Frank B. Brouillet

An Oral History

Interviewed by Sharon Boswell

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

Copyright 1999
Washington State Oral History Program
All rights reserved
First edition 1999
ISBN 1-889320-09-9

Library of Congress Subject Headings
1. Brouillet, Frank 1921-present
2. Legislators—Washington—biography
3. Washington—politics and government

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

Contents

Dedication
Forewords
Dan Evans
Ralph Julnes
Marc Gaspard
Preface
Acknowledgments
Introduction
Biography

1. **Family and Community** 1

2. **High School, College and Army** 18

3. **Teaching and the WEA** 35

4. **Legislative Service** 43

5. **Committee Work** 60

6. **Superintendent of Public Instruction** 80

7. **Chinese Exchange Programs** 92

8. **Initiatives and the Legislative Process** 101

9. **Thoughts on Education** 112

Appendix
Chinese Educational Exchange Programs

Index

To Margé, for years of patience, understanding and support. Without her assistance, we would not have such an outstanding family nor would I have been able to accomplish many of the goals that we have pursued.

Foreword

Frank B. Brouillet

I first met Frank Brouillet when we arrived in Olympia as freshman legislators in 1957. He was a bright, eager student of politics who quickly became known by his nickname, "Buster." Actually, I first noticed him years earlier while watching high school state championship tournaments. Buster was a dynamo at guard for Puyallup High School. His basketball was much like his later politics—faster than most, a straight shooter, and a team leader.

We shared a legislative interest in education and struggled to cope with the rising tide of war babies now inundating our schools. When I became Governor in 1965, I could count on Buster's support and leadership for a growing list of educational initiatives. He helped initiate the Education for All bill which opened school doors to the handicapped, supported the establishment of our community college system, and was a strong advocate for tax reform designed to solidify finances for public schools.

His leadership on educational issues was recognized in 1972 by his election as State Superintendent of Public Instruction, where he began a distinguished sixteen-year career as chief spokesman for public education in the state. Buster was a strong ally in efforts to stabilize funding for schools and tirelessly worked to open school doors to the underserved and the handicapped.

After leaving office he stayed in education, serving as President of Pierce College, but even more importantly as a respected advocate and counselor on educational issues.

Buster Brouillet contributed mightily as a leader in education during the latter half of the Twentieth Century and was respected widely because he put aside political partisanship when defending the cause of public education.

DANIEL J. EVANS
Washington State Governor
United States Senator

FOREWORD

FRANK B. BROUILLET

Dr. Frank B. Brouillet, known fondly to many Washingtonians as Buster Brouillet, was the most influential educator within our state during the last half of the Twentieth Century.

As Chair of the Legislature's Joint Committee on Education—buttressed by his positions as House Education Committee Chair, House Appropriations Committee Chair, and Majority Caucus leader—he was the unofficial gatekeeper and primary instigator of education legislation in the Sixties and early Seventies. As Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1973-1989, with the help of governors and legislative leaders, he continued to set the education policy agenda for our state.

My professional relationship with Buster commenced during the 1961 legislative session, while serving as a Ford Foundation legislative intern. The then chair of the House Ways and Means Committee, where I served my internship, introduced and recommended me to Buster for employment with the then Joint House-Senate Interim Committee on Education. In doing so, he advised I would be working for the next Superintendent of Public Instruction. He was right.

In time, Buster and I became a team. While he was always boss, it never felt that way. We thought alike and complemented each other with our different skills and personalities. Our formal employee-employer relationship ended on his last day in office, January 10, 1989, when I walked him to his car, silently reminiscing about his long and distinguished career in state politics, and tried in vain to envision the future without our close working relationship. I waved goodbye with mixed feelings and a lump in my throat as he departed from the Old Capitol Building, the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and where he had served as boss for sixteen years.

While it was unspoken, we both knew the political winds in Washington education were shifting and it was time to depart. The enticing call for state directed education reform—a package of accountability measures resulting in greater state control of district curriculum and classroom pedagogy, as articulated by very influential

official and unofficial state opinion leaders—was emerging. It was overpowering and very much inconsistent with Buster's legacy of creating and emphasizing state supported categorical aid programs for children with special needs and of significantly increasing state financial support for public schools. Moreover, his education agenda consisted of encouraging and maximizing local district opportunities to innovate and to establish unique education programs to meet community-defined needs. Only time will tell if the new politics of education will reap greater rewards and accomplishments for the students of our state.

The persona of Buster, the experiences and forces that molded his political and educational philosophy, his warm personality, his excellent rapport with people, his collaborative style of leadership, his loving concern for the youth of our state, and his deep devotion to family and friends all will be revealed to the reader of this oral history. He was and remains a role model for all educators and politicians.

RALPH E. JULNES
Former Buster Aide and
Now Just Good Friend

Foreword

Frank B. Brouillet

The life of Dr. Frank "Buster" Brouillet is both a living history of education policy development in our state, and a testament to outstanding public service. It is also about a small-town boy, known for his academic achievement and athletic accomplishments, who goes on to serve his home town as its representative to the state Legislature, and later, to win a statewide election to the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

"Buster," as all his friends call him, was born and reared in Puyallup and lives there to this day with his wife, Margé. This is also where their two sons were born and brought up. And, this is where the Buster legacy began.

If there was ever an example of an All-American boy, Buster was about as close as one gets. He excelled in school and sports and received All-State honors in both football and basketball. He was among the first generation of his family to go to college and eventually earned a doctoral degree. He was civic minded, caring greatly for his community, and continues to be a public servant to this day. And, even with all of his successes and accomplishments, he has remained the same Buster to all who know him, an individual of strong character and integrity.

How do I know all of this? Well, I am from Puyallup, too, and have had the honor of Buster's valued friendship and good counsel throughout my public service career in the State House of Representatives and the Senate, and now as the Executive Director of the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB). Actually, Buster is primarily responsible for beginning my twenty-three years in the Legislature. In 1972, Buster vacated his position in the Legislature to assume his role as Washington's Superintendent of Public Instruction, and I was elected to succeed him in the House.

Buster's leadership and influence on education in our state has been significant and critical. While he chaired the House Education Committee, he helped pass the legislation that created the community college system. As Superintendent of Public Instruction, he

emphasized and successfully argued the need for the state to fully support basic education. His leadership provided the framework for today's K-12 education improvement strategies. His recent service as president of Pierce College and his current service as a member of the HECB has brought a commitment to education access and a practical, common-sense approach to higher education planning and policy making.

This same type of leadership and influence goes beyond the borders of our state. In addition to his past service as the President of the Council of Chief State School Officers, Buster has also established several educational exchanges with the People's Republic of China. These exchanges, which involve teachers, students, and sister school relations, began in the early 1980s and continue today.

Our state has had the good fortune to have individuals such as Frank Brouillet in positions of leadership. He is an outstanding example of a public servant, caring foremost about the people he represents. His commitment to education and the opportunities it creates for all, are the lessons and the wisdom that Buster teaches, as well as his legacy for the future.

MARC GASPARD
Former State Senate Majority Leader
Executive Director, Higher Education Coordinating Board

Preface

The Washington State Oral History Program was established in 1991 by the Washington State Legislature. It is located in the Office of the Secretary of State and guided by the Oral History Advisory Committee.

The purpose of the program is to document the formation of public policy in Washington State by interviewing persons closely involved with state politics and publishing their edited transcripts. Each oral history is a valuable record of an individual's contributions and convictions, their interpretation of events and their relationships with other participants in the civic life of the state. Read as a series, these oral histories reveal the complex interweaving of the personal and political, and the formal and informal processes that are the makings of public policy.

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

Recollection and interpretation of events varies. Careful readers may find errors, for which we apologize. It is the hope of the Oral History Program that this work will help citizens of Washington better understand their political legacy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Washington State Oral History Program owes thanks to many.

We would like to extend our particular thanks to Frank Brouillet for his dedication and patience during the long process of creating this oral history document. From the first gathering of research materials to the final polishing of the manuscript, Mr. Brouillet gave this project his time and attention. We would also like to thank Margé Brouillet for her help in transporting the manuscript and other materials, and for all her encouragement and enthusiasm for the project.

Members of our Legislative Advisory Committee have consistently provided guidance, encouragement and critical support for the program. We appreciate their advice and unfailing interest in this work. The committee includes Senators Sid Snyder, Eugene Prince, Shirley Winsley, and Al Bauer; Representatives Sandra Romero, Karen Keiser, Don Carlson, and Kathy Lambert; Secretary of State Ralph Munro, Secretary of the Senate Tony Cook, the Chief Clerks of the House, Tim Martin and Dean Foster. Ex Officio members are Warren Bishop, David Nicandri, and former Senators Robert Bailey and Alan Thompson, and former Representative Don Brazier.

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

Our oral histories are printed by the State Department of Printing. State Printer George Morton, Operations Manager Dick Yarboro, Production Planner Evonne Anderson, Composing Supervisor Steve Pfeiffer, Press Supervisor Don Reese, Bindery Supervisor Ron Mosman, Marketing and Customer Service Representative Kelley Kellerman, Estimator Jade Joyce and the efficient production planning staff have greatly aided us in the production of this book. We thank them for their help.

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

Introduction

Interviewing Buster Brouillet

Like most other Washington voters of the 1970s and 1980s, the name Frank B. "Buster" Brouillet was very familiar to me. I had seen it often on the ballot under the list of candidates for the office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Dr. Brouillet was elected to that position for four terms after serving sixteen years in the state legislature. As a parent of school-age children, I closely followed his proposals for enhancing the quality of the state's educational programs. And, of course, his nickname was memorable—it seemed to give him a personality and set him apart from other politicians, even if one knew nothing else about the man.

But anyone who has met Buster Brouillet or heard him speak will immediately recognize that he has numerous other qualities besides a distinctive nickname that appealed to voters and kept him in office for so many years. His warmth, vitality, sense of humor, and obvious concern for others were readily apparent to me in our very first interview. His love of public service and dedication to the field of education were also obvious, not only from the pleasure he drew from his career experiences, but also from the enormous amount of time he committed to these pursuits.

Dr. Brouillet is most frequently identified with the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction or SPI in Olympia, but he has also made his mark in the high school classroom, the halls of the Legislature, and the college boardroom. Most of our meetings took place in the large corner office he occupied as the president of Pierce College. Buster Brouillet had been asked to fill in at Pierce for four months until a new president was chosen, but ended up serving for nearly four years with characteristic enthusiasm and skill. Always friendly and easy to talk to, Dr. Brouillet made time for me in his busy schedule and yet never seemed rushed or anxious to hurry the process.

One of our sessions actually took place on the last day before he ended his term at the college, and presiding over the interview was a nearly life-sized photographic likeness of Dr. Brouillet that colleagues had mounted on cardboard for one of his going-away parties. I half-expected the smiling figure to chime into our conversation! That day the mood of the real Buster Brouillet reflected a mixture of nostalgia and eagerness to take on new challenges. Not one to sit back and relax, he had already scheduled some overseas travel and was

brimming with ideas for additional projects.

During our interviews, we found that we shared a strong interest in China. Many people do not know how active Buster Brouillet has been in promoting cultural exchanges with different countries in the Far East. He and his wife, Margé, developed a successful program that sent retired American educators to Chengdu and other parts of China's Sichuan province to teach in Chinese schools and which brought Chinese teachers to Washington state. The Brouillets made numerous trips to China and other Asian countries, themselves. Dr. Brouillet's "retirement" activities have included expanding the teacher exchange program and consulting on educational initiatives in other Chinese cities. I thought it was indicative of his character that he kept several copies of his favorite book about China on a shelf in his office and eagerly gave away copies to people, like me, who expressed an interest in the country and its culture.

Dr. Brouillet definitely thinks globally, but his strongest ties are to his hometown of Puyallup and to his wife, children and grandchildren. Buster Brouillet is above all a family man. For most of the years his office was in Olympia, he commuted back and forth to Puyallup to raise his children in the small-town environment he loves. One of his favorite topics of conversation is his grand children; he and his wife enjoy spending as much time as possible with this new generation of Brouillets.

The importance of family is also a theme that is echoed in his educational philosophy. "The key to a good education system is parents, family," he emphasized repeatedly throughout his career. "If I do one single thing, it would be to find a way to make sure parents stay interested in their kid's education."

In many ways, Buster Brouillet has made all the citizens of Washington his family, working at many different levels to better the state's educational system and to instill an appreciation for learning in every one of us. His folksy and friendly manner draws people to him, even if they don't necessarily agree with his positions on some issues. As one fellow legislator once noted, "The worst thing you can say about him is that he is too nice."

SHARON BOSWELL
Interviewer

Biography

Frank B. Brouillet

Frank B. Brouillet was born on May 18, 1928, in Puyallup, Washington, the second son of Vern F. Brouillet and Doris C. Darr Brouillet. He and his brother, Billy, attended grade schools in Puyallup and Sumner, Washington.

Brouillet received his nickname, Buster, early in life. There were a significant number of Franks in the Brouillet family. When he was still in a baby carriage a lady remarked, "My, what a cute little buster." That description stuck and Buster was forever known by that name.

Entering Puyallup Junior High in 1941, Buster was active in football, basketball and track, as well as being elected Junior High Student Body President. In addition, he was a debate champion, on the scholastic honor roll and was selected as the "outstanding boy" in Puyallup Junior High in 1943.

At Puyallup High School, Buster was Junior Class President, as well as captain of the football, basketball and track teams and was all-conference in all three sports. He graduated tenth in his class in 1946.

After declining appointments to the U.S. Naval Academy and the U.S. Military Academy, Brouillet attended college at WSU, UPS and the U. Montana, earning the B.A., B.Ed. and M.A. degrees. He lettered in football and basketball at UPS. In 1953, he entered the U.S. Army as a Special Agent in the Counter-Intelligence Corps and served overseas. In 1965, he earned an Ed.D at the University of Washington. Seattle University awarded him an Honorary Doctor of Humanities in l983.

In 1955, Brouillet was employed as a secondary teacher by the Puyallup School District. In addition to teaching social studies, math, and English, he coached football, basketball and track.

In 1956, Buster married Margé Ellen Sarsten. Their first son, Marc, was born in 1959. Presently Marc is a teacher and coach at Puyallup High School and a member of the Puyallup City Council. Marc is married to Tami Herriford and they have two children, Jordan and Brooke. Blair, Buster's second son, was born in 1964. He is the

director of a sporting goods chain in Verbier, Switzerland, as well as being Director of Apparel for Scott USA/Europe.

In 1956, Brouillet was elected to the Washington State House of Representatives from the Twenty-fifth District. He served in that capacity for sixteen years, during which he chaired the House Education Committee, the Joint House-Senate Committee on Education and the House Democratic Caucus.

In 1973, Brouillet was elected the twelfth Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction. He was reelected to that position three more terms and served until 1989. During his sixteen years in office, many advances were made in public education. Graduation requirements were increased and the physically handicapped were admitted into school classrooms. Programs for minorities, women, American Indians, and other groups were initiated. After establishing an agreement with Sichuan Province, China, Washington State's sister province, numerous teacher and students exchanges were started. Since this time, numerous additional exchanges and relations with other Pacific Rim countries have been initiated.

Upon retiring as SPI in 1989, Dr. Brouillet was recruited to become President of Pierce College. While bringing stability to the college, he inaugurated a second campus in Puyallup and expanded international programs. In 1993, he retired as Pierce College president.

In 1993, Brouillet organized and became director of the Pacific Rim Center at the University of Washington, Tacoma. In 1997, he became Director of the Education Program at UW Tacoma.

In 1992, Dr. Brouillet was diagnosed with cancer, leukemia. After many months of treatment and careful care by Dr. Lauren Colman and Margé Brouillet, his disease went into remission, where it remains today. As Buster retires from his position as director of the Education Program at UW Tacoma, he hopes to spend more time with his family and travel more extensively.

Chapter 1

Family and Community

Ms. Boswell: Let's begin with your family background. Your family name is French—do you know where in France your family came from?

Mr. Brouillet: No, perhaps Rambrouillet. That's about all I know.

My great, great grandparents came from France to Canada. My grandparents lived in Ontario, and then moved down to Minnesota, the Red Lake Falls area, which is a small town in Minnesota near Crookston, which is a fairly large town. Then, when my father was a junior-high student, they migrated here to the state of Washington.

Ms. Boswell: What were their occupations when they moved here?

Mr. Brouillet: My grandfather was a merchant of some kind and my grandmother was a housewife.

Ms. Boswell: Do you have any idea what brought them out to the Northwest?

Mr. Brouillet: I really don't. Nobody ever said why.

Ms. Boswell: Were they of the Catholic faith?

Mr. Brouillet: They were French-Canadian Catholics. In fact, most of the Brouillets are Catholic except our side of the family—we're all Presbyterians! But basically it's a Catholic family, French-Canadian.

Ms. Boswell: What about your grandmother's side of the family?

Mr. Brouillet: My grandmother's side of the family—my great-grandmother was born in the Midwest, in Kansas. I have some pictures of my great-grandmother, but I don't know where they lived in Kansas. My mother was born in the state of Washington. They had moved out here prior to that, and I don't know why. But my mother was born in Sumner.

My grandfather was born in 1869. My grandmother was born in 1886, and died when my mother was young, so her aunts and father raised her. My great-grandmother's name was Coryell and my mother's name was Darr. They were English-Scottish.

My grandfather owned the first grocery store in Sumner, Washington, in 1896. But then during one of the depressions he lost it. So they've been in the area a long time. They were related to a couple of other families: the Ryans and the Darrs. They both were old families in Sumner that owned the land and had the grocery store.

Ms. Boswell: When did the Brouillet side decide to move to the Northwest?

Mr. Brouillet: My father was in junior high. He was born in 1904, so I would guess he was about twelve years old when they moved here, just before World War I.

My grandparents on my mother's side of the family lived in Sumner. On my father's side, they lived in Puyallup. They probably had some friends there. There was a fairly large group of people from Minnesota that lived around here. I can remember as a little boy once in awhile attending the Minnesota

picnic—Pierce County Minnesota picnics, with the Darrs.

Ms. Boswell: What did your grandfather do when he got out here?

Mr. Brouillet: He worked in Puyallup in two or three retail stores.

Ms. Boswell: How much contact did you have with your grandparents?

Mr. Brouillet: I had quite a bit of contact. They passed away when I was in late grade school. The big Christmas celebrations, the Thanksgivings, everybody got together. So I had quite a bit of contact with both my grandfathers on both sides and my grandmother on my father's side.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about your memories of them. What are your most vivid experiences?

Mr. Brouillet: I think probably the most vivid things, or some of the most memorable, would be on holidays because everybody got together. We didn't spend a lot of time at my grandparent's. They didn't baby-sit or anything like that, because my mother did not work. So it was always when everybody got together over the holidays. There was always a lot of food. My grandmother would cook for days and days before holidays, making all kinds of homemade candies and cookies. She would cook big feasts. So that was always kind of fun.

Ms. Boswell: Any French traditions that carried over?

Mr. Brouillet: Some of the foods that my grandmother made, which I can't even pronounce—it was mainly food that was carried over. But they spoke French around the house. My grandparents, when they didn't want my father to understand something, would speak in French. Finally, he learned enough to understand what they were talking about. But my father didn't pursue that. He picked up some French, but my mother, of course, didn't speak French. I do recall that was interesting. So there was that legacy, and there were French foods, desserts, and things like that. But that all got lost when they became Americanized.

Ms. Boswell: Did they live right in the town?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes. We all lived in Puyallup. My grandparents lived right in the middle of town. In fact, they lived right across the street from Puyallup High School. Their house is now a parking lot for the school district.

Ms. Boswell: What did it look like then?

Mr. Brouillet: It was a big, old, wooden two-story house, like a lot of people had in those days. We'd go over there now and then, but we didn't spend a lot of time there. I suspect that my relationship with my grandparents was far less than my grandchildren have with my wife and I, because they come over and spend the night at our house. We didn't do anything like that. I think in those days, of course, there weren't many two working parents in the family. There were some, in fact, my aunt and uncle both worked, but they didn't have any children.

Ms. Boswell: What were the kinds of things your grandparents taught you?

Mr. Brouillet: I don't know. The family values, a support network if you needed it. But we didn't actually need it much. We had more like an extended family with aunts, uncles, cousins, and grandparents so that if something really bad happened, you always

knew that was available to you. But as far as teaching anything specific about life or whatever, they taught the traditional western European values, hard work. They all worked, at least the parents—the father worked. And the mother was at home taking care of the kids, which was the way of life at that point in our history. So I can't recall anything articulated, mostly, I suspect, by example. Because you grew up in that kind of an atmosphere and you just took for granted that there were families that got together and celebrated the holidays and supported each other and things like that. I suspect all of us learn more that way. We may not know, but it will influence our life pattern. I can't say we sat down and had long talks about anything.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about your father. Did he ever talk about that transition, coming from Minnesota?

Mr. Brouillet: No. Just kind of all washed away in the process. He used to tell me, once in awhile, about something in Minnesota, about the small town where he grew up. He used to say one of the biggest things for them—now we all like homemade bread—was to be able to go to the store and buy a loaf of bread because all they had was homemade. Their mother made all the bread and everything, so it was a big deal to go downtown and buy a loaf of store bread. It was kind of interesting. A rural state, in a sense that they were in a small town, with just few things to do in a rural community. When the lakes would freeze up they'd go ice-skating and things like that in Minnesota.

Ms. Boswell: Did they miss the weather or were they glad to be out here?

Mr. Brouillet: I don't think they missed it. Although, you know, you get places and all these people would come from Minnesota and have a Minnesota picnic. Well, obviously that means there were some ties, some kind of nostalgia about the old days. They probably talked about "the good old days" then, and how simpler things were in life than they were in the 1930s and 1940s, or whatever. The past always looks better than it probably was.

Ms. Boswell: Your dad was in junior high when the war started, so he wouldn't have been in World War I?

Mr. Brouillet: No. He was between the two wars. He was too young for World War I and by the time World War II came along he was too old—he wasn't too old, people that old were in it—but he had a family. So he was never drafted.

Ms. Boswell: Would he have attended the same schools in Puyallup as you?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, yes. Not grade school, but the same junior and senior high, which is still there. It's still being used. It burned down a couple of times. When he was there one year somebody burnt it down. That was 1923 or 1924 somewhere along in there. You can still go up in certain parts of the back rooms of the maintenance place and see charred timbers and things like that. The place has been remodeled twice. I see they're going to take all next year and move everybody out and remodel it again. But it's the same old place. Looks just like it did when my father attended, you know. A big, yellow, stucco building.

I went to school there. My kids went to school there. My grandchildren will probably go to school there, unless they move out of town or something. My son teaches there. My father went to school there.

Ms. Boswell: Describe your father to me. What was he like?

Mr. Brouillet: He was five feet, ten inches, 170 pounds. Physically, in good shape. He participated in football, basketball, and on the track team. So we had a legacy of that. There is a picture in the gymnasium of all the championship teams. He has a picture there and I can show my grandchildren all these pictures.

My father was a very hard worker. He had a work ethic about working hard and doing what you're supposed to do. Strict in some things. We knew our limits. I can't remember being physically spanked more than once or twice in my whole life. In a way he was the disciplinarian of the family so you had to behave. But family was very important. He really didn't have many hobbies except for the family, hard work, and those kinds of things. He expected you to do your best. But he was supportive, always supportive.

My father had gone to college for a year, but my mother had never gone to college. So one of the early things, the comments around the house were: "Well, you're both going to college." My brother and I heard that from grade school. So I just automatically thought you were supposed to do that, because you were, I don't want to say brainwashed, but you at least knew that was kind of taken for granted. And they always took care of us. Even though he was working for forty cents an hour during the Depression, we were always neatly dressed. What money we had, we spent on the family and we took vacations together.

My father was very interested in the family as far as athletics were concerned. He was a very good athlete himself. He worked with us. When I was in high school, he'd be out throwing the football, running up and down the field throwing the football to my brother and me. Things like that. But he was always there. Both my brother and I participated in a lot of things—athletics and scholastic things. And one of our parents, if my father couldn't make some things that happened in daytime, my parents were always at every event or activity that took place. If we had a junior high school basketball game that was played in the afternoon, my mother would come to it and my father would get there when he could. And my mother was a volunteer for the PTA in the school. They were always supportive and involved.

Ms. Boswell: How did that make you feel?

Mr. Brouillet: Well at the time I thought "Gee, it'd kind of be nice to get rid of them once in awhile." That had a lot of influence on you. First of all, you had a hard time getting in trouble, among other things. And when we went out in the evening, had a date for example, you'd better be home by whatever the time was, one o'clock or twelve o'clock, depending on what you were doing. And it was always understood and we got home at that time. Some of the girls' mothers liked that, because the daughters would get home, too.

And they were pretty strict with us about things like that. It was important that you not get in trouble and that you have a good reputation. At the time you wonder, "Everybody doesn't do this, how come I have to?" But in the long haul you look back and that was really very supportive.

Whatever happened, you talked about it. In fact, we had a very close family relationship. Probably had a closer family relationship than other students and other people. I cannot recall having any really good friends I ran around with all the time, because my brother was probably my best friend. He was a year older. We'd do things together like sports and such. So it was a very molding relationship.

You learned to do your best and always be on time. I say, in a town like Puyallup, you didn't have a car, nobody had cars. You walked to school, you walked home. Nowadays, all these kids have cars; they hop in the car and

run to Seattle and do whatever. There was much more restraint, much more involvement, and probably much more control when I was growing up. I think as a result of that we were able to grow up and have a pretty good reputation.

And Puyallup was a little town. At that time there were 7,000 people in Puyallup. There was only one school in the area, that was Puyallup. There wasn't any Franklin Pierce and some school districts up on the west side of the town weren't there. Bethel wasn't there. Rogers High School wasn't there. There wasn't anybody up on South Hill, so it was a fairly close little community. It was a white, middle-class community. Other than some Japanese who farmed, there weren't any minorities here. When I wanted to expose my children to other minorities, I had to drive them to Tacoma. Now, of course, it's different.

Values were white, middle-class America. It was a kind of an oasis, but with fewer difficulties than a person faces nowadays. A big deal back then was to get a drink of beer. You couldn't get any hard liquor, there weren't any liquor stores. I mean people had it, but it was hard for kids to get it in those days. Somebody'd have a party—there'd be a kegger we'd call it—but there weren't many of those, because if somebody got in trouble, they'd get tossed out of school for that. Now, I suppose, that the schools would say if that was the only problem, they'd be happy. Most parents were available. Not like nowadays, where everybody is working.

Ms. Boswell: What work did your dad do then?

Mr. Brouillet: He was a teamster; he was a truck driver. He drove for Langendorf Bakeries for twenty years. The other job he had was a milk truck driver. The bakery, Langendorf, was servicing stores—you put your bread in the Safeway store—and he drove. First job before that, I can remember, he was in the milk business. He used to deliver milk house-to-house. We'd get on the truck and run with him; it was a big deal. Maybe it was a holiday or something and we'd get on the truck. Of course, it was a big deal for him too. We'd grab that milk and we'd run up to the house. Get it delivered. He could be done in a half a day. We were out there helping him when we were in grade school or junior high. He'd say, "Get a quart of buttermilk, get a quart of this. It goes to that house right there, right on the front porch." And we'd grab that stuff and we'd run like heck!

I can remember during the Depression—I just have a fuzzy vision of this stuff—he was making like forty cents an hour. And he got a job as a milk truck driver and he was going to make seven dollars a day. But he had to work seven days a week, so he'd make forty-nine dollars a week. And that was a big deal in the family, boy, we all thought that was the greatest thing since melted butter. Going to make seven dollars a day, seven days a week. Then he'd get a couple of days off. Work seven, get two or three days off. When I think of that forty-nine dollars, there was a big celebration in the family, because he had been working at the cannery and been trying to find another job.

Ms. Boswell: So the Depression really hit your family hard?

Mr. Brouillet: I didn't realize it. But we used to go out and buy hamburgers at this place. We'd go in there and we'd buy regular hamburgers for a nickel, a dime for a deluxe. And we'd go in there and order and take them out, because we didn't have enough money to sit down at the table and buy something to drink with them. My parents didn't want to sit there and just eat the hamburgers; they didn't want to look like that. So we'd sit in the car and eat 'em. Ten cents for a deluxe! It

was George's, but I see the old place has been torn down just this last week. It was a place between Puyallup and Sumner.

I was young and my parents didn't tell me about all the problems they had. We ate. We lived. We didn't do much. We didn't hop in the car and drive to California or something like that. It was just kind of hand-to-mouth. But again, I was young enough that I just thought that was life. I thought everybody lived like that.

Ms. Boswell: It wasn't necessarily apparent around Puyallup that anybody else was any different or any better off?

Mr. Brouillet: No. See, all the problems about people being in food lines and selling apples, they didn't do that in Puyallup. They were doing that in Seattle or someplace else. People who lived there, most of them had a job someplace. It might not pay much, but they worked.

My dad worked at the local cannery for forty cents an hour. It was a big cannery: raspberries, strawberries, and pears. A big soft-fruit cannery.

Ms. Boswell: Where was it located?

Mr. Brouillet: It was right downtown in Puyallup. I worked there when I was in high school. Then, when I got into college, all of the local young people went down there and worked. It was a seasonal thing. We got all the berries, so a lot of housewives worked on the lines, sorting berries, putting them in cans and all that stuff. When I turned sixteen through to my first year in college, I worked there every summer. I thought it was pretty good money. It was good money in relation to what was going on. So every summer my brother and I, and a lot of the locals, worked there.

I'm not sure when my dad worked there. I think it was the early part of the Depression, because he got this milk truck job in the early forties. World War II had started, so we were almost out of the Depression then.

Ms. Boswell: Were your grandparents still alive at this time?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, they were alive. I think they probably passed away when I was in late grade school.

Ms. Boswell: Was there ever the thought that your mother might start working?

