member of the caucus.

The other part of the 1964 campaign was the sweeping victory of LBJ when he was elected president in his own right. I don't remember the campaign as much issue-oriented at that time as I do that it was a real battle of a liberal against a very conservative Senator Goldwater–and my district was not very conservative. The country wasn't either. People were not willing to buy Goldwater at that time.

Evans was elected governor. Shortly after the election he wrote me a letter and wanted our party in the Senate to join him in a redistricting commission, working out of the governor's office. I recall quite clearly that, after caucusing on it, I wrote him a letter saying, "We do not feel that it is our duty to abdicate a legislative responsibility to the governor," and while we'd cooperate with him, we said, "We will go our way and do our legislative duty as we understand it should be done." It was really a peace offering, not meant to be disrespectful. We did not join with the governor in that commission, and to the best of my memory it didn't come about at that time in that way.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I see. The Democrats in the state that year had won large majorities in the Legislature. There were thirty-two Democrats and seventeen Republicans in the Senate, and sixty Democrats and thirty-nine Republicans in the House. You've just offered a good explanation for LBJ's victory, but how about Dan Evans, how does he fit into this scenario?

**Mr. Bailey:** I served in the Legislature all of the years Dan Evans was governor. Evans was from the liberal, or at least the moderate, wing of the Republican Party. He was not a conservative in any sense of the word. Nor was he a radical either. He was in the mainstream, I would say, of the party and of the state. I doubt if a Goldwater program was any closer to him than Goldwater would have been to me.

The story used to go around that the Democrats in the Legislature were better to Dan Evans than was his own party. Dan was an independent thinker, a very progressive person, and was really an excellent person to work with. I think he had one of the nicest working personalities I've ever known. He was always relaxed. He was very firm. He did not yield to something he didn't believe in, and he held pretty firm in negotiations.

It was easy to reach him. He was always available to us on the Democratic side–maybe the Republicans had trouble, I don't know. I really think he maintained a fairly open office, accessible to legislative leaders anyway, and to legislators. My memories of Dan Evans are very good ones. I didn't always agree with him. We didn't surrender what we thought was right on our own side to him, nor did he surrender to us. Nine times out of ten he would be nearer to what we thought than some of his own party.

Evans was always courteous to us. If we went down with suggestions, I don't remember a time when he didn't go along with us, unless it was something we just challenged him on. He was an excellent governor and ran a very efficient operation.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Was part of his getting along with all of you so well that he established new conventions, ways of doing things to keep in contact with you, or was it a matter of principles and style?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think it was a matter of personality and the issues were not always the thing. You could go into see him if you were absolutely opposed to his stand on an issue and he would see you. He had a very warm personality and was very knowledgeable in almost everything that we had to discuss. At the same time, you left feeling that you'd been listened to.

Governor Rosellini and I were not very close, really, because Al had been in the Senate and left to become governor the day that I went to the Senate. Al had been very active in Democratic politics in the Senate and had a great many personal friends in the Senate and they were quite buddy-buddy. Consequently there was not that much communication between Al Rosellini and myself during my first four years.

I think there was much more communication with Dan Evans, although Al Rosellini and I got along fine and there was no problem. It was just a different method of operating. Al had close friends like Senator Mike Gallagher, and you could name a dozen others. They would get together in the evenings, or they would go drop in on him anytime. There was more communication that way with those people than there was with others of us. Of course, I was not in a leadership position until the 1961 session, so I should not have expected otherwise.

I can't speak for Greive, because, you see, Greive was floor leader at least four years before I became caucus chairman. I don't know how close he was to Rosellini. I know that they worked together, because they had done so in the Senate, but I don't think Bob was one of his close confidants, like Senator Gallagher, Senator Bill Gissberg and a few of the others. Al probably had the tendency to relay his wishes to someone he knew very well and it was a natural thing. The governor and I had no problem whatsoever, but I was better able to be near and analyze relationships with Dan Evans than some of the rest.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I see. In the 1965 session redistricting again was dominant. As you mentioned, the federal district court had ordered the Legislature to make redistricting its first order of business while retaining jurisdiction for itself. You did establish a redistricting plan and it took forty-seven days. Will you describe the ins and outs of that effort?

**Mr. Bailey:** Back in 1964 the court had said we did not redistrict the state properly and ruled that we must, and that in the 1965 session the only order of business was to be redistricting of the state of Washington before any other business was transacted. We had to go to court after the session opened to see if we could even do things like passing a legislative-expense bill, things like that. We were not sure we could. The judge gave his approval to such organizational, housekeeping matters.

We went into that session and did nothing but work on redistricting. Now it is easy to say we did nothing, but in the meantime all the committee hearings were going on for all the bills, because everybody couldn't work on redistricting. It took forty-seven days of the session before we arrived at an agreement on the redistricting bill, which passed both houses and was eventually signed by the governor.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How can you describe the process of reaching this solution?

**Mr. Bailey:** If I remember right, Senator Greive and I represented the Senate Democrats. Two members came from Senate Republicans, two from the House Republicans, and two from the House Democrats. We started meeting day and night–usually at night because we'd be on other things during the day. We'd meet in an evening, or whenever, and then send technicians back to the drawing boards just to draw new district lines and make estimates of population and come back to report at our next meeting.

So, we really worked on it. Most times we met in the governor's office. If we thought we were near an agreement we'd go down and meet with the governor because he would have to sign that bill, and we needed his agreement, too. We did feel earlier that he shouldn't be the one taking the initiative to tell us how to redistrict, because after all, it was a gesture. Republicans were in the minority and there was no reason for the Democratic majority to hand its prerogatives over to the

governor. Sometimes we had agreement and then one side or the other would make a further demand and we had to go back and see what we could do, and come back again.

Bear in mind that you're dealing with your colleagues and they have to vote on this, too. You've got to try to make it as agreeable as possible to get the votes necessary to pass. If you wipe a member out by redistricting you're not likely to get him or her to vote for the bill, and if you don't get a majority, you're not going to have a bill that passes. It was a struggle to get enough votes to pass a bill on a thing that affected everybody.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What kind of help did you have in determining population and drawing lines?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, we had the census. It was a little bit peculiar, because the census is divided up into what they call "census tracts." We didn't always have these census tracts available until much later in the game. We didn't always know where the lines were drawn in census tracts, many times. They weren't drawn on voting precincts and things of that sort. It was very confusing. We had a staff that Senator Greive had put together who spent their whole time studying precincts, voting patterns, how many people there'd be in each district, things like that. They could tell pretty close. They became knowledgeable. One of those is now an assistant to Governor Gardner–Dean Foster. He started working for Senator Greive and became an expert on redistricting.

The question was, though, the staff didn't have a vote. They could have the best system in the world, but if they couldn't get the votes–they couldn't put the program over themselves. Every time we Democrats thought we had an agreement, Evans and Slade Gorton would get together and decide they needed one more Republican-leaning district. One of our criticisms of Greive was we accused him of selling districts, because it seemed, although not necessarily so, that he was so anxious to reach an agreement of his own that he would give away another district. Eventually we reached an amicable settlement. It wasn't the best in the world, but we did it and the court approved it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I'd like you to talk a little more about the staff that Greive put together. Were they people who already worked in state government, or were they demographers or–?

**Mr. Bailey:** No, they were people that he brought in. Some of them, I think, had maybe shown interest in these matters before, and they were people that were eager to dig up figures and facts and run them through a machine. We didn't have computers like they have now. They were going constantly, trying to figure out how many people were here, and how many were there, and how many voted Democratic the last election, and how many voted Republican.

We had to do the same thing with the congressional districts, and the congressmen weren't happy, either, when they lost a good section of their old district. They were out here pounding on tables, and they couldn't do a darn thing about it. It was up to the Legislature. It all tied into a lengthy, time-consuming process, and I'm glad to see the people establish a bipartisan commission to take redistricting out of the Legislature, because it's one of those things that's a very difficult thing to do.

**Ms. Bridgman:** There were established forty-nine senatorial districts, with one member, and fifty-six legislative districts, forty-two of which had two members and the remaining fourteen had one member. Now will you explain what changes there were in your district and how it fit into this scheme?

**Mr. Bailey:** When I first ran for the Legislature in 1950, my district was all of Pacific County and the southern and eastern part of Grays Harbor County. It was terribly lacking in population. There was no doubt about this. We had one senator and two representatives. When we redistricted, after we amended the initiative that passed in 1956, we eliminated one representative. My senatorial district ended up with almost the same senatorial district but with only one representative.

Up to that time Grays Harbor County and Lewis County each had three representatives. In 1957 they both went back to two representatives and one senator. So in my general area of three counties we lost quite a bit of voting power in the Legislature.

In 1965 we carved up Grays Harbor County a little more. I would not let them cut up Pacific County. We took in western Grays Harbor, including Aberdeen and Hoquiam.

That year is the year that Bob Charette was a senator from Aberdeen and I was senator from South Bend. Under the plan Bob lost his seat. When we made this report, Bob Charette, who was very popular, a very talented guy, got up in the caucus and said, "I'm going to appeal this decision of the committee, and I'm going to fight for my seat and my district." And I remember Mike Gallagher getting up and saying, "I don't know what's going on yet Senator Charette, but I'm with Senator Bob Bailey." Charette withdrew his motion.

Charette and I were very good friends and remained so. He ran for and was elected to the House. He loved the House and its workings and he liked the people

around him. He thought the Senate was a little too staid and dull. I explained it to him later, it was not anything that I tried to put over on him, but it was the fact that I had just been elected for four years and he had only two years to go in his term. If it had been reversed it would have been my loss. He was one of the most talented legislators I have ever known. He became a leader of House Democrats and with my Senate leadership position, we were able to do a lot for the nineteenth district–and the state.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Another community-college bill was passed in the '65 session. What are your recollections about this one?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think this is a continuation of the two or three steps that I have explained before, separating community colleges from the common schools, making them a part of higher education. I'm not too sure, but this is probably the one where we created community-college districts. The big issue at that time was how we were going to treat vocational education. The labor unions were very strong in that they did not want vocational education put on the back burner, where community colleges could almost eliminate them. Labor had fought for years for establishing vocational-education schools in the state. It was a long battle and there was a great feeling against putting them into the other community colleges.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How do you explain this interest in, and emphasis on, community colleges during these three sessions, when before, and subsequently, there hasn't been that kind of interest?

**Mr. Bailey:** There were two or three things that happened in community colleges, and the reasons we made community-college districts. A member could come to the Legislature and put in a bill creating a new community college. They were growing like topsy-turvy without order. Without planning you could have five or six in one area if you weren't careful, and there would not be enough enrollment to sustain them. It wasn't a good way to grow.

Another thing about community colleges was the fact that their supporters were very militant. They were a group of people that really wanted to get more attention focused on the colleges and have them treated like higher education rather than just a portion of a K-12 school district.

It was a thing whose time had come, and we made the switchover. I think it turned into a very great system. I think students get a better education in those first two years of community colleges and can stay nearer home, without all the expense; they then can go on to the university or whatever and do pretty well. If we had all those people in the University of Washington, for instance, we'd have to double the size and at a terrible cost to the taxpayer.

Young people can go to a community college for two years and if they have the interest, they'll go on for the other two at another facility. If they go two years and don't have that interest, they're going to drop out, and it's better they drop out down there than to get up in the universities and drop out after great cost.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The advocates that you mention, that is the junior-college people themselves, were they faculty, administrators, or both?

**Mr. Bailey:** We came from a fairly small area where Aberdeen had the Grays Harbor Junior College, and the staff, the faculty, and the administrators were absolutely superb in taking an interest in things politically, and in constructive ideas for the area. I know this was also true all over the state. The move to community colleges had a terrific backing of the alumni, other booster groups, and quite a wide community support who were determined that this is the way to go.

It was also, I think, the same year that Evergreen College was being established. That was a tremendous legislative battle, trying to see where Evergreen College would be located.

There had been a law passed, many years before, that there could be no junior college within ten miles of another institution of higher learning. That had been done to protect the university, and others. Now even the university people became anxious to have community colleges, because they couldn't take care of everyone. The baby boom, or whatever you want to call it, was coming on fast. I don't think we had great opposition when we set up the community-college-district system, except perhaps from the labor groups worried about the fate of the vocational-technicals and some local school districts worried about losing control as well as extensive investment in junior-college facilities.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Charles Odegaard was president at the University of Washington from 1958 on, and he was, as you said, a very strong supporter of a community-college system.

**Mr. Bailey:** The restriction, I think, came from way back, probably in the thirties–when many junior colleges first started. Centralia might have been the first junior college and Aberdeen was very close behind. I think the restriction was because at that time they might have thought these communities would be soon coming

in and wanting a university before long and there was a genuine fear among four-year colleges at that time that they would lose enrollment.

The system was growing like topsy, and it needed order. Now you have a district, and if they want to establish a second college they have to come to the state and get approval, but you're not going to have one there unless there's sufficient need for it. It is an orderly process now.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What was the governor's civil-rights bill in the 1965 session?

**Mr. Bailey:** Actually, I don't have much recall of the civil-rights bill. I do remember demonstrations in Olympia by minorities. I can't recall any real drastic measure by the state. Anything we did was in conjunction with some of the national civil-rights bills that President Johnson had been promoting in his Great Society.

**Ms. Bridgman:** There were also passed, in that session, various bills to help county governments. Do you remember what kinds of help the county governments needed, and can you explain why they needed it at this time?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't remember any specific county bills. Every session saw a multitude of county bills and it seems to me that one of the things we had in the 1965 session was giving them some authority to raise money locally through some alternative taxes.

[End of Tape 19, Side 2]

**Ms. Bridgman:** Senator Bailey, in November of 1965 you were appointed Julia Butler Hansen's western administrative assistant. Can you tell us the background of that appointment?

**Mr. Bailey:** I was working at the *Aberdeen Daily World* as a Linotype operator and working on Julia's campaigns and running little errands for her in my spare time. These were things that didn't call for payment. They were things that I just liked to do because they were political. I had political duties, too, as a member of the Senate, as the more you get around between elections the less you have to campaign when the time comes. I was going day and night, and working, too. I had a sixty-mile trip, thirty miles each way, to and from my home to work, and it sometimes meant that I just stayed over in Aberdeen until the meetings were over, sometimes I went home and came back later.

Julia at one time wanted me to go on a partial payroll and still work, but pay my expenses. She offered it to me, but I didn't want to do it. I felt an obligation. If I was working I wouldn't feel I was doing a good job if I wasn't available when she needed me. So I turned that down. In November 1965 she called and wanted to meet with me and her Washington D.C. administrative assistant, Don Brown, as well as Riley Zumwalt, her western administrative assistant. Don came out and I met with them in Aberdeen. Later Julia came up from Cathlamet and was going through South Bend with Don Brown and we met at a South Bend restaurant. She asked me if I would take on the full-time job as her western administrative assistant.

I asked, "How much does it pay?" I couldn't afford to take a pay loss. "It's going to take a lot of travel."

She asked how much travel would it take. I was traveling sixty miles a day to work and back and that would be sixty miles times five, usually six, that's three hundred miles a week, making about twelve hundred miles a month. So I told her that I would be going at least sixteen hundred miles a month on her job. I also told her that I wanted to have the office in my home, because that way I could collect mileage and also write my travel off as expense. She agreed to that because she said she wanted me to open an office in Vancouver, and one in Longview, and I'd only have to be there one day a week at each place. There were also many demands in Olympia, and Shelton, and other places in the district, so it was necessary that I operate out of my house.

By the time she computed the mileage and everything, I think I ended up with a salary of about sixteen thousand dollars a year. This was higher than I think anybody in South Bend was making at that time, and I wouldn't even talk about it to anybody. Nowadays, of course, that's peanuts. Effective January 1, 1966, I quit the *Aberdeen World* and went to work for her full time.

I opened an office at the post office in Kelso and another office in the Federal Building in Vancouver. Julia had a secretary, Iris Hedlund, in Cathlamet who did a lot of work for her at her home, and she also had a little office that Julia used not far from Julia's home in Cathlamet. On my way through to Longview, I'd usually stop at Cathlamet, maybe dictate a few letters to Iris who would have all the mail from Washington ready for me. I was constantly on the go.

I had not even estimated my mileage properly because at the end of about three months I said, "Julia, I've got to have a talk with you."

She anticipated my talk and said, "I know you want more money because you're traveling more."

I was just going to tell her that I didn't estimate my mileage very well as I traveled at least twice as much as

I had planned. She immediately added that onto my salary. She refused to pay me mileage as such, because she didn't want to bother with keeping records, so she put it into my salary.

I did travel many thousands of miles a month. I was going constantly, but I always made it a point to go home at night. Very seldom, unless it was a really late meeting at some faraway place, did I stay away at night.

I was in constant communication with Washington D.C., three or four times a day, and, of course, I had a telephone credit card. When I'd get to Longview there'd be a line-up of people with problems waiting for me, and when I got to Vancouver there was another line waiting. When Julia came West I was in charge of her itinerary, and she'd usually call me and tell me what she wanted to do and I would work them into her schedule.

During my first year, 1966, Julia was running for re-election. Keith Kaiser from Olympia was her Republican opponent. She couldn't come out from Washington until about a week before the election, and I was constantly en route some place speaking on behalf of Julia Butler Hansen. Finally, one day Keith Kaiser got up and he said, "You know something, I've been running against Julia Butler Hansen, but you'd swear I was running against Bob Bailey because I've never seen Julia Butler Hansen." We used to laugh about that, but Keith and I became very good friends.

When she did come out, she had no problem with re-election, but it was quite a new experience for me that first year.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You spoke about a line-up waiting for you at Vancouver and a line at Longview. What sorts of tasks or problems were you expected to solve?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, sometimes instead of writing to Mrs. Hansen, they would come to the office and talk to me, and then I would contact Mrs. Hansen, or the proper people and try to help solve their problem. I would say quite a bit of it was about Vietnam. Someone would have a death in the family and want to get their relative home, or they had not heard from them, and problems like that. We'd try to locate them through their unit and get communications started again, and sometimes we could get them home for a funeral or critical family problem. There were just any number of things.

It was almost like the Legislature, and this sort of public turnout was not only true about Julia. One time as a state senator I announced that I was going to Long Beach and I was going to hold office hours for a day. Sid Snyder got me the city hall at Ilwaco, and I remember it was a terribly cold day. They had an old pot-bellied stove and when it was heated up, you'd burn on one side and freeze on the other. When I got around the corner at Ilwaco I wondered, "What in hell happened. Has the city hall burned down or something?" People lined up around the block. I never had such a day. It took me almost two years to solve some of the problems they presented. I took notes, followed up when I called help. I never saw anything like it, but people were just thrilled to death to have somebody to talk to about their problems.

When Julia came out West we always had office hours for a half a day or more, and we'd always advertise it in the paper. People would come to see her and visit, and I would run them in, one at a time, take notes while they were there, and later we would try to solve everything we could. Sometimes they just wanted to be heard. If she had a letter from somebody from the district, she would call me and then I would go to that town, Randle or Goldendale or wherever, and try to solve the problem. At least I would talk to them and tell them that she was very interested and would do what she could to help them.

They couldn't always write in the letter exactly what their trouble was, but usually we could help them solve their problems. I think you would call it an ombudsman now. It is an old legislative, congressional activity, and I think there's more of that type of thing done for constituents than there is actual enactment of laws.

**Ms. Bridgman:** To what extent were you responsible for the running and staffing of these offices?

**Mr. Bailey:** We didn't try to keep those offices open everyday. We posted our office hours and if there was a special meeting or something, like with county commissioners that I should attend, I would do so. I didn't have to go to those unless it concerned a federal issue.

Sometimes I had a secretary at Longview. Sometimes Iris would come up from Cathlamet to one of the offices and help me out. Sometimes I'd just pound out the notes myself.

Knowing Julia very well, I never made a decision for her. I never gave them anything on my own. I never did anything without saying, "Mrs. Hansen asked me." Sometimes she didn't even know it, but she was the one that was elected and we were working for her. It was up to her to serve her constituents, and I was hired to help her serve them.

It was a constant rolling through of people, personal issues, community issues, just any number of things. You could hardly believe how many issues. I then started finding out that when it was in my own area, that many times I had to wear two hats–one as a state senator and one as Julia's assistant. People knew who I was, so they'd fire the darts at Julia through me and

know that I would get in touch with her and let her know. It was a matter of communication, and it kept me extremely busy that first year. I was busy every year I worked for her.

It worked out very well. I could come to Olympia, and go to Agriculture or some other agency and deal with her problems as well as my own. I represented her at every Nine County Democratic League meeting and attended all meetings of Democratic county committees in the district.

At county fair time I helped set up the fair booth for our part in the Democratic booths, and would be there at least a day or two in each county fair. I hope I never see another fair. But that's the way it was–always something. We never let her name drag; we got her in front of everybody all the time. I also wrote press releases for much of her district activity and read all of the weekly papers as they came out.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How could you gauge the effectiveness of all of this action and travel and–

**Mr. Bailey:** You don't gauge those things until the votes are counted.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In April of '66 you went back to Washington D.C. for that entire month to work with Mrs. Hansen there. Will you describe that experience?

**Mr. Bailey:** Julia always wanted me to quit the Senate, and I didn't want to do so, because I figured I didn't know how long I'd last working in D.C.

She had a stormy record with employees, but was a generous person, although temperamental and a hard worker herself. She drove us to hard work, but I didn't mind it because she also worked hard, and she was very capable. She always wanted me to go back to D.C. Later she called me and said that Don Brown, her assistant, had left and it would be another month or so before she could get a new man to come on.

She wanted me to go back and I refused. I could envision as soon as I got back we would have one big fight and then I'd be stuck there with my family and no way to move my stuff back, and I refused.

"Well, then will you come back until I get the new man on?" I think it was three weeks or slightly more.

I said I would if she would buy my return plane ticket with a date certain. So she did that.

Lee and I and Mike, our son, had a room nearby. I figured that it was great education for him to learn something about the national government in a three-week period.

I went in to the office the next morning and introduced myself to the staff. She soon came down the hall and said, "I want to see you in the office," so I went into her inner office and she said, "I have to present my case on all of the public-works projects in the district to the Appropriations Committee this afternoon at three o'clock. Now you get to it and get the requests written up for me." She then left for a committee meeting. I didn't even know where the bathroom was, and so I said, "Yes, okay Julia I'll do what I can." It was typical Julia to make such demands, thus establishing her authority over the situation to a newcomer.

She said, "There are a few books over there, and a few books here." It would take me a week to read those books, even longer than that!

I didn't know what I was going to do, but she had no more than left the office and in walked Representative Tom Foley, now Speaker of the House. I'd known Tom in Olympia and he was fairly new to Congress. "Hi Bob!" he said. "I heard you were here, just came over to see how you were doing."

I said, "Well, pretty good." He said, "Come on in the office," and we went into Julia's private office where he put his feet up on her desk. I said, "Oh, my God, Tom, if she comes in here she's going to raise heck."

He said, "Don't bother me any. I got elected too." He just sits there and laughs. He was a down-to-earth guy.

I said, "You know what she did?" And I told him about the report.

"Well, doesn't that sound just like Julia?"

"I'll tell you what I'll do. Come back to my office with me." So we went back to his office and met Dick Larsen, later an editor of the *Seattle Times*, who was his assistant. He said, "Dick, Bob's got a little problem here."

Dick said, "We'll get right to work on it." I went back to their office about one o'clock and the whole report had been typed up. Julia came in at about two thirty and I laid it on her desk. She never asked me where I got it, or I would have had to tell her, but I did surprise her. "Why, that's the best report I've ever had given to me." Every time I think of Tom Foley as Speaker of the House I have to think of that day. I will never forget it, and Dick Larsen and I laugh about it every time we get together. Julia never asked where I got it, I am sure she well knew someone did it, but she had counted pretty hard on putting me in my place when I failed to produce. We fooled her.

She was that way. Those three weeks were a good experience. I stayed until the other guy was to arrive. My return ticket date approached and she came into the office to tell me she would like to keep me another couple of weeks. I told her I was not staying, and she said, "Okay, go home tomorrow," and so I did, on schedule.

The other fellow came on but didn't stay too long. She never asked me to go back again because she knew I wouldn't go.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What, now I assume every day wasn't like the first day. What other jobs were you given?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I learned to get along and get acquainted with the staff real well. They were hard-working. I had always talked with them by phone, but the personal contact was helpful.

You know Julia was a lot of bluster, but not always fearless. She had a tough exterior, but in mornings on campaign trips many times we'd go to a breakfast somewhere and she'd sit in the car a minute and say, "Bob, I'm just kind of worried. Do you think they're going to be friendly to me?" I'd almost push her out of the car and say, "Julia, they're your friends." Once she got started you couldn't have stopped her.

Al Rosellini was that way if he started to campaign. By evening he would just be going full steam, you couldn't stop him. He just loved people. He liked to get out among the people as much as possible. Julia was a lot that way, too, but she wasn't quite as tough inside as she put on. She didn't know how people were feeling out here on a lot of things–and it took a few days to break her into the feel of the district. She was very capable and wise in the ways of Congress. Still, she was very human.

We had many disagreements between ourselves and seldom in front of anyone else. At the very end, we got along well. I say I don't know how many times I quit and told her what to do with the job, and not too gentlemanly, either. Once, three days later, she even came out to Centralia to meet and talk me into going back to work for her. By that time I thought that I was going to have to get another job.