Mr. Brouillet: I don't think so. First of all, if two people in the family were working, there was a certain amount of discrimination. For example, teachers. If you were a teacher, you could teach, but as soon as you got married, you were let go. Only recently has that changed.

Ms. Boswell: Was your dad interested in politics?

Mr. Brouillet: He'd been involved heavily in athletics when he was in school, not politics. He went to Washington State University on an athletic scholarship, a football one, but whatever happened, I don't know, but he didn't stay. I can't remember any specifics, but I'm sure he encouraged us to do things like athletics at school, and obviously we did. He had a pretty well-known name, so, I don't want to say we were forced into it, but you end up over there and everybody expects you to be a great athlete. I suppose they expect my grandchildren to be athletes, and I don't know if they will or not.

So there is a certain kind of progression like that. And he worked with us, going out in the backyard and shooting baskets, showing us these different things. And as I say, he helped me when I was in high school, working

out all summer, punting and kicking. He had me punting, place kicking and passing. We'd be out there on Viking Field, which is an athletic field. We'd go out there and do all these things in the summer after he got off work for about an hour or so. That would be an important part of our relationship.

Ms. Boswell: You mentioned how much of a family man he was, so was his primary purpose to encourage you, or do you think it was his means of recreation, that he could still enjoy that?

Mr. Brouillet: I think probably both. I think he enjoyed it, but I also think he vicariously enjoyed it, seeing us succeed. Of course, being in Puyallup all we ever had was something physical, running up delivering milk, hauling bread around, all these kinds of things, so he was in pretty good physical shape. But yes, I think basically, it was to help us, and be part of the family, more than getting out and getting a little exercise. He got a lot of exercise on the job. So I think that he just wanted to help us out.

I remember when I was in high school, we had a big winning streak of about twenty football games and he was superstitious. At every half, he'd light up a big cigar. It was a ritual. Always wore the same coat to the game and at half time he'd light up a cigar, which was interesting.

Ms. Boswell: How was that interest in athletics viewed by the community? Was Puyallup very focused on athletics?

Mr. Brouillet: When we had a football game in a little town like that, we'd have several thousand people attending. That was about the only show in town. You'd go to the local cinema downtown, but there really wasn't all that much going on, so things revolved more around school activities. And it was a mark, I suppose, when you excelled in something like athletics.

Yes, it was a big deal in a small town. We had big crowds at all the football games. Now you can go in to a football game any time of the game and get a seat, but not in those days. Basketball, in a small gym, if you didn't come to the game an hour ahead of time you couldn't get in. It was not a big gym—the school is significantly bigger now than it was then, probably five times bigger—but we had as big a crowd then as we have now. It was a big deal in a little town. There were not a lot of recreational activities. They got a certain amount of press play in the local newspaper.

Ms. Boswell: When your dad got involved in politics later, did he have a lot of name recognition because he had been a football hero?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes. And later on, of course, when I got involved in politics, it was a big deal. When I was running for the Legislature from Puyallup, my parents would read about something in the paper, all this name familiarity—it was certainly an asset.

Ms. Boswell: How do you think your father became interested in politics?

Mr. Brouillet: I don't know, he was just interested. He was a precinct committeeman, but he never got involved or ran for anything. He worked on a few campaigns, but never ran. But he was interested.

There was a lot of table talk about what went on in school or about athletics or about politics. In those days we all sat down at the table every night and had dinner. You had meat and potatoes—my father was a meat and potatoes type, or pork chops or something like that—but it was a well-balanced meal. But everybody ate at six o'clock at night. Breakfast was a little more hodgepodge because my

father would normally be gone. But we'd sit down and have breakfast. So you had a certain period of time in which everybody was together. You'd sit and discuss a lot of things over that period.

Ms. Boswell: What was your father's political focus at that time?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, he was a strong Democrat. Coming through the Depression, he would have voted for Roosevelt no matter what, five more times if he could have. He saw Roosevelt as a person who helped him and helped the country. He was a Democrat as a result of all of that, because of his experiences, of what he thought the Democrats and Roosevelt and what those people did.

Ms. Boswell: Was he a Democrat, do you think, before the Depression?

Mr. Brouillet: I don't know. He probably wasn't much of anything. He might have been Democrat, but he was no where near like he was after 1932.

Ms. Boswell: Did the Depression really solidify his political affiliation?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, yes, and I suppose that's why I'm a Democrat. Listening to that, talking about it over the years, that's how you grew up. I'm a Democrat, though I have voted for Republicans. I voted for a number of Republicans. But he would never vote for a Republican, I don't think, no matter who it was! Could be somebody really good, but he would never vote for him. He would vote the straight ticket.

In those days, we had a lever you could vote the straight ticket and you didn't have to go through and punch everybody. When the Republicans got in, they took that out in this state. But then, he'd just walk in there and just push one button and that was the end of it.

One time, the people elected a dog in Milton—a real live dog—somebody put the dog's name on the ballot and he got elected as a city council person, I think, or as a justice of the peace.

A lot of things that you think are important in politics come through what you are exposed to as a child, both in your family and out. Unfortunately you probably get a lot of stereotypes, of Republicans trying to help big business and all those kind of things; the stereotypes about working people, and all this. That doesn't always work out, but at least that's the stereotype out there. Probably still is today in 1993, because Bush's big tax plan was to cut the capital gains tax. Now maybe it was good for the economy of the country, but it just reinforces the stereotype that he's not worried about tax cuts for the middle class or somebody else, like the poor, for example.

Ms. Boswell: Was most of Puyallup Democratic?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, yes, I think at that time they were. It was mainly a working-class area. But in Puyallup, we probably would have been, most of those small towns probably were. People were either working in Puyallup, or some place in Tacoma, I would suspect. However, there has always been a large block of farmers who tended not to be, although I think they started out as Democrats. I think that over the years they started to shift away from that.

Ms. Boswell: I was going to ask you about that. How much of an influence in the community were the farmers?

Mr. Brouillet: They had a certain amount, but not too much. I suppose you'd say they were more like conservative Democrats, because

when the New Deal started they were talking about farm subsidies. Although they didn't get much help, so they're probably a little more conservative. The things that the Democrats and the New Deal were talking about did not necessarily help the local farmer in Puyallup, but the farming community as a whole. Things like Rural Electrification; they all had electricity, and they weren't going to get subsidies for growing or not growing something. So, I think it's a somewhat conservative community.

But even if it was a conservative community, if you were one of them, and they liked you, they'd vote for you. I got elected and sometimes I think my voting record would not have reflected the community. I probably was more liberal on things like civil rights and those kinds of things than the community was. There were no blacks in Puyallup—blacks could not live in Puyallup. It wasn't written any place, but rather an unwritten rule. There were a few of them that worked in town, but they didn't live there. Now, that's all gone.

Ms. Boswell: As no blacks lived in Puyallup, none attended school, then?

Mr. Brouillet: There weren't any blacks in the school—there were some Japanese. Asians have always been a little more, I don't like to use the term "acceptable," but in the community they were tolerated better than blacks.

Ms. Boswell: As a child, do you remember any sense of discrimination?

Mr. Brouillet: I don't know that I do. I never saw the Ku Klux Klan doing anything. Of course, there was not much reason to live in Puyallup if you were black. There were no jobs for minorities other than farming. There wasn't a lot of industry in Puyallup. There was a cannery and so forth, but most of the minority people lived in Tacoma or Seattle.

Ms. Boswell: Who provided the fruit and berries for the canneries? Would the berries come from Japanese farms?

Mr. Brouillet: The Japanese were more in the produce line, lettuce, carrots, and things like that, and vegetables, rather than raising blackberries or strawberries. They were really strong in Auburn. A lot of them lived in Auburn.

During World War II, the Japanese were all interned. They were shipped out to Idaho, California, northern California, and they never came back. They lost their houses. I think what happened there was they got shipped out and they just lost a lot of things. Who do you sell it to? One day you're there, and the next day they've got you down in an internment camp, the main interment camp, at the Puyallup Fair.

They kept all the Japanese there. We used to go and look in, all the little kids. It was the temporary internment place. In fact, there's a statue down there on the fairgrounds about the internment. Even today, it caused a little stir in the community with some people not wanting to put that up. The Army went all around and gathered them up, took what possessions they could carry, and put them in there. They built a couple of big, barbed-wire fences and interned them all there. Then they gradually shipped them out from there.

Ms. Boswell: What was the feeling in the community at that time about that?

Mr. Brouillet: I'm sure the community was very supportive of it. The Japanese had just bombed Pearl Harbor and they were probably going to sabotage the war effort, that sort of attitude. Sure, I think it was a bad move, but it was very popular at the time. The people didn't understand the Japanese. People felt they were different and that they kind of stuck

to themselves. Their families were very close units, the Asian families, the Japanese. There were Japanese churches, although some of them went to a regular church, a regular community church. I remember, we used to go out to a Japanese church there in Sumner—I lived in Sumner when I was in grade school—we'd go out and throw rocks at each other. I didn't think much about it because I was still pretty young.

But everybody was kind of afraid during the war. There was a certain amount of fear because the government said these people were possible subversives. They had little shows about how bad the Japanese were during the war. The mindset for most of us, I suppose, was, "Oh boy, this is dangerous. There are probably a lot of subversives out there," when there weren't any to speak of. They thought the Japanese who lived in Puyallup were the basis of saboteurs and all those kind of things. So there was very little opposition to the internment.

Ms. Boswell: I wonder though, if there was any fear of the Japanese being interned in the community.

Mr. Brouillet: I think the people were pretty paranoid during that time. They were afraid the Japanese were about ready to invade the West Coast. They got to Pearl Harbor, to the Hawaiian Islands, so we had blackouts and all that kind of stuff to keep them from bombing the place. So everybody was a little paranoid about that whole thing. You know how people's fears get aroused.

But they were in a very unfortunate situation. If they were Japanese, we'd round 'em up and ship 'em out. They lost a lot of land and things in the Valley. And they just never came back. A lot of them didn't come back, so we don't have anywhere near the number of Japanese. A certain number of them settled out in the Fife area on some of those farms out there.

But they were very productive, hard-working families. I used to teach some in school and I never had to worry about the Asian kids. I mean, they went home and their parents really got on them. They did their homework. You could load them up and they would come back and have it done, whereas the rest of the kids might or might not get it done.

Ms. Boswell: What were your dad's views about the Japanese?

Mr. Brouillet: He was not very tolerant. I remember one thing—he would not go to Hawaii for years and years. This is later, after WWII. Because those Japanese were cooking food. He believed they were not clean. I don't know how he got that idea. But I think that, although he didn't preach to us particularly, I heard enough to know that he was not very tolerant of minorities. And I think that was probably pretty prevalent in the area. It could have been—the Japanese happened to take the blunt of it because of the war—but I think there was a lot of intolerance for other people, too. The Indians—there were a certain number of Indians around.

Ms. Boswell: What was the view toward Indians?

Mr. Brouillet: Of course, Indians, Native American Indians, even today, they never were a threat. The Asians were somewhat of a threat, because they worked hard, saved their money and did all these things, just like the Koreans and some of these groups today. But we had a lot of Indians around. In fact, the Valley was a big hop area, they grew a lot of hops. But something happened to the hops, disease, I believe. I remember my father was driving a bread truck then. He'd load up; he'd go early, a couple of hours early in the morning

during the summer and take a whole truckload of bread and pastries and everything to the Buckley area, where they had huge hop farms. He'd drop the whole load off up there for the Indians. Financially, that was good, because he really ran two shifts, except in one shift he just dumped everything off in the same place. He didn't have to pedal it—take it to stores and so forth. During the summer, I remember, there were a lot of Indians around.

Some of them were local, while some of them would come down from Canada, but they were very invisible in the community. Even when I was Superintendent of Schools, we had Indians around. We were trying to do an education program for them, and you couldn't find them! But they were all over. They were here, there, and there, and there were groups of them working a lot of times in farm areas. But they just kind of melted into the countryside and nobody ever saw them. They were never a threat to anybody, as I've said. They had an alcoholism problem—a very bad situation. We didn't do anything for them back then, and we didn't do anything against them because they never were around. They lived in housing projects out on the farms.

A very sad commentary, trying to do things for them. They were cheap labor. They picked hops. A lot of them came down from Canada to the big hop farms. In fact, the people that founded Puyallup, like Ezra Meeker, made millions in those days, millions of dollars from hops. In one season! I mean that's when the dollar was—you could live all week on five dollars then and they were making big money. Then something happened, they had a couple of depressions and then some kind of disease.

So the hops are all gone. There are no hops in the Puyallup Valley anymore. In fact, one of the historical things in Puyallup are the old hop kilns, which they're trying to save, because they're getting torn down. They're a funny-shaped house that comes up like this.

Ms. Boswell: Like a funnel?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, like a funnel. Out around Orting, and out that way, there are very few of them left. There were a lot of hops out in the Orting and Buckley area. The Caucasians weren't going to pick those things in those days. That was too much work, and there's a certain amount of skill involved. Even in those days you had a hard time getting whites to work the fields. So the Indians would come down from Canada and mix with the local tribes. There was a large group of them around, but they were invisible. Even today they're invisible.

So, there weren't any blacks. No Chinese. The Chinese, see, were run out of Seattle and places like that. There weren't any Chinese where we were. Some Indians. Some Japanese.

Ms. Boswell: So if your dad wasn't particularly tolerant, as was common then, how did your interests in civil rights evolve?

Mr. Brouillet: I think it evolved as I grew up and got involved in things. And as I got an education, and so forth. The situation where you had large blocks of minorities, they'd better be in the system somewhere. Or you're going to have trouble anyway because—not because they're a minority, but because the poverty was so bad. I just could not stand it. Get out in the world. See how the world is.

I think education makes you more tolerant. I'm much more tolerant. I can do a lot of things economically, and I've got more education to understand a lot more things. I think all those things help with your tolerance. I know if I was out there struggling, if I was a truck driver or something, and there was a lot of competition, and particularly if somebody didn't understand or know, you might be a little bit more intolerant. I think that's what happens to our society.

Ms. Boswell: How active were the Teamsters?

Mr. Brouillet: Not very active. I used to tell them how bad a guy Dave Beck was and my father would say, "He may be a bad guy, but he's taking care of us." "Yeah, but he's doing all these bad things," I said. But he was taking care of them. He organized them, got more money, and fringe benefits. Dave Beck outlived him, so I don't know what he would have thought about it at the end. But as I say, it was the old story. I'm sure that was prevalent among the truck drivers, that, "Yeah, this guy may be raking off some money, but he's taking care of me and my family."

Ms. Boswell: I would imagine some of that intolerance, too, was the result of labor disputes.

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, yes, yes. He came through—I don't know if he had ever been in a major labor dispute with people getting killed—but he came through labor disputes and he understood organization and, "By God! If we don't get together and get organized, these guys are going to take all the money and not treat us right." It's "them and us" in this country, if not true in all labor relations all over the world. So it's always been "workers line up over here" and "employers and their supporters line up over here." And the employers brought a lot of it on themselves. They did not—they maybe thought they were—but they really weren't being very fair with these people, and that was part of the New Deal. Labor unions were being organized and Roosevelt set us in with our unions; competitive pay and all those things. It's all mixed in together.

Ms. Boswell: Was your father involved in some labor disputes?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, but none of the kind where you got beat over the head like you see in the steel industry, where they got the Pinkertons out and they had them organized over here. You know all that history. None of that stuff. But as a result, the view of the company deteriorated. I think the company brought a little bit of it on themselves, because they had to work, fight, and scheme to get organized and get some benefits in the system. They felt they had to fight for everything they got. Dave Beck and his people organized and helped them fight.

Ms. Boswell: But union politics was not necessarily bad politics?

Mr. Brouillet: There was no such thing as a reform movement in those days; the Teamsters and Beck and those people really had a cut-and-dried operation. There wasn't any real dissent. They had their handpicked people for the committees, so my father wasn't involved in that.

Ms. Boswell: Were his political interests more national than local?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes. Partisan politics, Democrats versus Republican legislatures.

Ms. Boswell: What about locally? I don't know what form of government Puyallup had. Was it a city council?

Mr. Brouillet: We had a strong mayor at that time—they moved to a city council later. They tended to be a little conservative. It's the old story, the downtown people were the people that voted.

I think a lot of people in the town when I was in politics really didn't care for my voting record or the kinds of things that I might support, but they all liked me. So those were just transgressions that they'd accept: "He's honest, he's trying to do the job and he's one of our local people." So that was more

important really than the issues most of the time. In fact, it was a long time before they'd even publish your voting records. Then the local paper started publishing everybody's voting record on every bill, all the motions and everything else, but nobody understood it or cared.

The Democrats they would tend to elect were generally conservative. But they didn't—even when I didn't do what they wanted me to do—"I'm for an income tax and I'm going to vote for it. If you don't like it, you've got to elect somebody else." They never did!

Ms. Boswell: What did your dad think of that?

Mr. Brouillet: He thought that was okay. He might not like my forwardness sometimes. But I think you just tell them that and they said, "Well, that's terrible, but he's okay."

Ms. Boswell: Did the same kind of attitude prevail when you were younger, when your dad was maturing his political and social views?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: You were saying he was voting a straight Democratic ticket?

Mr. Brouillet: But that was because of the Depression and some of those things. But yes, they tend to vote for that—vote for the person. Most of the people didn't know what the issues were anyway. Their eyes would get foggy if you'd start to talk about issues. Because most people—five percent are issue-oriented, the other ninety-five percent vote on the basis of somebody they like.

I think I told you this, somebody in the University of Washington or someplace did an analysis of all the voting records of legislators. They said, "This guy Brouillet, he's in a rural agriculture area and he votes like he's from Seattle." And I thought, "My God! That's all I need, to have somebody publish that in the local newspaper." I'd vote for all these things like civil rights. I'd vote for this, that, and the other thing.

Ms. Boswell: We've talked a lot about your dad, but we really haven't asked anything about your mother. Tell me a little about her influence.

Mr. Brouillet: Well, her influence—probably my father's was stronger. I don't know if it's because of the time. But she was mainly involved in raising children, doing the kind of supporting things. Doing the wash. All those kinds of things you had to do. We didn't have a clothes dryer, so I remember hanging clothes all over the house to get them dry. Her reputation was very important to her. We had to have clean clothes and clean underwear because you might get in an automobile wreck or something and might have to go to the hospital. Of course Bill Cosby always said, "If they were clean when you got in the auto wreck, they wouldn't be clean afterwards anyway!"

It's really interesting in light of how things are today. She wouldn't let us wear Levi's or overalls because only the poor kids wore Levi's and overalls. So it was kind of a mark—at least in her view and I'm sure the society's—if you had overalls or Levi's on, you were poor. So we typically wore corduroy pants to school. We would not wear Levi's because that was—even though we were poor—it was important to her that we didn't look like that. Today you've got all the movie stars wearing them.

I remember when I was a kid, there was place called the Rabbit Farms in Puyallup—it was up on one of the hills outside of town—and the people up there raised a lot of rabbits. They were all very poor kids who would come to school in their overalls. We could pick out

all the kids from that part of town. I don't know if we were that much better off.

So things like that were important. Always had to dress properly. Always had to dress clean. Appearance and what the community thought were very important to her. So you got that instilled, you didn't want to look like a bum—whatever that means. It was important that you dress at least by the code of the day or at that time, and that you pay attention to what people thought in the community.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think that was part of her own upbringing?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, I think so. We always had clean clothes. Always had a haircut. All these kind of things. That's what was important to her. Of course she instilled that in you, that you had a kind of role in society that you were supposed to look good—how you dressed, your appearance, and decor was important. That we treated teachers with respect, all those kinds of things.

If we got in trouble at school, we got in trouble at home too! Never went down to the school and raised hell with the teachers, because they would keep us after school or punish us in some way. We weren't supposed to do that anyway! So that's what made teaching so much easier in those days. The kids didn't want you to call and tell their parents that they did something, like not getting their homework done, because they'd really get in trouble. She was like that, you know. Our homework was very important. We came home every night and sat down and did our homework.

Ms. Boswell: Did they help you with it?

Mr. Brouillet: No, they couldn't help. Well, early on, but as the work got more complicated, neither one of them were very highly trained or skilled. They helped us with reading or something, so you got along. Sit down and study, it's the most important thing you're doing. The first thing we did when we came home was our homework. If it took an hour or two, or whatever, you did it for an hour or two.

We had to go to bed at a decent hour, and keep good hours. That was important, sleep was important. Those kind of things. But they always said—I'm not sure my father believed it—but school was more important than athletics, but that's where you're going to have to go. So they put a certain amount of pressure on you. If I came home and they found out that I hadn't done something, I was in serious trouble. I'd probably get restricted or something. I normally did my homework, and I didn't have any trouble in school, because I was a pretty good student.

Ms. Boswell: Was your mom as much a disciplinarian as your father?

Mr. Brouillet: Not really. The heavy discipline came from my father. And he normally didn't lay a hand on us. I think I got spanked once or twice, and I remember both of them. Just their sheer disapproval was enough. "You're not going to go out for three weeks now, because you didn't get this done." Things like that were important to us.

Ms. Boswell: What were some of her other interests? Was she involved in politics? The community?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, she was involved in some of the community activities, such as the church guild and other philanthropic things. There weren't that many of them in town. She took us off to church, Sunday school, in those days.

Ms. Boswell: Who was the main religious figure?

Mr. Brouillet: My mother. In fact, I now am—

in terms of longevity—the second oldest member in the Puyallup Presbyterian Church. We joined the church when we were thirteen or so, got on up there and took communion and all. That's a pretty good-sized church in Puyallup, one of the bigger churches in Puyallup. The minister told me—and I could hardly believe it—that I've been a member of the church that long. Fifty years or something like that.

Ms. Boswell: And how did the switch come about? The early Brouillets were Catholics, right?

Mr. Brouillet: My mother was a Presbyterian, and my father wasn't that strong a Catholic. In fact, he joined the church when my brother and I joined. Joining the Presbyterian Church was important to him.

Ms. Boswell: Was your mother a pretty strong advocate of religious training?

Mr. Brouillet: Not really. It was kind of left to the church. I mean, we were supposed to do those kinds of things, the Ten Commandments and all that, but religion was not a topic around the house—we got that on Sunday. But I think the kind of things she expected of you weren't so much talked about; it was the kind of life you led, things like that which would have an influence on the outside.

But she was on that side of the equation: taking care of the home and those kinds of things. Work in the community—not a lot, but enough to keep busy. It was the person who was most responsible for religion. But again, we were not a religious family as such that we said grace before every meal. But she expected us to respond and to take care of those things.

Ms. Boswell: What about athletics? She was involved with your activities? Was she an athlete as well?

Mr. Brouillet: I've got a picture of her at home on the girls' basketball team in Sumner. That's about all they had for women in those days. I don't think they had volleyball—I think basketball was all they had at Sumner High School. I've got a picture of her with the team.

Ms. Boswell: What about politics? Did she have any political views or philosophy?

Mr. Brouillet: No, she wasn't particularly active. She did it because we were interested.

Ms. Boswell: Did she vote?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, yes. Everybody voted.

Ms. Boswell: What about her background and her upbringing in Sumner? How would you describe that part of her life?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, a lot like other women of her era. In fact, Sumner's probably even more conservative than other small towns. They were all very socially and economically conservative towns, Sumner a little more. There were more farmers over in the Sumner area. In Puyallup, there was a little more industry and more people worked out of town in Tacoma.

Ms. Boswell: I know her father owned a grocery store in the late 1800s. Was that during the time of her growing up, or later on?

Mr. Brouillet: Then he worked for many years at a big plant. Fleischmann's Yeast had a big plant in Sumner and he worked there for a long time; in fact, until he passed away. It employed several hundred people. It's closed down now, but the plant's still there.

Ms. Boswell: Would Sumner High School have been fairly small, or smaller than

Puyallup High School during her time there?

Mr. Brouillet: A bit smaller.

Ms. Boswell: Did you say at one time that you lived in Sumner?

Mr. Brouillet: When I was a kid, I went to the first grade in Sumner, the second grade in Puyallup, the third grade in Sumner, the fourth grade in Puyallup, the fifth grade in North Puyallup, and the sixth grade in Puyallup. We were always moving for some reason! I don't know why we were always moving, because we didn't own a house. I guess I went to kindergarten and first grade in Sumner, but other than that I didn't go two years in any one place, two consecutive years.

Ms. Boswell: Why do you think you were always moving?

Mr. Brouillet: I think one of the problems was finance. We probably'd find a better place to live or cheaper, I don't know what it was. But we were moving all the time between Puyallup and Sumner; those are the only places we ever moved to.

Ms. Boswell: In any of those times did you ever live with your grandparents?

Mr. Brouillet: No. I only lived with parents. I never lived with my grandparents or relatives. At the most, it would have been staying overnight some place. My Sumner grandmother died early, which left only my grandfather. We used to go overnight and stay with him, and he'd take us to the restaurant for breakfast. Oh, that was a big deal! Go to the restaurant for breakfast and get ham or bacon. And, gee, that was one of the big deals. We always wanted to go and stay at Grandpa Darr's place. We didn't do it very often, just once in awhile. He'd take us downtown to the local eatery and have breakfast in a restaurant. That was a shining light in our lives! We were young, in grade school.

Ms. Boswell: Would he have been similar to your father, politically?

Mr. Brouillet: I think he was a Republican, really. But we never talked about that. The family stuck together more, but we never spent a lot of time there. Just holidays, anniversaries, and birthdays. But it was a very tight family.

Ms. Boswell: When you moved back and forth, you were primarily renting houses?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, we rented. My parents never did own a house. Never in their whole lives did they own their own house. In their later years they lived in an apartment in Tacoma.

Ms. Boswell: Was it ever a goal to own a house?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, one time they put some money down on a house and they lost it. It was a goal, sure. But they just could never save very much money. And work was kind of tenuous at times. Because they had kids and were taking care of us, they put more of their money into the family. There wasn't the idea of saving all the money they could. If we needed a new pair of shoes, they'd buy us a new pair of shoes. That was first, so they never were able to get that. Then in later years, they probably could have bought a house, but then, why worry?

Ms. Boswell: Once you had finished elementary school, did your family stay in Puyallup after that?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, after that, when I got in junior high, we stayed in one house. One house

for maybe nine, ten years, right there in Puyallup. Eight or ten blocks from the high school. It was a junior-senior high school at that point in time.

Ms. Boswell: What are your memories of that time?

Mr. Brouillet: It was a nice place to live, a nice community, with a lot of other kids around who we played with. A good, stable neighborhood. My father put up the basketball court out back, and we'd trample the grass down 'til there was nothing left finally except mud. It was a good place, though.

We had a wood stove we had to cut wood for every night. If we'd forget, my brother and I would have to go out there, and one of us would hold the flashlight and the other would have to cut the wood or cut the kindling. Out there, seven o'clock at night, in the pitch dark, one holding the flashlight, the other chopping. But that was our job! Keep the wood box full and get the kindling for the fire. We had to mow the lawn with a push mower. Things like that were your duties and responsibilities. If you didn't get 'em done during the daylight hours, you went out there at night and cut them. It was a nice neighborhood.

Ms. Boswell: Did your family cook on a wood stove?

Mr. Brouillet: Sure, we cooked on a wood cookstove. The place was heated with wood. It was kind of interesting. Take our toast and put them on a rack, which would lay up on the stove. You would toast your toast on the stove, get over there and flip them over as best you could. That's how you cooked your toast.

Chapter 2

High School, College and the Army

Ms. Boswell: We've talked a lot about your family and the community and how they influenced you, but I wonder, as you look back, how do you feel about your education? Do you think it served you well?

Mr. Brouillet: I think so, even though it seemed like we were always moving when I was in grade school. I didn't go to the same grade school for two years in a row, but they were all in the local area. And those were kind of hard times financially. So I think we were moving around partly to find proper, affordable housing. I remember when my father was working for forty cents an hour. It was a difficult time.

I basically went to Puyallup and Sumner school districts, so it was fairly similar. I thought it was all right. Good teachers and it was a good experience.

Ms. Boswell: Do you have certain teachers that you remember, either good or bad?

Mr. Brouillet: I don't remember any bad teachers. I remember my kindergarten teacher, "Aunt Mary." Everybody called her Aunt Mary.

And interestingly, most of the teachers you had were single females, because in those days it was unusual to be married and be a teacher. As soon as you got married, you were supposed to give up your job.

But no, it was a good experience. I participated even at that level in athletics. I remember our sixth-grade basketball team at J.B. Stewart was city champions. I was heavily involved in those things and my parents were very supportive of that.

Ms. Boswell: Were the coaches influential in your life, too?

Mr. Brouillet: No, not really. Only one coach, Carl Sparks, my football and basketball coach had much influence. He was a great person with strong ideals. I suppose you started developing attitudes and teamwork and all those kind of things. It came kind of naturally.

Ms. Boswell: Were you a good team player?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh sure! It was middle-class—the kind of people I knew weren't very wealthy. It was a white, middle-class American society, a lily-white environment. It was in a time in Puyallup and Sumner—aside from the Japanese who lived in the area—that there weren't any minorities.

The traits and values of that system—hard work, doing your best, all those kind of things—would be a natural development for a young person in those kind of environments. The parents were involved. There was always a parent around, so I suspect you quietly and unknowingly—we didn't talk about attitudes and values, nobody ever discussed those—developed middle-class values there.

Ms. Boswell: So, the community fostered a system of values and morals?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes. You certainly had a value system that was, as I say, white middle class. They just developed. Nobody talked about it much, but everybody understood what they were.

Ms. Boswell: How would you say that value system was structured? What was of the most importance of that value system in your life?

Mr. Brouillet: I think there were things, as I said, hard work. Be part of the team. Relationships between individuals. Those kinds of things that people expected. Schools obviously, and the parents, to some extent, were involved, I suppose, in fostering these kinds of things. There weren't many two-parent working families. Most, if not all, were one-person working families—although it was not unusual to have a second person working.