I think she really liked to have somebody that didn't just say "yes." That isn't a service to a public official either. Although I never disobeyed her. She was the boss, and she was the one people elected.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Did being back in and having been in Washington D.C., and seeing national government up close, so to speak–how did that make the Washington State Legislature look?

**Mr. Bailey:** It made Olympia look pretty good. It's so distant back there. One doesn't know what the other is doing until they get focused on the floor in some battle. Each committee is a kingdom unto itself with almost complete autocracy. The chairman can do almost anything, and most of them do. It is so impersonal back there. It was just like working in an empty tomb as far as I was concerned.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Did your responsibilities for Mrs. Hansen change over time? You started in November '65 and then you mentioned her campaign in '66. But were the things you were doing–say in April '66–very much different or was it always work with constituents?

**Mr. Bailey:** It was mainly constituent work. Due to the fact that Julia and I had been in the Legislature together, we pretty well understood what each of us thought about many of the issues. Our thoughts were very similar, especially on state matters.

If I got into a problem with the Highways Department, which now wasn't her job in Congress, I would pretty well know how Julia felt about it and I would venture to do what I could and then report to her what I'd done to solve the problem. I worked through the local legislator, though, so that he or she got the credit as well. In return Julia got credit for her cooperation. It was a very interesting job. I loved it, even if it was an awful lot of travel.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Now the '67 Legislative Session. We're back home again in Washington now. The Democrats retained the majority in the Senate, twenty-nine to twenty, but lost it in the House where the Republicans had fifty-five members and the Democrats forty-four. How do you explain that change in voter preference since '64?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't remember any great issue.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The leaders for that session: O'Brien was a minority leader in the House and Greive was again the majority floor leader and you were the caucus chairman in the Senate. Something Greive described or the way he described the Legislature, I think, reflects something you just said. He said that the Legislature was now concerned with different issues. Things he called "problems of the affluent"–higher education, environment, and problems of rebellious youth, as he put it. In your opinion how accurate of a judgment was that?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't recall, I'd have to go back and put myself in those days, and I would have to do a little reading.

Greive was not an issue-oriented member of the Legislature. He had his own way of doing things. He was a very devout Catholic. I don't think he missed daily Mass. This is to his credit. He never drank.

Sometimes I thought he would have been better off if he'd had a few.

He was so intense about everything and he was extremely energetic. I don't know where he got all of his energy. In some of these statements, like talking about the rebellious youth, I think perhaps it reflects some of his really conservative family values and background. Without a doubt you will recall some of those were years when we had an awful lot of rebellion about Vietnam and many other things. I can't tell you that was what he had in mind or not, but these things would disturb him, I am sure. I know they bothered the rest of us.

[End of Tape 20, Side 1]

**Ms. Bridgman:** Tax reform was another issue in the 1967 session. Can you describe that session's deliberations over this perennial issue?

**Mr. Bailey:** Actually at one session or another it seemed like we always had a tax-reform measure in front of us. Sometimes we were successful and sometimes not. I remember that the '67 session did not reach any agreement on tax reform. In the end, to balance the budget, we raised the sales tax instead.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Earlier you named taxes, particularly the income tax, as an issue which for you involved principles and therefore made compromise more difficult. There was in that session a 3.5 flat-rate income tax proposed. Could you explain the principles involved here? Partisan principles or groups within the parties?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, no, except that the long-held Democratic Party principle of a graduated net-income tax was something that had been part of our party philosophy. We had always regarded a flat-rate income tax as being disproportionate to the person not making very much money and quite lenient to those that could afford to pay.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In '67 another issue was that of the secrecy of the Senate Rules Committee. Do you remember how it developed and was resolved?

**Mr. Bailey:** Maybe we could dispose of secrecy in Rules here and now, and wouldn't have to discuss it later. It took up a good deal of time for several sessions.

There was always a group of people that did not believe in the Rules Committee holding secret ballots. The secrecy had been a tradition; I don't know how far back, but as long as I could recall. The Rules Committee was a very democratic committee, otherwise. The lieutenant governor was allowed by the members to be chairman of Rules. Many times we had a very hotly contested issue and because there was some criticism that he was not elected as a member to vote on bills, Lieutenant Governor Cherberg would not even vote. He was very fair about that and he did not want to make his action subject to a floor dispute. In spite of that, while he wasn't a voting member he was a very influential member.

Each member of Rules would sit in the same seat every day. You never changed seats. Each member had a turn to bring out one bill. They call that a "pull." Moving clockwise around the table they would "pull" a bill, debate it, and then vote on it. If voted out, it would go to the floor. The purpose of the Rules Committee was to regulate the flow of bills on to the floor. Without it there would be chaos. After a member had his turn, the "pull" went to the next member alongside and so forth, and eventually around the table. Wherever we stopped for the day, that would be the place for the first "pull" the next day or the next meeting.

Most votes were by "aye" or "nay," but all anyone had to do was to demand a secret ballot. When there was a highly controversial measure, and there were times when there was a measure that some members wanted to play games with, they would ask for a secret ballot. All you had to do was request it.

I discovered when I became caucus chairman that there was at least one member of Rules who counted ballots knowing exactly the order of the ballots, kept them in order and could go to his colleagues from his hometown and hold this over their heads. They were afraid to do anything except what he asked them to do. I was advised of this by our secretary, Mr. Bowden, and so I had always jumped up and helped collect the ballots, and then I'd shuffle them like a deck of cards. He never said anything but he was terribly perturbed with me. He always told me, "I can collect them. You don't have to get out of your chair."

Secrecy made it a place for people to hide their votes, play games with legislation. This was resented by a lot of members and the general public. As public open meetings took effect more and more, it became a kind of phenomenon that I felt we had to stop.

I have to tell one story that I've heard told many times. We had a bill; I can't remember what it was, but Senator Gissberg got up in Rules and spoke very much in favor of it and its importance. It wasn't a very important issue, I remember that, but he claimed so. He sat down and someone demanded a secret ballot. When they were counted there were eighteen votes "no" and none for bringing the bill out. I remember Senator Gissberg standing up and pointing his finger at Senator

Knoblauch and saying, "Senator Knoblauch, you promised me that you'd vote for it." He hadn't even voted for it himself!

This sort of thing was ridiculous. In this session I believe that House Rules opened up. If I recall right, in 1967 the issue was whether or not we'd include open meetings for Rules committees in the Joint Rules. While I argued for it, the Senate did not accept opening up the Rules Committee to public ballot at that time. At that time Senator Greive and I were both against secrecy in Rules.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you identify the member for the record who liked to collect the ballots?

**Mr. Bailey:** Absolutely not. He's long gone. I just wanted to point out the way that some of these things could come about and be manipulated.

And another thing. There was no real secrecy. Fourteen members could vote for a bill and four against, and one of these people could run out of the room and "leak" everything. Sometimes a member would be very much against a bill and go out and tell the friends that he really wanted it, but the others voted it down. Secrecy lent itself to a lot of skullduggery and secret tips as to what Rules was doing. There really was no "secrecy," but plenty of distorted facts.

The Rules Committee had a real reason for existence. Many bills coming out of standing committees should never have come out in the first place but a chairman and members sometimes thought it was easier to hand a bill to Rules to take care of. They'd dump the load on the Rules Committee. I think that abolishing secrecy probably forced standing committees to take better care of their bills, instead of making Rules a dumping ground for anything that they didn't want the responsibility for. Secrecy was bad public practice, and I always felt that it was. I was glad to see it abolished.

I could see some redeeming features of the practice. There is a lot of grandstanding when everything is all public, too.

Opening up Rules was inevitable. It was the last stand of the old gang. One more thing about Rules and where it got its reputation. Prior to the time when I came to the Senate the Rules Committee sat like a real imperial house and killed major bills right and left, never letting them get to the floor. The committee got a terrible reputation. They adjourned without even considering major state bills.

When I went on Rules a number of new people were also put on and we didn't have that rigidity of tradition. We tried to consider all the major issues–one way or the other. Even then secrecy was not a way to conduct public business.

**Ms. Bridgman:** There was concern during that session also about legislative ethics. Why did the concern develop in 1967?

**Mr. Bailey:** There were one or two problems of ethics that had to be met–and there was no place to take the concerns except to the Senate or House floor. The constitution says that each house is the judge of its own members or something of that sort.

There were a couple of cases, not really criminal, where people were working for associations and at the same time serving on committees that served those associations during the session. It's a pretty difficult thing to make a set of rules for part-time legislators that must go out and get a job, between sessions, and then have them banned from working in about half of the fields because their employers have legislative problems pending. Without some ethics procedures, the only place to take such charges was to the whole Senate–public condemnation, innocent or not.

There was quite a need for some kind of code of ethics to decide what was right and what was wrong. And at the same time give a person charged a right to be heard, before a fair committee, a bipartisan committee, or to allow other people to bring charges against a member, instead of just taking it out on the floor or in the press. That was the real purpose of the Legislative Ethics Committee. The bill was passed and charged members of the committee with drawing up a legislative code of ethics.

I should deal with some of that now and we won't have to do it later. A year or two later, after many meetings, and really tough ones, we came up with a code of ethics. Instead of presenting it as a rule that we could abide by or change from time to time, all the members of the committee decided that it would be better to put it in a statute. That way we would not have the allegation that we were bending the law for one person and not another.

The Ethics Committee was made up of two members from each caucus and two lay members appointed by each caucus, making a total of eight in the Senate and eight in the House Ethics Committee. The House and Senate committees, meeting together, made up the Joint Board on Legislative Ethics. The joint committee would take up the things that affected the whole Legislature. House or Senate boards would handle affairs strictly in their own house. Each caucus chairman made the appointments.

I served on the committee along with Senator Fred Dore, and I had to appoint two lay persons, nonlegislators. My selection at that time was an Episcopal minister in Olympia by the name of Charles Howard Perry.

The other was former Senator Jack Petrich of Tacoma, now on the state Court of Appeals. The Senate Republicans made their four appointments. The lay members from both parties were outstanding members. Joint meetings were held for a year and a half until we could draw up the new code of ethics.

**Ms. Bridgman:** There was a special session in 1967. The governor wanted changes in taxes, and you've mentioned how that was solved. The newspapers refer to the Democratic Senate as wanting workmen's comp. There were many meetings during that special session that met in the governor's office with legislative leaders, and in Lieutenant Governor Cherberg's office. What kinds of things do you remember about this session and those meetings? And what was accomplished?

**Mr. Bailey:** Legislative sessions were always full of meetings for legislative leaders. Unemployment compensation, though, was an annual problem with people that were friendly to organized labor. Being for it always became a big issue because any attempt to change it was always fought by the Association of Washington Business. It would become a real tight issue just getting a bill out of committee. Conservative Democrats were not very pleased with "freeloaders" as they called the unemployed in those days.

For many years the highest amount of money that anyone could draw was forty-two dollars a week. Fortunately we had acted on this bill just prior to the big Boeing cutback. And I often thought that we would have had a real revolution in the ranks of the labor and white-collar workers if all those thousands and thousands of Boeing people had lost their jobs and were forced to live on forty-two dollars a week.

As it was, the changes were made and available when the trouble hit. Greive and I and other leaders met constantly with the governor to achieve agreement. We met day and night trying to draw up new regulations, and it was almost as bad as redistricting.

We finally reached an agreement and brought it up to the floor. Greive did not like the agreement so he got in touch with Joe Davis, head of the State Labor Council. We brought the bill to the Democratic Caucus to see if we could get the votes to get it through the Senate. Evans was getting some votes on the Republican side.

Senator Greive got up in caucus and said, "Joe Davis doesn't like this. . . he's against it." Joe's trouble was that he wanted to write every bill that came up about labor. I didn't always agree with him but I'm sure he had been egged on by Greive to oppose the agreement. Anyway, he came into the caucus to speak against it. I decided that if Joe came in I was going to invite the whole labor lobby in, too. It included the longshoremen, the timber workers, and everyone. Joe proceeded to tell the caucus, "It's absolutely out of place, it can't be done this way, nobody's consulted me and I don't like it." Normally, that would have ended it. I called on Harvey Williams, the International Wood Workers representative, and he got up and said, "We've met this morning and we endorse this agreement wholeheartedly in spite of what Joe says."

Then the longshoremen got up and others followed, all supporting the bill and opposing Davis. It wasn't very long until we went out on the floor and passed the bill. Later I felt Joe wasn't that upset. I think he was being used at that time by Bob Greive because if we'd let unemployment compensation go down the tube it would be used later as trading stock and Greive was a great trader. He would have loved to have that thing to play with and use for bargaining for redistricting or whatever. Greive was a master of this. I don't begrudge him these actions at all because he was phenomenal as a legislator. He could make simple legislation complicated and difficult and intertwine it with other bills and issues. I may have disagreed with Bob Greive and his methods, but I never doubted his ability or his integrity.

It's hard to tell exactly since the years run into each other and some problems we had with us every year. As a legislative leader I probably was coming up to Olympia with Representative Charette, one of the House leaders, sometimes two or three times a week. We met on some of these issues in the evenings, tried to smooth them out a little so that when all of us met in session we wouldn't have everything to battle.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Now 1968 was an important year in our national history with the antiwar movement and the year historians choose to analyze as being prototypical of the 1960s. I'd like you to reflect a little on the events of that year emphasizing the effects in Washington State and the extent to which Washington State politicians were concerned and involved with national events.

First of all, the withdrawal of President Johnson from the presidential race. You were quoted as having said that after he withdrew the issue among Democrats in Washington State was one of hawks vs. doves. As we all know, Robert Kennedy was assassinated and ultimately the state went for Hubert Humphrey.

**Mr. Bailey:** In the first place, this was probably just a forerunner of the volatile year of demonstrations against the war. Up to that time I think our county resolutions would support the war effort. This slowly changed and many of us were against the war, but we were reluctant

to do anything that would seem like deserting support for our troops over there. Most of us felt the men over there needed support, and it would be unfair to them to withhold support here for political purposes. I suppose we could have been called hawks. Hubert Humphrey was not a hawk. I think he was a peacenik, but I think that he was in a terrible situation, trying to serve President Johnson and stifle his own voice as a candidate. I think you'll find in our county platforms that we would like to get out of Vietnam but stopped short of withholding aid and finances for our troops.

The party had a faction of McCarthy people that approached it much more radically. The battle became apparent at the national convention in Chicago when all the riots broke out. Our state actually had been for Johnson. After he quit, McCarthy's people were the better organized. I guess I felt at that time that probably Bobby Kennedy had the money and the charisma to be elected. All that time we didn't know just exactly. Humphrey wasn't able to announce immediately or anything until Johnson withdrew and my comments were made when the press interviewed people right after LBJ's decision.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You mentioned the resolutions you made by the Democrats in Pacific County when you were a delegate to the state convention held in July. The Pacific County Democrats met in May and in the resolutions included a reassessment of Vietnam–called for negotiations about the war, but also called for moral support of the troops serving there. Am I correct then, in assuming that's what you were referring to?

**Mr. Bailey:** That's right. I also knew we had a substantial number in our county that were for McCarthy. Probably most of them were for Johnson, but at that time it hadn't solidified. One thing for sure, I don't think that many Johnson people were ever going to vote for McCarthy. That resolution, if you read it closely, was trying to steer the middle of the road.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What part did you play in developing these–this moderation?

**Mr. Bailey:** I probably wrote the resolution.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I see.

**Mr. Bailey:** Usually when it came to writing something they always said, "You write it up and we'll look it over." I don't think any McCarthy people would have written it. They would have written it so drastic on one side that no one but themselves could have supported it, and it would probably have resulted in a very, very bitter convention at the county level.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In addition to those Vietnam-related resolutions, the platform had resolutions supporting tax reform, working toward solution of urban problems, and improving civil-rights laws as well as giving a Vietnam bonus. It does sound like a Bob Bailey document.

**Mr. Bailey:** I could well have written one or more resolutions. There was a resolutions committee set up by the county chairman. I would usually be on it. We drew up the resolutions and sometimes the committee had to approve them before going before the convention. So more than one person's idea would have to be involved.

[End of Tape 20, Side 2]

## 11

# SENATE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS CHAIRMAN

**Ms. Bridgman:** We were discussing the Third District Caucus in July 1968, which decided that three and a half of the national-convention votes would go to Eugene McCarthy, and one-half to Hubert Humphrey. What part did you play in this caucus?

**Mr. Bailey:** I was a delegate to the state convention from Pacific County, but I would have been there anyway, because at that time I was working for Julia Butler Hansen in the Third District and it would have been my job to go anyway. I was for Hubert Humphrey.

But Pacific County was very small potatoes, as far as the number of votes were concerned. We didn't get very far in promoting Humphrey delegates. McCarthy people were extremely well-organized. They had a lot of righteous causes and enthusiasms for getting out of the war. Everybody was disturbed about it, but it was not attracting the real rank and file of people. McCarthy was a little too far-out for many at that time. They were very loudly heard and very well-organized, and when Johnson backed out he left his side almost disorganized to the point where they hadn't solidified behind anyone.

The district caucus selected the delegates to the national convention. Every member of Congress from the party, though, was automatically a delegate as were other elected officials. Each congressional district selected their own portion of the delegates to the national convention and this was the purpose of the district caucus.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The State Democratic Convention was held in July and described in the newspapers as tumultuous. But Humphrey supporters won. Will you give us your version of this tumultuous meeting?

**Mr. Bailey:** It was almost like a riot. The galleries would be packed and they'd start yelling at times and threw things onto the floor. I had wanted to see a couple of young Democrats get a chance to go to a convention, so I paid their way. One of my county commissioners came up to me during the convention and said, "Have you looked up above to see what your protégés are doing?" I looked up and there they were with paper bags full of garbage and things, nothing too foul, but they were throwing them at us from the balcony. The galleries didn't have votes but they had the voices.

It came out a pretty peaceable convention in the end, and at the end Humphrey forces had control. In those days it was fashionable to demonstrate. I took a big ribbing about whether I was going to pay anybody else's way to state conventions. At one time I wanted to go eat and I wanted my alternate to come down and take my place. My wife was also a delegate and would not leave and chance turning her vote over to a doubtful alternative.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Thank you. I want to note for the record that in 1968 you ran and were re-elected, unopposed.

What was your evaluation of Nixon's leadership abilities when he was elected that fall?

**Mr. Bailey:** You'd have to ask somebody that wasn't as partisan as I. I always thought he was a disgrace to the country and I still do.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Can you elaborate?

**Mr. Bailey:** No, it is a partisan thought borne out by later events. One thing I remember about 1968 was when we held our National Legislative Leaders Conference in Honolulu just after the election. US Senator Henry Jackson went over at the same time. He had a sister that was dying of cancer and took her on the trip. There was a big delegation of legislative leaders from our state. We stayed at the Ilikai Hotel and the Jacksons stayed at Fort DeRussey nearby.

One nice Haiwaiian evening we were out in the yard at Fort DeRussey having drinks and talking, and the senator got a phone call. It was from President-elect Richard Nixon. This happened several times that night as Nixon was asking Scoop to become his secretary of defense. He would come out and say, "That was him again." He got still another call and excused himself and went back in. When he came back out he said, "Well that's the last call because I just told him 'no.'" I always remember December 1968 for that reason. It was quite historic.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I should say.

**Mr. Bailey:** It could have drastically changed Jackson's future. It probably would have been the end of his public career, as I'm sure after what happened to the

president in 1974 at Watergate, it would have been curtains.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Now in the 1969 Legislative Session, Evan's inaugural address included requests for executive reorganization, tax reform, and references as to the necessity for solving various urban problems, among other things. You commented to the press, "There is agreement on the problems, the difficulty may come on how to correct these problems." The 1969 session and the special session was 120 days, which was the longest on record up to that time. Many issues, however, were carried over from the 1967 session. Let's begin with tax reform, that perennial big issue, which was carried over.

First, the income-tax proposal. A single rate was proposed by the Republicans and a graduated net-income tax was supported by the Democrats. Either would have required a constitutional amendment, which also called for a two-thirds vote of each house. What can you recall?

**Mr. Bailey:** Tax reform was ever with us and what was proposed, and what was done, are two different things because any member could propose anything and may not have support for it at all. We are wasting time talking about proposals. I'm positive most Republicans didn't want any tax reform. Governor Evans did and some of his Republican legislators also supported reform, but the large number of Republicans in the Senate were dead against change. They'd propose anything to try to kill off a proposal that might pass.

Eventually we did adopt an income-tax reform that came out of the meetings in the governor's office, and after much negotiation. We passed it and sent it on to a vote of the people.

I remember we were working hard on it one night, as was our secretary, Ward Bowden, who had a long, hard day. He went home late and the next morning died of a heart attack. I remember that so clearly because we always wondered if the stress and strain of working on tax reform with its long hours could have brought on his death.

My recollection is within the next week we passed tax reform, which went on the ballot in 1970. It was soundly defeated by the people. The defeat just seemed to fuel Evans to start all over again.

**Ms. Bridgman:** That particular measure that was soundly defeated would have reduced the sales tax to 3.5 percent and established a single-rate income tax at 3.5. When you were questioned about your support of this, and this was at the end of the special session, you responded that. . . "Sometimes it's better to compromise rather than kill the whole measure due to a philosophical ideal."

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I think that comment related to the single-rate.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Yes.

**Mr. Bailey:** But the single-rate, as I recall, had some degree of graduation, and it seemed to me like it was the only way to get the bill passed. I think that we passed two bills. One was to allow it by a constitutional amendment, and the other was a bill that would implement the tax and set rates if the people approved.

The details were in the bill that implemented it, and that was one of the reasons that later on Governor Evans wanted it resubmitted, so that we put every limit we could into the constitutional amendment, so that people couldn't argue that it is fine now but the Legislature can change it as soon as they get back into session.

The difference between the second proposal and the one that was defeated was that details were very ironclad and written into the constitution. I often worried that if we ever had real problems, how would we ever raise funds to meet them? We couldn't raise the sales tax, we couldn't change hardly anything. There were so many restrictions it would have been a horrible handicap if passed. There were ways to get around it, but it would be very difficult to get enough votes to raise taxes, no matter what the problem.

The proposal wasn't everything everybody wanted, but it was the only one we could get passed. It was a matter of trying to get something out.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The *Seattle P-I*–in an article about the deliberations over this–commented, that if the Senate passed tax reform, it would be accomplished because of you, and Senators Bill Gissberg and August Mardesich, working together. To what extent did the three of you work together on this?

**Mr. Bailey:** I remember that all of us felt that the time was coming when we had to get away from special school levies which provided a very unequal distribution of funds. A student in a rich district had a real nice school. A student in a poor district had a hard time because they had to go to special levies each year. We saw the need for more school revenue at the state level. Governor Evans was a leader in this. Senator Gissberg and Senator Mardesich and I apparently all agreed at that time that there was a desperate need to do something. It shows here that we ran around the end of Senator Greive again. I don't think we ever ignored him, but he was always busy on things of his own, and

didn't really have a great feel for some of the statewide issues.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You've mentioned Senator Gissberg several times and Mardesich once or twice. Will you describe their political styles and opinions?

**Mr. Bailey:** Mardesich was a very bright individual. He could take a look at a bill and tell you instantly what was wrong with it, and he was noted for his corrective amendments on the floor. A couple of times he got in trouble over those, because people thought that he had a special interest. I would have been suspicious of a bill that Augie did not amend, because he'd look at a page and be instantly up on the floor and have inserted a comma here or remove one there. He had a great ability. He was a very sharp person.

As a lawyer he had a limited law practice in Everett. He had inherited a fishing business from his father and his brothers and preferred it to the practice of law. They were in Alaska fishing every summer and it took a good deal of Augie's time. When he was in the House we used to say he could be Speaker anytime he wanted, but he just didn't want to work that hard and take it on. When he came to the Senate, he was a good worker and a brilliant member.

Senator Gissberg was a very talented senator and was able to really give an impressive and enlightened speech on the floor. He represented a Snohomish County district that our secretary, Ward Bowden, lived in. When "Giss" ran for floor leader one time he lost by one vote to Senator Greive. He was a great senator with unlimited ability. Gissberg would work hard for two weeks and then all of a sudden just take a couple of days off, but he was a very solid member.

I remember one time Ward Bowden came to me and he said, "What do you think of my senator?" And I said, "What do you mean?" He said, "What do you think of Gissberg?" I said, "He's a real good member." And he said, "Well, what I'm pointing out is he didn't get elected majority floor leader." But he said, "But anytime he decides to stand up and do something he takes the floor away from the majority leader, and he is the majority leader!" There was a lot of truth in that. He was a very capable and strong senator. It was a real loss when he decided not to run again.

**Ms. Bridgman:** A part of the governmental reorganization that Evans talked about in his inaugural were his hopes for the establishment of a transportation department. According to the *Tacoma News Tribune*, he wanted to have authority to fire and hire the director of transportation. There was a House bill passed which would give him that authority. Senate bills–among them one you sponsored–would merge and consolidate several agencies having to do with transportation, but didn't give the governor that authority. Will you comment on this whole issue and particularly the bill you sponsored?