Ms. Boswell: Was education, per se, valued as highly as athletic ability? I mean, if you were "the brain," were you more or less respected than "the jock?"

Mr. Brouillet: I suppose you had the same kind of problems that you have today. But in our family, the matter of education was very important. My father, like I said, graduated from high school and attended college for a short time. My mother didn't graduate from high school. But we were expected to go to college. We were told all the time while we were kids: "You're going to go to college." And our parents were very insistent on that and insistent upon—even though we participated in a lot of athletic events and programs—you had to study and get your grades. If you didn't get your grades, didn't study, you were in trouble! We were inculcated that way, that you had to get your grades and go on. And partly, I suppose, because they hadn't gone on and they saw the value of it for other people. So, they were always very insistent upon that, that you study for certain amounts of time. We didn't have any TV to watch, of course, which was probably of value.

Ms. Boswell: Did you ever rebel against that at all?

Mr. Brouillet: I never did. I'm sure some kids did, but I never did. I didn't even think about that. They started so young that you got kind of used to it. You didn't see a lot of that, although I won't say there wasn't any. It was part of the upbringing and a part of the social system.

Ms. Boswell: How would you describe yourself as a child, in terms of personality? Happy, sad, serious, boisterous?

Mr. Brouillet: I was very introverted. I was serious and I was introverted. I always got my work done and I worked hard at it. I didn't have much of an outward display of jumping up and down and all those kind of things. I played a lot of games with the kids in the neighborhood. But I was a very serious kid, who took things very seriously. I'd bring it home, do a lot of studying, go into a room and stay in a half a day studying, because I thought it was important to get those things done.

I had to learn to deal with people because I was pretty self-sufficient.

Ms. Boswell: It seems unusual for someone who has been in politics and public service as long as you have to have been that way. It is not the idea one usually has of public people.

Mr. Brouillet: I had to learn that sort of thing. I've been on, I don't know how many campaigns, a dozen or so, and I still don't like to campaign. It's a real chore for me to go out and knock on doors and talk to people and ask them to vote and so forth. I'm a fairly private person, although I think I've learned a lot more as I've grown older about relationships and how to get along with people and deal with people.

Ms. Boswell: What about friendships as a child? You mentioned playing in the neighborhood, but did you have one good friend or lots of friends? How would you characterize that part of your life?

Mr. Brouillet: I don't know. My brother, who was a year older, had more friends than I did. I don't know if I had many real friends. I had a lot of acquaintances, but my brother and I did a lot of things together. I didn't have a lot of close friends. I had a lot of people I knew and I participated with, but when it was over I went home. In later years, in high school, kids would go out together, and I never did any of that. When basketball or football practice was over, I'd go home. I developed a lot of friends, but not really close friends in the sense that we got involved so much.

Ms. Boswell: Did you feel that moving around quite a bit played a part in your development? That self-sufficiency that you spoke about?

Mr. Brouillet: I was pretty self-sufficient on my own. I was a good student and I was a good athlete, good this, good that, so I didn't really feel any kind of need for a lot of friends. I was doing my thing, going to school and working hard at it.

Ms. Boswell: Did you ever experience any jealousy having been so successful? Jealousy or ostracism from the rest of the group?

Mr. Brouillet: Sure. A lot of it. When I got to be a senior in high school, I was the "Most Outstanding Boy" in school. I was in the top ten of my class and there were all these honors, athletics and academics. Well, they decided when I was a senior that I shouldn't get the "Outstanding Boy" award because I already had too many things. The faculty decided that. Sure, I recall the idea of spreading things around.

Ms. Boswell: How did you feel about that? Was that a real disappointment?

Mr. Brouillet: I thought it was kind of "crappy." I mean, I had the best grades, best activities, been elected to all these things, and they pick somebody else because he didn't have enough awards, which I thought was kind of strange. It was supposed to be for the most outstanding person. But that's the way it goes.

Sure, I noticed things like that. I always noticed that when you're on top people are always throwing rocks at you. An old Chinese proverb: "People don't throw rocks at trees that bear no fruit." All through life, I've had to be more careful about what I do than other people, because everybody's always looking at what you're doing, how you react to things. I sold my house to the school district. I sold it for what it was appraised at. Everybody around me sold theirs for more, but people were watching to see what I sold mine for. So you always kind of lived in a glass house. You just grow used to that.

Other kids would be upset about this. That wasn't everybody, but you sensed a certain amount of that all the way through school. I just had to live with that.

Ms. Boswell: How did you handle it? How did you learn to live with it?

Mr. Brouillet: I just decided to ignore it. There isn't much you can do about it. And I think that made me, probably, a little more withdrawn.

Ms. Boswell: Would you tell your parents about it? I mean, would they help you through it?

Mr. Brouillet: No. No, it wouldn't do any good.

Ms. Boswell: I know athletics were real

important, but what other kinds of other activities were you involved in high school?

Mr. Brouillet: I was involved in football, basketball and track. I was the class president, junior class president. Junior high student body president. I was involved a lot with the Honor Society. A lot of other activities. Other than schoolwork and being involved in athletics, there wasn't an awful lot of time, because you went from football to basketball to track. In the summer you practiced football.

Ms. Boswell: Would you consider yourself competitive?

Mr. Brouillet: Very. Not noticeable, but very competitive. Yes. I've always been competitive. But not outwardly, not in the sense that I show a tremendous amount of emotion.

Ms. Boswell: What do you think is the source of that? Is that a family trait or a personal, inner trait?

Mr. Brouillet: I suppose it's partly family. My father was always very encouraging. He was very active in athletics in school, too. You start doing that stuff early. When I was in grade school, I remember a write-up one time about "Following the famous Brouillet." In the sixth grade I got my name in the paper. Our grade school team won, and then the guy went on to talk about my father and some big famous game. But the point was, you get indoctrinated into all this stuff early on. So it's partly family and partly getting involved in these things.

My brother was not as competitive as I was. But I was much more intent, much more competitive than he was.

Ms. Boswell: Were you competitive with your brother?

Mr. Brouillet: I suppose I was. I was the second child, and we were close enough in age that there was a certain amount of competition. I think you find that happening quite often in the family. The younger ones try to compete with the older ones. And it allows for a different kind of development. We had two boys ourselves, and although they were five years apart, the little one was trying to compete with the big one. So I think there's a certain amount of that, sure.

Ms. Boswell: How did your brother feel about that? As you were so successful, were there any ramifications?

Mr. Brouillet: He seemed to adjust pretty well. If he had any animosity or anything, it wasn't visible. I suspect it probably bothered him a little bit now and then. He couldn't help it. Although he was somewhat successful himself, too, but not at the breadth that I was.

Ms. Boswell: Maybe this is another difficult question, within the family structure, did your parents favor one child more than the other? Were you singled out for more attention as a result of your successes?

Mr. Brouillet: I don't think so, no. They were pretty careful about that. I might have gotten more attention from my father than my brother did, but I'm sure my mother made up for that.

Ms. Boswell: How did you choose the kinds of other activities you did besides athletics? Athletics, you had the natural ability and a father who was really interested, but why would it be student government rather than the chess club or some other kind of activity that was available at school?

Mr. Brouillet: I don't know. First of all, things like student body government and all those kinds of things were natural things. They were there and somebody was running; they were

always looking for somebody popular to run for those things.

Of course, in those days you were much more limited in what you could do. We didn't have a chess club. We didn't have a drama club. You only had a half a dozen things in the school to do in those days. Life was much simpler in regard to what was available to you. So we didn't have a lot of other activities.

Why did I get involved in student government? I suppose it was because I was a sports star and that kind of slops over into these other things. "Well, everybody knows him, maybe he can get elected to something."

Ms. Boswell: Were there any causes—was there an agenda of something that you wanted to accomplish, or was it more of a ceremonial position?

Mr. Brouillet: I didn't have an agenda. I don't know, I didn't have anything I remember that I wanted to accomplish. Well, typically the administration pays more attention to the students or something like that. But we would never have thought about demonstrating! Taking over the principal's office or something like that. I didn't have any great causes.

Ms. Boswell: What were your favorite subjects that you were particularly interested in?

Mr. Brouillet: I've always liked history and government, although I was a math/science major. I really enjoyed those other kinds of subjects, social studies, history, better than chemistry. I was going to be a chemical engineer because I thought I was supposed to, I guess, and I took all this chemistry to be something like that. You're trying to figure out what you want to do. There wasn't a lot of guidance. In those days, the guidance wasn't particularly effective. You kind of fumbled around and figured out what you wanted to do. So I decided I was going to be a chemical engineer. Well, that didn't last long. After I took all those subjects in college, I decided I didn't want to be a chemical engineer.

Life was relatively simple in those days. You're too young to recognize that. We played football. The same group of people moved on to basketball, then they'd go play baseball or track. It was all kind of the same group through life, as I say, that was it. Junior varsity team, all these kinds of things, so other people could participate. We didn't have soccer. There were no girls' sports, except girls' basketball, so you didn't have a lot of options in a way. All the things you have now, they were not available in those days, so you kind of gravitated to certain things.

Ms. Boswell: What about dating? Was that an important part of high school?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, yes, I had a girl friend and we dated. I dated the same girl most of the way through high school, at least the last couple of years.

Ms. Boswell: Was that common?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, yes, going steady, that was not uncommon.

Ms. Boswell: What kinds of traits were you looking for in a girl at that time?

Mr. Brouillet: You're delving into the mysterious past! It's hard to say. You look at personality, good looks, and all those kind of things.

Ms. Boswell: But you didn't end up marrying your high-school sweetheart then?

Mr. Brouillet: No. I went off to West Point and she got married. I wasn't really ready to

get married anyway. I didn't get married until I was twenty-eight years old. Although a number of people did in these small towns go through school and get married. I wasn't ready. I think she was a little upset with that. I had a lot of things to do!

Ms. Boswell: Did you feel, even at that time, that you had the maturity to say, "I'm not ready for this?"

Mr. Brouillet: Yes. I didn't want to get married and start a family. I decided I wanted to go to school. Of course, my parents were kind of pushing me along to not get tangled up and go on. They were always afraid I was going to get married like they did, have a family, and not finish school. I'm sure that was a concern of theirs.

Ms. Boswell: How did the schools at that time approach the concept of dating? Today sex education and all these things are such big issues. Was that at all a part of the training?

Mr. Brouillet: No, never. We had health education. There was a little sex education in there, but other than that, nobody talked about that kind of stuff. Nobody was supposed to talk about that in school. As I say, school was relatively simple: reading, writing, and arithmetic. You didn't deal with sex education. You didn't deal with AIDS. You didn't have to deal with any of this kind of stuff. You went to school, you took math, science, and history. Everybody did. You might have been a bonehead in math or English, that was possible, but there was none of that sexual education stuff that kids have to deal with today.

When somebody had a baby and they got married in high school, that was really a "no-no!" They were social outcasts in those days. Now girls will bring their kids to school, and they've got day-care for them and everything else. That would not have happened then. In fact, I think if you got married, you had to leave school, I would think, if I remember right. I think the girl had to leave and the boy could stay, you know—it was really a strange situation. Of course, you couldn't be pregnant and be in school—that was really bad.

Ms. Boswell: Did it happen occasionally?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, once in awhile something would happen. Somebody would get married or somebody would get pregnant and that was really a scandal in the old days.

As I say, the school system was quite simple. You had a counselor to help you and a college counselor, that was about it. You didn't have all these other things that the school is now involved in.

Ms. Boswell: I was curious about the concept of public service or citizenship. Was there much of an emphasis on that at that time?

Mr. Brouillet: I think there was an emphasis—not so much on public service—but on citizenship. Schools did that. Of course you had to be twenty-one to vote, so nobody registered anybody in school. But I think being a good citizen was part of the culture, of the American culture, at that time. You're supposed to vote, you're supposed to be a good citizen, you're supposed to pay your taxes, all these kind of things.

Ms. Boswell: What about the notion of patriotism? Was that accepted?

Mr. Brouillet: A lot of people belonged to the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars in those days. Of course, it was right around wartime, the 1940s, so it was a big deal. But I think even then there was a lot more patriotism: "Our country, right or

wrong." That was part of the culture.

And there was a lot less tolerance. The Japanese were in the area among the whites. I don't think they were discriminated against as much as they were looked down upon as some alien culture out there that talked a different kind of language and went to a different church. Even though some of your friends were Japanese, there was still a lot of intolerance. And there weren't any blacks living in Puyallup—they couldn't live in Puyallup.

I don't know how it ever came about, but some experiences linger. There weren't any blacks in Puyallup. There was a black guy who worked in the barbershop and he shined shoes. He didn't live in Puyallup, he was gone after work. So, I don't think the tolerance level was very good. And then, of course, World War II didn't help any. They interned all the Japanese down at the Puyallup Fairgrounds in the area.

Ms. Boswell: In school, do you remember anything in particular in terms of how they taught or changed the routine as a result of the war?

Mr. Brouillet: No, I didn't see that. I don't think the schools did much. Maybe out in the community. I mean the schools didn't teach that they were a suspicious people and you had to watch out for them. I think they kind of ignored the subject, really. I can't recall one way or the other.

Ms. Boswell: You talked about your parents and their views on education and their value on education. Would you say that was pretty representative of the community?

Mr. Brouillet: I think so. I think, generally speaking, it's kind of hard to say because I'm not sure. But the people I knew, their parents were like that.

Ms. Boswell: Was the expectation, generally, that most capable kids would go on to college?

Mr. Brouillet: Expectations didn't always happen, but that was the expectation. Some didn't want to do it or couldn't do it. But I think the expectation, the "Great American Dream," has been sold so hard that we haven't got any space left in colleges. But you had to go on to college in order to be a success, which was not a very good view of the world, but that was the road to success. If you went to college and got a degree, something was going to happen to you: You were going to make more money and be better off and so forth.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about your own experiences thinking about college. I think you mentioned to me at one point that you had been approached about going outside of the community?

Mr. Brouillet: The community got me an appointment at West Point. They thought that'd be a good idea, so some of the downtown people got together—in those days you just got appointed by your congressman. You didn't have to take a test or anything. The local congressman got me an appointment to West Point. Then I had a basketball appointment to Annapolis. Didn't go to either one of them. I was going to go to West Point. But I went back there, took the battery of tests, okay, but I didn't want to be clear back here. It was the first time I'd ever been east of Spokane.

Mr. Brouillet: The Navy offered scholarships to two of us from Washington state, who had played in the state basketball tournament, to go to Annapolis. I didn't do that. I had a lot of opportunities at that point in my life to do something different, but I really wasn't psychologically or socially or physically mature enough to hop on an airplane and fly

to West Point and stay there, or Annapolis. I just couldn't. I wasn't that confident of myself. So I didn't do either one of them.

You look back on what you have done with your life that would have been different. I probably wouldn't have been a career person in the service. But I didn't do that, so I did something else.

Ms. Boswell: How did you decide to do something else? How did you make the decision of where you would go?

Mr. Brouillet: I don't think I made a planned decision. Like a lot of things, you just—as I say, I went to college. I went to Washington State as a freshman on a football scholarship. I didn't like that. I didn't like college athletics, so I decided I wasn't going to do that and left. So then I transferred to the University of Puget Sound on an academic scholarship. I did play football and basketball there, but not seriously. Just as a way to get me through school.

I don't know. You start out doing these things and you kind of float along. I got a degree here, a degree there. I can't say I've changed. I started out to be a chemical engineer, and I decided I wasn't going to do that, instead I'd do something else. I decided I was going to be a CPA and I didn't do that. So you just kind of go through college, floating along, and I ended up being a teacher.

Ms. Boswell: Just like that?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes. I was getting all these credits and I said, "I've got to find something to do that I can get employed at." So I just kind of ended up over there.

Ms. Boswell: What happened about college athletics? What didn't you like about it?

Mr. Brouillet: It was too professionalized. I knew I wasn't going to do anything other than get through school with athletics. I wasn't big enough to be a professional football player, I could figure that out. I didn't want to work that hard and not have any fun at it. In high school it's a lot of fun, everybody carries themselves. But just to be an athlete in college, I decided I didn't want to do that. It was not worth the effort. You can do something else—study. I spent more time studying.

Ms. Boswell: What about the rest of Washington State University? Were there other things over there that did not appeal to you? Is that the reason you didn't stay?

Mr. Brouillet: Another thing was that I came over there in 1947 and everybody was getting out of the services then. Everything was a mess. We had a backlog of about four years of veterans coming back and it was just a big mess and I kind of got lost in the whole process. It was not a particularly good experience.

It was a big school and it was swelled with all these "old people." I was a young kid there, and there were these people in their twenties and it just didn't work out. I didn't like it. I had to live in an old Quonset hut, which wasn't all that bad, but from my point of view it was not a good time to go.

It was just too many people and not enough classes. All of a sudden this deluge descended upon the colleges and they all had the GI Bill of Rights, so they all came to college. The colleges were way overcrowded, and were striving to facilitate, as best they could. But for a young person, just out of high school, I thought college was what you saw in the movies. That reality was not my idea of college. That kind of mix. That kind of confusion. There were a lot of older people—four or five years older than I was. I was a babe in the woods. I perceived it as very impersonal, very chaotic. I didn't like that.

So I transferred to the University of Puget

Sound.

Ms. Boswell: And how did you pick the University of Puget Sound? Was it mostly the proximity to home?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, just close. And I knew some of the people that were going there. My brother was going there by now, and I knew some other people there. I just gravitated to that, I guess.

Ms. Boswell: In terms of your expectations about what would happen to you when you did finish college, were you pretty optimistic? How would you characterize your thoughts about finishing school?

Mr. Brouillet: I was optimistic. Especially when you go to college for a few years, the whole world opens up for you. Sure, I was optimistic, and things were going along well and people were prosperous both during and after the war.

It's like a lot of things, you don't worry about your retirement program until you get to be forty-five or fifty. "Things are going to be okay," you think. And you just kind of move along.

Ms. Boswell: What about the University of Puget Sound, did that meet your expectations?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh yes, it was much more secure, twenty-five hundred people or so. I knew a lot of people there, too. A lot of local people were going there. I joined a fraternity. Today my friends, most of my close friends, are people I went to college with. We still go to alumni meetings. Whenever I can, I go. Socially. Things like that. So the core was there.

Ms. Boswell: What was fraternity life like at that time? Did you live in the fraternity house or on campus?

Mr. Brouillet: No, I lived at home. I wanted to save money. For awhile I did, then I moved. I never really lived in the fraternity house.

It wasn't as wild as a lot of fraternities were. The people there were fairly stable people I'd known a long time. Sure, there was drinking going on. There weren't any drugs, but a lot of drinking. There was a lot of that everyplace. But it wasn't as bad as a lot of places. It was a pretty good group of people. I graduated with my dentist. I graduated with my doctor. My lawyer graduated with me. He's now a judge, so I don't have a lawyer any more. All these people went to school, all these professional people. They went off and did something else. So you see, the fraternity group—all those people were pretty successful.

Ms. Boswell: Did most of them come from the sort of small town Puyallup background that you did?

Mr. Brouillet: Some came from Tacoma. Some were out of state, but most of them were local, Puyallup, mainly Tacoma, actually. Now, the University of Puget Sound has changed a lot since then. They now try to get half their people from out of state; they think they're the "Harvard of the West" or whatever. But they recruit differently now. At that point in time, both Pacific Lutheran University and the University of Puget Sound were basically local colleges, although Lutherans might come from Minnesota or someplace. But basically, both those schools were pretty local. Now the character has changed, they've become regional in character, if not national. Particularly the University of Puget Sound. They've made a strong emphasis to expand—that kind of operation.

Ms. Boswell: What about activities there? What kind of things did you get involved in?

Mr. Brouillet: I got involved in the college fraternity stuff. I was president of the chapter. I did play football and basketball for a couple of years, but as I said, I didn't like that. Of course that got me a scholarship for a couple of years. My attitude was, "I like this kind of thing," but I didn't want to put in that kind of effort for that kind of result at that time in my life. Although it did provide me with a tuition scholarship. At that time they were charging $250 a year. I thought, "God, that's a lot of money." Now I think they're about $15,000! They're way up there! That was a lot of money in those days. Now, everything is somewhat relative.

Ms. Boswell: What about student government? Did you get involved?

Mr. Brouillet: No I didn't. I spent most of my time studying and participating in fraternity activities.

Ms. Boswell: You started in chemical engineering, but what were the other kinds of courses that you ended up taking?

Mr. Brouillet: I kind of gravitated without any great plan to history and government. I got a B.A. and a master's degree in economics. I don't know why I got a major in economics. It wasn't because I wanted to be an economist or something. I just liked the subject, so you end up taking a lot of these courses on the basis of what interests you. You like to study economics, like to study political science, then you do that. So what do I do with all of this? I had to do something with all of this, so I became a teacher to teach all these things. It was without any great calculations and any great plan.

I always used to admire somebody who knew what they were going to do. I suspect I was like more people than they were. You kind of wander in there and try different things. So I ended up in those areas. When I graduated from college I had a major in economics. I also had a minor in political science, English and history.

Ms. Boswell: Were there any teachers that you remember with particular fondness?

Mr. Brouillet: Dr. Chaplin who used to teach Shakespeare and English literature. He was really good. So I used to take his courses because I enjoyed the class. I had some good instructors. So I ended up doing these kinds of things, taking these courses because I enjoyed the people.

I started teaching in Puyallup and they wanted me teach English. And I said, "My minor's in English literature." And they said, "That's okay! You're the English teacher this year." When I first started teaching, I thought, "My God!"

But anyway you end up like that. So I ended up with a minor in literature.

Ms. Boswell: Did you go right on to graduate school after that?

Mr. Brouillet: The Korean War was now on. I didn't want to go off right now. So I got my master's degree at the University of Puget Sound, too, in economics. After that, I went down and volunteered for the draft. But I wanted to get that out of the way. My deferment let me stay in school and finish my master's. I got a bachelor's of education, too. I also worked on a teacher's certificate at this point in time, because I hadn't gotten it the first time around. You didn't really need a bachelor's of education, but you automatically got one in those days. You took all the courses, you just kind of fell into it. So I took that, and went on. Then I went to stay and do my master's in labor economics.

Ms. Boswell: So, what were you thinking about at that time? Were you thinking about teaching?

Mr. Brouillet: I was thinking about teaching. I liked labor economics, so I liked reading about the "Wobblies," the Industrial Workers of the World, and all these people. I wrote my master's paper on the American Federation of Labor (AFL) and how they started out and how they gradually moved over into the political arena. Wages, hours and working conditions. No other social activities, because they'd learn from Knights of Labor how all this had failed. They got off their main purpose. So I took that, and I became quite an expert on the Wobblies. I really enjoyed them—the Everett and Centralia massacres, all that stuff.

And at the University of Puget Sound, they kept all these books locked and down in the basement. I had to get special permission to go and read them. They weren't all that radical, but all this stuff is locked up. You could use them, but you had to go get permission. You couldn't just check them out. While I was going through this, I'd write on the labor radicals.

Ms. Boswell: Did they view you as some kind of a radical?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, I don't think so. I didn't make any speeches or anything. I was fairly liberal in my politics though, because I thought that poor people were being exploited. I subscribed to *New Republic*. I probably got on somebody's list by subscribing to that because the FBI was making lists in those times. So I was probably on somebody's list someplace.

But I was somewhat idealistic. Righting the wrongs of society, Don Quixote charging the windmill. But I wasn't vocal about it. I didn't get up at the college commons and jump up and down, or go after Weyerhaeuser or somebody like that.

Ms. Boswell: Was there some of that going on?

Mr. Brouillet: Not much there. They wouldn't stand for that in those days. The other day I saw the students were mad at the University of Puget Sound and had a big demonstration. I don't know what it was about—something the administration didn't do, didn't tell them about. Contracting work, I think. The students do some of that, but they're still not anything like the University of Washington. There wasn't a lot of that going on, and what was going on, was at the major universities.

See, this is a school where students had to go to church every week. I was there during the time they abolished it. But you had to go to chapel once a week. They even took roll. We were always trying to figure out how we could sneak in and sneak out. Finally, they abolished it. In fact, Pacific Lutheran University, all the time I was attending the University of Puget Sound, couldn't have dances. So students from UPS would have a dance and students from PLU would come over there. You couldn't have a dance on the campus at PLU for quite awhile. They were very strict. It was very conservative.

Ms. Boswell: Politically conservative, too?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, politically conservative. I was probably out of step with most of the politics. I didn't participate in it, but I was out of step with the political feel of the institution.

Ms. Boswell: But it didn't make that much difference? I mean, that was a time when in the whole country there was a lot of pressure—political pressure being brought to bear on people. McCarthyism running rampant. Was that a factor that you were aware of?

Mr. Brouillet: No. I think they just didn't tolerate anything radical. If somebody got up and started raising hell about something, they probably wouldn't be around. The University of Puget Sound was a small, private school that didn't have any real radical element. We had a right to attend the institution if we paid, but that was all. So I figured that out right away. There was no sense in getting mixed up in the political.

Ms. Boswell: What about the impact of the Korean War itself? You were in high school during World War II, but what about Korea?

Mr. Brouillet: I just missed the draft in World War II. My brother, who was a full year older, got drafted. I just missed it. They quit drafting about the time I got out of high school. They got him, and he spent a couple of years up in Alaska.

It wasn't like Vietnam. I don't recall demonstrations against the Korean War. Some people thought we shouldn't be there, you know that sort of thing. And we got in the quagmire with the Chinese, but there weren't a lot of riots or demonstrations that I can recall. I'm sure there were some place. But that was the last patriotic war we had, though not like World War II.

In fact, people my age, people I'd gone to school with, were in the Army. Some people I went to Washington State University with were Second Lieutenants, because of the ROTC. They got shot at and everything else.

I wasn't opposed to going in, but I wanted to finish school and do my own thing before I had to go. So I finished that, and this other fellow and I went down and volunteered for the draft. I thought, "If I was to get in right away, I probably would get out sooner." I never got to go anyplace and get shot at. I was in the Army for two years.

Ms. Boswell: What was your expectation of the military at that time? What did you think it was going to be like?

Mr. Brouillet: I didn't have any trouble. I was not married. Some people I was in with were married and they had families—not very big families—but they were really upset about having to leave. I was through with what I was doing, and I thought it'd be another good experience. I wasn't upset about it. I enjoyed the Army, even though I thought that a lot of dumb things went on.

Ms. Boswell: What about the whole military discipline angle? How did you relate to that?

Mr. Brouillet: I made out all right. I believed in discipline. You had to be disciplined to participate in athletics. You had to be disciplined to be a good student, unless you were a genius. So I didn't mind discipline. If I had got the call, I would have been a good soldier. I would have protected people around me and I would expect that of them. Camaraderie and all of that. I didn't have trouble with that.

I had infantry training, but I never went in the infantry. I went into the Counter-Intelligence Corps (CIC), so I had a good deal.

Ms. Boswell: Now, was that a choice you made or was that a choice made for you?

Mr. Brouillet: I'd read about these Counter-Intelligence Corps in some article and I thought, "I've got to figure out how to get in that." So I got into basic training, and I figured out where the Counter-Intelligence Headquarters was, so one day I went over there and talked to the CIC people. I had a master's degree then, so I was a pretty good commodity. My company command was upset when they found out about it. Then I went to Counter-Intelligence Corps School for six

months. So I was able—because I knew it was available—and I was older, I had a couple of degrees, so it seemed natural.

Ms. Boswell: Would most people at that time with degrees like you, if they had been in ROTC, would they have been officers?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes. If you went to Washington State University or University of Washington—I was in ROTC for awhile when I was there. And Central Washington University, all those places had ROTC. And it was mandatory, you didn't have a choice. If you were a male, when you went to Washington State, you took ROTC. Now it's voluntary. They still have it at the University of Washington and at Washington State University, but it's now voluntary. It was mandatory in those days. That was part of your registration: you went off, you got a uniform, you were in the ROTC.

Ms. Boswell: Oh, I had no idea.

Mr. Brouillet: Had to stay two years, if I remember right. But then, if you put two years in, they paid you for the next couple of years, so you made some money at it. So a lot of people stayed on, not expecting to go to war, but you get a little money and it wasn't bad.

Ms. Boswell: Where did you take your counterintelligence training?

Mr. Brouillet: At a place called Fort Holibird, Maryland. The training is not there anymore; it's down in Arizona. It was one of the undercover schools—it was supposed to be a transportation headquarters, but they really had a school on the side.

We had these people that didn't speak very good English. I found out later a lot of them were people that we'd scooped up in Germany before the Russians got there. Some of them were ex-German intelligence officers. I thought, "Gee, these guys have some funny accents." Later on, after I was out of it, I read about all these kinds of things. They were violent anti-Communists, of course, because that was a big deal. To them, it was a war of survival against the communists. Of course I was older then, and I didn't listen to all this stuff.

Ms. Boswell: How did you feel about that? Were you skeptical or patriotic?

Mr. Brouillet: I was very skeptical. I thought the organization was all right. But I didn't believe all the garbage they were throwing at us—sure the Russians were a problem for us—but I didn't believe all the stuff about all the subversion and all the stuff that they said was going on.

This is a time when the CIC was operating—we didn't do any of it—but they had the agents running around following people. They really were beyond their mission.

Ms. Boswell: Did you ever have any personal experiences like that?

Mr. Brouillet: No, not anything like that. I was a short-timer. But they had agents doing this kind of stuff. All the types of service, the Navy and everybody else, kept dossiers on political people. Now the FBI keeps them all.

It was interesting. I got out of school and they sent me to Alaska as a civilian. A civilian car, civilian clothes, lived in civilian bachelor quarters. I couldn't prove I was in the Army!

Ms. Boswell: What was your mission?

Mr. Brouillet: Basically two things. I did a lot of background investigations. If somebody was going for a top secret clearance and they lived in Alaska at one time, had gone to school there, they'd send us information on that. We'd

have to go around and talk to people see if they were telling the truth.