**Mr. Bailey:** There was always a constant disagreement about a governor's authority. When a Republican governor was in he wanted to reorganize and name and direct all the departments and commissions. There was always opposition from the other party, and vice versa. In the Department of Transportation there seemed to be some necessity for coordination of several agencies. The Democrats could not agree on turning the appointment of the administrator of highways over to the governor, but there were other agencies where consideration seemed logical. I recall that Evans' original plan was even to put the State Patrol in the Transportation Department. This met with a lot of opposition and I think history has probably shown us right, but at that time that was one of the issues.

Another issue was the Department of Licenses which was really mostly dealing with transportation matters. In the meantime, though, we had taken the professional licensing out of the secretary of state's office and put it under the Licensing Department, so it was not all transportation.

One of the big issues one year was highways personnel which had its own department of personnel. We thought it was necessary and later succeeded in consolidating Highways personnel under the state personnel director.

The bill started out placing the Department of Licenses into Transportation, but between the time it left the committee and got to the Senate floor it wasn't there any more. About all it did was rename the Department of Licenses the Department of Motor Vehicles. I will always remember Senator Rasmussen getting up on the floor and saying, "This is going to be really interesting. My constituents will go to the doctor's office when they are sick and think they are going to die. They look around the office and it says 'Doctor' So-and-So, licensed by the Department of Motor Vehicles. That should be reassuring." The bill was only partial consolidation, but never into one large Department of Transportation as had been requested.

Rosellini had requested some action on it, too. Evans did so almost every two years he was in office. I think that Governor Ray did the same and Governor Gardner is following suit this year. It has always been a question of control by the governor. We shied away a little because Evans did get through his superagency in the Department of Social and Health Services, which

consolidated so many things. I think people were avoiding more major agencies at that time.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well, that leads into my next question perfectly then. We've been talking about principles and compromise through all our interviews. Will you please explain how, and to what degree, principles were involved here, and I'm thinking of the limited authority of the governor in Washington State.

**Mr. Bailey:** I'm not sure that I follow you. The Legislature, in setting up many of the commissions, has usually tried to set up a bipartisan commission with staggered terms for a set number of years. The federal government usually does this, too. They're not subject to an instant change of governors.

The Department of Transportation, or Highways, was long under the governor, and it was Julia Butler Hansen in the 1951 session that sponsored and passed the Highway Commission bill. It was due to the fact that the program needed continuity and planning. Under the old system the governor appointed the director of Highways and the director could be fired anytime by the governor. With a new director there would be a whole new program. No one knew what was going to happen. That was a chief reason for the Highway Commission.

That was still one of the reasons the Legislature had been very hesitant to dump the commission and put it under the governor. It wasn't because of any poor action by a governor, but because it just had not worked out too well. There had been efforts under Langlie, especially, and other governors to take over Natural Resources and other departments and things of that sort. There were efforts under Langlie to take over the state auditor's office and that was resisted. There has been a reluctance to turn over a lot of authority to the governor at the expense of other statewide elected officials.

One issue we did have big problems with Evans over was the line-item veto.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Yes, yes.

**Mr. Bailey:** It came to a head later, but you could mention it under the same subject. In one bill, the landlord-tenant act, we had adopted a rights bill for those people renting as well as the owners. We worked hard on that and tried to protect everyone, so that the owner wasn't getting hurt and the renter also had rights. Some people were destroying property, and one couldn't do anything about it. In other instances, the owner was being unfair to the renter.

We drew up what we thought was a pretty good bill and sent it to the governor. By a line-item veto he struck single words out. If it would say "shall not" the governor struck out the word "not" and made it mean entirely the opposite of the intent of the Legislature. He wrote and actually legislated the whole bill by use of line-item veto. We were very disturbed and we didn't have any trouble at all in passing a constitutional amendment to a vote of the people, which they endorsed and which restricted the governor's right to legislate in this manner.

[End of Tape 21, Side 1]

**Mr. Bailey:** The governor in this state has many restrictions on his authority. But when I think about it, it hasn't been harmful. We are recording this interview in 1991, and there again is a considerable conversation going on about reorganizing the Transportation Department. That probably is not all bad as discussion is helpful, but I don't think that giving the governor unlimited authority would make it any more efficient. There are some times when it's to his benefit not to have to shoulder the whole burden for every little thing.

As far as patronage is concerned in the Transportation Department, I really don't know what would be involved except for the one big job as director of highways and perhaps a few administrators. It couldn't be that political. I suppose it's just a basic principle of good government to give someone all the authority necessary. I really can't see where we really had done too much harm to the governor in this state. He is not likely to rename engineers and interfere in the department in technical things. Usually he is not qualified to do that. We've had plenty of trouble in other departments that are directed by governors. I don't go along with the theory that the Washington State government has hamstrung the governor and his authority.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How typical are the views you've just expressed of the Democrats you served with during your career?

**Mr. Bailey:** It sometimes has been a partisan issue. If a Republican governor wanted more authority, the Democratic members did not want to give it to him and vice versa.

**Ms. Bridgman:** We need to get back to the 1969 session here. And discuss another issue that you have cited earlier as being one, for you, which is a matter of principle. That is abortion. In that session you were one of the sponsors of the bill, and it was held up in the Rules Committee. The newspapers tracked it and said that it was languishing in Rules. A citizens group responded by telling the press they were considering an

initiative. Finally in April of 1969 it did not come out of the Senate Rules. That was in the special session. Will you please, first of all, explain your convictions about this, and then as much as you can, in an issue with such a long history, describe how the Senate Rules Committee dealt with the abortion issue in this particular session?

**Mr. Bailey:** Here again I think it would be in the interest of coherence to talk about 1969 and 1970 as it related to abortion. I was in the Senate one day in 1969 when Senator Joel Pritchard and Senator Fran Holman, two Republicans, approached me, saying "We would like you to go on a bill permitting abortions." I knew it was a very hot subject, and I hadn't thought too much about it. I had always considered it a shame that poor women had to go to illegal places, under very unsanitary conditions, and things of that sort.

I knew they were doing it. I also knew that the rich people were going to Japan and places, and getting excellent treatment. I really had been very sympathetic to the women's right to choose to eliminate that sort of thing, but I remember telling them, "Oh, I don't want to get on that. It's too controversial. I'll vote with you, but I'm not going to be a sponsor."

Well, I went home that night and I got to thinking more about it, and I thought that if you think something is right, why shouldn't you be willing to stick your neck out for it? So I went in the next morning to Senators Pritchard and Holman, and I said, "I've changed my mind. If you still want me, I'll go on the bill."

It immediately hit the press. The press asked me as to what my feelings were on this. I explained to them how I felt, but I said, "You know something? My wife and I have never even mentioned the word, ever."

I had a phone call that afternoon from my wife, Lee, and she said, "I want to tell you something. I'm very proud of you for what you did." I hadn't realized how deeply women were involved in this.

From then on there were constant phone calls, letters, and other contacts. People would call me who were very strong Catholics and I'd be sure of their opposition only to have them say, "Bob, what can we do to help you get that bill going?"

On the other hand I had people that were offended. I know that when I ran for Congress in 1974 that these people went door to door against me because of this one bill. I haven't changed my mind a bit.

I know why I was asked to go on the bill, I'm not naive, but I was a member of Rules, and they also needed a Democrat, preferably one on Rules. Eventually the bill got out of committee and into Rules. It went into Rules and during the 1969 session we were not able to get it out. In the special session of 1970 the bill had carried over and was still in Rules. And I believe a motion was made to bring it out, but it did not come. Almost every member of Rules had been pressured, and I'm sad to say that many members of Rules had promised people they would vote for it, but when the vote was cast there was never enough votes to bring it out.

One day Senator Holman got up on the floor and moved to relieve the Rules Committee of the bill and report it to the floor. This is something that, for their own protection, members never do because they have bills sometimes they don't want out of Rules but wanted to avoid taking a stand in roll-call voting.

I was a member of Rules and I was expected to abide by the rules of the club and not cross my colleagues. I knew he would come awfully near having votes and also it would establish a bad precedent to discharge the committee. I stood up on the floor and told the Senate that I was very disgusted with those members of the Rules Committee that had made promises, and then went behind closed doors and didn't keep them. I thought it was dishonest. I said, "But Senator Holman, I just really think this is a wrong way to go. If you'll withdraw your motion, and if the Rules Committee doesn't bring this bill out in the next twenty-four hours, I'll stand up and sponsor the motion with you." I sat down and he withdrew his motion.

We went into Rules Committee and the bill came right out. I could tell you in between times I had a couple members call me everything under the sun, but later they came over and apologized. They were just really uptight. It was a most unusual procedure. The story was pretty well written in some of the papers.

**Ms. Bridgman:** And then will you tell us the results of this for the record?

**Mr. Bailey:** The bill passed the Senate twenty-five to twenty-three, and it passed the House sixty-four to thirty-one, and was sent as a referendum to the people and was adopted by the voters in November of 1970.

We didn't have a vote to spare. You have to have twenty-five votes to pass a bill in the Senate, and without the referendum on it, it never would have passed. The people passed it by a fairly good margin.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Yes. It probably will be useful to note again that this is 1991 and it is still an issue.

I'm confused about something, because my research indicated that you had voted out the secret ballot for the Rules in 1969.

**Mr. Bailey:** That is true. I didn't say we had a secret ballot in the last consideration.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Thank you. It was not you who confused me, but the newspaper articles I was reading.

**Mr. Bailey:** Not too many people were going into the Rules Committee to see who voted for what, and for a time, while we eliminated the secret ballot, the public did not go into the committee room as we were "in executive session" so to speak. The day we voted it out there were a substantial number of people in the hearing room. They couldn't talk to Rules members nor offer comments.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In February 1969, an ethics code was adopted. Do you believe we've discussed that enough?

**Mr. Bailey:** Perhaps. We adopted the ethics code, but not without a lot of problems. The press would pick at a little sentence here, and a little sentence there, and say we were too lenient. Senator Greive was very much against anything in writing on ethics. He didn't think it was doing anything but binding everybody's hand, and he would get up and make motions making the bill so severe as to ensure its defeat. Several times in talks on the floor I said that Senator Greive wasn't trying to reform, he was trying to defeat reform. Greive fought for the old ways of doing things. He found it hard to change the ways that he had become accustomed to.

We had quite a bit of trouble. Senator Woodall, a Republican, was against a lot of these restricted activities even though we thought we were presenting a moderate course of action. But we finally got it passed, fairly intact.

That session we were informed the Black Panthers were marching on Olympia from Seattle. They had rifles and were well-armed. I had brought up a couple of pages from home and everyone was terribly worried about everybody's safety. The leadership was called by the State Patrol and Lieutenant Governor Cherberg into his office. Leaders from the House and Senate and the State Patrol were there. Bill Bachofner was chief. Governor Evans was out of state, and Cherberg was acting governor.

The chief explained the problem to us and our attorneys said there was no law at that time against having rifles and firearms or guns in the Legislative Building or other state buildings. The patrol was getting and relaying reports as the group was approaching Olympia. It seemed like every time they passed a beer parlor they stopped and had a couple more. We didn't know in what condition they were going to be when they got to Olympia. Olympia looked like an armed camp that day. On every building top around the capitol you could see people standing with their guns. The Panthers arrived and checked in their firearms and were very courteous and polite.

In our meeting before, the State Patrol advised us that really we needed a law passed outlawing guns in public buildings, and we needed it quickly before they got here. The House had already passed a bill and the first thing in the morning, the Senate passed it also. Lieutenant Governor Cherberg signed the bill as acting governor on advice of the chief of the State Patrol.

Every one of us in that meeting could swear to this and when Evans came back he and the chief immediately publicly criticized Cherberg for being hasty and panicky, "overreacting." I thought that at least one of them could have come to the defense of John Cherberg who was being cautious and advised to do what he did. Cherberg never deserved that. He did exactly what he was told by law enforcement and was backed by both parties in both houses. It was an unfair treatment released to the press after the fact.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I'd like to go back a minute to the ethics code you adopted. You made a remark about it being something you could live with. What were the provisions of it?

**Mr. Bailey:** You'd have to read it. It's thirty-five to forty pages long and every word in it meant something, because we had fought over every word and each word was very important. It wasn't everything that everybody wanted, but it worked out pretty good. The lay members and the legislative members of the ethics panel all agreed finally. They came out with unanimous support. The legislative standing committees the bill went to offered the most opposition. There were people that didn't want any ethics code or restriction so they tried to kill it with kindness.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Did it not provide for full disclosure of legislators' private records?

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes. Legislators had to disclose everything long before the Public Disclosure Act went through. We had to disclose some things in more detail than the Public Disclosure Act demands. The Public Disclosure Act will speak in generalities where we would be specific. There was quite a time after public disclosure was passed that the legislators had to file their own disclosure, and also file one with public disclosure, too. Ultimately the law was changed and it was consolidated into one report.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Senate Rules voted the secret ballot out in 1969. Is there anything that you remember now that you wanted to add to that?

**Mr. Bailey:** No. I think we covered how Rules operates and how finally they yielded to open meetings. Rules would have lost their battle on the floor if they hadn't changed because of the tremendous move about that time for legislative ethics and open meetings. Of course, elimination of the secret ballot in Rules was one thing, opening up the meetings of Rules was another. They both came about.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The special session of the 1969 session, a very long one, ended with Governor Evans expressing anger at the Senate over no passage of the annual-election bill to ensure that his tax measure could be voted on in November. Will you please comment on his indignation?

**Mr. Bailey:** If we passed everything Dan and Slade Gorton wanted they would tell of the great and glorious session, even if we neglected the state in other matters. If we didn't pass everything they wanted it would be the "most horrendous" session. Slade would usually say something about how we needed legislative reform and that the legislators had to change. In other words to make it possible for him, the attorney general, to have more control and influence over the Legislature. These comments are just one of those political pingpong games that you play, that you get so used to, and that you don't pay any attention to. They happen after every session, one way or the other.

**Ms. Bridgman:** We've discussed thoroughly abortion and unemployment compensation during the second special session in 1970. There was also a teachers' retirement bill passed and signed by the governor. You, Gissberg, and Ted Peterson were considered important by the WEA in getting this through. Will you comment on this please?

**Mr. Bailey:** Over a period of time Senator Gissberg and I had been very strong supporters of teachers' retirement problems and many of these bills were just great improvements. Some of them had to do with the old retired teachers, where we tried to improve their lot, because they were making very little. I had been sponsoring bills on teachers' retirement for many years and they usually came to me. I was glad to help them out where I could.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You evaluated this special session, according to newspaper articles, by saying that it improved continuity, and here I quote, "We are moving into a more modern concept." The compromises, you said, were pretty well worked out. I'd like to know how you defined "modern" at that point. How was this opinion related to the kinds of issues the Legislature was dealing with at that time?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think I was referring to something that happened in 1969, when the state Supreme Court ruled that special sessions were no longer limited to sixty days. Therefore, after the regular session when the governor called us to special session, we thought we had been under a sixty-day limit. This ruling eliminated the need for those last-night careless procedures to meet deadlines and go home.

The Legislature itself was getting to be more of a continuing body instead of just every two years. Starting in 1969, Governor Evans called a special session in January of each even-numbered year, in anticipation of annual sessions some day.

We once introduced all new bills in a special session, but we started continuing those bills already from the regular session. You can see how we picked up on the abortion bill from the year before.

I think it was that and other modern changes of legislative procedure I was speaking of. In 1974 or 1976 we had a "continuing session" where we would recess and come back on our own. The people later changed the process by passing annual sessions.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I'd like to discuss two articles now that you brought to my attention. You saved them among your personal memorabilia. One is an article which ran in the *Argus* in March of 1970. It's attacking legislators who have had many terms and the writer ended by stating that, quote, "The glut of aging seat warmers is hurting King County."

The second article was in the *Seattle Times* and criticized the Senate seniority system, saying both Republicans and Democrats had groups of senators who had served a long time and prevented newcomers from having any real power. How did you react to these two articles?

**Mr. Bailey:** The press was very fickle. If it got what it wanted, or if you played to it, you'd get a good report. If you didn't, you wouldn't. I think it's the same reaction we see nowadays in limiting terms. That's nothing new. Our constitution forbids county officials from having more than two terms so they all got elected, went to the courthouse, and played checkers with the offices. They'd jump from one office to the other then back to the first at great cost to the taxpayer. Really, if people want an official, they should have the right to vote for them. If they haven't got the guts to go out and vote, they deserve what they get. I don't know of any time I was there that the seniority system determined things for anybody. We met and we appointed our

committees based on the issues coming up and who we thought would carry through our program. Naturally, newer members were not as experienced as others, as a rule, but seniority was not the only consideration as it is in Congress.

[End of Tape 21, Side 2]

**Ms. Bridgman:** Is there more you want to add on the seniority system in the Senate before we go on?

**Mr. Bailey:** I contend that the seniority system didn't play important roles in the Legislature like it does in Congress. Seniority there was used to select the chairmen, the committees, and that wasn't true in the state Senate at all. It was a matter of who might want on the committee and about what we thought was coming up. The caucus Committee on Committees voted freely to put people on the committees they wanted as much as possible. I suppose there were certain efforts at times to promote a person that had been a vice chairman the past year if the chairman didn't want it. The Rules Committee usually was made up of experienced, senior members and a member of Rules could not be chairman of a standing committee. That pretty well ruled out a lot of them unless they didn't want a standing committee. I don't think seniority played that big of a deal. There were always many new members coming in and they were always heard. It wasn't a thing like the congressional seniority at all.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You had your convention in Spokane in July 1970. And the party platform was designed by what the newspapers called the party liberals, those who had supported McCarthy in 1968. In the platform were statements supporting the income-tax proposal, amnesty to draft dodgers, pulling out of Vietnam, recommending that the attorney general should give legal services to draft dodgers. Even though the vote was close, these measures were all adopted. You and other Democratic legislators got together and made a statement in which you said that the platform was rightly the expression of the majority at the convention, but that you agreed that economic decline, not only in this state, but the nation, was a major problem with resulting unemployment and inflation. The signers said they were in no way bound by the state platform. You were cited as being the author of this.

Another provision of the platform was against the Elks Club because they allegedly discriminated by race, and this was considered a slap in the face against Henry Jackson for his US Senate opponent, Carl Maxey. Will you comment on this?

**Mr. Bailey:** The statement that I wrote for the legislators present not only said the economic conditions were major factors, but also that each one of us was running for election on our own. The party platform was just the expression of the majority of the people at the convention, but did not reflect on individual members and what they believe. It was actually a repudiation of the convention platform and was signed by almost all legislators present.

I have previously said that in this state people declare for office and there's no party platform adopted until long after the filings close. They really have no obligation to support the platform, unless they feel like it.

I remember quite clearly about the Elks Club issue. This came up very late in the day. It was getting dark and I remember that many of the delegates were off having coffee and even on their way home. The resolution passed and there were not too many people on the floor. I will never forget that about an hour later we were getting ready to adjourn when Senator Mike Gallagher from Seattle stood up, demanded the floor, and said, "Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know how soon we are going to adjourn. I want to be sure and get down to the Elks Club before they close." I always remember that because nobody took it very serious. I don't think even the Elks worried much, and at least it was hardly ever mentioned after that.

**Ms. Bridgman:** To put this platform in its wider context, we can recall the earlier comments I quoted by Senator Greive about the 1965 session. He remarked that the Legislature was now dealing with problems of the affluent. Now whether one agrees with his premise or not, the 1969 session–with abortion, the Black Panthers, the issue about secrecy in the Rules Committee, the code of ethics–and the special sessions following it were very different from those in the mid-1950s. And then there were the objections we've just talked to about seniority, whether justified or not. You've mentioned a trend toward public meetings and more open government. I've asked you earlier in this series to reflect on the 1940s and on the 1950s. So with all these things in mind will you now comment on the 1960s? It's a much-analyzed, poorly understood time.

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I think the 1960s would have been the time that we actually dealt with ethics and open government, and things like that that had long been passed by. The violent expressions of people on the streets regarding Vietnam had little to do with us. It certainly was nothing to do with the legislative process, but the activism probably had an indirect effect.

Some demonstrations started out more like an anarchy. At first they accomplished little except to voice what people were thinking, and eventually they accomplished just as much if they'd have gone to the polls and voted. We gave the eighteen-year-olds the right to vote about this time and at the next election we found hardly any of them had voted after they had marched on the streets for the right. I think that had little to do with legislative practice except it did change perhaps public participation.

Just realize that these party platforms are so damned unimportant that nobody could remember the day after what they actually contained.

**Ms. Bridgman:** But how much different did the decade seem to you than those preceding that time?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, of course, the decade started with the election of John Kennedy in 1960 and was followed by the very successful battles of Lyndon Johnson for civil rights, which carried over to legislatures to the extent that we didn't have that much trouble passing our own in our state. I don't think we had any great problem in Washington. But there was a general change in thinking about issues like school busing and things like that. We seemed to get them passed without any great strain.

Then as we went along and moved into the Vietnam era things became rather riotous about 1970 and in turmoil for several years. People were really getting activated. I told you about one group of blacks that came to Olympia. I think it was maybe 1971 that a group of organized welfare workers came to Olympia and they were really quite violent. We had to pile all the davenports and chairs and everything across the doors to keep them from busting the doors down. They were pounding and ramming them. They were not well-behaved. Most were people out of Seattle, and I don't know what group inspired them, but they called themselves welfare protesters seeking better handouts.

We were subjected more and more to this type of thing in the 1960s and 1970s. It was more of a public protest type of people coming to Olympia in big organized protests. We never used to have that years before. Maybe that's one of the changes that came about. I can't say it had great influence on the members. It probably is impressive to see thousands of people out there demonstrating if they behave themselves. They should be heard, and if no one comes out at all to express themselves the legislators are inclined to take things for granted.

**Ms. Bridgman:** To what do you attribute this bigger public participation?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, the protests started on the national level, sometimes violent. I think it carried over to peaceful protests. We have them today. They march for this, and march against that. It's just something that people started doing more of to be heard. I don't think that it's always effective, but many times it is.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How much of the change would you say was due to demographics, that is, the coming of age of the baby boom generation?

**Mr. Bailey:** I have never even thought about that. I think when they marched on abortions, it was a peaceful group of people who came down to Olympia against it or for it. Then they were not terrifically large in numbers, like they are now. The only ones I can tell you about were special-interest groups, and I didn't really put an age on them, baby boomers or oldies. I can't even recall age considerations on the welfare workers. Of course, Vietnam protests were more of a group of young people about college age.

You ask what the changes were brought about in those years. There is a lot more public participation in demonstrations in Olympia and elsewhere. It's more or less accepted as long as it's well-organized and controlled. Demonstrations could be for teachers' salaries, just anything. It's not just a group of young people or baby boomers.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How do you explain this change in habit, or ethic, or mood, which is so different than the kind of mood you described for the mid-1950s?

**Mr. Bailey:** I have no idea. It would take a doctor's degree in psychology to tell you that.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Let's begin then with the 1971 session. The Democrats had a majority in the Senate, twenty-nine to twenty, and the Republicans in the House, fifty-one to forty-eight. Democratic legislative leaders were re-elected by their caucuses.

Again we begin the issue of redistricting. One political writer, Adele Ferguson from Bremerton, wrote that Slade Gorton, who was attorney general, had a plan that the House, being Republican, would pass, and the Senate would reject it, and then the Senate would submit its plan, which the House would reject. Gorton would then take his plans to court and thus win the day. This writer referred to you on TV as implying that the 1971 budget would be held up until the Democratic redistricting plan passed. So will you recall what really happened and how?

**Mr. Bailey:** I remember that. They called me to Seattle to be on the TV program with Gorton because they thought I would probably sit there and swallow everything they threw at me. I remember that Gorton got quite indignant about how horrible the last session was. I finally called him on it, told him that it was amazing to me that when we did everything he wanted it was a great session, when we didn't do everything he wanted it was a horrible session. Then we sort of got into it. My wife told me later that, "You got pretty mad." I told her I was just not going to take it from that guy. We had figured all the time that he was engineering all of the redistricting for the GOP, and also for a court case.

He had a staff working with Evans on their own plans and it was strictly a partisan deal. Both were holier-than-thou and not responsible for anything bad, but you know, a good saint espouses good nonpartisan government while really developing a very partisan approach. I probably said that about the budget without consulting my caucus, but I'd have been perfectly right to tell him he would not get his own way, and he didn't either.

I don't think we gave him a budget in a hurry that year either. We did hold out to see what we could get. My recollection was we did not reach a redistricting agreement and eventually adopted a budget.

You couldn't hold important state government up just because a bunch of senators and representatives couldn't agree on shuffling the line of districts. Slade and I always got along, personally we weren't bitter enemies, but the majority didn't have to take orders from the minority and we did not.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The session was 120 days, that is two regular sessions and a special session.

Another issue that concerned you in that 1971 session had to do with gambling. You introduced a bill to abolish horse racing. You here again answered Attorney General Slade Gorton's crackdown on bingo. Would you please tell us about that?

**Mr. Bailey:** I once spoke to the Association of Washington Clubs in Seattle. Senator Walgren was their attorney at that time, and they invited me up to make a few comments. They were having constant trouble with what they called the tolerance policy. Gambling was forbidden in the state of Washington by the constitution, but was "tolerated" whenever officials approved.