Secondly, we were responsible for security on our post. This involved security inspections and overseeing classified documents. They used to send us a big stack of background assignments and we'd work like heck for about two weeks to get them mostly done, like a month's work. Then we'd do what we wanted for a month! We'd go down and visit the FBI and listen to them, or go out to the University of Alaska and read books. But it was really good duty. They even gave you a clothing allowance.

I had some credentials, and every time I showed them that they thought I was in the FBI. I started to explain to them I wasn't in the FBI, but I gave up, finally. I went to the Officer's Club and the NCO Club and the commissary and just show them my credentials! They didn't know who you were! They knew better, that they shouldn't be messing around with you. It was good duty. I almost stayed in for awhile.

Ms. Boswell: Were you anywhere else than in Alaska?

Mr. Brouillet: Just Alaska. Spent all my time in Alaska. Most of my friends got sent to Korea. They had one opening in Alaska. You put down where you want to go. Well, of course, I put down Hawaii, then I put down Paris. "I can't leave this third one blank, so I'll put down Alaska." They had one vacancy for an agent in Alaska. I was the only guy in the class that put down Alaska. The rest of them put down all these other places, and most of them got sent to Korea with the troops. Because they put counterintelligence agents with the advance of the troops. You're supposed to whip into town, run around and get all those secret documents. So, I didn't like that too well, but I went to Alaska. There was no shooting in Alaska, nobody shooting anybody, but it was overseas.

Ms. Boswell: I guess it would be, wouldn't it?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, it was overseas, because Alaska was still a territory. That was an interesting time in my life. I almost stayed in. I thought it was a lot of fun. It was an adventure. I didn't have anything else to do. But I got out, I went back and started teaching.

Ms. Boswell: What made you decide not to just reenlist?

Mr. Brouillet: I thought, "I'm not going to stay in forever, so why should I use up three more years of my life? I'm not going to stay in here. I'm just doing this because I like it." I'd done my bit. "I'm going to get out, so I probably should get out and do something," I finally figured it out, to get out and go to work. If I could make it a career, it would have been one thing, but I never intended to be a career Army person.

Ms. Boswell: Just out of curiosity, what kind of training did they give you in order to do that? Was it research, or how did they actually train somebody to do counterintelligence work?

Mr. Brouillet: All kind of things. You had things like surveillance—how to follow people around. And a lot of history stuff on the KGB, you learned all about the whole organization. How to pick locks, something I never used. Kind of like police training in a way, you know. Except there was a certain amount of indoctrination in it. You had a couple of English classes—how to write reports. But as I said, the political side of it was anti-Russian and anti-Communist. It was interesting. I'd studied a lot of that stuff anyway in political science.

It was sixteen weeks. How to do identification. One day you're sitting in class and somebody runs in and shoots a person, and runs out. They say, "Now describe what you saw. What they looked like. What kind of weapon." A lot of things like that with identification. A certain amount of report writing—I did a lot of reports in the Army. It was interesting. Sixteen weeks of basic infantry training. Sixteen weeks of marching over every hill and dale at Fort Ord. But it was all right, it puts you in good physical shape.

Ms. Boswell: Did you think, either in college or through that experience, did you see your values change or your perception of the world generally?

Mr. Brouillet: My perception of the world probably began to change a bit. I enjoyed just traveling around and being in another part of the United States. People didn't run around like they do now. I remember going to Washington D.C. one time. I had flown in an airplane when I went back to West Point. It was a propeller job. I think it took twelve hours to get there. We had to make two stops for refueling. The world was much more distant. I don't know to what degree it expanded horizons, but obviously it did that.

Ms. Boswell: I just wondered whether being away, or perhaps experiences with obviously a fairly wide variety of people that you might have met in the military, matured you even more?

Mr. Brouillet: Certainly, it's a maturing experience. You have to deal with a lot of different kinds of people than when you deal with little old Puyallup. A lot of sharp people—you've got to watch yourself now and then, don't let them steal your wallet, figuratively speaking, but there was just a lot more manipulators around, and so forth. So sure, those were all very maturing experiences.

When I was at Fort Holibird, I used to go up to New York once in awhile and see the big city. Those are very broadening experiences. If for nothing else than to just see the rest of the world and view different people. They are not a little enclave like in Washington State. There is a large minority population. I went up to New York one time for the Easter Parade to watch all the people and what they do, all the different kinds of people.

Ms. Boswell: What about in the military hierarchy? Did you have a chance to be in charge? It sounds like yours might have been a fairly independent kind of job.

Mr. Brouillet: It was a full-time operation, but the head of our detachment in Alaska was a West Pointer, a real jerk. It was a small group. There were just five of us in the detachment for all of Fairbanks north to the Arctic Circle. So we didn't have a big unit there. Pretty informal. I was never in charge of anything as I was just in for the short term.

I was just interested to see how the Army works. I had a sergeant and a warrant officer who knew everybody on the base. We never filled out a requisition for anything. We'd just go around and scrounge things. When I got there, I didn't have a parka, I didn't have bunny boots—snow boots. We'd go around and talk to these people and they would bring me back all this stuff.

Well, this West Pointer showed up and we had to start filling out requisitions for all this. You had to fill out requisitions to get brooms or soap when you clean the place up. These guys were old-timers, and they would go around and talk to the supply sergeant. So this guy shows up, and we had one clerk and he spent all this time after that filling out requisitions. We didn't fill out anything before

then. Like I said earlier, it was very informal operation. Everybody knew who we were, so they were very kind to us.

If you wrote up a bad report on someone and said they were questionable security, you could ruin somebody's career. I used to go to these units late at night—seven, eight, nine or ten o'clock—and do a check on their classified documents. We would show up and whoever the duty officer was would just about have a stroke. If he found anything, he would write it up and send it to somebody. I never did. I didn't want to ruin their career. If they were, let's say, a captain, and we wrote it up and said, "Well, obviously he doesn't do a very good job on security, since we found all these classified items lying around." He never would see the report, either. The CIC agent would just write it up and send it to the headquarters. Then it would end up in his file.

That's what bothered me about the whole thing. You could ruin somebody's career and they wouldn't even know it. If you really had it in for somebody, it would really be hard for him or her because we were not accountable to anybody except ourselves. We were okay, but I'm sure that somewhere, if you got somebody that you didn't like, you could really do them damage.

So, I was pretty careful about writing stuff, unless it was really an obvious thing of some kind. We'd look in the wastepaper baskets and find when they typed classified things and they had thrown the carbons in the wastepaper basket. That's a no-no. You are supposed to take those things and destroy them. I never did find any great subversives in Alaska. I found a lot of ineffectual people who didn't like being up where it was fifty below zero. Then you'd go out on maneuvers, and you would get people from the South who would be sent up in Alaska where they didn't want to go out. I don't blame them. They'd go out to camp and it would be fifty below zero. They would yell epitaphs about the Army and what a lousy outfit it was. The guys would call us up and say, "You've got some subversives down here." They were ineffective, but they really weren't subversives. But it did show me that things like what occurred during the McCarthy era could be easily abused. I could have put anything I wanted in anybody's file if I didn't like them. As I say, they would never know about it. It could have hampered their career. These were career people, so I was pretty careful about that.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think some people did that?

Mr. Brouillet: I don't know if anybody did, but I could see how it could easily be done. Somebody could be really gung-ho writing all this stuff up. Maybe it was serious, leaving the carbon paper in the basket, but I don't think we were going to win the war by reporting this stuff.

Ms. Boswell: What about your politics at that time? Were you still a Democrat? Were you for Eisenhower or Stevenson?

Mr. Brouillet: I was a Stevenson man. I liked old Adlai. I admired him because of his intellectual capacity, in addition to his politics. I've always admired people who have been in public life that have some kind of capacity other than just getting elected. But I didn't tell anybody in the Army, of course. I knew better than that, you know. When I got out then, I was one of those people. I think that comes from my family. My father was a Democrat. He was a son of the Depression. Roosevelt came through and did a lot of things, and he thought he was the greatest guy that ever lived. I'm sure he was very representative of a lot of working people.

Ms. Boswell: But you kept pretty straight party line throughout the time?

Mr. Brouillet: My father voted straight party line. I never did, but he voted straight party line. They took it off the ballot in this state when the GOP came in.

Ms. Boswell: But not you? Where did you deviate? What kinds of issues might have caught your attention?

Mr. Brouillet: I think I deviated a lot. I liked Stevenson, for example. If somebody I thought was of questionable character or integrity, I wouldn't vote for him just because he was a Democrat. Both parties have those kinds of problems. I voted for Dan Evans several times. I thought he was a good governor and was trying to do the right thing. I didn't agree with all his policies. I might not have agreed with his economic policies in some cases, but I agreed with his education policies. And I thought he was a good leader. Some officials are better leaders than others. I must admit, those were exceptions rather than the rule.

Chapter 3

Teaching and the Washington Education Association

Ms. Boswell: Tell me then, after you left the military, what did you do? Did you come back to Puyallup?

Mr. Brouillet: I went to Puyallup and started teaching. I had a couple of job offers, but I ended up in Puyallup.

Ms. Boswell: Did you know that when you left the Army, teaching was what you were going to do?

Mr. Brouillet: I was going to go back to teaching. I wasn't quite sure it would be in Puyallup. In those days, Puyallup made a real effort to hire local people. I was going to go to Sumner to teach and Puyallup found out about that and had a stroke. So I went to Puyallup to teach.

Puyallup is a very big city now, the tenth largest school district in the state. It's a big district now. It's all around Puyallup, up on the hill. They used to make a real effort to hire local people. They were pretty successful.

Ms. Boswell: What was the process like at that time? You just wrote and said, "I'm interested in teaching," or was there an application process?

Mr. Brouillet: I wrote to the Puyallup superintendent and said I had this deal from Sumner, but I'm not sure, and he wrote back, saying he wanted me to teach there. Small town, everybody knew everybody. The superintendent had been there when my father was going to school. So I was not an unknown quality. And so I started teaching there.

Ms. Boswell: What did you teach?

Mr. Brouillet: In those days, the old Puyallup High School, where it's at now, was a junior-senior high. I taught junior high social studies. And right across on the other side of the building was a senior high. Now they've got several junior highs and two high schools. I started teaching social studies and I ended up teaching English one year because I was a literature minor.

I started in junior high and I ended up partly in senior high, too. You just had to walk across the building. One teacher had a nervous breakdown, so I taught his history class for a couple of months and then he came back. I went back where I was originally assigned.

And I was assistant football, basketball, and track coach. For all that, I made $4,500. You got about $150 for each coaching job. I said to myself, "You know, we lived in Puyallup where I first went to school. If I could ever make $10,000 and have summers off and all, this would be the greatest job in the world!

I had a house. I was making $4,500 a year, and I paid $4,500 for this little two-bedroom house. About three and one-half percent on the GI loan. I thought this is really good. Then I bought a car. I had a great job, with an enjoyable place to work and the kids were good and I enjoyed it.

Ms. Boswell: Now, tell me about your personal life at that point. Were you married yet?

Mr. Brouillet: I had just got married. I got married during my first year of teaching. Three

years later we had our first boy.

Teachers didn't drink in Puyallup, we didn't smoke. If you wanted to drink beer, you didn't buy it in Puyallup, you went to Tacoma to buy it.

Ms. Boswell: Just for appearances or for some other reason?

Mr. Brouillet: It was a very strict district. The superintendent had been there for twenty-five years. He was very tight on this kind of stuff. I wanted to get ahead, so I didn't raise hell. I remember going out in the yard and my wife was drinking a coke. She had it in a glass. I told her that you had to leave that in the bottle if you go out in the yard.

Of course, it changed while I was there, but at one time—they didn't ask me this—but someone reported that, earlier, they asked you, if you were hired, "Will you go to church every Sunday?" Preferably the Methodist Church. Those kinds of things. Nobody ever asked me that. They didn't hire many Catholics there. You had to really be good to be a Catholic before they'd hire you. All these things went on in these little towns, which I thought was kind of usual. Doesn't make any difference what your religion is now, or whether you're a Muslim. I think they'd frown on you being a downtown drunk.

But I also believed it was very important to be a role model. I have always felt that education was the most important thing we do. And a lot of young people need role models, so if you're the football coach you shouldn't be going down to the liquor store and buying liquor and walking out with it. I didn't want the kids to drink. So, if I wanted to buy a bottle of gin or something, I'd be in Tacoma. I thought that was important. I don't drink very much anyway. Maybe just one for a holiday or something. But I thought it was very important to be that role model and an example. To me, it was as important as teaching.

I have always expected, which most people subscribe to these days, that teachers and people who deal with young people have a higher role and a more important role than somebody who works down at the foundry. And that you've got to expect that. And if you want to do all this kind of thing, go out and booze it up on Saturday night, then you shouldn't be teaching. That's not very widely accepted these days. We say that they've got the same rights as everybody else. I don't believe that personally. But that's the way it is. Try to force a dress code in this place. I'd go through school to see how people are dressed. I can understand why kids don't dress very well. Again, I think role models are very important and that we shouldn't do those kinds of things, but we complain about why kids do certain things, and part of it is because of what they see in society. These kids with the deviant behaviors, whatever they are, find themselves on their own a lot of time. They get these ideas from somebody else.

Well, that's very old-fashioned, and it doesn't get you very far these days because you can't even have a dress code here. I wear a tie almost every day. I feel like I was born with one. But that just happens to be the way I came to be. Some people wear the strangest outfits. Up here they're wearing their jogging clothes. I just take a dim view of that.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think it's purely the era, or did you have certain role models that were an influence on you becoming the way you are?

Mr. Brouillet: Sure. I think my parents were role models. Even though we were poor. Well, here's one example: They wouldn't buy us any Levi's or overalls, because they said they weren't the right kind of clothes, and in those days the only people who wore Levi's and overalls were really very poor people. Nowadays, everybody is wearing them. In

those days if you couldn't afford things, you'd go down to the Salvation Army or someplace and buy a pair of overalls. My parents were very proud, even though they weren't very rich. It was very important to us that we had clean clothes. I suspect part of my growing up was pride in the family and part of it is the culture. Now, most people around here aren't wearing ties on the faculty.

Ms. Boswell: What about educational role models? Were there some in education that you really look back on and say this is the kind of person I want to model myself after?

Mr. Brouillet: I think the coaches were more of a role model than the teachers. I had a coach, Carl Sparks. The field is named after him. He was the football and basketball coach. But he and my father were probably my two role models. He was fairly strict. You had to do this and you had to do that. No goofing off, work hard, no drinking or smoking. You had those kinds of things.

Ms. Boswell: What else made him stick out so much in your mind?

Mr. Brouillet: He was a good, nice, kind person, but he was also a good coach. He always expected the best of you. He didn't beat on you. He stood for the attributes that I thought were important. He treated you fairly and expected you to do the right thing. He was also the person who was there when I was there, so I didn't have other folks to look up to at Puyallup High School.

He was a very influential person. He bestowed us with all this kind of stuff. People like that have a strong influence on your life. I spent three years with him.

Ms. Boswell: How did it feel when you became a teacher and a coach, yourself? Was it different than you expected?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, a little bit. I tried to be like these people, they are good role models. I think role models are even more important today than they were then, because we had a lot of role models. We had families and everything else. A lot of young people, particularly minorities, don't have the kind of role models that you try to emulate and so forth. You have to have some kind of goals, some kind of desires. If all your role models are drug pushers, who have all the money or prestige in your area, that's one thing. If your role model is somebody who's been successful in something else, athletics or business or something, that is a real role model. And the role models we see on TV aren't all that good. All the movie stars are having troubles. Those are the kinds of things we read about. So I always tried to be like the people I admired.

Ms. Boswell: How would you characterize your classroom style?

Mr. Brouillet: Firm, but fair. I tried to be fair to everybody. When you're teaching, you start off trying to be firm, pretty firm, with the class. As you go along and everybody understands you loosen up a little bit. You can't start that way, so you try to lean on the class pretty hard about discipline, doing the work and everything, but you get along. I don't mean about the work, but you can be a little looser and allow a little more freedom in the class. For class control, when you've got thirty five-people in the class, you've got to establish the limits and the rules and everybody's got to live by those rules. You don't pound on them or anything. But that's why I start out firm with the class. It's always easier to loosen up on a class than to tighten up.

When this fellow teacher had his nervous breakdown, the kids were throwing chalk at him and everything else. They sent me over to the high school, and I go to this class of juniors and seniors in high school. And so they

said, "Well ha-a-a-a! How long are you going to be around?" I said, "I'm going to be around after you guys are all gone." They weren't behaving very well so everyday I'd throw somebody out of class. "You didn't put up your hand, you're talking, get out of here. Go down to the principal's office. I'll see you tomorrow, maybe." So pretty soon we established who was in charge. They weren't stupid, they learned pretty quick, and then they started doing things, the lessons, and all those kind of good things. But they knew they were in there for a job and they were going to do the job or else they were not going to be in there. In those days you could throw kids out of class. You didn't have to have a hearing with the parents. If they'd go home and tell the parents that they were thrown out of class, they were in serious trouble at home. Parents wouldn't have come up and beat on me the way they do now for removing their student from class.

And so, now six weeks later, the guy came back to the class—mistake number one—you should never put him back in. Anyway, he comes back and so they sent me back to my class. The class wrote a petition; they all signed it to have me come back. "Thank you, thank you." But they should have never brought the guy back. I guess he was phased out that year and he was through. I leaned on them hard. I wasn't malicious or anything, but I established what was going on in this class and who was in charge. They appreciated that and it wasn't a problem. So that was one of my experiences when I was in Puyallup.

Ms. Boswell: Was there a firm curriculum that you had to follow?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, it depends on the class. Like in American government, I'd try to do a lot of things, not only the book stuff, but also a lot of more practical things. For example, I organized a whole junior class into a political convention one year. Had everybody on committees: Rules committee, a platform committee, and the Democrats and Republicans. The Washington State Attorney General came down one time to speak to them. All these things I had going on. So I tried to give them something a little more practical as well as what you get in the book. Those worked out well. Those were pretty successful experiences about having these kind of other experiences. Like having a political convention, or a legislature, with writing some bills and trying to do those kinds of things. That was not in the book, of course. We had a syllabus we were supposed to follow. They didn't really beat on you too hard to follow it. I'd cover what was in there. I tried to do it in a different sort of way.

Ms. Boswell: What was your favorite thing to teach? Was coaching your favorite?

Mr. Brouillet: No. I liked teaching better than coaching, although I enjoyed coaching. I liked, I think, American government the best. By this time I was also in the Legislature. I only taught one full year. The second year I ran for the Legislature, so I was gone part of the year. I was able to give them some stuff on the political process. I also liked Washington state history. Freshmen had to take Washington history. And I gave them half Washington state history and half Washington government.

Ms. Boswell: What were the relationships like between teachers? Was the faculty fairly cohesive?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, yes. It was a small district in those days. Plus the fact that I had the situation where I'd had a number of these teachers teach me. So it was kind of interesting. I had a teacher, Mrs. Case. I never called her Didia. All these people I had before, I didn't feel good calling them by their first

names. Like Hilda Screen was an English teacher who I'd had in English. She was tough, but a good teacher. She taught college placement. But I'd never call her Hilda. I called her Miss Screen. All these people I had when I attended high school, I just couldn't bring myself to call them by their first names. It was an interesting situation because I'd had a goodly number of them who were still there.

Ms. Boswell: Was it exciting or was it disconcerting to come back to the place you'd been?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh no, no, I enjoyed that. They treated the teachers pretty good. I mean the administration wasn't really anti-teacher.

In those days, you had to belong to the Washington Education Association to be a teacher or administrator. It wasn't required by the state, but the superintendent of Puyallup required it. In those days the WEA was pretty well dominated by administrators, and so he wanted his plaque every year for being one-hundred percent in membership. Therefore, he insisted that you belong to the WEA, and we all joined and paid our money. Nowadays, the administrators wouldn't require you to join; in fact, they'd probably want you not to.

It was still a small town, but it was a nice place to teach and they were good to the teachers. Of course, teaching was a lot different then. It was hard to be antiadministration in those days.

Ms. Boswell: Why was that?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, we accepted things that people wouldn't accept today. If somebody said, "Well, that's the way it is," you'd say, "Well, I guess that's the way it is." Nowadays, you might have a grievance filed against you. People are filing grievances around here on different things, you know. In those days we wouldn't have thought of doing that. That would have been unprofessional, to file a grievance.

And the WEA was not really a union, then. It was an educational organization basically dominated by administrators, but it had a curriculum thrust. They didn't bargain or negotiate. You got your contract and you signed it. The superintendents in the area probably got together and decided what they were going to pay and that's what they gave us. So we didn't have much recourse. Although we had continuing-contact law, there wasn't any recourse. If you didn't like what was going on, you were kind of stuck. You could go up and talk to somebody and say, "Well I think I've been treated unfairly," and he or she might fix you up, or they might not. But, I mean, there was no organization to talk to if you didn't like what was going on.

Ms. Boswell: Were there any major issues in your early years? Major problems?

Mr. Brouillet: No. Later on people got more militant. And they got unions and all this, but there wasn't much then. People groused a lot. "The damned administration, they've done it to us again." But that was about the end of it.

See, now you're having a lot of dual families teaching. I think when you have two people teaching you're probably less militant than when you've got one. You don't want to rock the boat, things are going along well, you're making pretty good money, you're both working. I think that's made a little bit of difference. It's not a militant single male, which was the case when I taught.

Like everything else, high schools were males, junior highs were kind of mixed, and grade schools were all females. But now it's all mixed up. In high school, you don't have a lot of female teachers. Elementary still has some. Of course, as the district gets bigger, the people become more disconnected. Now there are almost a thousand teachers in

Puyallup. There were probably two hundred when I was there. Two hundred is still a lot of people. Four grade schools, one junior high and one high school.

Ms. Boswell: I am particularly interested in hearing about the Washington Education Association. How did you become involved in that?

Mr. Brouillet: When I was teaching in Puyallup, I was president of the unit there and the teachers' association, where, ironically, my son is now president-elect. In those days, everybody was involved in it. Puyallup had been at one-hundred percent for I don't know how many years. It was understood that when you got a job there, you joined.

In fact, one of the stories about it is that the superintendent was Paul Hanawalt, who was my father's high-school principal. Anyway, he was superintendent there for twenty years or so. A couple of people left or got drafted, and he paid their dues so Puyallup could be one hundred percent. When I first started teaching, the WEA was everybody— there was no principals' association and no superintendents' association. In fact, the administrators dominated the education association. It was not like it is now. It was much different. The administrators were heavily involved in it and so we all joined it.

Ms. Boswell: What was its major role then, if everybody was involved?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, not negotiations and those kinds of things. They did studies and curriculum things, and I guess it was more like you would think of a research organization— workshops, studies. English teachers would get together and so forth. They did lobby with the Legislature. In fact, Pearl Wanamaker, who was a previous state superintendent, was heavily involved with them. Pearl Wanamaker was also president of the National Education Association. All these organizations were heavily influenced and dominated by administrators.

After the war, the Great War in 1946, the people all came back, but still, things were starting to change. During my regime, for example, they threw the administrators out of the WEA.

When I got involved in the WEA, I was already in the Legislature. They were still more of an educational organization then and not a union. There were still administrators in it and so forth. We started to see the cracks in the structure. I got involved with them and I had been active at the local level. I don't know, somehow I got involved in running for president. The problem is, I was in the Legislature and I couldn't campaign.

Ms. Boswell: It sounds like a major conflict of interest.

Mr. Brouillet: Some people alleged that, that it was a conflict of interest to be president of the union and a legislator.

Ms. Boswell: How did you argue against that?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, the old argument of a part-time Legislature. There were labor people, and there were members of the American Medical Association, and there were members of the bar association, and members of the teachers' organization.

Ms. Boswell: But not presidents of those organizations?

Mr. Brouillet: There must have been past presidents. So my friends prevailed upon me, and actually, it wasn't a hard race. I didn't campaign. In fact, as the legislative session adjourned, I hopped in my car and went to the statewide meeting. They adjourned late at

night, so I hopped in the car that night and drove to the Tri-City area where they were having the meeting, had the election, and won. One thing, I had a lot of publicity and teachers were now starting to feel their oats, so that was not a major problem to get elected. And I had people helping me who did all the work.

Ms. Boswell: Back when you were a teacher in the 1950s, before you actually went in the Legislature, were you active at that time?

Mr. Brouillet: I was president of the Puyallup Education Association. I started teaching in Puyallup. It was about 1957 or 1958.

Ms. Boswell: So it was right at the same time you were going into the Legislature?

Mr. Brouillet: I was president in my spare time and evenings, and whatever. You went to meetings, nothing on school time, no release time then. In fact, when I was president, I didn't have any release time. I was a regular classroom teacher. So if I did something, I did it on the weekends or in the evenings. Now the presidents all get release time and they pay them a salary commensurate with the superintendents of the state of Washington. They get a car, expense accounts, and that's why they never return to the classroom.

In those days, a man named Joe Chandler had been executive secretary of the Washington Education Association for a long, long time. He and I knew each other. Of course, the staff didn't want us hanging around and getting in the way. Staff didn't want the elected people, because they wanted to run it, and they did run it. Actually, I did have a lot of meetings and PTA (Parent Teacher Association) conventions or something, but I had to do it all on my own time. I would have had to take the time off to do that, vacation or leave without pay. So in a lot of ways it was more ceremonial, and you were a figurehead more than anything. The board of directors met once every three months on a weekend. So you weren't really heavily involved in WEA politics in a sense, because the staff ran it.

Ms. Boswell: Was that just the way Washington State was, or was it pretty much that way nationwide?

Mr. Brouillet: I would imagine it was pretty much that way nationwide. Superintendents and principals are still members of the organization of which I was president. In fact, I appointed some of them to committees because I wanted to involve them. Administrators would never get elected to anything so the only way to involve them was to appoint them. And then shortly after that—after I left the office—the WEA moved over to where you couldn't be an administrator, so administrators left the organization. In the old days they might not have been very effective. There wasn't any bargaining, but they were much more effective politically in some ways.

Ms. Boswell: At lobbying?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, because everybody was there. You could get the superintendent to come down and talk about the bill, or a principal or the teachers or whatever. And they were not looked upon as a union. The union was there then, but they were kind of nonexistent as far as legislators were concerned.

In fact, even today, there are no local K-12 units represented by the AFT (American Federation of Teachers), the teachers' union. They are basically in the community colleges. The Washington Federation of Teachers represents Pierce College. I would say that they had roughly about half the community colleges. I don't have the real count, but they have a heavy visibility in the community

college level. At one time there were some in K-12 units in Seattle and some in Tacoma. Of course, what's happened is the WEA has moved over and usurped many of the things that they used to do. You know, they write salary schedules and negotiate. Well, the WEA is doing all that now. So now the elected WEA officials run the organization. They have an executive secretary. I know there is tension now and then because elected officials want to run it, and I think there is no question that the power of the staff has been greatly diminished. You don't read about the executive secretary ever doing anything. You can't even tell me who it is. Everybody knew who Joe Chandler was in those days, and so forth, and you read about Carla Nuxel and Carol Gregory and these people, when they were presidents. They were appearing in all the media.

Ms. Boswell: When you were a teacher then, was there some attempt at organizing the teachers' union at that time within Puyallup schools?

Mr. Brouillet: No. They were only in Tacoma, only in Pierce County and Tacoma, and there were some in Seattle. Teachers used to be teachers, by nature, not union oriented. They looked at unions as something that the carpenters did or something that the auto workers did, but not people in education. There were more women in education too, at that point, but not among administrators particularly. In fact, there were very few women administrators. But they did not look upon the teachers as being the union type. They didn't want to be on a picket line, and they still don't like it. They looked upon themselves as a professional organization, like a bar association, for example. You never see a bar association on strike or the doctors, although there are exceptions on these things now once in awhile. But, generally speaking, a lot of teachers were second incomes. So it has been a gradual evolution, and when you split and you get in an adversarial position, then they had a different view of the world.

Ms. Boswell: I am confused a little bit. So when you were at Puyallup and the president of the local, you said it was administrator dominated. Was it unusual for a teacher to be president?

Mr. Brouillet: Most of the presidents were teachers. That would be a step toward administration. A lot of them would go there and would move on to become a principal or something similar. Now when you are president, you are probably not going to go into administration, although you might.

Chapter 4

Legislative Service

Ms. Boswell: Instead of moving into administration, you moved into the Legislature. So how did that evolution take place?

Mr. Brouillet: When I went into the Legislature, I had to make a decision what I wanted to do. If you want to make an impact, you better decide what you are going to be involved in. So I decided early on that I knew a lot about education, and the area of appropriations, which is the key to education and everything else. So, I would spend my time being an expert in these. At least on the Democratic side, I was the resident expert on education and appropriations.

I introduced a lot of education bills. I suspect if you talked to somebody else they would tell you that I did not represent the administrators very well and that I was more prone to favor the teachers. For example, I introduced the collective-bargaining bill. It was inevitable, and I'm not sure how much it's done for education, but it was inevitable. Communication lines become garbled, so I introduced that for the WEA and it passed. I think that for a long time I had, from an administrator's viewpoint, to live that down. During the campaign trip for SPI (Superintendent of Public Instruction), that would come up. I also introduced sick-leave bills and buy-back bills for teachers. I did introduce other bills, too, but I think I was viewed as a strong partisan of the teachers.

Although, my relationships with everybody else were pretty good. I am not a hard-liner in any respect. I wasn't beating anybody up on it and so forth. I think, personality-wise, I was able to move along pretty well with both parties.

Ms. Boswell: When you campaigned for the Legislature the first time, was the WEA a strong supporter?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, I have always had strong support from them. They endorsed me. The local people were very supportive. You deal with blocks of people in elections, really. They were an important block. They voted and they talked to people. Everybody has friends or a daughter or a son or someone that's a teacher. That is not unusual. That would help for sure.