The tolerance policy was one where a mayor or other official could interpret gambling to suit his fancy. In other words, tolerance was a clear violation of the law, and it was stretching the imagination so the local police officer, or mayor, or governor, or attorney general had the privilege of determining what they thought the law meant. Gorton closed down all bingo and benefit parties as they were called.

Pinballs had long gone, but now they closed down bingo as a violation of law. This was a two-headed subject because at the Association of Washington Clubs they were distressed. Much of their money was raised by bingo, you know the Elks, Eagles, Moose, VFW, etc.

I suggested to them that they maybe ought to look at the state constitution and remove one word out of it. I think it said, "The state shall not allow the lottery," something like that. There was one word in there, "not," which could be removed. The following day I was at work and I got a phone call from Senator Walgren, who was their attorney. He asked, "What word are you talking about?" I told him, and in the next session of the Legislature Walgren and I introduced a bill that would amend the constitution. We couldn't get it out of committee that year. Everyone was afraid of it, but the following year everyone sponsored it and the bill went through the Legislature and to the people and passed. That's the reason you now can have lotteries and things like that.

Anyway, back to the bingo. It was such a silly thing because here we're allowing horse racing by law. It was the biggest gambling activity in the whole state and had a lot of big money behind it. When we couldn't do anything about it, couldn't stir Gorton to change his mind on bingo, I put in a bill banning horse racing and I issued a comment that this was the "sport of kings" and protected by law and Gorton wouldn't even let the little old lady in tennis shoes have any fun. It really upset the horse-racing people. I couldn't believe they'd send so many people down to lobby against a bill that I didn't think was going anyplace in the first place but was a means of protesting on a silly practice. I really got quite a lot of support, too. It ultimately helped result in the passage of the constitutional amendment that Walgren and I had introduced a year before. It didn't make sense that horse racing, the biggest gambling operation in the whole state of Washington, would get the attorney general's approval and he would lower the boom on bingo and raffles.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did Slade Gorton react?

**Mr. Bailey:** I wouldn't know. I was never near enough to him. He probably thought, "What's the goofball doing?" But I know the public really responded in terrific shape, and quite supportive.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Another issue in the 1971 session had to do with allowing revenue from property tax to be used for other purposes than road construction and maintenance. There were many objections to this, say-

ing that the counties couldn't take care of the roads as it was, and with this option added they would be less able to maintain and construct roads. You countered by saying that the county commissioners, being elected, should be able to make their own decisions, or let someone else take their office. To what extent was this an urban-rural issue?

**Mr. Bailey:** I would think that actually it was more of a rural-county issue than it was an urban or a King County issue. The trouble was that in establishing the amounts of the forty mills on property and how it was distributed, the Legislature set ten mills aside for county roads. Another ten mills went to county operating expenses, and the remainder to schools, fire, hospital districts, water districts, and so on. In the counties there were so many small districts that counties were pleading and saying they didn't have any money in their current expense funds. The ten mills could only be used for county roads. Many of these counties were actually hiring new engineers and paying them good top wages far above what county elected officials were making. A county could be poor on one hand and rich on the other, and the county couldn't do anything about it. This was very great for county commissioners, because every county commissioner had a road-district supervisor and he'd build his empire on his road districts with the protected ten mills.

I'm not saying they misspent it, but they had plenty to give out in this hand, and on the other they cried poverty. They sometimes couldn't even finance the offices of county treasurer or assessor to collect the money. It just didn't make sense to me and to several others to keep this barrier.

That was the purpose of it, to give those commissioners that right and responsibility. They came to Olympia and cried their eyes out that this would destroy their county-road funds. That's when I told them, "You were elected to do a job for your county and make decisions. If you can't do it, then get out of the way and let somebody do it who can."

My recollection of the bill, though, when it finally passed, is that the Good Roads Association was a little bit upset about it and wasn't too happy. Some of the larger counties were worried, and I think we finally put a clause in the bill affecting only certain class counties. At least there was relief given to some that needed it. You plead poverty in one pocket and one pocket is full; it is ridiculous. It didn't mean any tax increase to people. Commissioners always wanted a lot of help, but they didn't want you to bother with their rights to do as they pleased. But then they didn't want any responsibility if they could pass it onto someone else like the Legislature. We used to set all county officials' wages. We gave them the power to set their own wages. That's what they wanted. Then they decided that they didn't want that power. They wanted the power for us to set commissioners their wages, so they could be blameless, as far as their own wages went, but then they'd like to set the salaries of other officials. If we set their wages they could take it and not get blamed for giving themselves an increase. Raising pay is always a tough subject, especially your own pay.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You mentioned off-tape that the Satsop Rock Festival in the summer of 1971 was something you wish to comment on.

**Mr. Bailey:** We had several rock festivals in the state and they were complete disasters as far as law enforcement, drugs, and things like that were concerned. There was a proposal in the Legislature in 1971 that would regulate rock festivals. At the same time it also meant that we licensed them.

[End of Tape 22, Side 1]

**Mr. Bailey:** We passed the bill which was really more of regulation of rock festivals rather than to tell them they had no right to assemble and things like that. You could have people in a rock festival that absolutely obeyed every law. Under this act they would have that right to do so. We wrote quite a strict law. We also included that control was up to local law enforcement and their approval. In other words, the sheriff of Grays Harbor County or wherever who had to furnish the law enforcement also would have something to say about whether or not he could handle forty thousand people, before giving approval.

We wrote that into the law, and Governor Evans signed it, but vetoed that section so that it left it with the dubious right to hold a rock festival, with a state permit, but without local control, unless the state moved in. Here was a local sheriff who had nothing to say about whether the festival was held or whether they could control it, like it or not, but still had to provide law enforcement.

We got into the Satsop Rock Festival, with something like twenty to thirty thousand attending. It was total chaos. I remember when the city of Elma had to clean out their whole sewage system because of so many disposable needles in it from drug users. They plugged the whole system up. It was a terrible situation.

Immediately I had complaints from a couple of people who had been very good friends of mine. One of them even wrote a letter to the editor and blamed me because I voted for a bill and let the governor veto a portion of it. He overestimated my power. As it turned

out the festivals were going by the boards anyway. They were all losing money.

When I came back to the Legislature I was furious and I went around, talked to every member of the Senate, and got all but one to sign a letter threatening to override the governor's veto if he chose to cross out the restriction of "local control" we had put into the bill. I told Evans I was going to put in an amendment to the bill and if necessary we would override his veto on that part. He said he would veto it anyway. I think the Republican leaders went down and told him. The only one in the Senate I didn't have, couldn't get, was Senator Booth Gardner. We passed the changes and it went through, as I recall, without a dissenting vote. It passed the House, and the governor signed it without veto. It was a hot issue in my district and tempers were strained.

Many blamed me for the rock festival. Even Senator Walgren had to quote on the Senate floor an item saying that I was not able to take care of things because I had voted for a bill which the governor partially vetoed. How could I tell what the governor was going to do? On looking back, the bill probably was written by the guy who was sponsoring the festival and he had friends in high positions.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Senator Bailey, in the 1972 second special session, in January and February, redistricting was an issue again. It was required after changes were recorded by the 1970 census. In 1971 the US District Court had ordered the Legislature to come up with a new plan or they would again redistrict if you didn't come up with one, and you didn't. When no compromise was reached, your efforts were turned toward developing guidelines to present to the courts. Will you recall how the decision making went on this?

**Mr. Bailey:** In 1972 we were under orders of the federal court to adopt a fair plan or they would do it for us. They told us that we had to do something before a certain date or they would order the redistricting done themselves. We did not do it. We could not reach agreement. We worked hard on it, to no avail. It was strictly a political battle, and consequently, in April the court redistricted, and by April 21st, it became effective.

My comment would be that any court that took over a thing like redistricting and assigned it to a referee or whatever they called that person and who could reach an agreement on such a technical, complex matter as redistricting within a couple of weeks, had all the appearances that we always suspected, that Attorney General Slade Gorton had already written it out for him. The order was almost identical to Gorton's last proposal, and we assumed he had a remarkable influence on the way it was written. A person coming in looking at that whole subject could not have taken care of it in that brief a period of time.

Redistricting itself was not the most disastrous thing that happened. It was better to have it out of the Legislature, which was just spending too much time in a hopeless quest for agreement. The Democratic House and Senate and the Republican governor had endless negotiations and probably would not have arrived at any results.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How important was it at reaching results that the Republicans used the Nixon-Humphrey vote to calculate and the Democrats used votes for incumbent legislators?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I don't know how important it was. Nobody would ever know that. The thing was that that was just one of the differences. We didn't want to rely on just one set of figures, but to base it on several elections.

I suppose that maybe the Republicans felt it gave them an edge in some districts. It really boiled down to not disagreeing on every district, just six, eight or ten districts that were so-called "swing" districts. The ultimate result about redistricting is that it doesn't make any difference how you do it, the voters have a mind of their own and the district that you think is going to be heavily Democratic can turn out in the next two years to be heavily Republican, and vice versa.

That happened in my Nineteenth District in 1930 when the League of Women Voters, by initiative, put southern Grays Harbor County into the Pacific County legislative district to make it a more evenly populated district. Up until that time that portion of Grays Harbor had been heavily Republican and the GOP offered little resistance to the initiative. In 1932 and later, southern Grays Harbor County turned out to be the heaviest Democratic area in the state. A Republican couldn't hardly campaign there. There wasn't anyone to campaign with. As a Democratic candidate you didn't even have to go there, it was just heavily Democratic. In the election of Representative King and Senator Tisdale, and numerous others, the whole outcome was decided not in Pacific County but in southern Grays Harbor County. A Democrat could lose Pacific and pull ahead in southern and eastern Grays Harbor County. This shows that the people have the choice, and I'm not convinced that you can guess how they're going to vote in the future based on past records. It depends on the candidates, the situations, the issues, and it certainly is not worth wasting all that time as we have done.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In the case of the 1972 redistricting, what did you think of the results in the Third Congressional District and your own Nineteenth Legislative District?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well in my district it gave me the whole county of Grays Harbor, and only portions of Pacific County. It didn't seem to affect me any. Rather than have somebody from the populous area of Aberdeen run, they gave me very good support. Of course, I had been working in Aberdeen, and was a member of the Grays Harbor Central Labor Council, and a few activities like that, so I had very good support. It didn't alter the outcome too much that way.

The Third Congressional District was changed. It had been the nine southwest Washington counties for years. It now added Clallam and Jefferson counties on the Peninsula, King County down by Maple Valley, and a section of southern Pierce County. It spread the district out rather large. In return, however–we had a few years before had Skamania County and up the Columbia to Goldendale–this was taken away and put in with the Fourth District from eastern Washington. The third was still a huge district to cover geographically. Julia Hansen was very well-known throughout, and it was a good Democratic area, too, so we actually didn't suffer too much. It made it harder to cover physically from my job standpoint and her own, but it really was not much of a change politically.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The Third District stretched then all the way from the Columbia to the Canadian border?

**Mr. Bailey:** To the end of the Olympic Peninsula, yes.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In this same 1972 session, tax reform was again an issue. The House and Senate each had plans and they failed. Governor Evans invited thirty legislators to meet to discuss whether to call a legislative session on tax reform. Instead there was a committee established to come up with a new plan. By June the committee had agreed on a graduated income-tax proposal. The limit would be eight percent for individuals and twelve percent for corporations. You remarked about this that you didn't think that the people really favored an income tax. Will you comment on these negotiations? I think I forgot to add for the record that you were a member of this committee.

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I can't recall the exact time of the sessions, and the time that we met, but I do know that ultimately we had a committee that started meeting in the governor's office, our theory being that a proposal had failed in both houses during the regular session and that to put it out on the floor again was just useless, unless we could reach an agreement. We met day and night in the most grueling of sessions. We finally reached an agreement and the constitutional amendment that was presented to the people in 1972 was one that I didn't have any trouble supporting. I doubted very much if it would have public support, because an income-tax proposal had gone down to defeat so heavily in 1970. The constitutional amendment presented to the people was one that I worried about a little, because to mollify the people, to get them to vote for it, we put severe restrictions on the sales tax and the amount of income tax into the constitution. The very rigid conditions which made me worry sometimes in cases of an emergency how the Legislature would ever be able to act. It did go to a vote of the people and was soundly defeated again.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What was the relationship between Governor Evans with the Legislature this time with this negotiation going on?

**Mr. Bailey:** Evans was a major role-player in these negotiations. All of us knew that if the Legislature was going to do something we needed cooperation of both parties. However, I might point out that on the constitutional amendment Evans did not have to sign that, it went direct to the people.

During the session of 1973 we met almost continually in the governor's office discussing these things. Evans would be the one that could call the Republicans and Democrats together. He played a major role, and in fact, it was his push for tax reform that probably got it through the Legislature.

**Ms. Bridgman:** If Governor Evans persuaded some Republicans who might otherwise have objected to tax reform, particularly because it involved an establishment of a graduated income tax, can you describe in more detail the different philosophies or rationale concerning tax reform and who held them?

**Mr. Bailey:** That's so general it'd be awfully hard to say. The graduated, net-income tax was something that liberals, or progressives, or even moderates thought was a fairer form of taxation than the sales tax.

I'd have to hedge that a little now, and say the sales tax has become much more progressive since it was taken off of foodstuffs and prescription drugs. It became more progressive than it was when it was on everything and the poor people paid as much as the rich people. It was a philosophy but we had many conservative Democrats that were against the income tax. Some, but few, Republicans supported the fairness of the proposal. My recollection is that Evans would like

to have had Democrats provide the two-thirds. We didn't do that, and probably could not on tax bills. We always went to them and said, "Look, we've got so many votes." Even if we had more we'd say, "We've got so many votes and you better put up six or eight or this thing is going down the tube." We never brought a bill out on the floor on taxes or budget until they would produce their six or eight. It was a burden that had to be shared by everyone. Taxes are like pay increases for legislators. Everybody wants them, but everybody is publicly against them. Those same people break down the doors getting in to collect their check but don't want to have to be the ones that did it. It's an ugly game when you vote for taxes; you don't win the battle but someone has to do it. In this case we finally put something together.

Evans' influence was great, but limited. Members that were opposed to it were just very much against any income tax, but they probably represented the people in their districts.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How do you explain Washington citizens' continuing opposition to this?

**Mr. Bailey:** I have never yet seen any state where they voted for many taxes. Taxes are not considered the thing to make you popular in anyway. Somebody's got to do it, though, and recognize it's got to be done. But I don't think we're any different than any other state as far as attitudes go on taxes of any kind.

Oregon has an income tax, and no sales tax, and they probably need a sales tax but they've not been able to get the people to approve it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Let's return then to 1972 and talk a little about Julia Butler Hansen's campaign for Congress. Her opponent was a man named Bob Corcoran. There were various charges against Julia, various statements made about her and about you during the campaign. What was your reaction to these statements?

**Mr. Bailey:** Bob Corcoran had been a rabble-rouser on a Tacoma radio station for a long time. He made lots of noise with his mouth. He produced very little factually and he certainly never stuck to the facts. He was a poor version of Joe McCarthy. He would tell you, "I'm going to reveal all the names of these legislators that did this or that, next week. I have the list here in my pocket." And he'd jam it back in his pocket and say, "You tune in next week and you'll hear." Well, you never heard another word about it because he never had anything in his pocket, just insinuation.

He decided to run against Julia. He was a sort of populist, appealing to archconservative people. He was always raising Ned about property taxes and other things, but offering no solution. He was trying to appeal to the grass roots, but he was too offbeat even for the grass roots. He had a talk show on the Tacoma station and people would call in. I think Bob thought that he had big support from the majority of people in Clallam County, Tacoma, and other places. Only a little part of Pierce County, not Tacoma, was in our district, and you wouldn't hear Bob Corcoran down in Raymond, or South Bend, Vancouver and elsewhere. It was something local.

He immediately put out a scurrilous four-page pamphlet with pictures on it of things that Julia had helped finance through the Appropriations Committee. Most of them were pictures of something else that he'd put false labels on. And then he took out on me saying I was a scandalous operator because I was working for Julia, and running for the state Senate, and running her campaign. At the same time he ignored Julia for several weeks and he took out after me. It resulted eventually in the Democrats in almost all the districts coming out and running ads stating that there was nothing wrong, that the attorney general had ruled and the court had ruled that I did not have any conflict of interest. I was only a senator on part time. I believe at that time it was only one hundred dollars a month. But it was part time and my work for Julia was my full-time job. I was not necessarily running her campaign. I was working for her in her district. I stood up in meetings and defended her, and consequently it seemed to me like for quite awhile Corcoran and I were running for Congress and Julia was sitting back in Washington laughing.

He was pretty roundly defeated, but it was a noisy campaign. It was one of those where a lot of false information went out. When I would correct it, some of the papers would carry the corrections and some wouldn't. Corcoran never ever corrected outright lies and misrepresentations that he had in his brochures, but he didn't get very far. He didn't fool too many people, at least not enough.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I don't know if either of us specified that he was running as a Democrat.

**Mr. Bailey:** Yes, he ran as a Democrat, but nobody really knew what he was. It was a matter of convenience. I remember when McCarthy received the delegate votes in the area that he (Corcoran) said, "I'm going down to the polls and I'm gonna write in the name of Scoop Jackson for president, even if McCarthy is on the ballot." He was trying to gain a great following, and, of course, people like Scoop Jackson wouldn't have any dealing with his ilk for any reason.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You were also running for re-election to the Senate in 1972. One of your newspaper ads features prominently your opposition to what you called "superagencies." Will you please explain how your convictions about this had developed?

**Mr. Bailey:** In a business way it seemed it would be more efficient to have one big agency to conduct everything properly and not have as many small agencies with conflicting or duplicating duties. The Legislature had been convinced by Governor Evans to consolidate the Social Security and Health Department and just about every little related agency you could think of into a new superagency, the Department of Social and Health Services. Actually it put another layer of bureaucracy between the people and the department. If my constituents had a problem I used to be able to take it right to Olympia to one of those departments and get in rather easily because they were moderately sized and you could at least be heard. I won't say that DSHS didn't hear us, but I will say that a constituent that made a complaint had to make it to the local office, if there was one. Then they created a layer of district offices. One had to go to the district office, then go to the state office, and at the state office, if it was a health matter, talk to the health man, perhaps later even go up to the secretary of Social and Health Services. So it became just a tremendous bureaucracy, and it was not what we had envisioned in streamlined government. It really just went the opposite way.

There was an effort to make a superagency out of the Highways, or Transportation Department, to put Licensing and everything remotely connected with transportation into one big department. The dissatisfaction with DSHS more or less killed impetus of putting everything in big departments in state government. I don't think any great advantage has ever been proven–that the creation of the superagency in DSHS created efficiency. This is 1991 and we suffer still. Well, it grew too fast and in too many ways, and the red tape just grew with it. So it didn't really help efficiency very much.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How would you have solved the problem of inefficiency?

**Mr. Bailey:** Efficiency is something that you can't solve simply–you just have to work at it all the time. It isn't necessarily solved by throwing the baby out with the bath water. You just don't get rid of a department because one is inefficient. But it's awful hard to change a department sometimes. The workers are sealed in by the merit system, and the director, usually facing a concrete wall in staff decisions, can't change them either. I don't believe in going back to the old spoils system of firing and hiring all the time, but there's something to be said for somebody being responsible to the people.

We're rapidly becoming a government guided by the civil servant that doesn't have to answer to anybody, and not guided by the elected officials. The appointee or the state official that the voters vote in sometimes is just merely a figurehead. If they do make changes, the permanent staff soon resumes their previous practices when they are gone.

[End of Tape 22, Side 2]

## CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN: 1974

**Mr. Bailey:** The Department of Social and Health Services became a prime example of a monumental concrete block set up in the middle of state government, and it was so big it is hard to do anything with it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How much of this was foreseen by you and other legislators when these agencies were being consolidated?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think that actually we all probably thought that it was going to be a more efficient operation. But most of the opposition at that time was vocal and came from people already in the departments that were to be consolidated and were resisting change. They were protecting their own turf; they weren't interested in good government or bad government, they were interested in keeping things like they were.

**Ms. Bridgman:** We've reached now the 1972 presidential election. The Democrats in Pacific County favored McGovern. How well did you think McGovern represented rank-and-file Democrats?

**Mr. Bailey:** We Democrats were for McGovern, of course, after his nomination. We supported him, but also realized he didn't have the rank-and-file support among the people. At that time there was a lot of antiwar sentiment, but at the same time it was very difficult to the point of where a lot of people did not want to vote antiwar for fear they would desert our troops in Vietnam.

**Ms. Bridgman:** During state election campaigns in the autumn of 1972, rivalry between Senators Greive and Mardesich first came to public notice. The *Seattle P-I* carried a story saying that each was helping other Democrats in their campaigns in order to win votes for majority floor leader. Mardesich hoped to replace Greive. The Mardesich backers got together and composed a position paper which was called by the *Seattle Times* the "Mardesich Manifesto." The whole dispute or disagreement was much commented on by the press.

On November 20th you held your caucus and Mardesich won. Later, at the beginning of the year, Adele Ferguson of the *Bremerton Sun* wrote that the unhappiness of these two has stemmed from a caucus meeting and it was a personal quarrel. I'd like you to begin your reflections on this by commenting about how accurate the reporting was of these difficulties.

**Mr. Bailey:** We had some glorious times in caucus, supposedly not for the public, and it's amazing sometimes how I could read about it, and Adele Ferguson in particular would be able to write so accurately about our meetings. She'd even recall things that I did not recall the next day until I read her story. She was accurate. We always wondered who the mouthpiece was. There were plenty of them, but Adele had a great faculty of asking me, "Is it true that this happened?" I'd say, "No, it is not true." She'd go to somebody else and rephrase it about something else, "Is it true that this happened?" "No, it did not happen." She was an expert. She didn't need a positive statement but pieced together the negative and other responses and came up with one accurate story. People didn't really have to tell her anything, but in this case she must have been told by someone.

Greive and Mardesich were having real differences. Greive had accused Mardesich of some kind of an extortion effort with the garbage people, and Greive had an assistant, George Martonik, who was also the executive secretary of the garbage association. There were accusations going around about Augie taking money or asking for money. It got pretty bitter, and it was circulating everywhere, not just on the floor or just in the caucus. When Mardesich heard it he brought it up in caucus. I recall the incident very clearly. He stood up and gave a very impassioned speech and turning to Greive he said, "Senator, the next time something like this starts," he said, "I'm taking a knife and I am going to stick it right in the middle of the table. Where I come from–where my folks came from (in Croatia)–that means a fight to the bloody end." It was a very dramatic moment and Greive hemmed and hawed. He had little to say back.

Mardesich then began his campaign for floor leader, and he had good support. I remember Martin Durkan making a comment, "Senator Greive, I don't know what's going to happen, but I'm going to promise you that at the next election I'm going to be working for your opponent." He did, too. Of course that was still a couple of years off.

On the Mardesich Manifesto–before it existed, I had gone to the chiropractic convention at Ocean Shores and gave a talk. I talked about legislative reform, how I'd like to see the committees cut down in size and

number, good scheduling so that people could attend their own committees and not have two meeting at the same time, and things like that.

State Representative Leonard Sawyer was the lawyer for the chiropractors, and he asked me if I was really serious. I had long sought this approach, but Greive would make so many commitments that we couldn't cut out some of the committees without making enemies, and thus we couldn't get the votes. Lenny asked me if I thought we could do it. I said yes. Not too long after, Lenny was a candidate for Speaker and was elected about the same time Augie was elected Senate majority floor leader. They were long-time friends and worked closely together.

While he was running, Augie called me one day and asked if I'd meet him in Seattle at the airport. He said, "I understand you really think we could reform the Senate." I said, "I certainly do." And he said, "I'm going to go to Spokane now and I'm gonna visit several senators," and he showed me his so-called "Manifesto" which was right along the line I had advocated. He didn't ask me to endorse him or anything. It was right along the line which I'd been hoping for many years. I told him I certainly agreed with all of it. He asked if I would support him, and I replied that at this time I would not make a commitment, but "if Greive will not come out in favor of this reorganization I will not vote for Greive. I'm going to support you." I signed the so-called "Manifesto."

He went over to Spokane and obtained more signatures. I had signed the "Manifesto," but I did not promise Augie the support at that time.

When Greive refused to have anything to do with it–that was it. Augie won on that basis, and on the fact that Greive already had a substantial portion of the caucus against him. I think maybe the fact that Augie was able to raise a little money and help a few candidates–he created a few more votes for himself than if he had just let Greive go at the same game by himself. This made Greive very angry because somebody was playing his own game.

The caucus vote was by ballot, so most of the members that voted for Bob came over and cooperated with Augie. There were six, maybe eight, that held back. A couple of these were doubtful. They wouldn't go so far as to form a coalition. They played hard to get. Augie Mardesich was not a soft operator, either. He removed Greive from Rules Committee, which was almost unheard of, and he insisted on changes that had to be made. None of these nonconformists got anything to speak of.

Many years later I was talking to Republicans, and they told me that Bob had been over constantly meeting, trying to deal with them to form a coalition. They weren't anxious for it because coalitions are very fragile to hold together. But they were willing to listen, and, of course, would take over control of the committees and other operations in the Senate. Bob was willing to sell the majority out and deal with the minority for his own personal purposes. I think he might have encountered–in these dissidents–some very loyal Democrats who would refuse to go that far. And this might have been what stopped him.