Ms. Boswell: But you didn't make any sort of promises that you were going to be the representative of the teachers when you were in Legislature?

Mr. Brouillet: No. I talked about it as one of the issues. At that point in time Puyallup was more agriculture, so I was on the Agriculture Committee talking about farms, and they were interested in roads. So that was just one of many things. You can talk about education, but you don't have to talk about teachers and superintendents when you talk about education. Everybody does. Everybody is going to be helped by education. But the definition of that is a little different. Depends on who you are talking to.

Ms. Boswell: So, in that first election to the Legislature, was it a tight race?

Mr. Brouillet: The fellow who had been the legislator decided he was going to run for

county commissioner, so there was an opening. I had to cut short our honeymoon. I had just gotten married and we came back to campaign.

Ms. Boswell: How did that go over?

Mr. Brouillet: All right. Margé was very understanding. There were five people running. I think I had about 3,000 votes. Somebody had 2,000, somebody else had 1,000. It was not a big district at that time. But it was door-to-door. In those days, nobody was going door-to-door much. We started out and spent the whole summer going around knocking on doors in the district. Of course, I knew a lot of people. My family had been there for a long time. My father graduated from Puyallup High School, had lived in the community, and had been an athletic hero. I had lived there and coached there and was pretty successful at athletics, too. So you know, all things being equal, that's how you get elected. If there are a lot of people running and nobody knows anybody, it has nothing to do with intelligence or ability, really. It is just who are they going to go out and vote for, and I was a local boy. They liked me, and I had done well in school and everything else, so I got elected.

Ms. Boswell: Would you credit your victory to that door-to-door, personal kind of campaign? Is that key?

Mr. Brouillet: Probably three things. One would be the door-to-door. Some people I still didn't know helped. There were some in Puyallup, South Prairie, Sumner, Buckley, Carbonado, Wilkeson, a lot of little towns at that time. We must have spent some astronomical sum like $4,000 or $5,000 on the campaign. See, we didn't have any computer lists, didn't have any walking lists and didn't have any mailing lists. Things were, of course, quite a bit cheaper. It was very difficult to spend money. There were no TV ads you could buy. There was a paper in Buckley, Sumner, Puyallup, and Orting. You could get a pretty good-sized ad in that for fifty dollars, a little bit in the *Tacoma News Tribune*.

So, three things: one, was door-to-door. It hadn't been done a lot. The second was family. They had been in the area and a lot of people knew our family. The third would have been help from organizations like the teachers and the Grange; I was a member of the Grange. So I think you put all this together. But it wasn't a landslide.

Ms. Boswell: Had you been preparing? I mean, you were really active. Had you been laying the groundwork for this for awhile?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, not really. I had always been interested and been active in organizations.

Ms. Boswell: The Grange—for what reason would you have been involved in the Grange?

Mr. Brouillet: For election purposes. But that was after I got elected, or right about that time. Timing is so important, but it is something over which you have no control. Things break right and you couldn't get elected. If I were in a state like New Mexico, where you can only run one term for governor, I'd have been governor of the state. Time would have come around; I would have had my chance. But of all the people I knew, Evans was elected three terms, or Langlie ran three terms, and Rosellini was in there. But, not that I want to be governor particularly, but timing is the key.

You'll be in the right place at the right time. Patty Murray is a tremendous example of that. She was at the right place; the timing was right, the gender thing was right and Brock Adams got blown out of the race. There

seemed to be a tide at that time. A lot of other times, she would not have gotten elected to the U.S. Senate. But everything worked out for her. She was willing to take a risk and do it. But the timing is the key.

You don't have a lot of control. I've known a lot of people who'd have been good governors, would have been good at that, but were never right. People say: I want to be this. Unless you are a Kennedy or a multimillionaire and you can really do it, I think it's very difficult. You got to kind of go with the flow and be ready when the time comes to try have things organized—not organized, but thought through a little bit.

Ms. Boswell: When did that first seed start growing in your own mind? When did you know this is a direction you might want to pursue?

Mr. Brouillet: When I got out of school and got a job, I thought this would be interesting someday. Here is what happened. A man named Elmer Hyppa, a legislator from Buckley, decided in the early part of the summer that he was going to run for the state Legislature. Meanwhile, I am thinking someday I would like to do the same thing. But, all the seats that I could probably slip into are filled up around here. So, I got married and went off on a honeymoon. Well in June, Elmer Hyppa decides he is going to run for county commissioner instead of the legislature. So there you are. The spot's available and you're available, but a lot of it was good fortune.

For example, when Dixy Lee Ray got elected, that was a timing thing, it just happened. Spellman was very vulnerable. Dan Evans beat Albert Rosellini first term, and he was a long shot. It happened that Albert Rosellini was in trouble election-wise, and John O'Connell, who was the prosecuting attorney in Pierce County, probably would have beat Dan Evans, but couldn't get the nomination. Rosellini sews up the nomination, and then gets beat. Well, a lot of people could see he is going to be in trouble, but what do you do if a guy wants to go and he's standing there? So, for Evans, it was a fortuitous time. The time was just right. I don't believe he could have beaten John O'Connell, however. But he was willing to take the risks and he was in the right place at the right time and charged ahead. The result was quite a distinguished career.

Ms. Boswell: So, timing is key?

Mr. Brouillet: Timing is the key, and you don't have a lot of control sometimes over the timing. It's got to break right. I can think of examples all over the place where things have broken right for people and they have gotten elected. I used the example of Patty Murray. I think that's the best contemporary example I could think of right off. Nine times out of ten, or ninety-nine times out of a hundred, she would have never been elected to the U.S. Senate. If Brock Adams had not been in trouble, she never would have been elected. She wouldn't have beaten him. Even though there was a gender tide out there, I still don't think she could beat him. If he hadn't gotten all that bad publicity, he could have stayed there probably as long as he wanted. But he self-destructed and she was there, got started early, and got some things going for her. So more power to her.

Ms. Boswell: Well, what about issues, though?

Mr. Brouillet: People aren't issue-oriented. Ten percent are issue-oriented and five percent already have their mind made up. I mean we all go through that and you do that. I think I got elected, when I first got elected, on personality and family and those kinds of

things. I don't think anybody knew where I was on issues. I talked about them, got these brochures about farm-to-market roads, getting your produce—whatever you raised—out to the market. We had to have a good road system, and you know we talked about education. Everybody wants to do that. Oh, what else did we talk about? Oh, soldiers' homes. We had a soldiers' home in Orting. So we talked about veterans and building up those homes, and they're all still there. State employees were important. We had a lot of state employees who lived in Pierce County. So that was an issue.

I am always a firm believer that people do not vote on issues. Sure, there are people who vote for single issues, such as anti-abortion advocates. Near the end of when I was running, people said, "What do you stand on?" I'd say, "Here's where I stand." They'd say, "Poof, that's it." I'd say, "You mean I can be right ninety-nine times and if I'm wrong on this, you're not going to support me?" They'd say, "Yeah." That was not a problem in the early days. You didn't have the single issue of the fundamentalists fighting about prayer in school, or abortion, or these kinds of things, but you have to get elected first. I think people get a view of you and they support you, because they think you are trying to do the job, you're honest, have a good family, or whatever it is. They get an impression and they vote for you.

I've got to go back to Dan Evans. If they were issue oriented, he was for an income tax and got it twice on the ballot, which got defeated terribly, and he was against capital punishment. That got knocked in the head pretty badly, too. So if they were voting on issues, he was wrong on most of the major issues from both a public relations and the general public's viewpoint.

And I was against capital punishment. I'm probably more conservative now as I get older, but I've always been for an income tax. I would tell people, "Yeah, if I go to Olympia, I'm going to do everything I can to get an income tax and make it fair." I talked about fairness and equity and all that. People think that might be a nutty idea now, but they kept voting for me, and I used to win by big margins.

In fact, the guy I ran with was a lawyer. He won one election by nine votes. He was there when I got there. He must have been there two years longer than I. Won one election by nine votes, one by six votes because people had a negative impression of him. In fact, in those days, there would be two people running, or you'd run and the two highest would get elected. You didn't run for positions. And everybody always said, "I'm going to vote for you, but I'm going to vote for Republicans. I'm not going to vote for him." So I'd be running way up and he'd be running poorly. People had an impression, had a view of how you operate or whatever. It obviously was not a favorable impression, or he wouldn't have had all that trouble.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think it was more of a personal issue or was it the way the press portrayed him?

Mr. Brouillet: Personal. We had almost the same voting record.

Ms. Boswell: So, it was just the way he came across?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes. He was a lawyer and drove a big car, and everybody thought he had some kind of deals going. It was a small town. So things like that were important. Of course, the Republicans always campaigned against him because they thought he was the weakest. He got beat up more, even though our voting records were very similar. On some issues they were, but they didn't make a distinction. One time, somebody from the University of

Washington did a survey of the legislators and how they voted. One of the comments they made was, "Here's representative Brouillet, from a rural area, and he votes like he's from Seattle."

Ms. Boswell: How did you like that characterization?

Mr. Brouillet: I thought it would hurt me back home, but nobody read it. The author of the survey didn't have the media and the press available to get those kinds of things out. Now everybody's so aware of what's going on, somebody prints a word anyplace, why, they pick it up. The communications on elections have just exploded. Nobody thought things like that would happen. That's all I needed, was somebody to say that I live in Puyallup and vote like I'm living in the city of Seattle. I voted for civil rights and all these things.

Now, one of the Sumner papers started printing our voting records, printing all the bills. After awhile nobody read that, because they didn't understand what they read anyway. Now they don't do that, print just the voting record. Instead, they pick, and vote on certain issues. Civil rights are voted on, gays in state government, or whatever it is. They pick it out and pinpoint it. In those days they didn't do those kinds of things. I was able to be fairly liberal in a fairly conservative district. But again, people thought that I was trying to help them out. Not that I voted against things from the district or not, but I thought there were bigger issues. What went on in Puyallup didn't really matter from the statewide viewpoint. But people in Puyallup, they didn't care about the overall state.

Politicians now get a bad image. If people had a bad perception, you have a problem. President Clinton is running with that problem. He stumbled on a few things, and they've got him nailed. I saw a poll today, and at this point in history, he's the lowest-rated president ever. Even Truman ran ahead of him. And people abused Truman fiercely for firing MacArthur and doing those kinds of things. But Clinton's approval rate is lowest since they've been taking polls. People respond to these things. People knew how Eisenhower was doing, he was a hero, and they liked heroes. They liked Reagan, too. They voted for him—probably ruined the country financially.

So if they are voting on issues, going back to what we were saying, anybody who looks at the issues is looking at the national debt and all those kind of things. They should have drawn and quartered Reagan long ago, because he just ran up a tremendous debt—if you look at the facts and figures when he was governor of California and then when he got to be president. I've seen statistics of how many times the national debt multiplied while he was president. He was trying to have a military and everything else, and spend all the money.

But people, most of them don't look at issues. He probably could have run for reelection, and could have got elected. Which goes back to the issue, that we like to think—those of us in public life—that people are issue-oriented. We talk about issues, but other than the single-issue people, the public gets a view of you, and they think either you are doing the job or not doing the job. That is an oversimplification, but it's true.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think that your understanding of that helped when you got elected? Was your campaign influenced at all by that fact?

Mr. Brouillet: No.

Ms. Boswell: Did you have a campaign manager or somebody who was mentoring you through the process?

Mr. Brouillet: No, now they have a lot of these things: campaign managers and aides and people helping you. Then you just kind of got out and, basically, your family and your friends did it. Then, when you arrive in the swing of the Legislature, you find out that things really work like that every place in the world. So tactics a little; I came from a small town and I was not used to these wheelers and dealers, and I had to figure that out and not get caught up in it. You have to be very careful and not get caught up in some of the things that go on in business and government or something else.

Ms. Boswell: Project yourself back to 1957 for a minute. Your first days in the Legislature. What was it like to be a first-term legislator?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, first of all, it was only sixty days and then we didn't meet again for two years. Of course, we ran up a thirty-million dollar deficit, which was a pretty good-size debt at that time. Rosellini didn't want to call anybody back into special session, but he ran up a huge debt. A thirty-million dollar debt was a big deal in those days. It was kind of heady and I knew a lot of government theory, but I didn't understand really how the process worked in those kinds of things. There are all kinds of sharp operators, and my view of the world was that most people were trying to do the job. Some were more qualified and sharper at it than others, you know. But I really didn't know what was going on. I had a learning process, and you wanted to get on interim committees. In those days, you couldn't get on an interim committee or be chairman of some committee unless you had been there two or three terms. So I just kind of flowed along with the group. I went to the caucus meetings and went out to dinner now and then with a lobbyist or something. It was a real learning experience.

Ms. Boswell: Did they have any kind of orientation for freshman legislators?

Mr. Brouillet: We had a day where they told you a few things, like where to find the toilets. I really don't know. There was really no orientation, because in those days you were expected to be seen and not heard an awful lot. It's that way in Congress, too. You didn't make many speeches, hardly any, and you didn't get your name on very many bills. You might have gotten the committee you wanted to, or you might not have. And so it was a much more formal structure. You got to be a chairman of a committee after you had been there awhile.

Now, everybody is into all kinds of things. All those old rules are gone. One thing about the old rules was that you knew where everything stood. You could figure it out. Nowadays you go into an organization, the state Legislature, you have got to deal with about four or five different caucuses within the same caucus. It is a little more difficult to get things done because it is hard to make compromises. You have the city people over here, and you have the farm people over here, and the minority people over here, and the women over here, and you have the freshmen legislators now organized; it just goes on and on. And so to be a Speaker, a leader, it is a little more difficult.

I just kind of came in and sat down and said, "Yeah, I'll do that, okay," until I figured out what was going on. But today I believe it would be much more difficult to be a leader. I think there is more fragmentation. Well there's more fragmentation in our society, a little more fragmentation in the government too, and they ought to be able to pull things together. If we were able to pull something together and make a decision, you would probably get it passed. Now, you have people jumping—even some of your quasi-leaders are jumping all over the place. So it is more difficult. But I guess I

would say that there was a more structured situation in that there were more, at least—not written—rules, to follow than there are now. And that's both good and bad.

Ms. Boswell: How did you learn about those rules? I mean, if there were so many unwritten rules, how do you find out about them?

Mr. Brouillet: We had a group a people, a group of freshmen Democrats, and we used to meet every night to read the bills. So everybody got assigned a couple bills to read and we'd meet, because we wanted to be sure that people in power were not leading us down the primrose path. There was a man named John Goldmark in the group. And there was Mike McCormack who became a congressman. There were some very capable people. So we'd meet every night and read all the bills. We never found anything. That was kind of our way, I guess, of revolting a little bit. We never did much, but we felt we were at least trying to protect the people and those kinds of things.

There was about six legislators or so. As I said Goldmark was in there, McCormack was in there, a guy named Bill Kline, who passed away—he was a prosecutor one time down in Clark county, and I was there, and I'm trying to think who the other ones were.

Ms. Boswell: Who was the spearhead of it?

Mr. Brouillet: I think John Goldmark was the spearhead. Yeah, he later got defeated because his wife had been a communist. There is a good book about Goldmark.

Well, she got caught up with the McCarthy deal and they identified her as a member of the communist cell in Washington D.C. John Goldmark was the grandson to Judge Brandeis, the United States Supreme Court Justice. He came out here and settled up in the Okanogan and people said, "Why would someone come from Washington D.C. and New York and settle in the Okanogan? It is part of the 'great conspiracy.' They're planting these people around." Things like that were flying around. He finally got beat over there, but it's a conservative place. He flew an airplane in and out of his ranch up there. He was quite an interesting fellow.

Ms. Boswell: How did you find his politics?

Mr. Brouillet: These were all fairly liberal people, you know, because the old guard tends to be a little more conservative. Even Democrats had become more conservative. Younger, more aggressive, more liberal people tended to be more suspicious of them. I suppose when you are young like that, you do not think much of compromise. If it's health care, you have to get it done for everybody. On the other side, you compromise with the doctors, the hospitals, who some viewed as the "bad guys." That would be kind of the view of the world, and so you were much more susceptible to change. Leaders have to be much more cautious about it since they have to massage lots of people in the caucus or the Legislature.

They were in a public and private power fight too. In that point in time, John O'Brien was involved.

Ms. Boswell: Now, the year you first started, was it John O'Brien's first year as Speaker of the House?

Mr. Brouillet: No, I think he had been the Speaker the year before, too. He was Speaker several times.

Ms. Boswell: What was he like as leader?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, John is a very traditional person. I mean, you would wear your coat and tie on the floor, that sort of thing. He believed

very much in dignity, on which I don't disagree with him. You go down there now, you see someone voting on a machine. They are voting for about six people. He wouldn't allow that. You had to be on the floor and vote. John was conservative, but he was always fair with me, and I never had any problems with him.

We had to recognize that he was conservative. He was heavy with the Archdiocese of Seattle. You recognized that. He's an old Irish Catholic. But he also understood that for a Democratic program, you would go with it even if he didn't like it. Well, say an income tax—John would be there even though it might not sell well at home. If that was the position that the party and the governor wanted, he would be there.

From that viewpoint, you didn't have to go around and try to sell him every time. If you do it and you talk to him once, that was it. With these people, the old-timers, their word was their bond, and you were more oriented supposedly to the party that you ran with. Nowadays, you have to talk to people three or four times; they keep switching. But he was fair, and always a man of principle.

When I was in the Legislature, some of my friends said, "Well, Brouillet's going to run for superintendent of schools." That was about my second term. And John said, "So, we've got to get him to be chairman of the Education Committee." That was all right. I didn't mind that and so I got to be chairman of the Education Committee. It was useful as a springboard for something, since you are not going to be in the Legislature forever. In that respect he had been helpful to me, and that was part of the program.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me more about the process about committee assignments. At that time it was important to get on good committees, that's a given.

Mr. Brouillet: Right. Well, there was a lot of manipulations. When we were there, John got elected speaker, and then he didn't care who was on the committees, because he got what he wanted. Some of us tried to organize and get some friends on the Committee on Committees. We would try to organize people and get them set, get them elected to the committee that they wanted. The Committee on Committees picked standing committee chairmen and they gave them to the caucus.

This was a five or seven member group. Supposedly somebody from eastern Washington, somebody from western Washington, somebody from a rural area or maybe labor or something, trying to balance up. They would pick the various committee chairpersons. We knew that John O'Brien was going to be Speaker, so we said, "Well, what is going to happen next?" So we tried to organize to get certain people on the committees.

Committees are where you get your friends. Because even inside these little organizations, there would be these little cliques. There would be the Pierce County people, or there would be the education people, or there would be the farm types. The groups were more liberal once we tried to pack the committees. We were pretty successful. You know, we didn't get everybody. That made it easier for you to get your friends on committees. Committees are where the work gets done, the Speaker is mainly a figurehead, but bills you move through and what you get through. So we tried to achieve some success. That was our only alternative.

Ms. Boswell: But when you are brand new, just walking in, and you are from Puyallup, a fairly small district, how do you maneuver?

Mr. Brouillet: It takes you awhile. You don't do that the first time. You have got to figure out what's going on, who's who, and what's what, and who you want to put your trust in

and who you do not. I think, philosophically, you try to identify with people who are more like you. You say, "Well, this person has the same beliefs, about taxes or about government, public assistance, whatever it is, highways." You try to identify those people. I suppose you do some bonding with these people over periods of time, but not intentionally. But you are trying to pick their brain a little bit about the issues, of which you don't know anything. I think you kind of gravitate to like-minded people. I did—I don't know if everybody does. Some people just come in and float around for fifteen years. They just want to be a legislator or they just want to be something else. You know they don't really participate in a lot in things.

Ms. Boswell: Yes, but whom did you look toward in particular to give you that feedback and information? Who were people that you would go to, or look towards, to fill you in on information and that philosophically had similar ideas?

Mr. Brouillet: John Goldmark, who eventually became chairman of the Appropriations Committee, people like that. You try to follow their lead. But then eventually, you develop a certain amount of expertise. Anyway, I found out that it wasn't the big issues that got you in trouble anyway. You know you could vote for a $10 billion appropriation for something, and then you might get mixed up in a trivial issue and get tied down for days.

One big issue was the cows at Western State Mental Hospital. That tied us up for two days. They wanted to move a herd of cows. The Department of Corrections, I guess it was, wanted to consolidate the herd up in the northern part of the state. Out of a sixty-day session we spent at least two days fighting over whether they were going to move the cows from Western State to Monroe or someplace else.

Or you vote for something inadvertently, some amendment, and you don't realize what it is. Those give you more trouble, because the big issues are heavily debated and discussed. Some little thing comes along about doing something. You get hung up later on something like that, and you didn't even know you voted for it, or you might vote for something that you really don't care about, but because some friend wants you to do it. You get things done, and one place that people have trouble, particularly liberals have trouble, is that they want you to vote for their bills, but they don't want to vote for yours.

One of the classic examples I had in the Legislature was income taxes. We tried to get a graduated income tax for years, but couldn't get it. Governor Dan Evans came along and proposed a flat-rate income tax, and he didn't have enough votes to put it on the ballot. So I got involved in helping him get Democratic votes for this. My attitude was, "We've been for an income tax for years." Others said, just because Evans thought it up, it was just no good. Well, that was almost heresy for the Democrats, because I was chairman of the caucus at this point. But my view was, I knew we couldn't get a graduated income tax. You take what you can get and try to make it as progressive as possible by exemptions.

Well, I was able to organize it with the kind of pro-school, more liberal-type Democrats to vote for this so we could put it on the ballot. I took a lot of abuse for that, but I thought it was a better tax structure than we currently had. I would have rather gone one step further and done something else. So I helped Evans a couple times to get the votes to put it on the ballot. We were good friends with the governor, but some of my more conservative Democrats were upset with that. You know of course, years later they said, "That was probably the right vote but we didn't want to do it." I said, "That is the way

it goes, folks."

But my whole attitude was: "We're for an income tax, folks and this is our best chance to get it. It is not the kind we want, but it is halfway or two-thirds of the way there. Let's take and get that." It failed on the ballot. It failed twice, in fact. That happened later when I was in the Legislature and I was able to organize a rump group. As I say, it probably didn't do me a lot of good at that time. Later on, it probably did me a lot more good because the issue was right. Even the Democrats realized that. The Republicans appreciated it, so from a governmental viewpoint, it probably made me more effective in the long run. But that wasn't why I did it.

So, you learn after you've been around. That is why these term limitations are so scary. By the time you learn what's going on, you are through. It is so complicated. You cannot learn it in a session or two. The third session you are ready to go, and you're through. You'd get through the third session in the House and you'd be out. So, it means that staffs are going to run the Legislature and the big backers of those initiatives, term limits, are mad at staffers anyway. But what they are going to do is create stronger, more powerful staff. The continuity will be done through the staff, not through the legislators, because they are going to be gone. By the time they figure out what is going on, they are gone. So I thought that was a paradox.

Ms. Boswell: Going back to the 1957 session, though. You had a sixty-day session and then didn't meet again for two more years?

Mr. Brouillet: And go through another election before the next session. Well, it hasn't happened since then. That was very unusual. Pretty much after that there were special sessions. The governor had to call them. The only constitutional requirement was for a sixty-day session every two years, but the governors usually called a special session in the other years.

Ms. Boswell: Rosellini was governor when you came in?

Mr. Brouillet: Actually, when I first got elected, Langlie was governor. He was on his way out though. Rosellini got elected in 1956, also.

Ms. Boswell: How was that, starting out with a new governor?

Mr. Brouillet: Again, I was there for sixty days and I didn't know a lot. I didn't get on any interim committees, I was junior member on the Agriculture Committee. So I wasn't much of a player in the process in my first term. Things were much more traditional and organized and you didn't get to become a chairman right away. It was kind of a familiarization process.

The present series of interim committees and studies is all new. In the old days, there was a Legislative Budget Committee and a Legislative Council and there was the Transportation Committee, and that was it. The Budget Committee did the budget, while the Legislative Council did everything else. If you had a study you wanted to do on nursing care costs, they did it. If you had a study you wanted to do on education, they did it.

What we were able to do later was create an Interim Committee on Education. It expired after I left. I was a big pusher of it. We were able to create a House/Senate Interim Committee on Education of five members from the House and five members from the Senate depending on the party's solution. But when I first started, there were only three committees and they were all senior people. So you got people like me that didn't have a chance.

Ms. Boswell: When you finished your sixty

days in the Legislature, would you go back and teach?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, I'd go back home. I had a few community meetings and things like that, but basically, as I said, you couldn't get a lot done. Now, you'd be on every kind of committee holding weekends in the Legislature. You didn't have any of those things. There were no legislative weekends, there were no committees. Once in awhile there would be something—I wouldn't say there would never be anything—but there would be a few, and that was it.

Ms. Boswell: Did you live in Olympia during session?

Mr. Brouillet: The first two sessions I lived in Olympia, and after that I decided not to do that. I drove back and forth to Puyallup.

Ms. Boswell: Why did you make that decision?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, I had a family and I wanted to see them. At least I could see them in the mornings. I could get up; we had one son when I started. I have seen a lot of careers flounder on politics. Husbands are gone or wives are gone. But I had a family, and it was important to maintain the family ties, plus maintain ties with the community. People called me up at night and "bitch" about this or that or the other thing, which is fine. There wasn't all that much going on.

I didn't notice at the time, but a lot of marriages flounder on politics. I had a lot of chances to get in trouble in those days, too. A lot of parties. There was no public disclosure and there was a Committee Room X where lobbyists wined and dined you. I saw a lot of people and their families get in trouble, so I decided that there is no sense in tempting fates. So I drove back and forth to my family. Even when I became Superintendent, I drove back and forth—I drove back and forth from Olympia for thirty-two years.

But it was not bad. Going from Pierce County to Olympia is not like going from Pierce County to Seattle. The traffic is normally pretty good. It is a lot worse now than it used to be, but it was a quiet time. It was a forty-minute drive, we'll say, and it wasn't bad. But I commuted mainly for family and personal reasons. I didn't want to be around the night life and be involved in social things. So, if I had to make any socialization with my fellow members, I would have to do it during the day. I won't say that I never stayed there. I was also interested in my reputation. Your reputation can get badly bruised.

Ms. Boswell: Your reputation at home or here in Olympia?

Mr. Brouillet: My personal reputation. As I see it, you are already suspect anyway. I found it easier to leave and there were no problems. However, it goes back to your image. You project a certain image. Maybe you are not as sociable, though. But in the long haul it serves you well. I am not sure of the short haul, because you are making all these deals and I didn't get involved in that. In a sense, I was not involved. It wasn't that people that were involved were making nefarious deals either. So I just think, you know, that everybody has got to do his or her own thing. I just decided it was better for me and for my family and everything to drive back and forth. Even when I was in Olympia, and I stayed there for the first couple years, I didn't go out in the evenings to the parties and so forth. I stayed away from those.

Ms. Boswell: You were reading those bills by the hour.

Mr. Brouillet: I was reading those bills, finding out who was doing us in. I didn't go

to parties.

Ms. Boswell: In Rosellini's first session in 1957 and 1959, I was reading his speeches, where the governor gives his address to the Legislature and tells what he plans to do. How much of a leader is the governor really in terms of getting some of these plans accomplished?

Mr. Brouillet: If he's from the major party, it makes a difference. I think the governor can set the tone pretty well. I think the governors have been pretty forceful. Look at old Mike Lowry. He's got probably too many ideas, but he has got a lot of ideas out there and he is trying to do this, that, and the other thing. I think the governor can pretty much set the tone. He has always got that line-item veto, a very powerful thing. The president is trying to get the item veto, but he can't get it.

In early days they took words out of sentences. I remember a coalition took over when Evans was the majority leader. It was in 1963. Five Democrats jumped to the Republicans. It was the coalition which later made Evans governor. They jumped over and passed a bill about a Legislative Council to do some investigation. And Governor Rosellini took words and money right out of the appropriations. Now the courts have ruled that you have to take out a whole paragraph or a whole section. He took out, like $25,000. So with a veto, the governor can be a big player, like Mike Lowry has been a big player when he got involved in a couple of these things. He's up there in the Speaker's office; they are calling members in and the Governor is buttonholing them and everything else. So it depends on how active you want to be.

Ms. Boswell: What about Rosellini? How would you characterize him?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, I didn't have much contact. The leaders were doing most of the meeting. He was not anywhere near as active. But he had certain things that he wanted done. I remember he vetoed that pay raise for everybody. He vetoed his own pay raise. Then he came down to the Legislature to talk them into overriding his veto.

Ms. Boswell: He had to do some arm twisting?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, everybody thought, "Gee, why should we do this? He vetoed it, let him live with it." But they overrode it. I thought it was kind of silly.

Later on, he called us down to his office. We were having trouble balancing the budget and he ran on about kindergartens. Actually, he is one of the guys that started kindergartens. They had been going for several years. He did a lot on mental health and mental institutions. I'll give him credit for that. The Governor said, "Take out kindergarten and save a lot of money. That's one way to balance the budget." Of course, he'd run on that program, but he wasn't going to take it out. I said, "Tell you what, Governor, we'll send it down and if you don't like it, you can take it out."

But I'd say this for him, and I know I've said a couple things, but he was a good governor in a lot of respects. He got a bad rap in some cases. He tried to get an income tax pushed through, for example, but he did a lot for mental institutions. He got them all accredited, he got kindergartens in, and he did some other things. Again, it goes back to image. He was Italian and people were always kidding him about being Italian, being in the Mafia and all that. He had no ties with those people that I knew of, but people had that impression of him.

So when Dan Evans comes here, young, clean-shaven, and all this kind of stuff, and talking about getting rid of the old politicians and creating "the new order." He didn't call it "the new order," he meant doing things, becoming more active and working on

schools. He was able to project an image and they elected him on that image. How many times did we elect Governor Evans? Four times. He was the longest serving governor we ever had. Evans was one term longer than either Langlie or Rosellini. But, anyway, Evans had an image and people found that interesting. Governor Rosellini was very political. You had to be political to get elected.