Eventually the scars healed, but we did have serious problems. I don't remember that they ever voted as a block on bills or anything like that, but there certainly was animosity in the caucus.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What was the basis for their continuing support of Greive? Philosophical, geographical–or what?

**Mr. Bailey:** Greive was still carrying the story about $10,000 that Martonik, of the garbage people (a Greive employee), was supposed to have recorded on a tape recorder. When you listened to it, you couldn't understand it–it was the worst tape recording I've ever heard.

The garbage charges eventually ended up before a grand jury. There's no doubt but that the whole incident was fomented by Senator Greive. Mardesich was later cleared in court, but encountered some more serious troubles after that, which eventually caused his resignation. There were things that came out in court beyond the charges he was on trial for, and therefore not before the jury in the case in which he was acquitted.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You mentioned that there were other issues between Mardesich and Greive before the specific charges about the garbage haulers' kickback and before the development of this rivalry. What were the more fundamental underlying issues?

**Mr. Bailey:** I wouldn't know what it really was. I think if anything, the underlying problem was that August Mardesich was too smart to subject himself to the machinations of Greive and was an independent operator. Greive was smart in his own maneuvering ways, but I think that Augie, before these accusations, resented Greive trying to protect his own turf. Augie probably resented a lot of the working behind the scenes that Greive was very capable of doing. Many of our members were truly disgusted. Greive could not figure out how to reach him, and Augie was not available.

We were not always let in on Greive's plans. It could come as a result of a commitment he made to someone for their district, or some other commitment

made unilaterally. I am positive no anti-Greive people ever got any financial assistance from Greive. When first running, I think every Democrat got some help from him. I never checked it out to see who he gave to. All I knew is that when he gave me anything he always said, "I'm not tying any strings to it." Way back, I don't know, but I may have got help in my second election, I don't remember. Later, I just told him I didn't need it, and I usually didn't.

He always wanted to send people down to help my campaign, and also to take it over and run it. I always told him I could do better myself, and I wouldn't let them come down. He would sometimes get very upset about the fact that I wouldn't take this or that advice or help. He set up a sign factory and delivered something like five thousand big signs for me to hang up. He had delivered them to my dad's house in Tacoma. They were all treated with wax so they would be waterproof, but they had no union label on them, and coming from the Printers Union, this was dynamite. I told him I couldn't use them, and they concocted a deal where they would take a rubber stamp and stick the label on the bottom. Just last year, in 1990, I went into my dad's garage and took almost a thousand of those out to the dump because we wouldn't use them. My dad did like them, though, as they were waxed and he could start a fire in the fireplace real easy. We never brought them home and we never used them in the district. That was one of the ways Greive worked. He helped a lot of people, he did a lot of good campaign work, don't get me wrong.

I think you'll notice one place the *Longview Daily News* said that Senator Don Talley was on the loser's side, but that they had to trust me to protect Senator Talley. A lot of Greive's support was gratitude because he had helped some of them tremendously.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Later on, in 1973, you were quoted as opposing Greive's investigation of the state Fisheries Department. Apparently you said that Greive was utterly hellbent to destroy anybody to satisfy his own paranoid attitude. Greive, among other things, had complained about his private secretary being taken from him. You'd spoken before on other tapes about his careful accounting of the Greive fund and his activities. In your opinion, how and why had he changed so dramatically so that you could not call and say that his attitude was paranoid?

**Mr. Bailey:** Maybe he'd been a little that way all the time. I don't really know. He became very unstable at times after he was defeated for floor leader. He was never a very firm advocate of issues, and he could switch rather rapidly and develop very intricate schemes. In places where you and I take a direct route, he would go in a very circuitous route. That session after he had been defeated he was just stirring things all the time, and he needed something like an investigation–in this case Fisheries–to refeed his authority and his ego.

He was like that on the ethics bill, by being nice, pretending support and trying to put things in the bill that he knew would kill it. He didn't have the job of floor leader anymore, so he was desperately trying to get something going that would bring attention to himself.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In that 1973 regular session, in January through March, you addressed the desirability of legislative reform. There were competing proposals for annual and continuous legislative sessions. Finally, in April in the second session, there was a compromise. What was your position on these matters on the annual sessions as opposed to the continuing Legislature?

**Mr. Bailey:** I usually supported annual sessions as against continuing sessions, because most of us were working at other jobs to earn a living. All of us were not making any money as legislators, but were working elsewhere. How could we hold down steady jobs and be in continuous session, subject to call at any time, and frequently? It was hard enough to find a job that would let you be away for two or three or four months a year, let alone the uncertainty of times the year-round. I thought that the only way to go was annual sessions where it was clearly defined and set out.

This issue came about because the state Supreme Court had ruled just prior to that that where we had always supposed that a special session called by the governor had to end in sixty days, there was no limitation on a special session. That left the Legislature with the power to stay in session all year, once called, and then recess when they wanted to, and come back into session. Once the governor called a special session it was possible we could stay in until the next election. I don't think I could have held my job under that sort of an indefinite situation, subject to call at any time. That was one of the big arguments.

We finally settled on a compromise where we did go into extra sessions, on a limited, temporary basis, usually on a Saturday or a Sunday. It was sort of a restricted plan so that people could meet their obligations on their regular jobs. Maybe once during that year we went in three or four days, to tackle some big issue. It was a forerunner of the constitutional amendment which passed in 1978 for annual sessions.

**Ms. Bridgman:** This kind of reform required the restructuring of committees so that the regular standing committees were established as interim committees as well. You were involved in that effort. At the time how did you think legislative reform and changing the committee structure would affect this growth of bureaucracy that you've talked about?

**Mr. Bailey:** If anything, the Legislature is the only check on bureaucracy that we have. Practically every member in the Senate was a member of an interim committee. A large number of House members were not on any of them. I felt that if we're going to have committee reorganization and more frequent sessions, it was the proper time for those standing committees to replace the interim committees and do that work. It didn't make a lot of sense when you meet that often to have an interim committee on education draw up a new bill, then have to go to the Legislature and sell it to the standing committees on education of the House and Senate. Maybe not one of the interim committee was a member of the standing committee. It just made sense that if we were to expedite our work, we should have the standing committees on education meet in the interim and replace the special interim committee. This was true in almost all other subjects which had interim studies. We did consolidate most of those.

Maybe it serves a purpose, but one of the things we did not abolish was the Joint Highways Committee. It still exists, largely because of a unique funding situation by which it funds itself.

The old legislative council used to take in the vast number of major issues that weren't covered by some of these special committees. When we abolished the council, we took over their vast research library of decisions and hearings and put them into the Senate and House research committees. For awhile there was the danger they were going to be destroyed. They now offer research to any committee that asks for help, in either house, or for any member. The new system involves all members and probably saves the state money, at least by removing duplication of hearings and other efforts.

[End of Tape 23, Side 1]

**Ms. Bridgman:** Senator Bailey, will you comment, please, on the staffs which these committees have now acquired? I'm thinking again of your discussion of your objections to the superagencies. How would you compare the permanent staff members of the legislative standing committees to the bureaucrats in the agencies?

**Mr. Bailey:** In the first place, legislative staff is not under the merit system and serves at the pleasure of their bosses and is subject to continuous change. While the House went full bore on appointing staff and everything, we went very cautiously in the Senate. We maintained an office in the caucus room where we had a secretary for Senator Mardesich and myself. The office was open all the time. They also answered phone calls for other members and did secretarial work for them, since most offices were closed.

We established a secretarial pool where a member could call up and dictate a letter and the copy would be in the mail that night and at their home the next morning so they could sign it. We did this rather than have a big staff going on all the time in the interim. Eventually we had to yield, and since 1977, when I left, there are some pretty big staffs.

You cannot really compare legislative staff to the entrenched bureaucracy. They have no merit system and serve at the pleasure of their bosses. Some of them are now trying to get merit-system job security. That would be a mistake.

The danger of a staff is that the staff sometimes adopt policy for the boss. If I were in the Senate and a staff member announced policy, he wouldn't be there very long, either that or he'd be transferred into a broom closet. It is up to the members to stand up for what they want, but many will not, and that makes you fear maybe the lobbyists aren't working with legislators any more, maybe it's easier to work on the staff members. Does this mean staff is influencing a member's vote?

I'm not saying lobbying is wrong, but the influence these staff people have is tremendous. As long as they keep in their place as research assistants, they are valuable. But whenever they start to establish policy it is wrong; who elected them? I'm afraid there are a lot of legislators, just like there are administrators, that find it easier to accept the decisions suggested than reach their own. Sometimes in the press you'll see statements by the staff saying something they are advocating or opposing certain issues. They shouldn't be doing anything except in the name of the person or the committee they're working for. If it's a committee, it should be only after a vote of the committee.

Year-round staff is also a positive thing. You have greater research, greater assistance, greater ability to know what's going on than you did otherwise, but you have to beware of those people that are on staff for a purpose and then walk out, sometimes taking a position they have made possible for themselves. I could name several heads of state government right now who have advanced their cause to the point that they were appointed directors of the departments. Many times a tip

to the press says that if their boss happens to be mentioned for a state job he will greatly increase his pension and that kills that appointment, which they sometime get later for themselves. No one mentions that whoever gets such an appointment usually multiplies his pension four or five times. That happens to be pension law, whether for a state legislator or a career bureaucrat.

I would write my own letters in blood before I'd ever have a secretary assigned me by the merit system, if I didn't have the choice of my own personal secretary.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Do you see an alternative to some of this?

**Mr. Bailey:** There is a possible alternative. Some say they ought to have limitations on the terms of legislators, but if they do that I think they ought to have limitations on the terms of state staff workers, and particularly, registered lobbyists. Otherwise unelected staff, state workers, and lobbyists will run the legislative process–through experience–which they don't seem to want state legislators to have.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In the 1973 regular session you sponsored a geographical-names bill which was designed to create, or to establish, official place names. How had you become interested in this project?

**Mr. Bailey:** It was a very inconsequential bill, although it was very important to some. As I recall, it came from the Department of Natural Resources and there was a need to correct some of the geographical names like fifteen dozen Black Lakes and two dozen Long Lakes, and a few things like that. There was the need for some official recognition of how to name and avoid duplication and confusion. I don't know if my bill became law, but one was passed. It was a good bill and whether it was my bill or not is not important.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In that session also were passed a no-fault divorce and the Landlord-Tenant Act. These are some issues that have continued to affect many Washington citizens. What was your position on these two?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't recall details of the no-fault divorce, nor remember any great argument over it. It came from the legal people on Judiciary and was to simplify divorce proceedings.

The Landlord-Tenant Act was quite a difficult problem because landlords were being ripped off by tenants and they couldn't do anything about it. Sometimes the tenants were being ripped off by the landlords, and they couldn't do anything about it. We had a bill presented to us from the governor's office and we worked it over. It was a very difficult bill to work out. We tried to balance it so the landlord had protections of his property and the tenant had rights, too. The tenant couldn't be evicted out into the street, things like that, and shouldn't have to live in total misery, either. The landlord also had rights.

I remember this bill very well because this is the one I mentioned before where Governor Evans took apart line by line, word by word, in an exercise of line-item veto. The veto would strike one word and reverse the intent of the Legislature. The governor had actually written the whole bill, by line-item veto. This created such a dissension that the next Legislature put a constitutional amendment to the people for a vote. They eliminated the governor's right to line-item veto except in rare cases. We felt that he was not just vetoing an objectionable article, he was writing legislation. It was a horrible example of executive abuse.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What were the different opinions about the line-item veto among legislators of both parties?

**Mr. Bailey:** After his abuse of landlord-tenant, I don't think there was too much partisanship in the Senate. Up to that time it might have been opposed because Republicans probably would think it was a slap at their governor. Maybe if the Democrats had the governor they would have opposed it at that time for the same reason. You'd have to look it up in the record, but I think it had a substantial support with very little opposition.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In 1973 ERA was also an issue. It was in Senate Rules for awhile, and then came on to the floor. You were identified as a "steady supporter." Will you please recall the various positions taken on ERA and the results?

**Mr. Bailey:** It's about the same positions that followed later in the Congress and things, where people were trying to keep ERA from going into the US Constitution. I still don't understand why they would oppose such a thing, but we did have delegations come up in opposition. I remember one delegation came in from Seattle, a group of very conservative women opposed to the ERA, and they gave me a little mouse because I had voted for it. It was supposed to represent that I was "a mouse in the House." I believe it was the same group of women that came in later and brought a cream pie. I didn't do it on purpose, but they handed me the cream pie and I thought it was a joke so I pulled my hand away and the cream pie went over the brand new red

carpet in the Senate office. It splattered everybody, but everybody got to laughing about it. But it was embarrassing. They were not a bad group of women and they were courteous and well-behaved and dedicated to their beliefs. It was the women who came in against ERA, it was not the men.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In 1973 the annual-elections measure which had been considered before was again considered. How was it finally decided?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't recall the year it was decided. It had been attempted many times and finally adopted. One good reason was that Evans definitely wanted the tax-reform bill to go on the first election possible. He didn't want to wait until the next general election, over a year away.

I don't think most of the legislators wanted to run in the same year they had an income-tax proposal up either. In this bill we shifted cities and some other units of local government to the annual elections on the off years. Each November would see an election, state or locally. It works in very well with the fact that we have annual sessions. It means that whatever you pass this session goes to the people in the fall and doesn't have to wait for two years.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In 1973 there was a controversy involving a man named Keith Dysart, who formerly had been an assistant attorney general and then had been suspended for questionable practices in the 1972 governor's election campaign when Rosellini ran against Dan Evans. In 1973 he was appointed to the staff of the National Governors Conference, of which Evans was chairman. This caused some dismay and you were appointed to a committee to look into the charges. What were the results of this?

**Mr. Bailey:** There were many accusations, mostly out of ex-Governor Rosellini's camp, that one of Attorney General Slade Gorton's deputies was on state salary to spy on Rosellini's camp and do some other questionable things. I can't recall exactly all the details, but anyway, it turned out it was his assistant attorney general, Dysart. The accusations were going so strong that it was hard to ignore them because they were in the press constantly. Finally the Senate Rules Committee decided to look into whether or not there was probable cause that charges ought to be brought, or whether there should be further investigation. The Senate Rules Committee, under Lieutenant Governor Cherberg, established what they called the "probable cause" committee. This committee was to look to see whether there was probable cause that a formal investigation should be instigated.

Rather than make it a big investigation and find out nothing was there, just political accusations, we assigned one of our members, a lawyer and also a retired detective, to go into the matter and investigate. It was a bipartisan committee and even the Republicans said if the charges were true they certainly did not approve of it.

While all of this was going on, Evans was very active in the Governors Conference and Dysart got an appointment that took him out of the state and got him away from here. I don't recall any definite conclusion being reached. I only recall that he had gone. It became sort of a moot issue. It created quite a stir for a little while and it created quite a few meetings that we had to have to hear these reports. Everything was very confidential because our man was a true private eye. He was really looking and remained more or less anonymous. The Senate Rules Committee took no further action, but I think the main reason being that Dysart was gone. It would be too difficult to bring him back, unless you had very good evidence. It just faded away. There's no doubt but they got him out of here because they didn't want him around to be questioned. It also is worth remembering, after the fact and after future development, that Ted Bundy, a state employee, was deeply involved in this incident. Remember Ted Bundy?

**Ms. Bridgman:** Yes, of course. What was the quality of the evidence?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't remember that real well. I remember that there was a lot of substance to the accusations but they were difficult to prove. There must have been something or Gorton would not have laid him off of his attorney general's staff and helped get him out of state. There must have been some substance to it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** We've already discussed in the 1973 session the passing of a graduated-income-tax bill.

**Mr. Bailey:** To the people.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Yes. It was without an implementing bill, but then in September you did pass that.

**Mr. Bailey:** The implementing bill was a minor bill in my recollection, because we had put so many restrictions already in the constitutional amendment. The implementing bill was to further reassure the voters.

**Ms. Bridgman:** We've been speaking about events in 1973. There was, of course, not only scandal, an alleged scandal in Washington State, but President Nixon was becoming ever more involved in what we now refer to as Watergate. When he fired Cox and Attorney General Richardson resigned in October of 1973, you were quoted as saying that Nixon would have a very difficult time regaining the confidence of the country. And it was your opinion that Congress should be looking hard to see if impeachment was warranted. In your opinion–and I'm asking you now to look ahead to Nixon's resignation a year later–in what ways did this national scandal affect the attitudes and actions about legislative ethics in Washington?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think it had anything to do with it at all. The national scandal reached its zenith during an interim, between legislative sessions. I recall the "Saturday Night Massacre" of those three people. I know I had never been a supporter of Nixon as president, but I felt that if every time the press or the three television networks decided they were going to dump a president, that it would be too easy. They could set the precedent just getting on the air every night for about three nights at six o'clock and in the morning papers and we would be running government not by four-year terms any more, but whenever the press got mad at someone and flexed their muscles. This would be horrible constitutional government.

Nixon had second thoughts about the charges and was going to try to make everybody happy by appointing three good men. They were highly respected and I thought he was on the right track and then when he didn't get his own way he fired them. Nixon was riding high about that time, thinking that the worst of it was over.

My statement to the press at that time was that it was just like throwing a match into a can of gasoline. He reignited every charge that had been made against him.

Everybody began to have second thoughts about what in the world was going on in Washington D.C. It wasn't any perception on my part, and I never dreamed that he'd ever quit. The "Saturday Night Massacre" was the turning point of where people started really having doubts about what he was doing, what he was, and how he was running things.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How do you think citizens–I'm thinking now of your particular constituents–reacted to this great national scandal and then concurrently to things like the Greive-Mardesich quarrel and other state scandals?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think the Greive-Mardesich quarrel was a top state scandal in my area. It was an internal problem in the Senate and was given a lot of publicity by the daily press in legislative reports. My little town probably wouldn't even know who Senator Greive was. In fact, sometimes I would get district criticism when I was one of the majority leaders, that I shouldn't be spending my time on the Rules Committee and leadership matters. I should be representing our district. Little did they realize some of the things you can do if holding one of these positions.

As far as a presidency and Watergate are concerned, I don't recall any great public clamor one way or the other. Everyone read the daily newspapers and formed individual opinions. It was far removed from us, even though we had opinions. It probably wasn't brought dramatically home to us until at the very end when the US House committee voted to recommend impeachment.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You mentioned a moment ago the reporting of the big-city press on the Greive-Mardesich affair. As a printer and former newspaperman, how would you evaluate the coverage of that?

**Mr. Bailey:** I thought it was pretty fair. The press likes a good fight and they produced in fine fashion. You have to also recall that Augie Mardesich came from Everett and the *Everett Herald* had a man down here and he was writing lots of stories about his senator. A little later, Adele Ferguson from Bremerton had Senator Walgren and similar stories. There was more detail in the hometown areas than in the Seattle papers or elsewhere in the state.

My people liked it when they'd read a daily paper and saw my name in an article. I got a kick out of that, because I always had my own local contacts, but when they got so they'd call me on everything and ask for a comment, my people got so they liked it. It helped build name familiarity, too.

**Ms. Bridgman:** By 1974, during the minisession in April, you were quoted as saying, "We're headed for disaster and it was a big mistake." You were referring to the minisessions. The disaster was presumably because the budget was not going to be passed. How concerned were you at this time about this new arrangement of the minisessions?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think I lost a lot of sleep over it, but I think the thing that concerned me when we first started minisessions was the tendency to think, "Well we'll be coming back into a session in a few weeks and so we won't take care of this right now, but later."

Where there once was pressure to get a budget passed so the state could operate sensibly and responsibly, there was no deadline or pressure now. Some of us feared that we were going to postpone budgets right up until the last minute, the last day of the biennium. That would be a disaster and that is what I was referring to.

[End of Tape 23, Side 2]

**Ms. Bridgman:** Senator Bailey, in 1974 you ran for Congress in the Third District when Julia Butler Hansen retired. As early as 1972, when there were rumors that she might retire, you were seen by the press as her likely successor. In the primary you ran against Bob Corcoran, who had run against Julia earlier, and against Don Bonker, who was Clark County auditor. Why did you decide to run?

**Mr. Bailey:** I decided to run because I thought I had a reasonable chance. I lost the primary in a fairly close vote. It was close right up to the very end. There were several candidates in the Democratic primary, each of which siphoned a few hundred votes here and a few hundred there. Corcoran, of course, was well-known in the northern, rural areas of Pierce County, in our district especially, and picked up quite a few votes there.

I'd had a meeting with Corcoran, arranged by Senator Martin Durkan, in which he had asked me if I would promise him a high-paying job if he would not run against me. I dismissed him very sharply because that would be against federal statutes. I did get stuck with the lunch.

I have no excuses for not winning. We worked hard. We worked every day of the campaign. I didn't have a lot of money, but we had all we thought we needed. We didn't have enough money to go into a lot of the things–like full-page ads, extensive television, and things of that sort. I had resolved that if I ran I was not going to mortgage my house and lose my family and a few things like that. So it was laid out as a pretty businesslike operation.

It's a natural thing to want to advance, I guess. I have to say I'm very proud of the support I got. I had the support of practically every prominent political figure, Republican and Democrat, and almost all of the organizations of the counties, as well as organized labor and other groups. If anything, our old-fashioned campaigning–lining up people and groups–was quickly passing away in favor of the more electronic methods we now have in campaigning. Automatic letter-writing and things of that sort–we never heard of them.

Be that as it may, I think the other thing that contributed greatly to my defeat was the fact that no matter how much you get out and work, you can't reach a lot of people in a big district. It was all of the Olympic Peninsula, southwestern Washington, and southern Puget Sound. Don Bonker, who was the successful nominee, had run for secretary of state two years before and he had name familiarity for those outlying areas. This was coupled with a primary election which had a very low turnout.

Another thing I had to face was the fact that people would rather buy a pig in a poke than they would the real thing, so I had a legislative record and I do know that some of the fundamentalist church ladies went out door to door against me because of my stand on abortions. Others could find a vote somewhere they didn't like. My opponents had no record.

Log exports was another issue. Our county depended on log exports. Actually, the logs would have rotted on the ground without exports. If the local buyers wanted cheap logs, they really wanted to do away with the bidding system, bid cheap, and let the low price win, which would raise havoc with our schools. These little mills were not designed to stay with us long, anyway. They close when the market gets bad, and it had nothing to do with log exports. They had a limited source of supply even before they invented the spotted owl. It was an issue which didn't really hurt me with voters as much as it did that it gave Don Bonker finances, most of which wasn't reported until after the election. Don told me one time way back when he was county auditor that "Someday I'm going to run for Congress and I'm going to use log exports for this purpose and raise the money from them." That's exactly what he did. But that is sour grapes. He was a good congressman and I'm probably alive and better off for not having won it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Julia Butler Hansen was your honorary chairman, and Senator Charette, the chairman of your campaign. Ralph Bowen was treasurer. And Bert Cole, the state land commissioner, was the chairman of the finance committee. What were the responsibilities of each of these people?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, Julia offered to take on this job and I was glad to have her. She endorsed me. She wasn't too active in my campaign because she was busy. I couldn't depend on her to do certain things, because she was so busy and if I signed her up for an event she might not be able to be there. I don't mean I couldn't depend on Julia, that's not the point. The point is that she was busy enough that if we decided to hold a fundraiser tonight or next week we couldn't really say Julia could be there. She might well have to call in and say, "I can't make it." That would have been hard to explain. We had a limited way we could use her.

Charette was very helpful. Ralph Bowen had a horrible job. He was retiring from the state auditor's office and it was one of the first years of state reporting of congressional campaigns. He kept the books meticulously straight, but it took a great deal of time.

Bert Cole was very instrumental in getting people to work in different communities and setting up fund-raisers and things of that sort. They were all very active. Every one of them volunteered.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What kind of fund-raisers did you hold?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, there would be something like a party where we'd have hors d'oeuvres and drinks, sometimes just coffee hours. They would be varied. Some of them were receptions for fifty dollars or more. We got good turnouts. We raised our budget without too much trouble, but I still refused to be diverted to other expenses and go into debt. At the very end we were met with a blitz of full-page ads in daily newspapers and things like that.

There's no excuse for losing, you just lose.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What other ways did you raise money?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I think that was mostly at receptions, or at fund-raisers, whatever. We held them in different parts of the district. I had a lot of contributions that came in voluntarily or in answer to a mailing. It's all on the record down at the PDC.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You've mentioned log exports. You've mentioned your record and your stand on abortion having worked against you. What were other issues in the campaign?

**Mr. Bailey:** The abortion issue was behind the scenes. It was not really out in front. Maybe log exports was the nearest thing to an open issue. The unions opposing exports even endorsed me because I'd had a very good legislative record for unions and labor. There was one union at Longview, the Pulp and Paper Workers, who did not. They were dead against any log exports.

If we hadn't worked hard or slept on the job, I would feel bad. But we really worked, early until late every day.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You've said that you didn't take out full-page ads at the end, and you've named the issues. What kinds of things did you do to advance your cause?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I was out all the time. My county committees were setting up meetings all the time. I was gone every night to some sort of meeting. I can remember one time when I was called to Clallam County by the local labor council for an interview to see who they were going to endorse. I had to cancel another couple of meetings to go up there, and when I got there three people were present. I got their endorsement, all three of them. I was really disappointed, because you know, I canceled a meeting where there might be sixty or seventy people. As I was leaving, one of the men said, "Bob, don't feel bad about the turnout. There were only two last night when we had Don Bonker." I wonder if those three even told their other members. It was hard to set a schedule, because you'd be in the north end of the district and hoping to spend a week there and really do a job, when you'd get a call from a supporter that you had to be in Longview that night. You'd have to chuck everything and go to Longview. Your friends are good workers, but sometimes they can do you a lot of harm. They try too hard!

It really was awfully hard to cover everything. I didn't cover too much in Pacific and Grays Harbor counties. I didn't feel I needed to, but I also felt, though, that when they had something going on I had to be there, because to ignore them would be to take them for granted. Several people criticized me for that, saying I should not have been wasting my time. If I hadn't been there, they'd have been the first one to say, "He doesn't care about us. He's taking us for granted."

It's a very difficult thing to do, but I'm convinced that name familiarity is the biggest asset. I think of Charlie Hodde running for governor in 1950 when he really had a lot of good publicity as Speaker of the House. When he ran for governor he only carried his own legislative district and a couple of others in eastern Washington. Your name is not always as well-known as you think it is.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How many other people participated directly and consistently in your campaign, besides those five?

**Mr. Bailey:** That would be awfully hard to say. They'd probably be in the hundreds. I had a lot of people working for me. The problem is, again, maybe a lot of them took my election for granted. I had fairly large committees in each of the twelve counties working for me.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did this number work together?

**Mr. Bailey:** They never had to get together. There was no way to get together. People of Clallam County

never go down and meet with people in Clark County. They just worked on their own. Their job was to get the vote out in their own county.

I didn't run a bad race. I was disappointed with my race in Olympia, where I thought I would do fairly well. Otherwise, it was a very close race. Don had a lot of friends in Longview, because he came from Vancouver, later Ridgefield, a short ways down the road in Clark County. He also had the endorsement of the Pulp and Paper Workers on the log export issue.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Had you decided on particular strategy at the beginning of the campaign?

**Mr. Bailey:** Your strategy in a campaign is to get votes! You go out and meet people. There is no such thing as a smart strategy. Strategy to one candidate can be poison to another. You have to go out and meet people and get them to know you. As I've said, this was a problem, as name familiarity was one of the big contributors to my loss. My opponent had been on the ballot two years before and many of these people would remember a name and wouldn't even know who I was.

**Ms. Bridgman:** *The Aberdeen Daily World* cited some of the same reasons that you've mentioned. Particularly that those who knew you well from your legislative work considered that it was a sure thing and may not have worked as hard as they should, had they not considered that you were a sure winner. They also cited the lack of your use of TV at the end. Do you think that was it?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, if it was, it was a lack of money at the end. TV in our area costs, dearly. Don had a few TV ads, but I remember best his full-page ads in all the dailies, just before the election, with pictures and everything. For TV in our area you have to go to Portland as well as Seattle to cover the district. It is a double cost. Even Long Beach at that time couldn't get a Seattle station; they could get Portland. We ran quite a bit of radio and had an advertising firm take over that sort of thing as well as our newspaper advertising.

**Ms. Bridgman:** *The Aberdeen Daily World* also specified the political writer at the *Vancouver Daily Columbian* as being important because he favored Don Bonker and then noted that he went to work for Don Bonker as a public-relations man after the election. In the *World* article at least there was an implication that this is, was, not quite ethical.

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't remember that. He must have been real important, I'll try to remember his name. The man and his wife both worked at the *Columbian*. They had separated and he went back to Washington. He didn't stay very long with Don, and I don't think that was terribly influential in the campaign because at that time the Third District only took in one little section, around Ridgefield, of Clark County and Vancouver, and the *Columbian* was not even in the district and had limited circulation there.

Don Bonker lived in Vancouver and moved his home to Ridgefield, Washington, when he filed. He advertised that he and his wife lived in an historic house in Ridgefield and just loved this area. As soon as he was elected he moved up to Olympia into a mobile, didn't even stay there but used it for mailing purposes until redistricting restored Vancouver when he left Olympia. He had a mobile-home address across the alley from where my house is in Olympia. I went over one time to see if he was there, and they said, "Oh no. He just rents this to use it for a mailing address." So you see, Vancouver and Clark County didn't have a whale of a lot to say in this thing. Maybe Jim Von Ostrand was able to give him some other professional assistance, I don't know what it would be. It would be limited.

But he didn't get much support from writers up our way. The press was certainly very friendly to me. I was very proud of one thing, the numbers of people in my own county that supported me. I had about thirty-five hundred plus votes to five hundred plus for Bonker. It was just overwhelming. Grays Harbor County gave me a real good vote, as did Wahkiakum County. In the other counties we fell behind. Many were very close and I couldn't quite make it up. It still was a matter of who turns out to vote in the primary and who doesn't. With thirty percent out to vote in a primary and eighty percent out to vote in the general election, it boils down to which of those thirty percent shows up. You never know that until it's over with. Don won it fair and square. No problem.

**Ms. Bridgman:** We'll go on to the 1975 Legislature. The regular session and special session immediately following lasted a record 146 days. In November the Democratic leaders were re-elected at a caucus. The papers called the caucus harmonious because Senator Greive had lost his re-election bid as had Senator Fred Dore and were not on the scene anymore. You were again caucus chairman and Mardesich, floor leader.

You were quoted in reference to the Greive-Mardesich troubles that you wished that caucus members would bring their troubles to the caucus first, and not to the press. Will you please describe the background to that statement?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I think that goes back to the question you asked me earlier about Greive and Fisheries. Greive had the tendency to try to develop an issue and go to the press and belittle the rest of us. That's about what it amounted to. That was the reason I was a little caustic with Greive even though we still remained friends, even if a little more distant. If a person really has a grievance they should take it up with the caucus first and shouldn't go to the press and blast it all over unless all they seek is publicity. That was the point of my statement, I guess, and I think it was made in caucus.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Yes.

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I think the point there was that we were trying to get some of the things behind us that had plagued us for two years. If someone really had a gripe, take it up in the caucus and the caucus might be able to settle it right there instead of taking it out on the floor and airing their dirty linen in front of everybody.

We really didn't have much problem that session, though, as far as caucus went. It was fairly harmonious. The acrimony of the Greive defeat had died away. I think it had pretty well died away in 1974 for that matter, in the special session.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In January 1975, Mardesich was indicted by the federal grand jury, as we've spoken about before, and found innocent later on. He stated that he would retain his position, and there was no attempt by the caucus to change that. Then in July of that year Attorney General Slade Gorton began an investigation of Mardesich's campaign contributions and reporting procedures, and Mardesich did admit that he had kept a sum, raised in the campaign, for his own purposes and had not reported it.

The Senate Board of Ethics, of which you were a member, considered this matter and in November you were quoted as saying that his, Mardesich, "loss of the majority floor leader position was imminent." Later he did lose it, and the caucus elected Senator Gordon Walgren.

In December the Ethics Board found that Mardesich had committed three violations. Through all this, what was your role, as caucus chairman?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I was walking on a very thin line. I was the head of the Senate Ethics Committee and the press was constantly pushing, trying to get me to make a statement, which would have been unfair before a decision had been reached. I certainly was no judge, but a judge that gives an opinion on a case before he hears it is certainly not operating properly. To top this off, the fact was that Mardesich and I were working out of the same office. I had my office, he had his, but with the same anteroom. We were very close friends. Augie was a good legislator, and the problems that he got into were above and beyond that. It wouldn't have been very fitting for me to make comment after it went to the Ethics Board.

I think the toughest thing I had to do was trying to keep it from splitting up the caucus. Statements that I might make could split it very easily. There were people in our caucus that were still with Greive–in fact, fomented by Greive. The thing was that in the caucus we had to hold things down. We could have stirred it up and hurt individual members of one opinion or another. I had this constant pressure from the press that we should do something now, untimely as it would be, and I was trying to keep things under control.

It was brought to the Senate Ethics Board early in the year. We refused to hear it at that time. We held it in abeyance, because if he was under trial at that time we should not influence the court case one way or the other.

With the grand jury action coming up, it would not be right for us to render a judgment because of charges fomented by Senator Greive and Gorton because the most we could do–if we found him guilty we could only turn it over to the prosecuting attorney for investigation. The Senate Ethics Committee decided that it would be premature for us to judge him before his trial. It was a tough situation because the press was demanding immediate justice now, to hell with a legal trial.

[End of Tape 24, Side 1]

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you continue with your evaluation of the role of caucus chairman during 1975?

**Mr. Bailey:** It was a difficult situation to keep it from breaking out in the open and at the same time try to wait so that we could see that what we did was just rather than hasty. We held fire until the jury determined that Senator Mardesich was not guilty of his problem with the garbage people.

The charges about campaign funds never became the issue. Another problem entered. When the judge announced the verdict of the jury finding Mardesich not guilty in the garbage case, he said, "Mr. Mardesich, the jury finds you not guilty. But if the jury had the evidence before it that has been brought out here, you're a very lucky man, but it can't be considered in this case."

It seems that after Augie was elected Senate leader there were a number of firms, including Seattle First National Bank and others who began paying monthly amounts to Archie Baker, a Democratic worker in

Everett. They paid him, and he was passing it on to Mardesich each month. In other words, they were financing Mardesich's extra expenses incurred for time spent as Senate majority leader. This came out in the trial and was what the judge was referring to when he said, "You're lucky that you're not on trial for some of the other things that have been brought up."

The little bit of money that Augie admitted he had taken out of the campaign fund and used for expenses he incurred never became an issue and probably was justifiable. It wasn't long after that that Seattle First hauled their official into the board room, and I think he got his walking papers as did a couple of other people. Archie Baker, in the meantime, had died of cancer and he was not able to testify as a witness. He was the only one that could have testified as to receipt of the money and why it was paid to Mardesich. He and Augie were good friends, active Democrats, and I suppose he was willing to do this chore. If he hadn't died the matter would never have been uncovered.

With all of this publicity, the Senate Ethics Board had to pursue it. When we went into caucus, members would ask, "What are we going to do about Mardesich?" Some would try to bring it to a vote, but I would never let it go that far. I thought it was racking our members too hard if word got out that a certain senator voted to support (or even oppose) Mardesich, and the member's home paper printed the information. The members might be crucified for no reason at all. Someone would always raise the issue. I don't remember ever actually voting on it. We didn't ask him for his resignation at that time pending outcome of the Ethics decision. During this time I kept talking to Augie, asking him to spare his colleagues. He was killing his friends. I told him he had to do something.

Just before the Ethics Board had made a decision, and I think he knew what was going to happen, I met in his office and asked him again, and he said, "Don't worry about it. I'm going to do it when the time comes." I knew he was going to quit. He gave me his word and he did it in his own time. Two guys, Augie and I, sat there with tears in their eyes in that office that day. It wasn't fair to the other members for him to continue putting pressure on our members like that. At the same time I think the Senate Ethics Board, the caucus, and Senator Mardesich acted without hasty judgment.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How were the meetings of the Ethics Board conducted?

**Mr. Bailey:** This was a Senate matter so the Senate Ethics Board had charge. We decided that only the lay members of the board would hear Mardesich's case. It would look too much like we were helping to protect a colleague. They were very fair individuals and I don't think even Augie had any problem with them. The meetings were held often, but not at regular times. Ordinarily, they would be held every two or three months or when we had issues before us. Much of it was on personnel matters, so proceedings were confidential unless the individual asked for an open meeting. Most of the business was out in the open, and the public could attend if they wanted to. They were good meetings, but they were time-consuming. We met in various places, in Seattle, Olympia and elsewhere. We usually did not meet in the legislative buildings as we were constantly harassed by the press waiting outside, wanting to know what's going on, what we were doing.

We had two very good lawyer-members, Justice Fred Dore, then a senator, and John Petrich, a former senator, later on the state Court of Appeals in Tacoma. They were very helpful with their legal minds and were very protective of the rights of those accused. Fred Dore was excellent. He could be argumentative, but he was a bright, good lawyer. John Petrich was about as fair as any lawyer I could ever remember. He was always looking out for everybody's rights. I don't remember whether Jim Anderson was on the board then or later. He was one that was very firm in enforcement of law and everything, but was protective of a person's rights in every way. We had good in-house legal advice, as well as good citizen input.

We didn't really have to have a full-time lawyer, although I think Max Nicolai was our attorney most of the time, and he was a brilliant lawyer.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well, how would you describe caucus morale after this was all settled?

**Mr. Bailey:** It picked right up and went right ahead. Augie was a good team player. He came right back on the floor and participated in everything. He was not a hand to carry a grudge or at least not to show it. I have a hunch he didn't forget a lot of things. Who could? But at the same time he was an excellent member.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In the 1975 session that ran so long, a prominent issue was schools. The Legislature was dealing with the drawbacks of the levy system, which had become particularly apparent when a Seattle school levy went down the second time in April 1975. You had proposed a special income tax for school support only. The Senate okayed that, but finally settled on a sixty-five million dollar appropriation for temporary levy relief. Governor Evans promised to veto that, and did. There was a special session called, and all of you in the Senate adjourned after three days, leaving the

House to do the same. Finally Evans did sign the sixty-five million dollar appropriation. He reportedly was very angry and blamed the Legislature and said it was the same old gang. Will you explain the underlying issues of this long decision making process?

**Mr. Bailey:** It again is a question of "If I get my way it's a great session. If I don't get my way it's a bad session." That's about what you gauge these statements on.

Evans and all of us felt that special levies were a terrible way to finance schools. They gave one school better educational facilities than another, and we didn't think that was the way to go. Evans didn't, either. I think Evans was using this as an example of the reason we needed tax reform.

Without a doubt, it was a very good reason we needed tax reform. But there were also other considerations. If the rural schools didn't pass levies all over the state and the kids didn't get a good education, you wouldn't get any support out of Seattle. But if Seattle schools didn't get the levy, the whole state was supposed to come through and support them. I can't remember the formula, but I do think the sixty-five million dollars helped everybody. I don't think we could get a bill passed that would only help Seattle. This effort was only temporary and stopgap.

I am sure Evans was not against the school aid. I think it was that he would have liked to have seen a more dramatic and permanent approach to tax reform for school funding

Two years later, in 1977, the state Supreme Court ruled that special levies were not to be used for basic education, that it was the duty of the state Legislature to provide for basic education. The Legislature proceeded to do that and limited special levies for special purposes only. Now, 1991, some people want to go back to special levies. Four or five years from now I can see them coming back and saying, "We've got to abolish these special levies! That's not the way to finance schools." And then we are back to square one.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How much deterioration had there been in the relationship between Evans and the Legislature during his time as governor?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, I don't recall any. Evans really had a good relationship with the Legislature. We had our ups and we had our downs. It was not much different than a family, I suppose. It was just normal, and I don't think that his relationship with us went downhill toward the end. Many times it was just a jostling for position, sometimes political, sometimes an honest difference of opinion.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In 1975 you were made manager of the Port of Willapa Harbor. You were chosen after you assured the port commissioners that there was no conflict of interest, that had been determined by attorneys, and that you would not be on the payroll while you were in the Legislature. How did you feel about this job?

**Mr. Bailey:** I volunteered these things myself. The port never raised them. When I decided to run for Congress I resigned from Mrs. Hansen's staff and I didn't work all of that year, but I did personally borrow enough money from the bank so that I would have a set income for myself and the family, away from campaign expenses, so that we could live normally and wouldn't have to suffer for my politicking around. After the election Julia called me the very next day and said she wanted me back on the staff to help her close out her offices. So I did. I went back to Washington and helped her a little bit, but I mainly came back to help her close out her district offices. There were boxes and boxes of things that belonged to her containing books and papers. Many of them went to the University of Washington. It was a big job. On January 4, 1975, Julia was out of Congress and I went to the Legislature.

Bert Cole and a number of people started in talking me up for a state job when the Legislature adjourned. I guess Bert even talked to Governor Evans at one time.

During this time there was the vacancy in the port position and I wrote a letter saying I'd like to have the job. I was accepted. It was a job that paid fair, and for once I could stay home.

I really enjoyed the time I spent there. The Port Commission was great to work with, as was the crew. The port was folding up as a shipping port, because the army engineers were no longer dredging the harbor and shipping had dropped to nothing. We went into industrial development as the alternative. We shifted our whole emphasis. I had just got a grant from the state for hiring a few employees on the dock to bring in a beer distributor. They had just poured the concrete groundwork when I went to the Legislature in the 1977 session. I was appointed chairman of the Utilities and Transportation Commission in March and I took it.

The years in the port were a very pleasant interlude in my activities. I was able to stay home. I did a lot of organizing in the way of economic-development committees and things, getting the committees working with state people and, of course, I had the right as a senator to ask the state for a few things, too. I didn't hesitate to do it, either!

The Ports Association people, as well as the local group, were very nice people to work with. Our port

was really suffering. It was a very small port. The port of Ilwaco, in the same county, had a big fishing fleet moored there. We had nothing like that and had to start toward industrial development. Marshall Briggs, the mayor of Raymond, followed me as manager and had five or six more buildings built at the port. He was a good promoter. I always think about when the state gave the money for the first building they said, "This is just the seed money to start something going." It sure did. It's not operating as a shipping port too much, although it has docks and places for boats to tie up, things like that. It does maintain quite a little industrial complex and that area needs everything it can get to create jobs.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In 1976 it was reported that you were considering resigning your position as caucus chairman. Why did you consider resigning, and what changed your mind?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think it was the fact that I had a job and I was home. My state legislative job was just taking more and more time in order to keep up with everything. There was a tendency, both with Mardesich and with Walgren, and also with the continuing-session concept, to have to go up to Olympia frequently. If you didn't come you'd lose touch with things. I think that's the main reason I was thinking about quitting. I don't know why I thought out loud. I usually don't do that. I also had some real reservations about even running again for the Senate. I had a job, and I liked it, and I didn't want to imperil it by leaving. I couldn't afford to.

At one time Senator Walgren called me and said, "I want you to run again." I told him, "I don't know. I haven't made up my mind, but I'm thinking about not running." He said, "I'll tell you who wants you to run." I said, "Who is that?" He replied, "Your Port Commission." Walgren had apparently talked with them and when that was cleared up I had no problems running once more.

**Ms. Bridgman:** For the record, you did win re-election, and you were unopposed. That year, also, Dixy Lee Ray ran for governor. You and Sid Snyder were her campaign co-chairmen in Pacific County. How long had you known Governor Ray?

**Mr. Bailey:** I had never know her at all, and neither had Sid. Most of us had been longtime friends of Wes Uhlman, a former state senator, mayor of Seattle, who was also running. Wes did not win the nomination.

After the primary I invited Dixy to a caucus we were holding in Seattle. She came over from Fox Island and half of my members were upset that I had invited our own nominee. They had been Uhlman supporters. She gave a little talk and had to go downtown to a big fund-raiser and didn't stay long. I think it was Sid that called me over and said that she needed a chairman in Pacific County, and we both agreed to serve as co-chairmen. I think that's the first time I ever met Dixy who by that time was our nominee. Later on, the same people who refused to shake her hand at the caucus applied to her for state jobs. Unbelievable.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What were your responsibilities?

**Mr. Bailey:** Not much. Just use of our names. She was like Julia, she ran her own campaign. We just lent our names. That was about what it amounted to.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you please describe her political style and convictions? That sort of thing. What first impressed you?

**Mr. Bailey:** The first impression you have of Dixy is while you don't know her, you feel like you've known her all your life; she just sets you at ease immediately. She is just a tremendous person that way. She was very naive politically, and I think she'd be the first one to tell you that. I like to think my wife put it right one time when she said, "You know people voted for Dixy and Jimmy Carter that year because they were both outsiders and people like to hear it like it is, from an outsider." At that same time, after Dixy got in and let them hear it like it was, if it wasn't what they wanted to hear they turned against her. Other politicians would hem and haw, and you never knew where they stood, but not Dixy. She was a very charming person from a standpoint of just setting you at ease. You'd feel like she was part of your family, but she had very positive opinions.

Politically she didn't quite know how to grab ahold of political situations because she was a professor and a scientist and made decisions based on facts, not politics. She was always decisive and seldom swayed from her decision no matter what. I certainly didn't agree with her on a good portion of her political statements, especially nowadays. She is very conservative, but at the same time, if you know Dixy, Dixy will continue to be Dixy, whether anybody likes it or not. She was extremely bright and intelligent and an outstanding person.

I also believe that the Democratic Party people made a whale of a mistake. They were chagrined because their man didn't win. And they immediately almost ostracized Dixy as governor. They operated on their own and never made an overture to take her in. She

went her way, too. I still think if they had been a little more considerate, a little bit helpful to her, she would have come out as one of the best Democrats and probably wouldn't have had any trouble getting re-elected either. Of course I remember when she wanted to dump the state chairman, and when asked why, she said, "Because he drinks too much." She was brutally honest, and I just don't think that people were ready to take it. They really prefer hem and haw.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Will you give some examples of the two things you mentioned, the first being her making decisions without considering the political implications?

**Mr. Bailey:** You'd have to know Dixy to know her decisions. She was a very bright woman, and in the most technical situation she understood things quite thoroughly. She didn't have to be briefed on it, she knew it and then would make a decision. That was the way she operated.

Politically it was not practical. She never did get comfortable with party leaders and the party leaders didn't try to get comfortable with her, either. They just treated her like she was an accident and consequently they indirectly elected John Spellman four years later. I think the state Democratic Party made a horrible mistake. They had an opportunity and they fluffed it. She certainly didn't get much cooperation out of the party, and in return she did little to accommodate them.

**Ms. Bridgman:** There's one final issue in 1976, which much was made of by the press, and that is beach driving. You were quoted as disagreeing with the State Parks and Recreation Commission because they wanted new rules prohibiting driving on the beach. Will you please describe your views on this?

**Mr. Bailey:** Long Beach Peninsula is twenty-some miles long, and by law is a public highway. It was designated that in 1901 when it was set aside for use by the public. Since then accretions had built up so tremendously that in some places it is a good mile farther out than at that time in 1901.

People from Spokane had an out-of-area dream of Waikiki and Florida and advocated no driving on our beach, absolutely none. They envisioned Oregon's beaches where you can't drive, but Oregon's beaches don't have a long stretch of beach and there were no accretions. There's always a curve and a rock or something, so stretches of Oregon beaches are relatively short. My contention was that if you eliminated beach driving, all you were doing was creating a private beach for many upland owners that faced on the beach, as it was sometimes a very long distance between public approaches. If they were going to prohibit beach driving, I felt that State Parks owed it to the people to build many public approaches to the beaches, close to each other. Parks Director Charles Odegaard and I never sat peaceably at the same table in later years. He was intent on closing the beaches to driving and getting autocratic power to run the beaches in his own way.

[End of Tape 24, Side 2]

## UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSIONER: 1977-82

**Ms. Bridgman:** Senator Bailey, when we last talked you were explaining the differences between your view and those of Charles Odegaard, director of State Parks. You'd begun to describe his opinions about driving on the ocean beach. Can you continue with that, please?

**Mr. Bailey:** The ocean-beach areas of our state were in constant turmoil because Mr. Odegaard wanted authority over the beaches. Now that doesn't mean that he would have stopped all driving on the beach, but people didn't trust him and they didn't want to take that chance. I had always contended that driving on the beach, at least our beach, did no environmental damage. I paraphrase Governor Ray when she said the ocean beach is one of the most rugged environmental things in the world–the tide cleans it up twice a day. You can drive on it and not hurt anything. But the dunes above it are a different matter. Those accretions are very fragile. So as long as you don't drive on the clam beds you do little harm environmentally, and if you do you're probably going to have to get a wrecker to get your car out. I always contended that if Charles Odegaard really wanted to do something he should have absolutely forbid any driving of dune buggies and things like that on the dunes. As Dixy said, they are very fragile, environmentally. People can walk from uplands out to the ocean twice and they've broken down a pathway that's killed off all the new vegetation. It's very fragile. But Mr. Odegaard would never do that. At one time he represented all-terrain vehicle groups. He and I just never got along very well and my people didn't trust him. He was in great disfavor in my area.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How was the issue finally settled?

**Mr. Bailey:** The issue arose every year, and at one time we allowed him authority to close sections, but my amendment would not allow him to close all of the beach at the same time. He took this to court and the court upheld my amendment. There were certain areas you couldn't drive anyway, such as around the rocks at the North Head, and places like that where there wasn't enough beach to drive on or perhaps the soft sand made it impossible. The bill we passed gave him limited authority for closing a few areas at a time. These were usually areas where people could reach the beach by walking from parking areas in the uplands. They could not ban driving on the total beach. It was an issue every year until about four years ago, in the late 1980s, when they finally reached an agreement and passed a law on beach driving which met with the approval of almost everyone in State Parks as well as citizens of the area. It was much ado about a lot of fears, and finally, after many years, they worked it out. I'm confident that Mr. Odegaard could never have worked it out because he did not have the confidence of the people of the area and they mistrusted him.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I'd like to begin now with the 1977 session of the Legislature in which you served in the first regular session from January 10 to March 10. One of the issues that year was legislative reform, again. There was a proposal to open conference committees to public and press. It was favored by Common Cause and there was also another idea to open the caucuses. You were quoted in a newspaper article in January saying that caucus members needed the privacy to discuss things and ask questions, and that if the caucus were opened it would just drive private meetings elsewhere. First, what happened concerning the conference committees?