On the other hand Dixy Lee Ray was not very political. She was an aberration of the system. She got Spellman at a bad time and swept in there and got elected, and then got knocked out the next time around in the primary.

Ms. Boswell: How can you say she wasn't political? I'm interested. What do you mean by that?

Mr. Brouillet: She was certainly political. But she wasn't political in the sense that she was out to destroy someone or work closely with one group or the other. She wanted to make Attorneys General be appointed. I honestly can't remember the specifics of the debate. I said to her one time, "You know we might be able to get this, but it's very controversial." I said, "You ought not to be pushing it so hard. Get some legislators to put the bill in and push it." She said, "This is right, I've got to do it."

Like I told her, she pushed so hard it became a focal issue, and it was going nowhere. All the attorneys general who were still alive were against it, appointing attorneys general. Not the attorney general himself, but the assistant attorneys general. It was not a big issue, but it got blown up to a big issue.

She was very adamant, and still is very adamant, about environmental things. She got up there on the bridge of a supertanker and was helping pilot it down through Puget Sound, when the majority of the people were against it. She was a lady of strong convictions. Normally, you can have strong convictions, but to be an elected public official, like a governor or president, you have to modify things once in awhile. You can't come out and hit everybody right in the eye.

I remember one time we started a gifted program in the schools for kids in the state and we couldn't get much support out of her. She wouldn't recommend much appropriation for it. They came out beating up on me all the time. They said, "We're going to take care of this. We're going to go to the governor and get some money." I said, "Fine, go to the governor and get some money." So she makes an appointment, takes them in the office, sits them down, and then beats them all up! She is screaming about how it's not a state obligation to fund gifted programs. Well, normally you would not do that. You might say, "Well gee, this is a good program, but we don't have any money now." Or you might send some subordinate in to say that. But she sat right down and kind of kicked them right in the eye. They came back and said, "Gee."

I said, "Well, you kind of understand the problem I've got here now." That was not a very astute way to handle the problem, I thought. You can be against things, but politically, you try not to make everybody mad when you're doing it. You try to slide off a little bit. That was kind of Dixy; she was very straightforward. You always knew where you stood with her. She was a very smart lady, very smart lady in a one-on-one conversation. She'd as soon hit you in the eye as not. I just want to say that she was not very, maybe "political" is a bad term to use, but not very smooth. And she'd probably say, "Well, that's what people want to hear. They want to hear the truth." Well, people don't really want to hear the truth that hard.

Like everybody says, we have to do something about the national deficit and the budget. Well, you either cut or raise taxes. Nobody wants to cut and nobody wants to raise taxes. Here's poor old Clinton caught in

the middle. The public means that, but they don't want to pay for it. "Get tough on crime," they say. We're passing bills all the time on crime, but you try to site a jail or try to get money for a jail, and it's almost impossible. So people think they want to hear solutions, but they don't want to act. Now, I'm not talking about those people who understand that you've got to do this, but the mass majority are sometimes uncompromising on these issues. They want these things, they want state parks and all this stuff, but they don't want to pay more taxes for it. Anyway, that's a little digression.

Ms. Boswell: No. I would agree. In terms of sponsoring legislation, how does the process work? I notice that in your first term, for example, you were a cosponsor on maybe four or five different bills. How does that process work?

Mr. Brouillet: First term is different. You've got to depend upon senior people getting you on a bill. If somebody gets a bill that's a fairly popular bill, they say, "Well, we've got to get Brouillet on here. We gotta put somebody on here to give them a little free publicity."

Ms. Boswell: Then, is it really just sort of a "patting your back" type of thing?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes. As you go along, pretty soon, after you've been in a few terms as chairman of the committee, the Education Committee, for example, well, they'd figure they'd have to have the chairman's name on it to make it move. So then I got all these bills. Then I'd decide which ones to sponsor, and I'd go around and get people to sign up for the bill. I'd say, "Well, here's a good bill. They're going to love you back in Bellingham with this bill. Get on this bill. Non-controversial and it makes everybody happy." Then you'd get a hot bill like collective bargaining, and I'd say, "Now look, you may not want to be on this bill." But somebody would, so you'd tell him or her what it was. You change from when people are trying to help you along, particularly of the same party, until you get to where you're kind of picking and choosing different bills and helping other people. And that, of course, cuts across party lines. If it's a bill that you really want, then you need to get some strong Republicans on it.

In those days lobbyists helped you a lot. The lobbyists, let's say for the WEA, had a bill for sick-leave buy out or some important bill. They'd go get the Republicans. They'd say, "Well, I talked to John Smith and he's willing to sign on. Is that okay with you?" I'd say, "Sure, that's okay." In fact, they may even carry the bill around for you.

Ms. Boswell: Oh, really?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, yes. When I was first elected, I didn't have an office and I didn't have a secretary. I had my desk on the House floor and if I wanted to get something done, I'd get there a couple of hours early and I'd get all these letters in front of me, and I'd call up the steno pool. They'd send a steno down and I'd say, "Well, here's a bill. Here's all these letters on, say, drinking on Sunday." I had an answer kind of jotted down, and I'd dictate to her and say, "Well, here's ten letters. Send them to these people, will you?"

We didn't have any staff. I never had an administrative assistant, ever. When I became chairman of Education, I got a secretary and an office. The committee room was my office. Now everybody's got an office. I look at the lady that represents the district where I live now, and she's got an office in downtown Puyallup and somebody working in there. She's got an office in Olympia and somebody working in there. They've got secretaries and aides. When I got the Joint Committee on

Education, we had a staff. I got a staff over in the office, too, so I used them. We had a lot more things going on and I was also campaigning for Superintendent on the side, looking ahead.

Ms. Boswell: Oh, but you weren't using those people to help you campaign, were you?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, never! They didn't do campaigns in the sense that they do now. They've got a whole staff that's campaign-oriented. All they do is campaigns. They didn't do any of that stuff, but they were helpful in making sure that if we had a meeting the press knew about it, but they never campaigned. Although they might take time off on the weekend and come out and knock on doors with me.

Now, they've got all these monstrous staffs, they've got kind of got caught up in it now. In the caucus, they've got James Smith, who is responsible for districts 25, 26, 27 and 28. They've got all this kind of thing going on.

Just to contrast it, I was making five dollars a day when I started. No office, no nothing. I got one trip to Olympia and back, at the start of session and the end of session, from Puyallup to Olympia. I'd drive back and forth on my own money, which was fine. I got five dollars a day when we were in session. Then it went to $100 a month a little later, and later still, we got so much per diem—ten dollars a day or some number. Then it went to $300. It was $300 when I left.

Ms. Boswell: So, you clearly didn't do it for the money?

Mr. Brouillet: No, I lost money when I was a legislator because I took 180th out for every teaching day I was gone. I deducted my salary at the Legislature because I wanted to make sure I wasn't on anybody's payroll. So I said, "I want to take out 180th for every day I'm not in the classroom." I'd lose money. I wouldn't lose a lot of money, because with per diem and driving back and forth, I came out okay.

I lost some money, but that was because I drove back and forth. I didn't rent a house and gas was fairly cheap, so it was cheaper driving back and forth than living there. I wanted to make sure that there was no question that I was not working for the school district. Now, since then legislators that are teachers, that have been teachers, have worked different kind of deals.

Ms. Boswell: Did you just set up a deal with the school district? How did it work?

Mr. Brouillet: For every day I was out of the classroom, teaching day five days a week, they'd take 180th off my pay for every day of my salary, so it would be a third of my salary. I was making $4,500 so I was getting $3,000, but I was getting a little money from the Legislature. I wasn't hurting, but I wasn't making any money.

Ms. Boswell: How did they fill your place in the school?

Mr. Brouillet: They hired a substitute for about half that. They made money when I left for the Legislature. I thought for the appearance of fairness, even though you weren't going to vote any different, you ought to be off the salary completely. So they filled in with a substitute. I made all the lesson plans out. In fact, I saw one of the substitutes about ten years later and he said, "I was teaching U.S. history and Washington State history, and these were really good lesson plans and I'm still using them."

Ms. Boswell: Didn't it make it hard to shift gears, though, and go back to school after you'd been in the Legislature for two or three months?

Mr. Brouillet: It got worse later, because you got more involved with things when you had a committee and you had things going on in between. It wasn't so bad in the beginning. I wasn't really much of a participant the first session or so anyway. I was just kind of there until I got to be chairman of the committee. Then you got involved and people wanted to talk to you. If you're a lowly legislator, not on any committees or on an interim committee, you have very low seniority and nobody is really interested in talking to you much.

Ms. Boswell: During those earliest sessions, what did you see as the key issues? What do you remember as being the big issues of that time?

Mr. Brouillet: At that time institutions were a big issue in the state, because a lot of our institutions had lost accreditation. Taxes were a little bit of a problem; we were still working on the income tax. Kindergartens and education were important. I can't really remember, without going back and looking.

Ms. Boswell: I was wondering about two things. One is an initiative, I think it was called Initiative 199, which was redistricting issues.

Mr. Brouillet: We've always had redistricting issues.

Ms. Boswell: It went into lawsuits.

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, yes. I haven't even touched upon them. They were always big issues. Redistricting is life or death for the politician. For example, the guy in the Senate who did all the work was Senator Bob Greive. He spent all his time working on, even between sessions, redistricting. In fact, he would never put his name on a bill that he wanted because he didn't want people retaliating against him. I'd forgotten about that. Redistricting was always a big issue. People would fight and kick and scream and eventually it ended up in court. We've been redistricted a couple of times by a geographer from the University of Washington—Morrow. He redistricted the state a couple times. They've had initiatives; they had legislative enactments. Now, of course, that's all gone. It's all taken out of their hands, figuratively speaking. I'd forgotten about that, redistricting was a big issue.

Ms. Boswell: Has that ever affected your district, in particular?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, yeah. But not a lot. At one time, I had part of Tacoma in my district, the Salishan area in east Tacoma, along the ridge. I had all that, but they took that out a while ago. But they haven't done a lot. The basic core was Puyallup and Sumner.

Now what's happened is, of course, around the fringes, up on the hill and up on Lake Tapps, big houses have been built. The district has become Republican. The core is still pretty much the same, but the growth has been all around it. These are all new people and they're building $500,000 homes, which means both spouses are working to pay for the house. They're not the traditional Democrats that we used to have, the small-city Democrat who was left over from the New Deal. So the district has changed considerably since I was there. It's become Republican. As soon as Senator Gaspard gives up in the Senate, if he does, we might lose that seat, too. He's a local boy, popular, been around long enough. He's done a good job, but I'm sure that when he decides he doesn't want to do that anymore—sometime he'll run for something else, or do something—and they'll probably lose that seat out there. So the change in that district has been all around the perimeter, not in the downtown core. The

people up on the South Hill, Manorwood, all heavy Republican precincts. Nice houses.

Ms. Boswell: The other issue, in those early years, that I wanted to ask you about was civil rights.

Mr. Brouillet: On the state level, the thing we basically got hung up on or argued over was busing in Seattle. That came along mainly when I was State Superintendent. Civil rights was not a big issue, no. It wasn't a big issue in state politics.

Ms. Boswell: It wasn't in education, either?

Mr. Brouillet: Not until we got into busing in Seattle. Then we got a couple of special programs passed. It was an attempt to pump money into urban-racial disadvantaged areas. We were to pump several million, many millions into that. Basically, it was in Seattle and a little bit in Tacoma. But it was an attempt to get some more money in, because we couldn't get extra money for them with all the central city problems. Then we got involved in busing. Then we moved it to urban-rural-racial disadvantaged. We tried to get the farmers in there for a little more political support. And that helped out, but it wasn't a big issue. You look back, I don't know how successful it's been. But it was $30 million or $40 million, and most of it went to Seattle. They've done away with busing now. They are still trying to figure out how to get more money into those low-income places because that's where the real problems are in society. It's not in Puyallup. It's in places like Seattle, Tacoma, and Chicago, and those places.

Chapter 5

Committee Work

Ms. Boswell: We were talking about that a lot of the work of the Legislature was done in the interim committees since it only met once every two years. I wanted to learn more about interim committees and how they worked, and in particular, the Interim Committee on Education. I know that's the one you were involved in. How were those interim committees set up? Who chose who would be on them?

Mr. Brouillet: In the early days—1950s, 1960s and 1970s—there weren't very many interim committees. In the entire Legislature there were three interim committees. There was the Transportation Committee, the Legislative Council and the Legislative Budget Committee.

The Transportation Committee did things about the highways. They were a standing committee and had staff during the session and between sessions. They were funded out of the highway construction money. They didn't have to fight for support like the other committees that came out of general apportionment or general appropriations did, which was to their advantage. It was quite an advantage to them, so they built up quite a staff and it was an ongoing operation. Every other year when the budget was prepared, the Legislature just dipped into the transportation money—and nobody seemed to care because it wasn't general fund money—and gave it to the committee. It was a very active and well-known committee and did a lot of things.

The Legislative Budget Committee dealt with budgetary issues. That was a very important committee because they worked on studies between sessions and anything that had to do with the budget. They were a standing committee too, so during the session they became the staff of the House and the Senate Appropriations Committees, whereas the Transportation Committee kept their own staff. So that was an ongoing thing with the budget.

Then there was the Legislative Council, which was kind of a general committee. If the Legislature wanted to do a study on kindergartens, or if they wanted to do a study on penal systems, or whatever, that would be done through the council.

The Transportation Committee on the highway budget handled matters in the interim, but in the session they became the legislative committee. The Budget Committee became the Appropriations staff. The Legislative Council, which would do a lot of these other things, would take on two or three issues a year that legislators would get concerned about, and the Legislature would pass a resolution saying they should study that subject.

I guess the one we were most interested in was the Legislative Council because they would do education studies, they'd do institutions, agriculture, whatever it was. Many of us felt that there wasn't enough action in the education field. Education is the number one expenditure of the state. So some of us agitated for more action, because two-thirds of the general fund went to education.

Ms. Boswell: How could one committee have expertise in so many areas? Would they just hire out for a particular study?

Mr. Brouillet: They didn't have a lot of expertise. They'd have to go outside. These were generally fairly conservative committees, too, because you got on there by seniority. The Speaker would appoint the House members, and the Majority Leader, through the Lieutenant Governor, would appoint the members from the Senate. And they were all "long-termers."

People like me, when I was a freshman, I went down to Olympia and did my thing and went away. Once in awhile, one of these committees would hold a hearing or something and you could go to that if you wanted. But you weren't really involved in the process. When there wasn't any special session in those times, you came back and started over again. And so there was a lack of trained personnel in some areas. Whereas the Budget Committee had trained personnel and the Highways did, but the Council did not. They had a person on the staff responsible for education, a person who didn't have a lot of expertise, nor did they do much. Some of us thought that there were a lot of things to be done that we should be doing, more agitating for some action in education.

Of course, today there are many committees out there. And I think the thing that first got it going was community colleges. There was a lot of agitation for community colleges. The law as it was written said you couldn't have a community college in any county that had a four-year school. Thus, in the major counties in the state of Washington—in King, Pierce, Spokane—you couldn't have a community college because there were already four-year institutions. And Thurston County had St. Martin's. The whole question of community colleges and how they're organized became a major issue.

On the first interim committee, we had Senator Andy Hess from King County, Burien. He really wanted to have a community college at Highline. But he couldn't have one, even though he was Senate Education Committee chairman, and had been around a number of years, both in the House and in the Senate. He was the first chairman of the interim committee. Our first activities focused strictly on community colleges, looking at where they were. We hadn't got into the argument about control of them or how to organize yet. We were just talking about starting them. That's a later interim committee activity, but at this point in time, it had a lot of support in both the House and the Senate, so the committee was organized. It was the first interim committee to look at community colleges. We flew around the state and looked at community colleges, had citizens' committees comprised of leading citizens of King, Pierce, and other major counties. The final upshot of all this was that the law was changed.

Ms. Boswell: How did you get the Legislature to agree to doing this interim committee on community colleges?

Mr. Brouillet: The first interim committee was only a temporary thing. We formed it later as a permanent committee. So it was a temporary committee, and the purpose basically was community colleges and higher education.

Ms. Boswell: What do you need to get something like that going?

Mr. Brouillet: You certainly needed the Speaker, and "the movers and shakers" in the body to do that. And, of course, the Senate always worked a little bit differently than the House. It was much more, "You do your thing, I do my thing and if you want to do it, it's okay with me." So, in the House we'd fight over everything and they still do. But if you had Andy Hess on the Senate Education Committee and he wanted to do something on community colleges, their attitude was,

"Well, that was Andy's thing and if you wanted to do it, fine. Give him a little bit of money and let him go."

Ms. Boswell: Where did the money for it come from, then?

Mr. Brouillet: There'd be an appropriation of $60,000 in the budget.

Ms. Boswell: And would the members of the Legislature that served get a salary for doing it or how did they work that? Were you paid to serve on this committee?

Mr. Brouillet: We got per diem if you went to a meeting. My first year you got five dollars a day while you were in session and five dollars a day for interim activities.

Ms. Boswell: So, at that time, then, it was a plus to serve on these committees?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, it was a plus. You were in the action and they were the decision-makers between sessions and proposing things and so forth. That was where the action was.

Ms. Boswell: How did you get on the committee at first? You must have only been in the Legislature, at least one term, maybe two.

Mr. Brouillet: I was chairman of the Education Committee my second term, so I got on the committee. Eventually, the committee had five senators and five representatives. We'd tried to get it six House members and five Senators, but they wouldn't go for that. The Highway Committee, from the Senate's viewpoint, made a big mistake with, like, eleven House members and ten Senators. An odd number, so that a House member was always chairman. So there were five and five on the committee. The majority party had three and the minority party had two.

Ms. Boswell: Because of your service on the Education Committee, is that the reason that you became chair of the interim committee?

Mr. Brouillet: Legislation was passed on the community colleges. But we still thought, some still thought, that there was more to education than creating a few community colleges. That happened to be the "buzzword" and the issue at the time. But there were a lot of other things. And so we worked with the Legislature and got a regular interim committee created.

Andy Hess had run for another office, so he was out of the Senate, and I was able to exert more influence. Obviously, if the senator is well known and been around a long time, almost by nature they would have more influence and be chairman. But we did create a temporary committee to start with, which we later made a permanent committee on education. And we hired permanent staff. A fellow I hired served as the executive of it. Eventually, when I moved to the SPI, I took the staff of the interim committee with me, so I had a built-in staff, which people always struggle with when they get elected to higher office. I just took the executive, his assistant, the secretary, and three or four people with me to the SPI.

Ms. Boswell: Who was the executive?

Mr. Brouillet: Ralph Julnes. He's at the University of Washington now. He is a lawyer, and his main activity over in the College of Education is on handicapped issues. We worked the handicapped bill in 1972. He did most of that work, and so now from a legal viewpoint, he knows more about handicapped education than probably anybody in this part of the country. It's one of those deals where you learn it all in the Legislature and move

into something else. He had a lot more feel for the interim committee and so we hired him. We had offices at the University of Washington.

Ms. Boswell: How did you swing that?

Mr. Brouillet: Ralph worked with Senator Fred Dore. Some of those old buildings, they're probably gone now, but they were like old apartments on the southwest area of the college over there along Roosevelt. We got an office there and they saw that as an advantage, having a group of legislators on the campus. We had a staff there of three or four or five people.

Ms. Boswell: Initially, it was temporary and then it became permanent?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes. We did many studies. One of the senators, Wes Uhlman, was interested in urban education because he was from Seattle. We created a bunch of subcommittees. A lot of members had subcommittees. We'd figure out what the issues were, and we dealt with such things as racial concerns, and urban issues, and Native Americans. The committee had subcommittees then.

In addition to that, we'd go to the SPI office and get somebody to staff a committee on a part-time basis as part of their job. If we wanted one on finance, we'd get somebody out of the SPI office to help us with that as a finance person. It was a good deal for them, and then we'd also bring in citizens from the community. People who were interested in education. Somebody from Spokane who was with the League of Women Voters. Somebody from Tacoma. Fred Haley was one; he was interested in urban education, so he was always on that one. We tried to get a wide range of people on them. Some school people, maybe a couple of superintendents, a couple of teachers. The idea was that you got more involvement this way and you spread your net a little farther and wider.

There was an argument was over who was going to be chairman of the Interim Education committee because every two years we had to elect a chairman.

Ms. Boswell: You began as chairman in 1961?

Mr. Brouillet: I was chairman most of the time.

Ms. Boswell: That was only your third term. How did you finagle that?

Mr. Brouillet: By now the Democrats had become the minority party in the House. The committee was made up of five Democrats and five Republicans—a standoff. So I always had to negotiate with the Republican senators. Work something out with them. Finally, though, Fred Dore became chairman. They got tired of the House members always being chairman, so they made Fred Dore chairman one time.

Ms. Boswell: Now, tell me about your role as chairman. Aside from essentially getting it rolling, tell me what you did.

Mr. Brouillet: Most of the Legislators weren't in education and they didn't have broad backgrounds, so we were able to set the agenda. We'd get a program laid out for the members each couple years. But we'd talk to people and negotiate. Some of them didn't want to touch desegregation, for example. Some of them didn't want to deal with the organization of small schools. So, we would get these committees together and set the agenda and then we'd create a group of subcommittees. They would be working off my agenda and Ralph's agenda. We'd get together and figure out what we wanted and how we could sell it to the committee.

Somebody had to set the agenda. I didn't want to go into the meeting and say, "What are we going to do?" I prefer to go into a meeting with my own agenda and then work off that.

Ms. Boswell: I know that in the interim committee that followed the 1961 Legislature, you were the chair and there were five subcommittees in that particular year. Some of the same ones you mentioned earlier. There was one on junior colleges, organizational pattern of boards and school districts, the extended school year, teacher/administrator relationships, and merit pay, and then higher education. There was a couple that seemed to get a tremendous amount of publicity in the papers at that time. One, as you can imagine, was the extended school year. Tell me a little more about that.

Mr. Brouillet: A lot of people were discussing in those days the issue of the school year being too short. The school year is based on an agrarian system, and we needed the kids to "bring in the crops" and that sort of thing, plus the fact that other countries were going longer and learning more. So there was a lot of discussion around that time about the extended school year. We added to it by appointing this committee and talking about extending the school year to 240 days and different things like that. There was a little bit of it going on in the state, but not much. It never caught on, really. Like now, it's catching on a little more now, but it's still a financial problem.

So, yes, we did that. That was a good issue in the press and they picked up on it, and on merit pay. There was a lot of agitation for merit pay for teachers. The committee never recommended it, but they did investigate it and have hearings on it. Merit pay and the extended school year had a lot of press coverage. So, at our meetings we courted the press to get some publicity on these kind of things and sent out news releases and all these kind of activities about what the committee was doing.

Ms. Boswell: Is that something that you would coordinate or did you have a press liaison on the committee itself?

Mr. Brouillet: No. The executive secretary would do most of that. On some of the important issues, TV would show up.

Ms. Boswell: What about your own stance on some of those issues? What about the notion of an extended school time or year-round school?

Mr. Brouillet: I was supportive of those things, but in a political world you figure out what's doable, too. If it wasn't going to fly, I wasn't going to break my pick on it. Most of the things that we did would be things we'd be in favor of. I wasn't too happy about getting mixed up in merit pay because I knew that was a controversial thing that was going to lose and wasn't going anyplace. But some of the people on the committee decided they wanted to explore that. We've had some fairly conservative people on the committee, as well as some liberal people, and they wanted to pursue those issues. But we believed in every issue we pursued.

The extended school year seemed to me to be the way to go. You get more out of your expenditure; you've got the building sitting around for three months a year without a lot of action, and a lot of capital tied up in that, and there was a lot of things you could do. Even if it wasn't for all the students, it was always for helping students who were below average. Maybe some students didn't need it, but some did. So if you talked about people in the city of Seattle who had some little deficiencies, it was worth the extended school year.

We'd pick out the issues and present them

to the committee and get them to approve it. They generally would go along, most of the time. If they got to be a chair of a subcommittee, they were more likely to support us. There's some perks in this for legislators, too. They were getting some publicity and their pictures were in the paper and all these kind of things. It was a win-win situation. Not only were you doing something, we hoped, for education, but you were also doing something for the people on the committee. Everybody would get a little something out of the whole thing.

Ms. Boswell: Did you find that most of the people worked fairly hard on these committees?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, yes. We'd have a weekend in which we'd have two or three committees meet. We did a lot of things on the weekends. Friday afternoon and Saturday, we'd have two or three committees scheduled.

When we were talking about Indian education, we would go over to the Nez Perce Reservation in eastern Washington. We had a couple of meetings over there at their schools. Not a lot of press up there, but you'd see what kind of schools and the problems they had. Or we'd go up to Neah Bay, or over to the Yakima Reservation. We tried to schedule meetings in places like that where the problem or the opportunity, whatever you wanted to call it, existed.

We'd meet in Seattle and talk about the handicapped or desegregation. You always got a big crowd in Seattle and the press would come out. The TV would even come out for those kinds of things.

Ms. Boswell: I know, especially the first two years it was in operation, there was some mention in the press that on the eastern side of the state, there was only one representative from the that side of the state on the committee. That person happened to be Senator John Happy.

Mr. Brouillet: A very, very conservative person, too. He's the one that wanted merit pay, which was fine. John was okay. We could negotiate with him.

Ms. Boswell: Was that a problem? Was there any discussion on that issue?

Mr. Brouillet: Not really. Not really a problem. Now we get into more committees. People would want to be on these committees, and they'd have to go deal with the Speaker and the majority leader and the Committee on Committees. We didn't have any control over that; they put John Happy on there. If they wanted more eastern Washington people, it wasn't in my control.

Everybody would tell you what committee they wanted to be on, the Highway Committee or something, and of course you'd end up with senior people getting on all the committees. The Education Committee was now in there, so they'd put down their choices and the Committee on Committees picked them. We tried to influence them and we had some influence, but it was more of an influence to get movers and shakers on the committee rather than an east/west balance. That wasn't a big concern. Of course, it wasn't a big concern to me because most of the people were from this side of the mountains. I suspect it was to some eastern Washington people.

Ms. Boswell: I noticed that initially there was one woman on the committee: Mildred Henry.

Mr. Brouillet: She was from White Salmon. Her husband was a senator. She was a House member. And the thing was, there weren't many in the Legislature at that point in time who were women. We didn't have half a dozen women House members. There was Margaret

Hurley from Spokane. She was on either the Budget Committee or the Legislative Council. She'd been around a long time. Women were in very short in supply. Senator Marc Gaspard was telling me that now the Senate Democratic Caucus is composed of half women and half men—fourteen of each. That's really a big change. There were very few women in those days. And so the idea of trying to get women on all these things, well, there just weren't enough to go around. And if there was a woman, if she didn't have some seniority, she wouldn't have got on the Budget Committee. Margaret Hurley got on it because she'd been around awhile.

When I was in the Legislature, the chairman of the Highway Committee was a lady named Julia Butler Hansen—strong lady. She was on my Education Committee, too. She ran the Highway Committee like it ought to be run.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me a little more about her.

Mr. Brouillet: A very strong lady. Julia started out in education, but Pearl Wanamaker was SPI, so she figured if Pearl was going to be heavily involved at the state level, she would move into Highways and run that thing with an iron hand. She was always chairman because the House had one more member than the Senate. Strong leader. She eventually went to Congress and became very active there, too. She has since passed away.

I remember one time I was in a committee meeting and something wasn't going right and later she said, "Come here, Brouillet. I want to talk to you. You don't run this committee right. You've got to have somebody in the committee you can point at to move the previous question and this one to second it. You can't just let this thing wander on by itself." She had somebody like Joe; she'd look at Joe and he'd make the motion. No question about who was in charge. The highway budget was separate from the regular appropriations bill.

Ms. Boswell: She was responsible for that?

Mr. Brouillet: She was responsible for that whole budget. She was chairman of the Transportation Committee in the House, and then she was chairman of the Transportation Committee in the Joint House-Senate Committee, too. I remember one time somebody got up and tried to move the transportation bill into the regular Appropriations Committee. Of course, it didn't carry. This guy was from Kettle Falls. Art Avey was his name. He had a little logging company there. So she had built right across from his place a weigh station, so he'd understand not to cross her.

In my view of the world, she was generally right. But if you were on the wrong side of her, watch out! She was lobbying for years for a cross-Sound bridge. She said, "Now, I've got to count on you Brouillet, you're going to be on this." I said, "I'm not sure," but she was going to put in a cross-Sound bridge. Came close, but it never got there. She was a fairly liberal lady, too. She came from South Bend. Her father was a logger; her husband was a logger. She was a great gal. Everybody knew who was in control. She went to Congress and made quite an impact. She was there ten or twelve years, I guess. Really outstanding.

Ms. Boswell: To be a woman there when there were that few in the Legislature, did you have to be that way? To be that hard-nosed?

Mr. Brouillet: I don't know. That was just Julia. You probably had to be pretty tough. The "womanly characteristics" wouldn't have got you very far because that was a tough business. You got that position with a certain amount of firmness—some would say ruthlessness—but firmness in running things

and you stuck with your friends. If somebody crossed you, they did at it their peril. That was the way the system ran in those days. It was based a lot more on friendships and alliances and these kinds of things than it is today. You got together and made a decision.

One of the problems with the Legislature today is that it's hard to make a decision. You go into the caucus, you've got an urban and a rural caucus. You've got women, you've got minorities, and you've got liberals in there. People break down in so many different ways and so politics has become more complicated, being a consensus and making some kind of quid pro quo and all that. You've got to deal with all these different groups.