**Mr. Bailey:** When there are differences between the House and the Senate a conference committee is appointed of members of both houses and of both sides, pro or con, of a certain bill. Their job is to try to work out the differences. At first they are limited just to those differences, and then if they can't reach agreement of a majority, they go back to their respective house and ask for the powers of free conference, which means that they can rewrite the whole bill. At one time a conference had to have unanimous approval. That has, since then, been modified.

The procedure is a parliamentary tool to end the legislative stalemate caused by differences between the two houses' final conclusions. If these conference committees are public, you are going to start all over and have public hearings with people sitting in on those decisions, then you have actually started the whole process all over again, and there isn't much point to it. You might as well return it to the original committee.

The plan didn't propose for calling testimony before that conference committee, but there are a lot of people in the public and many members who play to the press. Someone with future political ambitions could disrupt

the process terribly when they go in front of the press and TV and deliberately pose questions made for headlines in the media instead of trying to settle the actual differences. I was a member of the press at one time in a smaller way and don't blame them entirely. I've seen times when members of the press would even pass questions to members of the Legislature to be asked on the floor. They would write their story before it even happened and have it ready for release. I think open meetings of conference committees would be disruptive to the legislative process. The meetings of a conference committee are no different than any group that goes into executive session.

As to the caucus, members have to go someplace where they can discuss things without ending up on page one. Some members are not always up on every issue, but in caucus they feel free to ask questions on even minor bills. If the press and public were sitting in there, few members will ask and appear to lack knowledge. I think opening the caucuses, too, would have been very disruptive and harmful to the legislative process. I said if they can't meet at some place and do something, they're going to find another place to go.

The caucus is a place where they could go behind doors and ask questions. They might seem dumb questions, but members always came out better for it because they have found the answers. We had many hassles in caucus that should never go out on the floor, but once we ironed them out we could go out on the floor and ultimately present a fairly good legislative program, without the bickering. Someplace, somehow, someone's got to be able to talk freely. We never took definite actions in caucus, that would violate open-meeting laws, but we had a place to go where we could frankly discuss problems. Open caucuses encourage grandstanding.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I've not asked you to describe a typical caucus meeting. How many people would speak?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, a typical caucus meeting was open to any member who would want to speak and there was no one ever denied that right. A typical caucus would come to order with a roll call. Very seldom did anyone miss a caucus. The lieutenant governor was not a member of our caucus, but he was usually invited, and he usually didn't come unless we had something he was very interested in. He was always aware of his position, a nonmember, but president of the Senate. The secretary of the Senate was always there. We were in the majority in those years. No one else was allowed in the caucus, unless invited. We would probably have our attorney present. After the roll call we would go on to any business we had, or that anyone wanted to discuss. There was no rigid structure.

We would then go into the calendar of the day, which took up a great deal of our time. That's where our attorney would come in. He would brief us or answer questions that had to do with the bills on the calendar for action by the Senate that day. It could be fifty or sixty bills sometimes, and usually there'd be no problem with them, but members could ask questions, and perhaps why they were needed.

We never took votes on those bills. We–the caucus–was used, in this case, for informational purposes, not decisions.

At one time the two caucuses had their own research, and each turned out their explanation of bills–"the poop sheets." In the last several years I was in the Senate, calendars were done by a joint committee of attorneys, and gave a very nonpartisan look at what these bills did, eliminating much duplication and cost. Both caucuses worked off the same papers. It was a very good step forward.

When people see a senator roaming on and off the floor, perhaps to speak to a constituent, answer a phone, or confer with staff, they get the idea of a lack of attention. Actually, most members had already been briefed thoroughly and know the contents of the average bill being voted on. Members were very familiar with bills on the calendar, at least in the Senate.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How much varied opinion was typically expressed?

**Mr. Bailey:** We had terrifically varied opinions. Everyone spoke up without hesitation. Bear in mind again that ninety percent of the bills are nonargumentative. They were probably minor to many, but might be major to somebody else. When we got into some tax bills and appropriations bills and a few major things like that, we would get a lot of people going on both sides.

If we were the majority and had to present a tax bill, or an appropriations bill, we did not take it out on the floor unless we had sufficient votes to pass it. It would be ridiculous to do so. Once a bill goes down to defeat on the floor and is reconsidered once and defeated, you haven't got any bill any more. You have to start the legislative procedure all over. So it was just good organization and good sense to have a little discipline.

If we had enough votes and the other party was opposing it, it was not unusual for either myself or Senator Walgren, Greive, or Senator Mardesich, to go across and tell the minority that we could provide so many votes, but we needed six or more votes from them before it could pass. Nine times out of ten, if we were down to the crunch, we'd end up with those votes. It

wasn't fair that the majority party would take care of the necessary state problem all by itself and the minority part would be completely aloof. They should share the burden, too.

The biggest legislative demagoguery is when a member would vote for every appropriation and against every tax bill or load an appropriations bill and let others pare it, then enjoy both worlds.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How were risks associated with supporting any given measure discussed and worked through and decided on? For example, suppose that something was controversial, how much discussion of different possible effects was there?

**Mr. Bailey:** Those things were usually taken care of in committee. The caucus doesn't amend bills or anything like that. It only discussed the bill as it came out of committee and went to the Rules Committee and then onto the floor–and the Rules Committee did not amend bills, either.

When I was caucus chairman we never bound our members to a vote, one way or the other. However, if we did call the roll as to how many would support a tax bill or something major, we did expect that member to keep his word. We did not tell them how to vote.

They could vote any way they wished, but we had to know how many votes we had on the floor or the whole session would collapse and start all over again, and that would be anything but good state government. Frequently members would get up and say they couldn't vote for a bill. We didn't care as long as we were forewarned and could anticipate what would happen on the floor. Sometimes a member would have a very good reason to have to vote against a bill. It could be something that really hurt their district. We always took things like that into consideration. I've known some Republican caucuses where they were bound to vote with the majority of their caucus.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You've been described so often in newspaper articles as gentlemanly and reasonable and always able to keep the caucus orderly. How did you, as the press claimed, calm things down using these qualities?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't remember really having any member of our caucus accuse me of being unfair. A couple of times people got angry and they usually come around within a short time and apologized. Perhaps I had to apologize to them. I really don't remember that the caucus was ever out of hand. Everybody had a right to speak and everybody did.

In those eighteen years I was there, with only a few exceptions, it was seldom personal between myself and our members. It was always on issues, with only a few exceptions. More personal feelings came out at the time of the Greive-Mardesich exchanges.

A few personal things bubbled out here and there, but they were confined to a couple of members and they did not really become major problems. It is overdrawn to say that I had much to do with it because the average member we had was very cooperative and wasn't inclined to stir up trouble.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How would you describe your function in your role during one of these more difficult times?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I was just the chairman and I pounded the gavel. I sometimes nearly broke it, and they used to say I made a lot of noise. They were usually very cooperative. In the caucus they could get it off their chest and sit down and somebody else would get their turn. Different ideas, but with peace and harmony.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Well, perhaps that peace and harmony was what impressed the press so much.

About this time, in January 1977, legislative leaders began to express concern that Governor Ray was not filling appointive posts quickly. You were quoted as saying that you were concerned mostly about her personal staff, especially her top aide. Slightly later, at the end of February, the *Tacoma News Tribune* ran an article saying there had been no honeymoon for Dixy Lee Ray and her legislators, that most legislators had in fact supported the candidacy of Wes Uhlman or Martin Durkan for governor.

You have talked a little bit about Governor Ray and her relationship to all of you in the Legislature, but what were at this time specific concerns of the legislators other than these appointments?

**Mr. Bailey:** I would like to remember it in a little different way. I had nothing to do with Governor Ray until later when I was appointed to the UTC. She was our governor, and I think we expressed concern about her hesitancy in making some appointments. The concerns were dug up by the press in the first place, and they would ask you what you thought. When asked over and over, sooner or later you are going to say something. For awhile she had a number of people coming up to the Legislature and saying, "The governor is interested in this or that."

I always recall quite clearly the fact that Jim Dolliver, as chief aide to Governor Evans, did such a good

job for the governor and made a good name for himself. He had excellent relations with the Legislature. We may not have agreed with him, but he certainly was an orderly administrator and lobbyist, too, and you knew he really spoke for Governor Evans.

I made a comment to the effect that I was concerned that she had not yet found someone "to be the Dolliver of her administration." It was just not a recognition of Jim Dolliver who deserved it, but it was also the fact that Governor Ray needed someone like him, and later on she did have a couple of very capable legislative assistants.

The filling of other positions was a unique thing. She came in with the idea of not just dumping everybody out overnight, but had ideas of replacing department heads as she found good appointees. I think that I have never seen such a disgraceful attitude in state government as the department heads left over from Dan Evans. They serve at the pleasure of the governor, and it's usually the custom that their term ends with that of the governor unless asked to serve for awhile until a new appointment is made. All of these Evans heads that had not been replaced right away lingered on in Governor Ray's administration.

I had heard the story, and she heard it, too, that when asked as to what was going on that one of the lingering holdovers said, "The old lady doesn't even know what the score is yet, so we're still on the payroll." That might have been on a Friday, but Saturday night came the "massacre." She sent them their Kleenex to wipe their tears away and gave them the notice they were out. They, knowing better, went in righteous rage and the press even supported the fact a great injustice had occurred. To me their statements were misleading and outrageous and exhibited utterly ignorant actions on the part of the press and the appointees. They should have quit the day she took over as governor.

I asked Governor Ray later when she was taking such a beating in the press if any one of those people ever came to her and said, "Governor, I'll be glad to stay on until you select my successor." She said, "Not a one except Chief of Patrol Roy Bachofner. I was very happy and very pleased." She said, "I would have thought a lot different of them if they'd have done something like that."

I thought those people, mostly seasoned political figures who knew better, exercised poor and cheap judgment. They cried bitter tears and she sent them the Kleenex to wipe their eyes away. But the governor took it on the chin because the press played it up as a terrible action and through them it became known as another "Saturday night massacre." They should have been massacred at midnight of the night that she took over.

**Ms. Bridgman:** I want to go back to my question about what other concerns legislators had in January.

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I don't think we had any great concerns. We were wondering who was going to speak for her and who we were going to deal with. I don't think we had any greater concern with her at that time than any other incoming governor.

I mentioned this before that Governor Ray was not from inside the Democratic Party. She was a new face in politics and partisan politics were new to her. I still think that the state Democratic Party passed up a great opportunity–even they chose not to warm up to her as governor. They more or less ignored her on the state level, and she responded in kind, staying pretty aloof. People say, "Well, she didn't make herself welcome." Well, I would say that after she was governor the party should have done something to make her welcome. Many Democrats supported her, but a lot were soreheads, poor losers.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Were these soreheads those who had supported Uhlman or Durkan?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think that's probably basically true. Durkan and Uhlman were both longtime members of the party. I think the election caught the other people quite unawares.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In February of 1977 Adele Ferguson of the *Bremerton Sun* wrote an article describing what she called name-calling between Cherberg and Mardesich over Cherberg's prerogatives in the Rules Committee. She said that you were going to talk to Cherberg and get it resolved. Then in March, after you were appointed to the UTC, she said that nothing had been written, that nothing had been taken care of, and that this disagreement between the two men was still going on. What was the basis of this?

[End of Tape 25, Side 1]

**Ms. Bridgman:** We were discussing the Rules Committee.

**Mr. Bailey:** Well let me just go back and maybe repeat what I just ended up saying on the other tape.

It was a question of many years as to whether or not the lieutenant governor should be voting in the Rules Committee, which determined whether bills came out on the floor or not. He was made chairman of the Rules Committee by members of the Senate. The question was whether he should have a vote. The lieutenant

governor can vote on a tie in amendments and procedural matters. The constitution provides that no bill shall become a law unless a majority of the elected senators vote for it. The lieutenant governor is not a duly elected senator, and does not have a vote in final passage.

It apparently was just a whim of Senate Rules that they allowed the lieutenant governor to vote in committee. No such motion was on record, although it was common practice over the years. This procedure started at a time years before when there was a secret vote and in such cases, no one knew how anyone voted. I don't know how many years it had gone on, but apparently Mardesich and the lieutenant governor had some difference over a bill that probably failed to come out by one vote.

Anyway, Augie picked up the battle, which had arisen from time to time before. He had some Republican support. They would like to knock the lieutenant governor, a Democrat, out of his voting ability. The Senate did not need him as a chairman if they so chose. It had been done for so many years it was custom. The argument between Cherberg and Mardesich got into the press somehow. I voluntarily went to Lieutenant Governor Cherberg and talked with him, hoping to settle the matter without doing anything to embarrass John Cherberg. Adele was right. When you challenged John Cherberg openly, he became a very stubborn and effective fighter. And he could fight, too. He had unlimited friends and exercised great influence. No one can underrate what he did as lieutenant governor, and his influence, when he chose to exert it, but while the real arguments were against him, most of us would not want to embarrass him.

As I remember, he was challenged by Mardesich in a meeting, and he replied something like, "If you want to question my right to do these things, you stand up and raise the question. Until you do, I intend to exercise every right of every other committee chairman of the Senate." This went into the press. I personally went to see John right after that, and we talked it over. I was worried that Augie, with Republican support, had the votes, and I didn't want to see Lieutenant Governor Cherberg embarrassed. Technically his vote was on shaky ground, and he had already decided quietly that he was not going to vote any more on any issue, especially when his vote determined the outcome of the bill.

Adele may have thought she was right, that nothing had been done. But John and I agreed there would be no embarrassing public statements. He had arrived at his decision before I talked to him. I thought it was handled very diplomatically. Augie was satisfied and did not pursue it further. Apparently everyone forgot to make a press release, quite intentionally.

**Ms. Bridgman:** We've mentioned that you were appointed by Dixy Lee Ray to be chairman of the Utilities and Transportation Commission in 1977. After that appointment was made public, February 23, 1977, you were interviewed by a reporter on the *Yakima Herald Republic* who called you one of the good guys. He asked you to reflect on your legislative career. You responded that one of the biggest problems in 1977 was people doubting the integrity of public officials, and that you "can't think of a finer group of people than the ones I've served with." Finally you said that you have faith in the electorate, in their ability to make the right selection.

How do you think the public views the integrity of public officials now in 1991, as compared to when you left the Senate in 1977?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't think it's any different. When you run for public office you're asking for criticism, and it's probably a good thing, too. It's the old saying, "That session was a horrible one. They wasted time, raised taxes, but Bob, you did a good job." When I worked for Mrs. Hansen it was, "That Congress, Julia, was the worst damned Congress we ever had. They didn't do anything, but Julia, you're doing a good job." That's the historic story, repeated every year. People actually don't get very near their public officials and consequently, they read about them in the press and perhaps one little quotation makes news, but it throws their whole story out of context. Many times the people that criticize the most don't even vote. The process is there to be used if people want to use it. If they don't want to use it, that's their funeral, and they can't blame the public officials.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How has your view of the peoples' wisdom in making the right selection changed since then?

**Mr. Bailey:** If you didn't believe in the peoples' wisdom, you wouldn't believe in democracy, that's a sure thing. When I went to school we were criticized if we said we lived in a democracy, because we don't. We live in a representative republic and the people elected are elected to do a job to represent the people. If they don't do it, they're voted out of office, or should be. A democracy is something we seem to be heading for and have with us now. It's made up of interminable committees of citizens that sit around determining what their elected representatives should do. They may not even go to vote, or they might have been the one that was running against the guy that got elected, and then they go on a committee trying to tell him what he's

supposed to do. That's a terrific shift in government. I'm not against committees of citizens taking the public interest, but the biggest public interest that they could take is getting out to vote for their representatives.

Many people join a committee after they're defeated for public office. They couldn't make it themselves so they are going to try to tell the guy that got elected how to operate. They should get elected, then do their best to represent those who elected them.

**Ms. Bridgman:** And are there more of these committees now than when you were serving?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh, there's a committee for everything now, and every community has one or many committees. There's nothing wrong with that. The point, though, is that sometimes the decisions are made in other places than by the elected official and exert influence on the elected official even though not representative of the majority, usually unorganized, that elected that person. These people sometimes make all the noise, but noise does not always represent the majority.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How would you compare today's legislators with those who served with you?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think they're still high-grade. It takes a lot of interest and a lot of dedication to spend all of your time on public service. While they pay better now, really some of the pay they're getting compared with what a dollar would buy back when we were making very little is probably not that great either. It takes a great dedication to spend all that time away from your family, or away from your regular job, or whatever. I can't find any fault in the representatives of the people. You may not agree with everything that everybody does, but they wouldn't agree with us, either. It's the best system we've devised yet for governing, any time, any place.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You supported annual sessions back then in 1977. How well do you think the annual sessions function now?

**Mr. Bailey:** There isn't a little county in the state where the county commissioners meet once every two years, nor a mayor and his city council that would only meet every two years. It doesn't make sense that a big state can have their group meet once every two years unless they turn it all over to the executive, and to the various bureaus and departments and just let them run amuck for two years. It just made good government to meet every year. It made better sense to change it so that they weren't necessarily dependent on a call by the governor alone.

From 1969 on Governor Evans called a session every year. He recognized the need, but it was at his whim and it was always questionable whether it would be or not be held. A person holding a job like myself never knew whether we were going to have to get off in January or what, until the governor made up his mind. Evans recognized the problem and determined he was going to do it on a regular basis.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Then you advocated a balance between a professional and a citizen Legislature. To what extent do you think that balance has been achieved?

**Mr. Bailey:** This is 1991, and we have a much more full-time Legislature now. I still think that there are pretty good remnants of the citizen Legislature. It is still made up of people who are attorneys, doctors, teachers, and other groups, and that still leaves a citizen Legislature fairly intact, but not as much as it used to be. There are some that spend their whole time on their legislative job, and they always did. On the other hand, if they hadn't had done something like raising pay, and making it more financially attractive you might have had a lot of retired people spending their full time on it and they wouldn't have represented the whole spectrum of the public. There is nothing wrong with retired people. They should be represented, as should every other group possible.

I know many teacher-members of the Legislature who had problems because they were away from class so long, and it was just because the school district was very tolerant to them that they could serve. It must be bad to send your child to school to a certain teacher, and then have him gone most of the time to a legislative session. Those people were not paid as teachers during that time they were in the Legislature, but it had to be very disruptive to themselves, the districts, and the pupils.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You spoke positively about the argument and deliberation that went on in the Legislature. What about the endurance of that argument and deliberation that you valued?

**Mr. Bailey:** The legislature that deliberates and argues, and sometimes does nothing, can be a better legislature than one which does a great deal. Not all need action, and sometimes it is better if nothing is done. If you don't argue and deliberate, you are subject then to someone behind the scenes telling you what to do. The citizen ought to really start to worry about that. Deliberations, while lengthy, are part of the process, and it's

probably the best way yet devised. It certainly wouldn't be good to have everyone acting as a rubber stamp. It certainly wouldn't be good to have everything that was proposed passed into law. Deliberations kill a lot of bills. Sometimes bills are killed this year that next year are changed a little and become adopted without opposition. Deliberations don't hurt anything. Other people have ideas too, and the Legislature is a place where the elected representative can sit down and work them out.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Looking back now, what were the most important things accomplished when you were in the Legislature? First, of all things that you were involved with.

**Mr. Bailey:** From a purely personal standpoint, I think probably the biggest thing and the most lasting thing that I could think of was being one of the key persons in the building of the Astoria-Megler Bridge, which everyone said couldn't be done, but we did it.

Maybe when I look back at it now I couldn't pin it on any one bill, but it was a pleasure to try to represent the people that I did and try to work out their problems, ocean beaches, just any number of things. I think maybe the thing I look back on now the most was when I was in a leadership position trying to help pull major state bills and programs through the Legislature. It was not necessarily a personal interest to me, but because of the leadership duties, I felt it was necessary for someone to take on. The leadership has to take over to see that the budget bills, the education bills, tax bills, and other major things are taken care of. Those are major issues and they've got to be met. Too many members represented only their own districts and didn't look beyond their own small, local bills. You should represent your own district, but you have to look beyond. Someone must take care of the state of Washington, too. And I think I found more pleasure in working at that angle of it, toward the last seven or eight years as a member of the Senate, than I did in some of the personal bills. I did not neglect my district, either.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In retrospect–what accomplishments you weren't involved with were most important?
**Mr. Bailey:** I couldn't even try to answer that. My mind won't reach out that far.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What do you remember as the most difficult times in your legislative career?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think the most strained times were when, as a member of the Senate Board of Legislative Ethics, we had the matter of Senator Mardesich before us. We were being pressured by the press all the time for a statement. I was particularly targeted because I was around the chambers all the time. I think Senator Dore was badgered, too. The lay members of the board were out in the field and probably wouldn't have been as bothered, but we were particularly plagued by the press and everybody wanting to know what we're doing. They wanted action. We were in the position of being a judge and jury and were being asked to make statements before a decision was reached.

We couldn't make comments of any type, because it would certainly be unfair to the person being heard. It was tough not to make one mad by not telling them anything. It went on for several months and it was not easy. I don't blame the press, for they wanted to keep abreast of development. It was tense and it was difficult to brush them off.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What things would you do differently?

**Mr. Bailey:** Nothing. In some subjects or issues I might think differently now because we've had changes of thought and times have changed. On the other hand, I don't know of anything I regretted doing. I could probably think of plenty in the next year or so.

**Ms. Bridgman:** What are the subjects and issues which come to mind where things seem different than they did then?

**Mr. Bailey:** I don't know of anything in particular. I suppose that over a period of years a person does change perspectives and attitudes. Some of the things we worried the most about don't even bother us anymore. Things that we should have taken care of we didn't. The old Episcopal confessional prayer says that, "We have left undone those things which we ought to have done, and we have done those things which we ought not to have done." That fits almost every legislative session I was ever in.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Aside from the increasing rapport between the Democrats and Republicans that you were a part of and witnessed when you were in the Legislature, what were the other important changes that you saw over those years that you served?

**Mr. Bailey:** I think that generally, legislative ethics improved considerably because of public disclosure and the open-meetings laws and legislative-ethics codes. They were all great advances for the public good. They are also paying legislators better now, which is a good idea. Some of the members in the old days were paid, five dollars, ten dollars, a day, and up until 1948 they were paid nothing a month. You get what you pay for.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Before we go on to your time with the Utilities and Transportation Commission, there are a couple of things that are sort of epilogues to your legislative career that I'd like you to reflect on.

First, they both have to do with 1978. The first is the postage-stamp problem. The press called it the "legislators' stamp collections."

**Mr. Bailey:** That was much ado about nothing. But even this highly publicized issue ended with good results in improved legislative procedures. The system of allocating postage stamps to members developed in stages.

As legislative business increased, one of the first was the allocation of postage stamps to each member to be used in answering his or her mail. A motion would be made on the floor of either house that each member would be allowed a certain number of stamps–perhaps three hundred dollars, or whatever.

Many, like myself, answered a lot of individual mail, but did not use our whole allotment. Many others issued regular mailings to their constituents, and were soon out of stamps. It was then that on mutual agreement a floor motion would be made to make an additional stamp allocation to each member.

Eventually, on the books, each of us had a little "savings book" listing our allocations and our withdrawals, and our balances. We could draw on our accounts. The attorney general had stated that these stamps were for our expense as legislators, but if converted to cash, or used otherwise, could be termed as income and we would have to report it to Uncle Sam.

Somehow, someplace–it matters not as I was not in the Senate–there was some evidence that some allotted stamps had been used for campaign purposes. This brought the whole issue into focus, as well as a check on the stamp usage by each member.

Now, over the years, the Senate had also adopted a "meter" system, and increasingly, each year, that system had been used. I had never used the "meter" as my experience with the office of Julia Butler Hansen and Senators Jackson and Magnuson had always demonstrated to me that a stamp was more personal.

Consequently, as I was leaving the Legislature to go to the UTC, I decided to write a general report on the session and drew stamps for the same. I will guess it was about three thousand dollars, and I must have had another eight thousand dollars or more left in my account.

I became very busy those last few days, and the secretary of the Senate informed me that I had to complete my "Report to the People" before midnight of my resignation or it would be too late. All speed ahead, I completed my report and had to resort to use of the meter to get the report out on the last day.

When the stamp story broke, of course, I was listed as drawing my three thousand dollars or whatever, just prior to resigning, and also using the meter for a big mailing. The stamps were still intact, in a sealed box, and eventually returned, but when questioned by a member of the press, I had to "check this out." This was referred to as my "stamp collection."

If I had wanted to profit, I would have drawn the whole amount of eight to eleven thousand dollars over the year. Despite this episode distressing me, at least the incident resulted in a whole new procedure in which members use the meter and are clocked for it. No stamps change hands, and in my mind, a much more effective control has been established which should prevent any further abuses, such as were alleged.

Don't get me wrong. Many of us sweat blood trying to reconstruct where each roll of stamps could have gone for a period of about five years. If you can imagine trying to reconstruct the amount of your correspondence, the amount of stationery you used, and related matters–and having to swear to these facts and figures under oath, you can imagine a person's concern.

Ultimately, after a gleeful number of days for the press, the Public Disclosure Commission closed the books on the matter, and insofar as I know, no senator faced charges. The possibility of abuse was great, however, and the great ado brought about some real reforms in stamp allocation.

In moving from South Bend to Olympia, my "stamp collection" was packed with our other movables and since I could not possibly have used that many stamps personally, I would have returned them anyway, sooner or later. As I recall it, after returning the three thousand dollars or whatever, I had about eleven thousand dollars in my account, which reverted to the Senate. Had I wished to make any money out of this, I would have withdrawn the whole thing.

[End of Tape 25, Side 2]

**Ms. Bridgman:** One more thing before we begin on the UTC. You served on what began as Dixy Lee Ray's governmental task force. You were chairman of the Economic Development and Employment Committee. Will you describe the workings of this–your group and the other groups involved in her cabinet?

**Mr. Bailey:** This isn't a very important thing really, and came about after I was on the Utilities Commission.

Heads of departments and commissions held brown bag lunches at the governor's mansion about every other week. They could be called cabinet meetings I

suppose. Governor Ray organized what other governors had done before, and after, too. She organized a number of committees in this cabinet and put members on different committees. It happened she named me chairman of the Economic Development and Employment Committee. It was to gather expertise on the subject, and they assigned one of the state employees to do the clerical and research work. I remember Charlie Hodde was on my committee. Gene Weigmann, head of Employment Security, and several others were on the committee. There were other committees, too, on Fisheries and things of that sort. We would hold meetings once every week or so.

I was called upon a large number of times to go out to the chambers of commerce and speak to them about what we were trying to do in economic development. We tried to formulate ideas that the governor could use for future legislative programs, or even executive programs. It was a method I think all governors have used off and on. It was not a major undertaking, but it took a little time and was very interesting, too.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How different was it from the kinds of things you've done in the Senate?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, I had never really worked on that particular angle very much, but the expertise was there. Charlie Hodde was an expert, as were the others, as well as our research man. Gene Weigmann, director of Employment Security, contributed a lot from the employment situation and other economic angles.

We had experts in to talk to us at times, and by working on these issues demonstrated the governor was concerned about economic development and employment. This was only one committee of maybe five or six working in this fashion.

We would make progress reports at the cabinet meetings when we finished. We made a report suggesting things that could be done by the Legislature or by the governor or by the departments involved to promote economic development. It was an interesting committee and lasted one year and then they shuffled them up and started again.

**Ms. Bridgman:** These committees were to suggest both policy and program implementation plans. Was there more emphasis on policy, or what?

**Mr. Bailey:** It depended on what it was. It could be anything. It might be all policy or it might be all program, but it was dependent on what the issue was and how it had to be dealt with.

It was largely also a matter of cooperation with local economic-development people. Kas Watanabe was the director of the Department of Commerce and Economic Development and he was a member of my committee. I remember also the Agriculture Department was represented by their director. All told, we had pretty good input from our members. And we worked and cooperated with the local and state associations for economic development and chambers of commerce, groups of that sort.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You received, on January 4, 1977, a letter from Dorleen Duval, who wrote that there were rumors that you would be the new chairman of the Utilities and Transportation Commission, and that she would like to be considered for your secretary, which was the occasion of her writing the letter. She was also a constituent of yours. You wrote back and said that you were surprised, that you hadn't heard the rumors. When did you begin to hear them?

**Mr. Bailey:** After Dixy's election I never heard a rumor, except for Dorleen's letter. She later told me she had written to everyone mentioned. When I lost the congressional election in September 1974, Julia called me to go back to work for her and help close her offices. I worked for her until her term expired in January, and then went to the Legislature. I decided to look for a job until the session was over.

I do know that Bert Cole told me one time that he had talked to Governor Evans, that I would certainly need some kind of a job. There was a vacancy on the Utilities and Transportation Commission at that time. Adele Ferguson started writing articles about how this would be an excellent job for me. I never talked to Adele about it. I never talked to the governor about it. It got so that I was almost embarrassed to see Governor Evans, until one day I told him I didn't have a thing to do with the stories.

Ex-Senator Frank Foley was appointed. Be that as it may, that's where I think the rumor started. And that was a full two years before my 1977 appointment. Subsequently, after the session I went to work at the Port of Willapa Harbor as manager, so I didn't look–didn't need any other job. As far as Dixy went, I never ever talked to her about this, and she never talked to me.

When I went over I took my secretary with me. Dorleen was very good, and later on she did work for us in that capacity when my secretary retired. Dorleen apparently picked these names up from the earlier stories. I said, "You know when you wrote that letter I had never ever heard anything about it." And she said "Well, I wrote the same letter to everybody I heard mentioned."

It was news to me when Dixy called me down on Washington's Birthday, February 22, and said she

wanted me to become UTC chairman. I told her it was a very technical job and I didn't know if I was qualified. She said, "We don't want anyone like that. I want someone that will use some common sense." And she said, "Your staff will provide the detail and expertise. It's up to you people to make a few political and economic decisions, based on common sense." I found that she was right. The staff and the companies themselves provide the expertise. We had to make a common sense decision.

She also charged me with two things: She said the morale was very low, and she wanted to see if that could be raised. She also said, "We have a backlog of cases to be acted on. I want to see that we move along on these without too much delay." I did the best I could.

The appointment was a complete surprise to me, and it was announced the next day, as Dixy said I told her I would not leave in the middle of the regular session. She wanted to make the announcement soon, as she said, "Even the walls in Olympia have ears." It was even a surprise to her staff.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Why do you think you were chosen?

**Mr. Bailey:** I really don't know. When the rest of the Democrats were not very helpful to Dixy, I tried to help where I could. We weren't even in session and I told Lou Guzzo to feel free to use my office when he wished. They were downstairs in a room smaller than you can imagine. It had only one phone. Lou Guzzo and I had become pretty good friends over the years, and he was on the *P-I* for a long time.

I had run into him when I was running for Congress. Lou and I had been friendly, but I had never discussed anything like an appointment with him at all, and never discussed anything with Dixy, either. Anyway, I really don't know where she picked up my name, but I always had a suspicion that maybe Adele planted the seed in her stories which she ran earlier. They might have come to mind when they were looking at appointments. Perhaps Guzzo also contributed the idea. I didn't have any intention of doing anything but going back to the port job.

Lou Guzzo was Dixy's chief assistant in organizing her administration. He assisted her back in Washington, and brought her out here and ran her campaign. She leaned on him heavily for assistance. I'm just guessing at that. I've never talked to Lou Guzzo about it, never talked to Dixy about it.

**Ms. Bridgman:** When you left the Senate, there was a very quick confirmation of you. They set aside the procedure and didn't send it to committee. There were very affirmative comments made about you by both Republicans and Democrats. Senator George Scott said, "Seldom is there an opportunity to be so well-advised on the qualifications of an appointee." The resolution includes such phrases as reference to your outstanding record, that you performed with the highest standard of conduct, and you had a sense of fairness and justice. You had the longest term as a caucus chairman up until that time.

**Mr. Bailey:** That had to be when I left the Senate, and was not my confirmation.

**Ms. Bridgman:** That's correct. I didn't make that explicit enough. Reading this resolution it's obvious your fellow senators had very great esteem and affection for you.

**Mr. Bailey:** I think you'd find that about any senator that retired. We had Senator Sandison, Senator Pearson, Senator Wilson, everyone. I don't think it's unusual. Senators get very, very eloquent in their praises of their colleagues, especially when they leave. It was an emotional time, too.

I didn't really want to leave the Senate, to tell you the truth, and I used to wake up at nights worrying about it, and whether I could go through with it emotionally. They promised me there would be no great ado on my leaving.

Right after the resolution and Senate ceremonies, they duped me over to a Senate meeting in the office building
–the Cherberg Building–and the damnedest party I've ever been to in my life. It lasted forever.

Actually I think that those flamboyant resolutions are like John Cherberg's introductions to the public: "The most gracious, the most outstanding, the most sensational," and "white-haired senator from Pacific County whose graciousness," and it goes on and on. Senator Bruce Wilson once gave Cherberg a dictionary of adjectives to be used in the future introductions. Cherberg was a master at that and whoever writes senator resolutions was excellent. I think you'll find they use the same adjectives, maybe just twisted around a bit, about everybody.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You did have some reservations about leaving the Senate?

**Mr. Bailey:** Well, no reservations about leaving the Senate at all. It was just a heartbreaker to leave. I loved the institution. I had reservations about going. I was getting awfully tired of getting more and more work to do, and I was just getting a little weary of it and

not getting any richer, I'll tell you that. It was a question of sentiment.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You also had to leave your home in South Bend and move to Olympia. How was that?

**Mr. Bailey:** By that time I was all geared to it, and, of course, we resolved we'd keep our home down there. As time went on, and we had a couple of renters, and I was having to run down every weekend and fix a drainpipe or something else, I finally told my wife we just couldn't keep it up. So we sold it. We kept some property there which I just sold a year or so ago.

When I quit the commission, inflation had driven mortgages up to twelve and fourteen percent and more. There were few new buildings in South Bend, and if you built, that was expensive, too. My wife said she was not going to build another house and have to organize it and move. She acquired a diabetic problem in the meantime which meant that her doctor was in Olympia and we would have been up here about every week anyway. We decided that since we were buying our house here at around nine percent, we'd be better off to stay with it. We sold our house down there, but we kept the lot nearby, but sold that later.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The proceedings of the Utilities and Transportation Commission are described as hearings which are adversarial. The public is represented by an assistant attorney general. Will you please describe the proceedings of a typical hearing?

**Mr. Bailey:** A power company or a phone or other regulated company comes in and says they want to change their rates, or their service. They may want to change their rates, or raise them. During my commission time inflation was high and rate-change requests were many. Just before I went on the commission there was something like three major rate cases a year. There were eighteen the year after I went on. The commission was in constant hearings. As prices go up, companies have to raise the price of natural gas, or phones, or power, to meet the rising costs and rising wages. With inflation we had a flood of cases.

The companies would file their requests with us, telling why they were needed and furnish the necessary financial data. We then sent these requests down to our staff which was to analyze them and try to determine the real "need" of the company involved. Our staff was composed of economic and fiscal experts. We had CPAs and auditors of every type. They would go in and maybe spend three or four months doing nothing but going into the books of the company and determining whether they were telling the truth or not. Then they would come out and make a recommendation that we accept the request or deny it or perhaps reach a compromise.

The Utilities and Transportation Commission had the job to represent the interest of the public, but in the next breath the law says, "and to assure an adequate return to the stockholders." So after the staff was ready we would hold hearings. The companies and the assistant attorney general would appear before us and we had to make our decisions based on the hearing.

An administrative law judge would conduct them in a very legal manner, but the commission could ask questions or interrupt whenever we wanted to. When the commission had a case before it, we could not even talk to the staff about it, nor could we talk to the company. The attorneys for each side had the right to object to anything that was said, and cross-examine, and things like that. It was just like a courtroom.

After the hearings, the commission would go into executive session. We had our own personal staff of two or three people, and usually one attorney not otherwise involved in the case would come in with all their final recommendations, which we would go through and make our decisions, and then publish our findings.

It was a lengthy process, in most cases. We had a lot of simple orders, though, that were signed at a weekly public meeting and with very shortened hearings. They were extemporaneous things that came up that we could sign and didn't have to go to hearing. Our orders could be appealed to the court, and a few have been.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How congenial was this kind of operation to you after you'd worked in the Senate?

**Mr. Bailey:** It was very interesting. Some of the economic problems were very technical. I'm not a CPA, not an economist, and there were terms and things that were very difficult. I'm sure that some of the companies thought I was a total idiot. On the whole, however, I agree with Dixy: Most decisions were purely judgmental, political decisions. Not Democrat or Republican, but political, economic, and social decisions. As far as the technicalities were concerned, we got hung up very little. The bottom line was were they making money, or did they need money.

One of the big problems we had when I was there was paying off for those nuclear plants that had gone sour in the WPPSS debacle. That problem is still going on. It's a problem now as it was then. One time we'd grant a little bit of leniency, another time we wouldn't let them go as far as they wanted to go. The antinuclear people were just on our tail all of the time, and trying to cut them out entirely. They would just as soon break a power company if they could. What they didn't realize

was if they broke them the public would end up paying a lot more and it wasn't the power companies that would suffer, it would be the people. I had a neighbor that lost ten thousand dollars in WPPSS. He put his retirement money in their bonds because they were government tax-exempt bounds and supposedly safe. He got very little back. Sometimes you think you are hurting big companies, but you're hurting a lot of little people.

**Ms. Bridgman:** You were quoted in the *Aberdeen World* as saying, "When I was in the Legislature I never realized the complexity of arriving at these decisions." And you've also emphasized to that reporter that Governor Ray never let you know directly or indirectly what she wanted. How long did it take you to master all this complexity?

**Mr. Bailey:** Every case was a case unto itself, and it was based on the record that was made. We'd read the record and sat through almost all of the hearings. When our personal auditor-economist got through, he'd boil it down to three or four issues that were the big issues in the case. We had a limited amount of decisions to make, but having read the records, we would question if we thought he was wrong. Many times we wouldn't take his advice.

It wasn't a matter we posed as experts. We made decisions based on the records of the hearing. When I was appointed, someone asked me what experience I had in this line. I said, "I guess I have the experience of a ratepayer." Well, this came out in the press and it really offended two of the members of the commission. They thought that I was saying that they hadn't been paying any attention to the ratepayers. But what I meant to say was that really my experience was as a ratepayer.

This commission regulated buses, trucks, dump trucks; regulated trains, regulated power and phones, and many other things. Now don't tell me there's anybody out there that knows all about all of those. You might get a power expert or you might get a phone man, but that's all he'll probably know. He will have to learn the rest. Not only that, but if he is an expert on one of these, he probably comes from one of the companies he's going to regulate. So it's really probably better to keep it as a kind of a citizen board, if you see what I mean.

[End of Tape 26, Side 1]

**Ms. Bridgman:** Senator Bailey, in August and September of 1977 the UTC was involved in a hearing about promotional advertising by gas companies. And it was okayed by you commissioners in September. How important was promotional advertising for the gas companies?

**Mr. Bailey:** Natural gas was under state regulation and the fuel and heating oil companies were not. At sometime in the past–probably to keep people from switching from one energy to another too fast and create a shortage and upsetting the price structure–the commission had long before issued an order that prohibited natural gas companies from promotional advertisement. It would not allow the natural gas people to promote use of natural gas by advertising. The unregulated heating oil companies were very happy because they could go out and advertise all they wanted to and natural gas people could not do so. If natural gas advertised they had to place it "below or above the line" and had to pay for it out of their own pockets and not by the ratepayers. The shareholder, not the customer, had to pay for it.

It was a most unfair discrimination and I don't recall the case exactly but I do remember that all three commissioners thought it was unfair and outdated. I remember that I wrote the order myself, amending this, and giving natural gas the right to be more competitive. Immediately, of course, the oil companies became very upset. They weren't regulated; they were doing as they pleased, but wanted restrictions on their competitors. It was a matter of fairness.

Another issue before us when I was on the commission was that the previous commission had allowed contributions to political campaigns as expenses of doing business. This meant ratepayers were ultimately paying for this activity. I didn't think that was fair and most of the user and consumer groups did not think it was either. Even the two other commissioners that were on when this was allowed had both said that they now thought they had made a mistake. At the first rate hearing that we had, I believe it was on Pacific Northwest Bell, we reversed the previous decision and disallowed any use of political donations or contributions as part of doing business that could be charged against the ratepayer. The companies can do that anytime they want, but it has to come out of the stockholders' portion shares and not out of the ratepayers' share and used as expenses to justify rate changes. Shortly after we did this, we received a state Supreme Court decision which totally agreed with us and therefore it is not an issue anymore.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Would this have been the Washington Water Power decision in March 1978?

**Mr. Bailey:** It could have been any one of the utilities, but it was something that they recognized as affecting

all utilities thereafter. The commission was unanimous on both of those issues so it was not a matter of just my vote.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In September 1978 you held hearings on Puget Power's proposal to give interest-free loans to customers for insulation and other energy-saving methods. What were the results of that?

**Mr. Bailey:** There were several proposals, and my recollection was that in this proposal the company wanted the power to do these things and give a lower rate, or give a credit to people that did insulate and tried to conserve. We had an energy shortage and the big purpose was to save energy, especially in the line of new construction. Refitting would also have a part.

We went way out on a limb and were really promoting it, but the Association of General Contractors, AGC, bitterly opposed it. They said it would add too much cost to building and construction and lose them jobs. While we were out supporting this and thinking it was a great idea, Puget Power entered into some sort of a deal with the contractors and eliminated the necessity for it. They also eliminated any conservation effort of any consequence as far as I could see. We were a little bit bitter about it, but in recent years the Northwest Public Power Council has recommended this, and the AGC has come to the Legislature and fought it bitterly right to the end. About two years ago, about 1988 or so, there was a bill passed, but I understand it's very watered down and agreeable to the construction people, which means it doesn't amount to much.

**Ms. Bridgman:** The things you've said would indicate that by 1980 there were more cases heard, and because of economic changes, the tasks of the UTC had changed. For instance, in that month Puget Power, Pacific Northwest Bell, Washington Natural Gas, and Washington Water Power all proposed that they be allowed to increase their rates. Their requests were granted. When questioned about this, you tried to explain it by pointing out that the UTC wouldn't protect the public if they destroyed the companies. What kind of reaction was there to this?

**Mr. Bailey:** That was in answer to a question asked by the press, and we had little if any public reaction. At our hearings we had large turnouts of people, particularly older people who couldn't afford to pay increased rates very well, and groups, things like that. As we went along, there were intensively organized groups, antinukes and other people that would start showing up, calling themselves ratepayers associations and other groups. Many were basically antinuclear. Once we made a decision, it seldom had much public outcry. Many might say we raised the rates again! On the other hand, the city council or local utilities who would raise Cain about us raising rates would turn around and double your garbage rate the day after tomorrow, without even a hearing half the time. The public reaction was immediate and then resigned, I guess, because it was seldom pursued.

**Ms. Bridgman:** In November of 1980 you and the other commissioners went to Houston to try to gain allies from other states' utility-regulatory agencies against the change in the federal subsidizing of basic long-distance rates. How did this Houston meeting go, and what happened?

**Mr. Bailey:** All three of us had long wanted to be sure that Congress did not allow a repeal of the 1935 Telephone Communications Act. I know I went to my congressman and I said, "I hope you'll support us." He said, "I'm with you all the way, but we've got to do something about that 1935 Act. It's got to be changed because it's pretty old!" I said, "My golly, Don. That is the same act that's gonna kill us." Most members of Congress didn't understand the reason. Our commission was one of the first to make a poll of all the phone companies, and arrived at the conclusion that the change suggested would lower long-distance but raise local rates. Pacific Northwest Bell, a subsidiary of AT&T, denied this, saying, "It might, but it's not likely." You can see now that our study was right on target. The Supreme Court was taking this problem on in order to break up the trusts. Congress never acted so the court made the changes.

We wanted Congress to act and give some protection to the little ratepayer. Congress had control over the interstate long-distance rates. Our contention was that if you make long-distance cheap, since long-distance was supporting the lower local phone rates, local rates would have to be increased, and they did. When you eliminated that long-distance subsidy that was going to the local companies, you would have to raise local home phone rates. That would not be good for senior citizens, the handicapped and others, who needed basic phone service.

Long-distance was a luxury, and you didn't call long-distance unless you could afford it. A home phone once was a luxury, but now was a social necessity. Every household needs to have a phone.

**Ms. Bridgman:** John Spellman was elected governor in 1980, and in January 1981 he appointed Robert Bratton, who had been his aide when he was King County executive, to be the new chairman of the UTC.

Later that year there was publicized in the press a feud between Bratton and William Metcalf, who was an administrative law judge for the UTC. At issue was Bratton's administrative style and the backlog of cases. Will you describe his style and what this was all about?

**Mr. Bailey:** Governor Ray asked me to give a report on the Utilities Commission activities to assist the incoming governor. In the report I mentioned we had a backlog of cases, and we hadn't even been able to take our vacations. I guess that sounded like we were not able to get to them. The real issue was the workload. Everything was proceeding on time, but the major cases took time. When Governor Spellman sent Bob Bratton over, he said, "I'm sending him over to clean up that backlog." It made us look like we were negligent.

While I think Bob realized that, later he started by putting a chart on the board to show just how each case progressed and how fast it was progressing. Before I left–two years later, I had a great deal of fun with him one day. I came in, I said, "Bob I want to show you something. You were going to speed things up, and look–you've taken two months longer in each case than we did before you came over here!" He said, "Who gave you that information?" And I said, "Hell, all I had to do was look up the record! I can show it to you."

A case hearing is a lengthy process. The feud between Metcalf and Bratton was strictly in-house and a clash of personalities. Metcalf became angry at an incident when we, in a public meeting, were talking about giving to the local United Good Neighbors fund drive. It was in an open meeting on a Wednesday morning, and Mr. Bratton asked the secretary to get him a list of all those who have not contributed to the United Good Neighbors. I objected and said I certainly hoped that we were not going to try to force anyone to give. He said, "No, I'm not going to do that." I asked that if any such effort was made that they not use my name because it is a voluntary thing, and should remain that way.

About a day later a staff member came in and told me that Bob had written all the letters, and signed them. I withdrew my contribution to United Good Neighbors. Metcalf had been unable to be in the meeting that first day. Judge Metcalf was very bright, but he was very emotional and temperamental, and you didn't know exactly what end would come up at times. A little later the commission was sitting on a case with Metcalf presiding. He had gotten his letter asking for a contribution and arranged to have it delivered to the bench while we were at the hearing.

And he jumped up and slammed down the gavel, and said, "This meeting is in recess while I confer with the commissioners." He stomped out of the room, and Bob went with him. Someone detained me for a few minutes, and consequently I was late in joining them. When I got to the door, I could hear they were really going at it. The problem was solved and the hearing resumed, but it got into the press. The stories portrayed Bob as reading the *Wall Street Journal* all of the time, not listening to the case. Bob was on a diet and he would eat raw carrots and sometimes nibble on them during hearings. No one but Metcalf or the other commissioners could see him. Metcalf turned that into the press. It became a very bitter feud, but ultimately Metcalf got into some other problems and left the commission. It was a personality clash, but it started Bob out in a very stormy fashion.

**Ms. Bridgman:** Your term ended in December 1982. How did you feel about leaving?

**Mr. Bailey:** I was ready to go. On the commission we divided our work insofar as organization was concerned. One member took over utilities. He headed that area to supervise the workers in the utilities division. Another one took over transportation matters, and the chairman usually was head of the staff, the administrator.

All three had to vote on every issue that came up. Mr. Benedetti was an expert in power retired out of Tacoma City Light, and he wanted to be on that section. Knowing this, I offered to take transportation, and I did. I thoroughly enjoyed it, but I was ready to leave. I didn't ask the governor to keep me on or anything, and it was not likely he would anyway. In the meantime, Spellman had taken a lady out of the University of Washington and put her on as a Democrat when Mr. Benedetti resigned.

Actually, it was Republican slot to be filled for a short term, but Spellman wanted to take my full six-year term and put a Republican on it. It was a political shenanigan to upset the bipartisan, staggered, board terms, so as consequence, ultimately, Mary Hall–his appointee–was never confirmed, and the Republican named in my place for the Democratic slot was not confirmed either. He just served out Spellman's term, and as soon as Spellman was out of office the new governor had two appointments to make.

**Ms. Bridgman:** How did you feel about retiring after being so busy for so long?

**Mr. Bailey:** I guess the hardest thing to get used to is the lack of discipline in your daily life. You didn't have to get up at a certain time, although I still get up at the same time. You had no regular schedule to keep. My wife says I get up as late as ever and run like the devil.

I've kept busy all the time. In that first year my father became ill and he was in the hospital a good portion of May and June of 1983, and he died in July. So I was up in Tacoma almost every day taking my mother to the hospital and things like that.

So I sort of worked into it, to the point of where I didn't have much time, and haven't got much time right now, so I have almost to make an appointment to go anyplace now, and I really can say I'm busy, doing anything!

**Ms. Bridgman:** As a sort of last question here, suppose you explained your life and your career to one of your grandsons, now, or when they're a little older. With your experience, what would you predict Washington will be like in fifteen or twenty years when they'll be adults?

**Mr. Bailey:** Oh Lord, I've got enough to worry about. I'm not gonna worry about that. I have white hair now worrying about some of the things we have already.

I really don't know what a person could say in that line. I would urge them to take part and do things in their own communities–be a part of wherever they are. Our son has been elected to a local fire commissioner post, but he's never been interested much in politics. He knows all about them, he could tell you all about them, but he's never taken that big an interest. I don't know what the grandsons will do, but I certainly hope that they exercise their right to vote and take part. That's the main thing, because otherwise you just have no kick coming, whatsoever.

As I look on this whole interview, this long, long interview, if they ever get it edited and typed up, I don't know what to say. It's just a matter of one person giving his own opinions and taking a lot of time to do so. Some of these subjects are easy to talk about. Some are not. It's only an opinion and it is difficult to remember everything. Others may remember the same incidents in a different way. At the very best, they only represent one person's memory and opinion–mine.

[End of Tape 26, Side 2]

[End of interview series]