It used to be you'd go in and deal with one group and that would be it. The people say that was much less democratic. Probably was. But you could make or arrive at a decision a lot easier. Now in some cases it's almost impossible to arrive at a decision because the political parties have disintegrated. And so whom does that leave the power with? Probably more power with lobbyists and special-interest groups and people like that.

But now in the process, that's much more important because everybody's got their own little group out there. So people get upset about gridlock and things like that. But that's the old politics which people don't like either. A few people make the decisions. And so we broadened the base and made it more democratic and made it a lot looser. So to arrive at a decision is much more difficult, because you've got to negotiate, or placate, or whatever you want to call it, so many different kinds of individuals and groups. You give up one thing for something else. You've got more input and you've got more involvement, but you've got a lot harder time arriving at a decision, good or bad.

The thing operated like that for good or bad. If you told somebody that was it, that was your word and that was important. It was a whole different kind of relationship between individuals than they have now. I look back on it with nostalgia. I didn't have to go around and talk to everybody every time. They formed an alliance with you, and if it was an education bill they'd come and ask me about it, and I'd say, "This is what it does." They'd say, "What do you think of that?" And I'd say, "Well, that's what I thought of it." If I had something on highways, I'd go ask Julia Butler Hansen. I'd say, "I don't understand this, it's pretty complicated. What's happening?" I'd say, "Okay. How does it affect the district?" And you'd make a decision.

Now you've got all these studies and you've got computers and all this information. You've got strong interest groups at all levels pounding on you. It's a different world. I'm not sure that you're making any better decisions now than you made in the past, because there's so much fragmentation. But that's the way things are now.

Ms. Boswell: If there was so much emphasis placed on people's relationships and your word, were there certain people that you knew you couldn't trust?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, sure. Pretty soon you had everybody typed. When you've been around awhile you'd figure out, "Boy, I'd better watch this guy, he's out here trying to work some kind of deal to make some money or something." Not a lot of it, but there were people like that, like in any process. So, you develop those instincts.

I think it's kind of like teaching in a school. People in the school are not for merit pay, but everybody in the school knows who's a good teacher and who's a bad teacher and who's in-between. You can go into Clover Park High School and after you've been there for awhile, you can tell who's doing a real job and who's floating around. The mass group may be in-

between. It's like that in the legislative process. It's a people-oriented thing.

You figure out who is who and what's what. If somebody gets up and makes a speech for something, a subject you don't know much about, and you don't have a lot of time—we didn't have all these computers and all this information—what you have to depend upon is the reason. So, somebody would get up and talk about institutions and what we ought to do. That would have more of a weight than it probably has today. Although I still think there's a certain amount of that going on, if certain people could speak.

Ms. Boswell: And you didn't have the staff to rely on, to supply you with information?

Mr. Brouillet: When I was chairman of the Education Committee, I had just a secretary. Later on, about ten years later, I got an aide in there. That was it. I didn't have any other staff. My first session, I didn't have any staff. I didn't have a secretary, I didn't have a desk, except on the floor. I could go to the Legislative Council. They had some limited information, but frankly, I'd go out and talk to the lobbyists on each side of an issue. I'd say, "What do you think of this bill?" They'd tell me what a bad bill it was and why, and what a good bill it was and why. I'd have to form some kind of decision if it was something I was really interested in. I'd also try to pick up information from other people.

I think people did a lot more work on their own. Now everybody's got staff, they've got aides. House members have a secretary and an aide in their office, and the caucuses all have people. So, I think people tend to be a little lazier than they used to be. Of course, there's a lot more information, so you couldn't assimilate it all yourself anyway. We used to have to find all this stuff out by ourselves. You'd talk to people. Life was a lot less complicated. There's no question that the budget has gotten a little more complicated since I started in the Legislature. There are all these issues and so forth. The Feds are mixed up in it, so I suppose you need some of this help. But I also think that it tends to—unless a person is really aggressive—it tends to make people much too dependent upon staff.

That's what's going to happen even more with term limits. The only continuity that's going to be left in the Legislature is going to be the staff. The people that passed term limits don't like the fact that some legislators hang on forever. They think they're going to make it more democratic, but where is the continuity? You need three terms in the House just to figure out what's going on and then you're forced out. And so the continuity will come through the staff and their development, which means they're going to be more powerful than they used to be, which is contrary to what the people who were touting term limitation intended.

You can't help it, because it takes awhile. I came out of education so I knew a lot of things. If I hadn't come out of education, being on the Education Committee, it would take me awhile to figure out what's going on. You don't do a lot of figuring out during legislative sessions. One of the problems is that during the legislative session you are so barraged and inundated with information, and people wanting to talk to you, citizens calling you, and everything else. You're trying to figure out what's happening and what the issues are and how to deal with them. You don't have a lot of time for introspection.

So during the interim is when the real work can get done. I don't know if they've gone too far or not, but it's important to have interim studies. It costs money, but you don't learn much during the legislative session. I mean real, in-depth information on a subject. You deal with the subject that comes up and you get the information on that subject, but it may be only one small part of it.

Talk about prison reform. Well, you can't deal with the whole subject of prison reform in a legislative session. You deal with lengthening of the terms, or "tough on crime," or "three strikes and you're out," which is one of the initiatives we've got on the ballot now. But you can't deal with the whole question of prison reform.

Now, the interim committees are not as important as they used to be because the Legislature's in session so long, it now has standing committees that continue to work on things. This was a better way than having interim committees. They'd break up and some of their stuff would never get considered because the committee members would go someplace else. Now you've got the Institutions Committee or Finance Committee doing their stuff, and it's just an extension of the interim committee. I always thought that was a better way to go anyway, rather than to have specialized, separate committees.

Ms. Boswell: When you were the chair of an interim committee, did you attend the sessions of all the subcommittees?

Mr. Brouillet: I'd try to attend most of them. I was kind of ex-officio on all the subcommittees. We'd meet on a weekend, and I'd try to attend as many as weren't overlapping or in competition. I'd try to keep up on what was going on, kind of keep things flowing evenly so they didn't get wild and carried away. Sometimes people would get these great ideas and they'd be off and running and I would try to exert some kind of control on what was going on. I worked at it pretty heavily. As a result, I became chair of all these overlapping committees. Plus I'd had an education background, and on some things I'd be the most knowledgeable person in the House of Representatives on education, or almost any subject.

I had a staff to help me. The staff was around during the session, and we'd work on bills. I used them as the staff for me and anybody else, but most people weren't that interested. They'd help the Senate Education Committee, too. I figured that it would be awfully hard to get a bill passed through the House that I didn't agree with. People figured that out right away because I had a certain amount of influence in that area and had worked at it. I got along well with people. All these things kind of rolled together, so that everybody wanted me to sponsor all their bills. If they had an education bill, they'd run up to me and want me to sponsor it. Then they'd try to figure out what Republican they wanted on it.

Ms. Boswell: So, even when the Democrats weren't in power, you still were able to have some measure of control?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes. I even got to be chairman of the interim committee when the Democrats weren't in power. I had a good relationship and I tried to be open and aboveboard. I laid it out to people and I said, "Well, you know this is a tough bill, folks. The school directors are violently opposed to it, but the teachers like it." If they wanted to be on it, I'd say, "If you vote for it, this is who's going to be happy and who is going to be upset about it. This is what the bill does. I don't want you going home and finding out later that you voted for a bill that your local school directors didn't like. You've got to know it right up front, then you make the decision."

I tried to be fairly open with them and explain it to them. With the Republicans, too. Even though I was a fairly partisan Democrat at times, I wasn't a Democrat in the sense that I would vote only Democrat. It had to be an issue. I've supported Republicans. I got in a real buzz saw supporting Dan Evans twice on income tax. They really got upset about that, the Democrats did. I said, "I thought we were

for an income tax, folks."

"That was his income tax," they'd say.

"I don't care whose income tax it is; it's the only income tax out there," I said. That's why I was able to drag off about twelve Democrats to vote for it. It made the caucus a little upset. "Hey, I campaigned on income taxes and just because Dan Evans has got it, it's the only show in town and you should be supporting it." Well, eventually a lot of them did support it next session, but they were mad that session. But I'd tell them right up front: "That's the way it is, folks." And it would generally tend to be the people supporting education or strong education supporters. There were a couple more teachers in the Legislature by now. That's life in the legislative process.

I thought it was always important to maintain your integrity and how you deal with people. I had to hold my nose a few times and vote for things because somebody had helped me out on something, and it was an important bill to them. I wouldn't vote for something that compromised my principles. I thought "Gee, that's not very good, it's kind of questionable legislation." But it's a question of getting things done that you want to get done, which people don't like sometimes, but you've got to play the game a little bit. You try to preserve your own integrity and you wouldn't do anything that was dishonest. Some bills floating around the Legislature—somebody's going to make some money—and you wouldn't get mixed up with those. You'd be against those.

It worked out well for me. My legislative time, even though in the last few terms I was in the minority, I can't complain about it. We passed things in the committee. Education tended to be more bipartisan or nonpartisan than a lot of subjects. People might break down whether they liked merit pay or something like that, but they were for things like the standard school year, they were for more involvement of parents. It was a subject that really didn't generate a lot of political animosity, so that worked out well.

Ms. Boswell: Would the interim committees actually draft bills, or would they just give the ideas to the committees to draft the bills?

Mr. Brouillet: We'd draft bills. We'd present bills. If we didn't draft them ourselves, we had the code reviser's office draft them. Ralph Julnes could draft some things, but we'd probably draft something in a rough draft and then take it to the code reviser. You'd explain to them what your ideas were and what you wanted to do. You'd give them as much guidance as you could. Yes, we drafted bills and we'd have them drafted, which we could as legislators. Then we'd get the committee to look at them. And they'd say, " We don't want to do that one, it might get introduced anyway." Then we'd put "By Interim Committee Request," and that added a little more status to the bill, just as the Legislative Council would put "By Legislative Council Request," which indicated it was kind of a bipartisan operation. The committee carried a little more weight.

Ms. Boswell: When drafting bills that you really wanted to see go through, what was the difference between a good bill and a bad bill in terms of the way it was drafted? Were there some bills where the idea was good, but they just weren't well drafted?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, but that's why we spent time figuring out what the principles were and what we wanted. You are more apt to get those bad kinds of things in a legislative session when you haven't got a lot of time. Some legislator gets an idea and goes back and has a town meeting, and somebody says, "We've got to do this. I am going back there and draft a bill and drop it in." That's when you get a

badly drafted bill. But if you go through all these hearings and talk to all these people, you generally knew what you were doing. That would be the beauty of working between sessions, whether it's on an interim committee or standing committee. I remember, I almost got beat up for introducing a bill which said you couldn't buy cigarettes until you were eighteen. I had it drafted, but then they took something out of it, and I got the heck beat out of me for the part they took out. They took out of the bill that it was okay to have cigarettes in your possession, but you couldn't buy them. It got so mixed up, and I said, "Boy, that's a bill that's going to see the deep six."

You get these ideas, you think it's a great idea without much knowledge about how it affects and influences things out there. That's when you get in trouble. But if you worked through a committee like the Education Committee, we'd pretty well research those things, because we knew where everybody was and what the pitfalls were. People would come and tell you what they were in these meetings. We'd have hearings and the citizens for this or that group would come. So you'd figure out that we shouldn't do it that way, so you'd try to work those things out in these hearings.

Ms. Boswell: What about the role of lobbyists in that time period? You were saying earlier that to a degree you needed to get information from lobbyists just to know what was going on. What role did lobbyists play with the Interim Committee on Education?

Mr. Brouillet: They had groups like the Washington Association of Retarded Children, the PTAs, the principals, and the superintendents. In a sense, they were not the big-money lobbyists. They didn't have much money, most of them. Not like the PACs they have now. Most of them were, I suppose we'd say, were "good government" lobbyists. I'm not sure that's right, but they were influential. Sure, the PTA was around the state and they could generate interest, and the superintendents had a tight organization. You dealt with them, and you'd take their point of view and listen to it, and try if you could do something without compromising anything. If they had a really serious problem, you'd try to alleviate it and solve it.

We had a collective bargaining law that passed when I was in the Legislature. I was the main sponsor and I got "beat up" a long time by the administrators on that one. They didn't want them to bargain collectively. My attitude was, "You were going to bargain some way, that it's a way of life. I'm not saying that it doesn't complicate your lives a little bit, but bargaining is here. You're going to talk to your employees and they've got a right to talk to you." To get the point, on an issue like that, you try to make it as pliable or as workable as you can for the administrators, but they didn't like the principle of negotiating. I don't know if life's better or worse since then, but it happened, and it was going to happen one way or the other.

Ms. Boswell: Now later, in campaigns, you were accused of being the representative of the teachers. Did you see yourself as that, even back then?

Mr. Brouillet: I was a teacher. I was sympathetic to the teachers. I could see where all the action was, who was doing what, and where the real problems were. They weren't in administration. There were in trying to deal with those young people in the classroom.

I got that reputation because I was president of the teachers, the Washington Education Association, in 1964 or 1965. I was just telling a reporter yesterday, "That's kind of interesting, because when I was president of the WEA, there wasn't any principals' association, there wasn't any superintendents'

association, there was just the Washington Education Association, and they represented everybody." The split came a little later and the WEA became the teacher organization. Everybody said, "You know he's president of the teachers' organization." Well, the time and the situations were different. I guess to be fair I'd have to say that I was sympathetic to the teachers. I wasn't unsympathetic to the administrators, but I always felt that the action and the help had to be at that level, rather than make life easier for the administrators. That's where the contact with the students was, I was sure.

In fact, when I got elected Superintendent of Public Instruction, I ended up with administrators' support because the other guy was so bad. They didn't have those kinds of druthers. They didn't want to support me particularly. The teachers did. They were one of the cores of my support, the workers; not so much for money, but putting up signs and going door-to-door. And labor was very important. They were very helpful. There were other groups, too. We put a coalition together of handicapped organizations and groups like that. They were supportive. Teachers, labor, but I didn't get a lot of support from business. I didn't get a lot of support from administrators. They were the least enthusiastic of the groups, I think that's fair to say. Sure, they perceived me as being more sympathetic to the teachers, and I probably was.

Ms. Boswell: I happened to see some of the campaign literature when you ran against Shirley Galloway in 1984.

Mr. Brouillet: She accused me of being a fox in the hen house, which suggested that I was in charge of schools, but really supported the teachers.

Ms. Boswell: She was accusing you of being the union leader and all kinds of things.

Mr. Brouillet: As I said, I was sympathetic, but I always looked upon most of the things I did as for education for young people. The fights that the teachers and the administrators had really weren't all that critical. In some ways it was a power struggle. Sure, I'd listen to the teachers. I'd listen to the administrators, too.

I was one of the first people in the SPI who would listen to teachers. The previous superintendent was nominated and supported by administrators, and the teachers, who didn't dislike him, they supported him too, but he was an ex-local superintendent. I was never a superintendent. That was always a knock on me, that I never was a local superintendent. That I really didn't know how to run a school district. There was a certain amount of truth in that; I never was superintendent. I went to the Legislature. I couldn't have been a superintendent while I was in the Legislature.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about the relationship between the superintendent's office and the interim committees. You mentioned that you would use some of their staff to give you information, but was it generally cordial or did you find yourself at odds with them?

Mr. Brouillet: It was cordial. Most issues got controversial once in awhile, like say collective bargaining. Ninety-five percent were supportive. They were the ones looking at the year-round schools and they were interested in doing things for the handicapped. So our relationship was good. We had two or three of their key staff people, the deputies and the assistants, on our committees so they could have a lot of input. I think it worked out well.

Ms. Boswell: It seems as though there would be the possibility that you would be operating to take away certain responsibilities that they may have wanted to keep themselves.

Mr. Brouillet: Mr. Bruno was a good superintendent. I think he did a lot of good things, but he was not political. He shunned the political process. They didn't have anybody assigned, for example, full-time to deal with the Legislature. They did it on an ad hoc basis. So it didn't become a political question because we tried to work with them to get them involved. There were a lot of things they were supportive of, too. I think there is more friction now between the Legislature, the governor's office, and the SPI than there used to be. I think they perceived us as trying to help them out, and they didn't like that political stuff anyway, and it was never a real problem.

We got into a real problem, however, on the control and organization of community colleges.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about that.

Mr. Brouillet: It became a big upheaval in the early 1960s. There was a law in the state of Washington that you couldn't have what were officially called junior colleges in any county with a four-year school. That was basically to protect the private schools. In essence, you couldn't have a community college or junior college at that time in Thurston, Pierce, King, and Spokane counties— the major population centers.

Andy Hess, state senator from the Burien-Highline area, who was very active in educational things in the Senate, wanted to have a community college in Highline, but it wasn't possible. I was chairman of the House committee and he was chairman of the Senate committee. So, we had a committee create a special interim committee, and we went around and talked to people. We flew around the state in an old DC-3 and finally came to the conclusion, which was not any surprise to anybody, that you ought to be able to have a community college in those excluded counties. The first thing that happened was the repeal of the old law.

These colleges were still part of the local school districts. Highline College was one of the first new ones created. There was one established in Highline and one in Moses Lake, two new colleges after this legislation was passed; one in the eastern and one in the western parts of the state. They were still part of the school district, but that was the first step, to eliminate the limitation on having them.

That was the first move. Andy Hess was involved with the special committee. After that he got involved in other things; he ran for another office. I was chairman of the House committee and that left me, because I had been there in charge. Then we put together, for a couple of sessions, this temporary Education Committee, until we finally created a permanent committee. One of the things that kept coming up was, that as these colleges grew, then organization became a question.

Community college people, particularly presidents, were stressed out that they had to report to the local superintendent. In many districts the deputy superintendent for finance controlled their budgets, and they perceived that they couldn't have a real college if they were the thirteenth or fourteenth grades of high school in a school district. There was a lot of disagreement between the junior college presidents, who wanted to control their own colleges, and the superintendents—they didn't want the superintendent telling them what to do. In the district it might be a superintendent and a junior college dean, and a dean for finance, and they saw themselves as being limited by this. At the same time there was a strong national movement in junior colleges and community colleges all over the country. It kind of blended together.

We got into this discussion, and it became quite an issue, and so the Legislature approved a study. They gave the superintendent of

schools, Louis Bruno, a certain number of dollars to look at this problem. He hired a consultant group, the Arthur Little Company, which is a big firm out of Boston, to come in and look at the problem. Bruno had them do a survey and see what should be done about organization. They came in and looked it over, and also looked at how it should be organized at a state level.

The consultants came to the conclusion that the colleges should be separate from the local school districts. Growth and a lot of other reasons factored into their decisions. There were a lot of reasons for it. But the consultants were looking around the country and said, "You really need to separate from the local district." Then the question was "What about the state office? Should it be part of the state office?" Still, to this day, it is in Oregon.

Well, there was some feeling, and I think I'm accurate in this, that Louis Bruno was not going to create a separate operation in the state office and have a superintendent for higher education. The feeling among the colleges was that they wanted their own board. They felt like they had better control over their own destiny. There was a feeling that if they could have their own board, they could rule more, have more control over it. So that issue came to the Legislature. They chose to separate the community colleges from the school districts.

The consultant told me one time that, if the state office would have taken a little different view of the world and allowed them more autonomy at the state level, they would have recommended that they stay in the state office, just because of coordination. We didn't need another state board. But the state office, the State Board of Education, at that time was not amenable to that, so a separate state board was created for community colleges.

I was helping the community college people at this point in time. I thought that they probably should be separated. They could have stayed with the state office, if the state office would have said, "We'll create a community college section," like they do in Oregon. But the superintendent and his deputies wouldn't do that. "By God, it's part of your regular education and you've got to run through the common school budget like everybody else." That upset everybody. Finally, the consultant went around and talked to them, to see if they weren't going to make any move or any accommodation with the community colleges. They would not and he recommended that it be separated.

I helped to get the bill out, much to the disappointment and opposition of the state office. I always thought they could have kept that thing in with the state office as Oregon did, if they would have played a little different. But they weren't willing to make the compromises, so they lost the whole thing. I was part of the process, but as I was in the minority. A Republican lady named Marge Lynch was chairman of the Education Committee and introduced the community college separation bill.

Ms. Boswell: How closely did the interim committee, which was so involved with this, work with the state for the education or with the state superintendent in particular?

Mr. Brouillet: We were generally in favor of separation, mainly because the other higher-education institutions were supporting separation. They weren't actually involved in it, but they were supporting it. They couldn't get the state office to make a move, and I personally thought that they should stay with the state office, but they weren't willing to do something before it was a done deal.

There was a lot of pressure on people at this time. Some were saying there was a movement around the country and there was pressure on it that this isn't really a K-12 operation. We want these things to be colleges. A lot of the presidents in charge of them

wanted them to be colleges, even if they were glorified technical schools. So there was a lot of pressure to do this and the only people supporting the State Board of Education were the local superintendents. The story went that the Board hired the consultant and they lost control of the study. I don't think that it makes any difference if the state board thinks its okay, if the community college board is okay. In fact, there is some reason to say that there ought to be more coordination and fewer state boards but, hey, that didn't sell to anybody.

Ms. Boswell: At one time there was talk about starting, in the early 1960s, as many as twelve community colleges, pretty much bang, bang, bang. There seemed to be some resistance to that idea. Was the notion that we really needed to catch up with the community colleges once we got started?

Mr. Brouillet: It was so quick, and everybody likes them. It is an institution; it is an instant college. It was not as big a deal as building a university. In addition, there was strong feeling about not only the academic aspect of the two-year schools, but there also for vocational training and retraining. Actually, there wasn't a lot of retraining in those days, but vocational training became a big issue. The colleges got tied with the labor organizations and with the business organizations, with the manufacturers, general contractors and all these people. There were a lot of ties and they were popular institutions. In addition, they were not expensive.

Nowadays, there are twenty-seven community colleges and five technical colleges. From just half a dozen to thirty-two, and they are still continuing to grow. I think that we are pretty well saturated in the state now, but what you will find happening now is, like in Pierce, where you have a large district and you have a new campus developing. The new campus is where the majority of the people live now. Down the road there will be some agitation to have that as a separate district. All those Puyallup people on the board will eventually say, "We want our own college. We don't want Pierce at Fort Steilacoom." There will be a problem up in Skagit County. They are developing a satellite, so there is going to be some of that. But I would guess that they're fairly stable now, except for some population shifts in the next several years. There won't be a lot more. But you're right, there were just a few of them and all of a sudden there were a lot of them.

Ms. Boswell: Did the administrators, or other people involved in four-year institutions, have any problem with that growth?

Mr. Brouillet: The only problem that they had was that they could see the allocation of resources down the road. I don't think that they had any trouble with growth itself, but I think that some of the more perceptive ones might say, "You could see that, hey, that's $300 million that is going to come out of the budget." But they were generally pretty supportive.

Ms. Boswell: Then they didn't see them as rivals for students?

Mr. Brouillet: No. First of all, the community colleges did a lot of things that they didn't want to do. Now they can get rid of a lot of remediation classes and focus on what they wanted to do. English as a Second Language—ESL, and all that stuff is in the community colleges. At the University of Washington the grade point is over 3.5 to get in. They could be more in line with what they perceived was their mission.

I found myself allied with the Republicans who were all for this, so that helped a lot. But I found myself supporting something contrary to the mainstream in K-12 education. The

superintendents who had these community colleges were upset. Most of the superintendents didn't care, but they still came out against it. I can't remember where the teachers stood. But here I was helping these people. I was on the other side of the issue from some of my old friends, but it was going to pass.

As a result of that, the community colleges have been able to expand and grow more than they would have if they'd been tied to the high schools. They would probably be gone now, or at least they'd be a separate operation. You could have separated them locally, put a section in the state office to deal with community colleges, and had the same state board. They could have dealt with it, but you would have had to cut them away locally. Well, they weren't willing to make that compromise and so the whole thing got taken away from them. I think it was a good move.

Ms. Boswell: Now, with your experience at Pierce College, you can look at it from the perspective of the junior colleges, too.

Mr. Brouillet: I think the only thing you lack a little bit, as a result of the cut away from the SPI, is the lack of some coordination between high schools and community colleges. There are a lot of things going on in high schools that need to be coordinated with community colleges and higher education. I think that would have been valuable.

But overall, it had to go this way, because it's either this or nothing. When you get caught up in politics, if something is going to happen and you're against it, you better figure out if it's fairly popular, and what you need to do, because the status quo may not survive. So you need to figure out what the issues are, and how you can compromise them and maintain at least half the pie, or whatever it is. In this case, the K-12 people weren't willing to do that, so they lost the whole thing.

Ms. Boswell: Was that primarily a matter for the state superintendent, or was this a broader bureaucracy who made this decision?

Mr. Brouillet: I think the state superintendent dealt mainly with the local superintendents on this issue, and that was not a broad enough base. I would guess that if the local superintendents had said, "Yeah, cut them away and do this," the state office would have probably gone along with them. It was a combination of those groups, and a lot of the other education groups from all over the place. I don't think teachers had a strong feeling about it, because they could organize them either way. The superintendents did and the state office did and that was kind of the operation. That's what led to what happened. It didn't take much to figure out that it was going to happen. It was going to happen, and then what do you do to save part of it? The art of compromise.

Ms. Boswell: When you made those compromises, sometimes you alienated some people with whom generally you were allied. What makes the "cutting edge?" Were those people permanently alienated, or could you get them back?

Mr. Brouillet: Most people allow you a transgression here or there. If they think you're doing other things right, you can, once in awhile, do something that your traditional support groups don't like.

If they understand the legislative process, the people who work in Olympia or Washington D.C. will understand it. The people back home might understand as well. They understand that the world runs a little differently and that sometimes a person, because of their district or whatever reason, they can't always do what these groups want. The ones that live a long time and are around

to lobby, or support groups understand this. At least their leaders do. They know that you're going to be with them most of the time, and you're for the main things that they're for, so they've got to allow some kind of slippage or transgression now and then. If they understand this, then they will take care of the people in the support group at home. They won't come out and say, "Brouillet's a complete loss, he did this bad thing." They'll say, "Well, he voted for us ninety percent of the time and that's pretty good." So those people have a certain responsibility, whether it's business or labor people. You say you support the business community on these things. Then all of a sudden, you vote for some labor thing, like personal leave or family leave. They say, "Well, he did vote for that, but he's with us most of the time. He just happened to think that's an important bill, and he needed to be involved in that," and that sort of thing.

Ms. Boswell: What about with appropriations or taxes? One of the things that prompted that question was the notion that, today with all the tax issues and the debate over revenue, that there have to be hard decisions made. As a legislator, am I going to vote for taxes, and is that going to end my career if I do? Or is Mike Lowry not going to be governor for another four years because he was in there cutting programs and raising taxes? Is that the issue that people can't forget, or do they forget that too?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, they forget a certain amount, but I don't know how many times you can "stick 'em." I agree with what Mike Lowry is doing. I'm a strong supporter of his. But I don't know how many times you can tax them and get away with it. There's a tolerance level out there some place. He's trying to do everything, and it all needs to get done. Reform on health care, we need to do something about the taxes, we need to support education, all these kind of things, I don't disagree with, but I guess the question is timing. I think you can do things, but you have to gauge how much you can do.

I read an interesting story the other day. Callahan in the *Tacoma News Tribune* said that the Democrats would be "lucky" if Initiative 602 passes. I mean from a political viewpoint, not from an economic viewpoint, because that will no longer be an issue. They won't be able to beat you up on that. That will be water under the bridge, and so they won't be able to beat on the governor as much, because he did these taxes, because they're gone! To maintain that kind of level of intensity among citizens is hard to do, particularly when the issue is gone. I thought it was kind of an interesting analysis. It will maybe help him politically, but it's sure going to ruin everybody economically.

So I guess it is a question of timing and trying to gauge what's going on out there. The problem the president's got is that all these things need to get done. Everybody admits they need to get done, like balancing the budget and eliminating the deficit. But they're getting upset about being taxed, or whatever. They are all opposed to it and ninety percent of them think it's going to eliminate the deficit. "As long as you don't tax me, it's okay."

Clinton's going to get caught in that same syndrome. I see he wisely dropped health care off the agenda for awhile. He had too many things going on at once. People were getting upset. And so there are people upset about health care, people are upset about taxes, people upset about gays in the military. They all come together and it's a huge mob out there that is after you.

The key is pacing yourself and timing. Somebody says, "We gotta get out of town. Mike Lowry's going to get a new idea or two." He's kind of like that. He's very issue-oriented, and he wants to sell them. I don't disagree. I think I'd only question the timing of them all at once. I'd probably deal with the budget first;

it's a difficult thing anyway. But maybe you do it all at once. It seems to me, there's the question of how many tigers you take on at one time. My idea is that you don't take them all on at once. They'll just chew you up. You try to pace yourself.

Ms. Boswell: What do you think, looking back over your career, are the issues or the accomplishments that you're most proud of, or that you feel had the greatest impact?

Mr. Brouillet: I think that the one single issue is community colleges. I think that helped this whole mid-education structure. We were sandwiched between the K-12 and the higher-education people. I think that was a significant accomplishment. It probably would have happened eventually, anyway.

I was just reminiscing yesterday about one of things that I seemed to have been deeply involved in was "outreach programs" to those groups not in our system. We tried to reach out and include these people and support them. You wouldn't have a lot of argument about kids not being able to read and write these days, but that was not a big issue when I was on the Education Committee. Most children went to school, and most families were functional. Things were getting done, so there wasn't a big "Johnny can't read" type of thing, although there may have been some slippage in the system. I think the things that we tried to deal with were some of the groups in our society who were important, and we wanted to make them happy, productive, successful people.

My contention was that the problems in education were not in Moses Lake particularly, but were in Seattle, Tacoma, and the larger cities. The Native Americans have terrible completion rates. We have these large groups of migrants coming in and we need to take care of them.

We have passed some handicapped legislation. Our handicapped bill was passed before the national bill. The national bill was partly patterned after ours. We talked with Washington D.C. They would call us up and ask us about it, so that was a successful program.

I always viewed my job as SPI and also as a legislator as a way to get resources into the system. I worked hard to get programs funded for certain groups of people who were not in the system, who were having difficulty. When were we going to pay for them? Now or later? If we didn't give them an education so they could be employable, then they'd be on public assistance and cost us more money, or they'd be in jail. Sending a child to Harvard was cheaper than keeping a person in jail for a year, and so education was an investment.

I also viewed that as part of my job, to get the resources to do what we want, because in the legislative process it's a competition. There's a limited amount of money and a lot of requests, so who gets what, and who gets this and that. As SPI, and also as a legislator, I was always trying to get resources into the system—better funding for basic education. I went to court a few times on that. I didn't have any great plan when I started this, but it just developed that way, talking about the under-educated and the uneducated and special education. We worked hard on gifted programs, too. Not just for the poor people and the people who are under-educated, but to help people in the upper levels to learn more skills. I guess if I looked back, that's the kind of things I seemed to have championed and developed in the legislative process.

Ms. Boswell: Is there one issue or one thing that you did that you would like to change? Not so much that you regret, but something that you would like to have done that you didn't get to do? You seem to have done a lot.

Mr. Brouillet: I don't think we ever achieved the proper funding mechanism for education in this state. We have a very poor tax structure,

which ultimately affects schools, colleges and other public services. Every time the economy is bad, they have to cut important things. It's not a good funding system.

Ms. Boswell: Do you foresee changes in the near future?

Mr. Brouillet: No. It's even more difficult now. People are more "anti-tax" than ever. You can't even talk about the income tax, which is something we really need. You need some kind of tax on the wealth of our state and country that is not already taxed. Those are intangibles. We beat the heck out of property. We're not as bad as Oregon and California, but we have high property taxes. But the wealth is no longer in property, it's in intangibles, and we don't touch them in this state. The federal government does, Oregon gets their income tax, and California gets hit with everything, I guess. Our tax structure is not responding to the changes in economics. Talk to people about an income tax and they get paranoid. I don't see it happening though. I don't know what'll happen.

Ms. Boswell: Is tomorrow your last day here at Pierce College?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about the future. What's your next job to tackle?

Mr. Brouillet: I don't know, I'm kind of loose right now. I just want to look around and take some time. I think I'll probably do something in international education. I'd like to do something there. I've been involved with citizens going to China and Korea. We've developed a Korean program at the school. I've got twenty-two teachers going to China in September, retired teachers. I'd like to do something more like that.

I don't know what it is, but I'm looking and I figure it's going to be voluntary work, too. Everything that has happened to me has just happened. I was there and I did that, and I ran for the Legislature, got elected, and there I was. Then I said, "Gee, the superintendency is open. I've been here long enough," so I ran for that. I came to Pierce College to help them for four months, and I'm here at the end of four years and I'm just leaving. That's worked out well.

I'm not worried, I'll find something to do. I think one thing I have in mind is something like international education, because I think the future is not only in education, but it is also in international education. The future is out there in the world. We will have a global economy, a global education, pretty soon everything will be global. Europe's going to have a common market, so we're going to have these kinds of things. I think I'll stay involved somewhere. I'm not sure where. Maybe nobody will want me to do anything.

Ms. Boswell: Well, I hardly think that.

Mr. Brouillet: I'm not available now for employment. I've got to spend some time working against Initiative 601 and 602 in the next few months. I'd like to do something there for the next few months. I've got to help them kill both of them, but don't know if it's possible. The University of Washington lobbyist thinks it's possible. I don't want to bet any money on it, but I want to work on it.

Chapter 6

Superintendent of Public Instruction

Ms. Boswell: Working on the interim committee, the Education Committee in particular, did it take you all over the state and give you fairly high visibility? Were you thinking at that time in 1961 or 1962, of running for the state superintendent position?

Mr. Brouillet: That wasn't why we did it, but the thought did cross my mind as we were doing these things. The discussion was on high visibility. I couldn't say that job didn't give me that. For example, every time I showed up in Spokane, they would come down and interview the committee and we would have a story about what was going on. I think that is a natural phenomenon, but we did it because we were really trying to help the image of the public schools. We were trying to give education a boost, plus we got a lot of discussions on the issues no matter what they were. We wanted people in the state to discuss the issues.

You can't always meet in Seattle, so you go to Walla Walla, to the *Walla Walla Union Bulletin* newspaper. That would be a big deal there. If the committee went to Seattle, the visit might have made it out in the paper or it might not have, but if you went to Walla Walla, you would get on the Tri-Cities TV. There is a lot more exposure. There is a lot of feeling in most places in the state that the only thing people are interested in is Seattle, so we tried to get around to dispel that line of thinking.

Sure, I would say that thought did cross my mind sometime or another, that I wanted to do something else.

Ms. Boswell: How did the state office of education react to the involvement of the interim committee? Did they see it as competition or as a support for their activities?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, I think probably both ways. They got involved. We were talking about some things that they may or may not have wanted on the agenda right now and we were exposing a lot of people to these issues, and sometimes they are controversial. We were talking about desegregation. It was controversial in society, and the districts would just as soon not have controversy if they can avoid it because they have to run levies and get along with the local people. So we exposed some things and talked about some issues at fairly great lengths and at great depth.

The state board may not think that is the proper function or the proper location to have these things done. I suppose that we got on their nerves now and then, because they were proposing that we do this and that, and that we might change somewhat the operating structure. Sure, they probably perceived it, I'm sure, as a political activity—which it was, which I would never apologize for, because even the state office is somewhat political. But they perceived themselves not as politicians, nor in political activity, but as educators. I am sure that we ruffled their feathers off and on during this process. But we were taking things that were generally discussed only in the education circle, and in the education family between the organizations. There we were, taking them out and exposing them all over the state, which I felt was good. But I am sure that we didn't win many awards among some school people for doing what we did.

Ms. Boswell: Later, when you became

superintendent yourself, what was your relationship with the Legislature? The interim committees then were not as important, were they?

Mr. Brouillet: No. In fact, they wilted away and died. Having been a legislator, I spent a lot of time with the Legislature because, like it or not, they were the great school board in the sky. We got our money from them, and they passed all the laws. When I was in the Legislature, the state office only came around now and then, when something came up. But we tried to be a little more proactive. When I was superintendent, I tried to either get things going, or stop whatever it was, at the period of time. We would say sometimes, "Gee, that's a strange idea." It was the same thing that the state board might have said about us earlier.

When I was SPI, we had two people, one of them Terry McCarthy, whose whole job was to work with the legislative staff. He had support during the legislative sessions, and he spent a lot of time working with staff. They'd want to do something, and he would go up and talk to them about it and say, "If you want to do it, this is how you do it," which wouldn't raise hell or confuse a lot of people or cause problems.

Terry previously worked for the Legislative Budget Committee. He was very qualified and very competent and also he brought to the office a certain skill. Maybe there was something that we wanted, that we thought should be done, so we wanted to get the staff talking about it and making suggestions to the legislators. We spent a lot of time on that, because common schools represented forty-seven or forty-eight percent of the budget. The regular Education Committee and the Appropriations Committee had people over here working on our level.

Some legislators had a bill to eliminate corporal punishment. Well, that's a bill that we tried to help with. Our position was, "If you want to do it folks, you don't do it that way, because you'll cause a lot of confusion and it won't work out in the district. If you don't want to do that, you do it this way, if that is what you want." We may not have been a supporter of some of the things they wanted to do, but we wanted to make sure that if they did them, they didn't cause great confusion or problems with the local school districts.

So sometimes we proposed things that we were very excited about, and later on we might have worked against them. We proposed or showed legislators how to do it. So we did a lot of technical things like that, which never show up. Before I was superintendent, they never did that. Something showed up on the docket and the office would send someone up to testify on it. Well, that's kind of late. You need to get in on the ground floor and help legislators develop these things, then you can testify for or against it.

Ms. Boswell: We have talked about Louis Bruno, your predecessor at SPI, but can you tell me about some of the other past superintendents?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, Louie was a local superintendent. He was drafted by the superintendents' association to run for the job. He was much more attuned to how a local district runs and the problems in local school district administration.

Before him was Lloyd Andrews, who had a vocational education certificate, but he was really running for governor. He only stayed one term, then ran for governor and was defeated. The school people were always suspicious of him.

Before Andrews was Pearl Wanamaker, who served four terms and she went for a fifth when Lloyd Andrews defeated her. She was an ex-state senator and a great lady, but boy, she was hard as nails. She used to speak on all the school matters and be involved in

everything, which under our Public Disclosure Commission rules today is difficult. I think she goes down as one of the strongest superintendents we ever had, and a strong believer in education who fought hard for it. She would go up there and pound on legislators, and she even went out and campaigned against some of them. I don't know if she ever beat anybody, but if she felt strongly about it, she was out campaigning for it. She was a strong voice.

She had been in education, but then she got in the state senate. She came out of there and ran for state superintendent. She was drafted by the school people, and she was controversial in a way. There was no question that she didn't think much of private schools. She believed you can't spend state money on those people, so the private-school people were upset with her.

She did a lot of school district consolidation. I think when she became superintendent, we had twelve hundred school districts. Now we have less than three hundred. And she fixed it, and pushed the law through that said if you want to consolidate two districts, they didn't both have to vote for it, just the total vote had to be for it. A big district could always gobble up a little district because they always had more votes. That hurt her in the long haul when Lloyd Andrews ran against her, that was one thing used against her. All these little districts were mad that they had been consolidated. But there was no reason for twelve hundred school districts in the state of Washington. She did a lot of things like that.

But she was around long enough that she verbally beat up on the Legislature and that made people mad. She was always a strong supporter of the system of schools, public schools, and that angered some as well. She worked hard to get them money for buildings and everything else, but if you are in a high level of activity, after sixteen years, chances are you have made a lot people mad. But she was a great superintendent.

There was another lady who was also superintendent, Josephine Corliss Preston. She was superintendent from 1913 to 1929, which is sixteen years. Josephine Corliss Preston was another strong lady.

Ms. Boswell: Pearl Wanamaker was a former legislator, but she didn't utilize the Legislature as much as you did?

Mr. Brouillet: Pearl was a former legislator and understood the process, and she could be a very persuasive lady. The Legislature knew that she wouldn't mind going out to a local district and talking to the PTA and telling what a poor legislator they had. She didn't use the system, but there wasn't that much of a system then.

Now, to be effective in the process, you need to figure out what the system is, and work through that. You can't just say that, "It's a great issue," and go out and pound the Legislature. But if you want to get something done, you may not have the issue, you may work it quietly and get things done, but you don't get as much credit that way. The issue may get solved and nobody knows who solved it. The Legislature thinks they solved it. The superintendent thinks they solved it.

So, I guess the question is, how do you operate? Do you operate out front, make a lot of noise and pound on people, the press, and all this stuff, or do you work quietly behind the scenes? My attitude is that you work quietly and if the Legislature wants to get credit for it, fine. They have got to get credit for something. You can't be taking credit for everything. If they want credit for it, and take it home and tell the people what a great job they did, that's okay. As long as it gets done. It's a little less flamboyant, and one of the problems you end up with is that some of your constituents don't think you are doing

anything. They don't see you out there, you know, raising hell and pounding on the table. But you are trying to get it done within the system, quietly, and accomplish something.

That's in reference to people we know in the public life around the country, who have issues and go out and talk about them and nothing ever happens. So, I guess it's a matter of style. But what I did probably was because I was in the Legislature for sixteen years, and I knew a lot of people, had a lot of friends, and I knew how the system worked. I was more interested in solutions, rather then everybody abusing everybody.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about how you decided to become state superintendent.

Mr. Brouillet: It was kind of a natural evolution. I was in education and I was a teacher, a coach and all those kinds of things. Where do you go next? Do you stay teaching? You make a decision of whether you want to stay in education and be an administrator. That takes you out of the Legislature—you can't do both. At least you couldn't in those days. I enjoyed the Legislature and I had the nerve to become a teacher and I liked that kind of activity. I decided this was a great job—and I had a certain amount of support, I wouldn't say pressure, but probably some, from my staff too. You know, they want you to do something, and they are ambitious to move on and move the whole organization.

Ms. Boswell: The staff you are talking about now, would that be the interim committee staff?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes. I took a lot of the people from there with me to the state office, which caused a few problems because they were looked upon as politicians and not educators. I brought the nucleus of my office, the key people—not the people that do the bookkeeping and run the buses and all that—but the nucleus of the decision-making people. They were all legislative types, which was unusual. It wasn't accepted by everybody, being too political, even though all the money is political and involves the political process. Some people, I'm sure, perceived that as a politicalization of the office. I know they did. I guess, if you want to get something done, you bring in the right people to do it.

So, the nucleus of the people I had in the SPI came from the Legislature, from the joint committees and these kinds of things. I just moved them over with me. They were, of course, ambitious for you, too. It was kind of a natural progression. I liked government, I liked the Legislature, and I liked the political process. I'd been teaching it and everything else. My degrees are in political science and economics. I've got one in education, too, but that doesn't mean I don't know politics. So you move that way.

Louie Bruno was there and I wasn't going to run against him. It was a question of, do I sit around and wait for him, because I knew I wouldn't beat him? How do you beat an incumbent that is a fairly popular person? But he was not going to run, since he had run successfully three times previously.

Ms. Boswell: So, you would never have challenged him?

Mr. Brouillet: Probably not. How could you beat him? He was popular enough and hadn't made any mistakes, and he hadn't made a lot of people mad like Pearl did, which was sad. Then again, he was more of an administrator. He's a good guy, did a good job, but he saw the office as the administrative office.

I guess I saw the SPI as a political office, proactive and some other things, but you know he didn't get hurt and nobody was mad at him. Everybody thought he was a great guy. I personally thought there were some things that

we ought to be doing differently. Maybe they weren't ready for Louie's time. But in my time, maybe they were ready now. I think it's fair to say that he saw it as an administrative job and working with local superintendents.

I came out of the teachers' organizations. I was president of the state teachers, which made the superintendents very nervous. I brought the teachers into the fold more. They had more to say. Again, it did not endear me to a lot of administrators, but I thought they were a legitimate part of the process, and that they ought to be involved in all educational deliberations. And this is about the time when I was president of the Washington Education Association.

All educators were in the WEA, all the superintendents were there, all the principals were there, all the counselors. There was only one educational organization in the whole state. By the time I got to be superintendent, it started to break up. So, people would accuse me during elections, saying, "He's president of the teachers." Well, that was true, but I was also president of the superintendents. But nobody ever said that. Some people were mad at the teachers because they were more aggressive.

I tried to bring those people into the picture and I tried to bring in a lot of other people who hadn't been involved, which is somewhat threatening to superintendents, because they no longer have the complete control. They never were overwhelmed with me, but there wasn't much that they could do about it. If I had a problem, I wouldn't just ask them, I would ask the teachers about it, I'd ask the PTA. I'd get everybody's opinion. I may or may not do what they wanted. That made them mad. I just thought that people wanted more participation, but in many cases I did not do what they wanted.

Ms. Boswell: In terms of your own career, let me just ask you one other thing. At about the same time you were also running for Speaker of the House. Was that a different area of interest than education? How did that fit in?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, in the legislative process the Speaker of the House talks about where you are going to go and has control over everything, not only education. I was just excited by that. I had been in the Legislature for a long time and I thought, "Why don't I do that?" The problem that I had was that the guy also seeking it was my seatmate from Puyallup, so I didn't hang in with that very long. But it was the natural culmination of the political process. However, it would have made me more general rather than specific.

Ms. Boswell: When did you finally decide to run for the superintendent's position? What about the differences between running a legislative district campaign and then a state campaign?

Mr. Brouillet: It is considerably different. A legislative campaign is pretty much low-key. I spent between $3,000 or $4,000 per campaign. Now, you wouldn't even hardly get into the race, hardly get a place to operate now with $3,000 or $4,000. People like to be low-key and after awhile you knew everybody. Blocks of people and so forth. So the legislative campaign was not very difficult.

But when you go statewide, you had to have some kind of organization. Also, rather than working through individuals, you had to work through groups. You can't go around and see everybody, plus you've got to also work certain areas. So the coalition was teachers, where I had a lot of friends, and had been president of the organization. Labor, at that point in time, was a very strong organization, and they could deliver some votes. Issues like civil rights and people who have gotten into the system and so forth. They were all, of course, Democrats. Even though it was a nonpartisan position—I was in the Legislature

for sixteen years on the side of the Democrats, and I couldn't very well go Republican. They were very helpful, too. The Republicans weren't against me and some individual Republicans helped me in the legislature.

But it was a coalition of Democrats, some of the people who were brought into the system and the teachers and labor and House members. They were all very helpful, too. I tied on to a lot of their existing organizations. They put a picture of me in their pamphlets shaking hands with them or something, or they would provide me with an opportunity to speak. They provided some of the organization required to run a campaign. In the Tri-City area, for example, they'd tie you up with their local people. So you had that going too, and then of course labor had an organization, the teachers had a statewide organization, and so the main question was coordinating all these things.

Ms. Boswell: Did you have to hire a whole campaign staff to do the coordinating?

Mr. Brouillet: I usually hired a manager, who was probably a Democrat and had been involved in statewide campaigns. Everybody else was volunteer, and a lot of the people who worked for me would take time off and work on the campaign. They would go off the payroll and work on the campaign. And of course you got the organizations, like labor and like the teachers, who had paid people. So it was more coordination with the different groups, because you wanted to make sure that the labor council in Spokane got it, the teachers in Spokane got it. They would do their thing and the teachers would do their thing with their members. The legislators would help you out a little bit, and you had all these different groups.

You also spent your time in Pierce, King, and Snohomish counties. That wasn't the only place you spent time, but you spent the bulk of your time there. A fair in Garfield County, or someplace else is like a gift, or a little frosting on the cake, because the key in the election was King, Pierce, and Snohomish County, which were where most of the voters lived. It isn't like running for governor, where you got a lot of people out running an organization all over the state, although we had groups of people. For example, we had to leave it to the labor people, who would make sure that you got taken care of in Longview. I might go down there once, I might go to Walla Walla once, or I might go to Spokane a couple of times. But you have to rely on other organizations to do the legwork in those places, to get the word out, put your picture in their paper, and endorse you and those kind of things.

Ms. Boswell: The Superintendent is one of the few nonpartisan elected offices and a statewide position. Did the Democratic Party support you? Can they make contributions? How does that relationship affect your candidacy?

Mr. Brouillet: We didn't get any money out of the Democrats.

Ms. Boswell: Are there restrictions on that?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, there weren't then. There wasn't any PDC, there wasn't anything. I suppose we spent less than $100,000 the first campaign. That was the most that anyone had ever spent in an SPI race. Now they spend a lot more, but we spent less than $100,000. It kept going progressively higher as we went along, mainly because of advertising. The money we had, we tried to put in television. At first it all went into radio. As we went along, however, more and more went into television to make the biggest bang for the buck. We still put some money into radio. But even though we did not receive money from

the Democrats, they would put me on their sample ballots, with the governor, maybe a U.S. Senator, U.S. House members, and all the state House members.

Money was hard to come by. Labor would give us some money and the teachers would give us some money. Other groups would give us some, not a lot of money, but some because they were so busy.

The main thing was in the organization and numbers, as opposed to money. If, for example, the Labor Council is supporting you, I think all the labor people in all the counties would put you in their newspapers. SPI is such a low-visibility office outside of Olympia. Outside of Pierce County, nobody knew who I was. Those groups were much more cohesive and had more influence then, but labor lost a lot of people. They provided for you, and you depended on those people. That's worth a lot of money, I don't know how much. I suppose now you would have to list it as in-kind contributions. I doubt if I kept track of that stuff. But there were a lot of things they would do that we didn't even know. They didn't have to tell you, but you knew when they were working for you.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about your opponent.

Mr. Brouillet: The first time I ran there were seven people running. Six of them were pro-education: the deputy superintendent, the state superintendent, the assistant superintendent from Tacoma, a school board member from Buckley, the state music supervisor, and me. Then one fellow named Jim Moore, who was not an educator, but was a school psychologist in Seattle. He quickly figured out that there was not much space over on the pro-education side. He could look at the lay of the land and see that all of us five were splitting up the pro-education vote. He got off with more conservative people and the Republicans. He talked to more conservative Republicans and talked about opposition to busing. That was a big issue in the campaign, and he ended up being anti-teacher and all the things that the more radical right-wingers believed.

All the papers and everybody thought that there would be two people from the pro-education camp. Well, here you are, all fighting for certain votes, and Jim Moore was over here all by himself. He got nominated and everybody was surprised. I got the most votes, and he was second. Well, then even the people that weren't overwhelmed with me didn't have a lot of choice—he came out for teachers' loyalty oaths. He had done this at the University of Washington, of all the places.

That got all these people there very excited, and so they went out and did something for me. He was very conservative about issues, like teachers shouldn't be involved in the political process. So a lot of people came down, and then I got all my primary election opponents to endorse me. They ran a newspaper ad endorsing me. Jim Moore was also on the short side of things because he wasn't the average citizen, and all the PTAs went door-to-door helping me. That helped a lot.

So that's how I found the organization. Jim ran the next time, too, but that was a one-time shot. It made for an interesting campaign. But I was talking more about things the typical school person talks about. He was talking about how you reform things, and how you get rid of the people, and cut out the waste, and the superintendents are spending too much money. He also charged that I was controlled by the teachers' union. Well, it made for a more interesting campaign than we normally have. One year when Louie Bruno won, he and his opponent rode around together to all the meetings. They would have a forum up in Bremerton, and they would get in the car and drive up together. Now it has become a little sharper and more partisan.

Ms. Boswell: Were the issues clearer then?

Mr. Brouillet: Yeah, we had clear issues. I wasn't overwhelmed with busing, but I would think, how do we do it? So I had to settle with Seattle and talk about local control within the area, but if there was a problem with segregation you would have to take care of it. So we danced around that a little bit. You don't want to come out and say, "Yeah, I'm for busing every kid around town." Now they are out of busing. But you know Seattle was the first major city district in the United States that was desegregated without a court order. I was trying to support them. I believed in trying to change some of the rules and making it easier for them and for financing and so forth. They were trying to do it and they wanted to do it, and it seemed to be working. I wasn't going to get in the way. Well, Moore was out campaigning against this, and that struck a tone with most people, but that didn't sink me.

Ms. Boswell: You said that you brought some of your staff with you. Tell me a little more about what you did setting up the office.

Mr. Brouillet: Well, first of all, Terry McCarthy, who I told you about previously, worked for the Legislature. In the previous administration, the assistant superintendent for finance, George Eisentrout, was a strong person. He was also the budget person. One thing I did was move the finance activities, or the budget activities, from that section and put it right next to me downstairs. Terry had an office right next to mine. I wanted to know what was going on and this is how you make your priorities.

We still have the assistant superintendent for finance, but he was for administering what went on in the school districts helping them. Your policy is made really in the budget. If you are going to do something on bilingual education, for example, you put the money in the budget. So I moved the budget down there and I had a little tighter control.

I came out of the legislative process and that took place in a known sphere, plus the fact that under previous superintendents it was like a school district. I wanted to know what was going on in the agency and I didn't want to do everything myself. Obviously, if you had an assistant superintendent for vocational institutions, I wanted to know some of the basic policies, some of the direction, but not the details. We built skills centers, and that was a major decision to build high-school skill centers around the state—state-funded mostly. I didn't want to know what kind of courses they were going to run. I wanted to be involved in the big picture. I expected them to run the other stuff. But when we got involved in a policy decision, I wanted to bring those people in and talk about it and so forth.

Ms. Boswell: How big of an office, at that time, was the state superintendent's office, in terms of the bureaucracy?

Mr. Brouillet: There were about 300 people, in that range.

Ms. Boswell: When a new superintendent such as yourself comes in, how much turnover is there in that group of people?

Mr. Brouillet: The only thing that turned over were deputies or assistant superintendents. There were five of those, and I created some administrative assistants. About five people and then about ten, twelve people, some secretaries. I always let the exempt people choose their own secretaries. They didn't have to take the one that was there. We didn't fire the replaced secretary, we moved them into another place in the agency. I thought that as a top administrator, they ought to be able to pick who they wanted to work with, someone

who they felt comfortable with. I replaced all the assistant superintendents. It might not have been too comfortable working for somebody who worked for the other person for ten years. But with some people it would be okay. The other 250 people were all civil service.

Ms. Boswell: So, you really were not into massive restructuring?

Mr. Brouillet: That would take a little doing. You had to win those people over. They had definite ideas. Sometimes they liked the previous administration. So you had to work on that internally—not how you organize, but how you make those people be supportive, and maybe some new ideas.

Ms. Boswell: From where did you draw those people, the new assistant superintendents? You said that the superintendent group was a little leery of you because of your teaching background.

Mr. Brouillet: I had a deputy. I always chose a deputy from a local school district. Twice, I took the president of the superintendents' association. It was somebody I could get along with. They'd be the deputy. But they're mainly for internal dynamics. They got involved, to some extent, in policy discussions, but I looked upon those people as running the organization on a day-to-day basis. They dealt with personnel and all with the other assistant superintendents. I used to try to get a finance person out of the local districts or somebody in state government to fill that position.

I hired Monica Schmidt as the president of Fort Wright College. I tried to get quality people, because I felt that somebody for the private schools ought to be a private school person who understood private schools. Like a vocational person, a finance person, and for the handicapped, I tried to get somebody who had some experience in those areas. I looked upon all those people as the conduit or the focal point to the organizations. So, if I hired somebody that was a vocational person, I expected them to be the person that articulated what we are trying to do, or if ideas came back in, they could come through there. I didn't think I had to run around myself to do all this. So I did that and it worked out all right.

Ms. Boswell: Now, were those mainly people that you had come into contact with during the earlier years of legislative work?

Mr. Brouillet: You always had in the back of your mind, as you move around and see people that, "Gee, there's a good administrator." So you always have a half a dozen people in mind. I never advertised for a position. I never once advertised for an assistant superintendent or administrative assistant or deputy. I would be up in some place, like at Renton Technical College, and I would say, "That gal is a really good administrator." I would have watched her over the years, and would call up and say, "Hi Jane. I've got an opening here. Are you interested in coming down here?" Most of the time they would say, "Yes, but I want to talk to you about it." I would say, "That's fine." But I never once advertised for those types of positions. All the civil service jobs obviously were advertised, but I knew enough people, I had enough experience that I knew where people were. Over the years in the Legislature, you dealt a lot with these people so you got a view of them.

Ms. Boswell: What about an east-west balance? Was that something you had to think about?

Mr. Brouillet: I didn't worry much about that. One time I had a deputy superintendent and one male assistant superintendent and four female assistant superintendents. I had a lot of females in the agency. In education there are a lot of females, but at the higher levels their numbers go down. I once had Mona

Bailey work for me. She was the principal of a junior-high school. I went down and hired her from there. Again, that didn't make some of the administrators too happy.

But I was trying to get certain people, to get some females, to get some minority representation, and somebody from Seattle. So all these things sort of rolled together. The point is, there were people that I knew in all these fields that I had been exposed to, that I could draw on. I also had pretty good continuity. I didn't have much turnover. Once in awhile somebody got to be a superintendent and wanted to leave. Basically, we had pretty good longevity and some people worked with me for the whole sixteen years.

Ms. Boswell: You mentioned, too, that you did bring some people from the Legislature, like McCarthy. Were there others?

Mr. Brouillet: Ralph Julnes from the Interim Committee on Education. He was my administrative assistant. Bill Daley was an administrative assistant also. Actually, these people are very influential, and I had worked with them for a lot of years.

Ms. Boswell: Ralph Julnes, for example, what basic tasks as administrative assistant would he perform?

Mr. Brouillet: He was a general administrator. There would be a lot of details floating around. I'd say, "You got to get on to this. This is a program I want to get started, and why don't you go down and talk to somebody or someone? I just got this call from the superintendent who had to do something about that." He did a lot of general things. When you get at that level you need somebody to do a lot of detail work, somebody who's good at details and could follow through and get it done. That is really important for a person working for you. If you haven't been a detail person, you are in serious trouble. A lot of details come up and you need to get them done, and you're not going to have time to run around and do them. You don't want to keep coming back to ask, "Did you get that thing I talked to you about yesterday done?" If you have got to do that, you're in serious trouble.

Ms. Boswell: Julnes was designated as the "detail man?"

Mr. Brouillet: The detail man. He was also a law-school graduate. He wasn't practicing then, but he knew something about the legal angle, too. He has gotten a little more involved in legal things now.

We've got two or three lawyers now to keep track of things. We talk over things with these people, the cabinet people, and say, "My gosh, we've got this problem." I can see it coming up, or see somebody ready to deal with it. So we talk about it. "What do we do?"

Now, in my view, you can go broad on that and talk to everybody in the agency and never get anything done. Or you can be in a little tighter control and have a better handle on it. There is a problem that you've got to be careful of when you do that. The people downstairs don't think that anybody upstairs is paying attention to them. They think everything's being decided by a small group of people who are really a bunch of outsiders, a bunch of politicians that don't understand education, because Ralph and Bill Daley had never run a school system. Ralph had been in a community college. So you had things like that going on. It's how you work with the agency. Those people can either help or hurt you. If the PE supervisor at the PE meetings tells everybody that things are really screwed up in the state office, and we're not getting anything done, we've really got a problem. So you got to work with all those people.

Ms. Boswell: Somebody told me, though, that Ralph Julnes was your "hatchet man." How would you respond to that?

Mr. Brouillet: Sometimes you have to make unpopular decisions, and Ralph was the guy who got stuck with that. So, everybody liked me and a lot of people didn't like Ralph, but he served that function in the agency. You had to do something. I would say, "Ralph, we've got to take care of this." He's mellowed a lot. In fact, he's at the University of Washington now. He's mellowed over the last few years. But they pounded on him; sometimes I thought it's not what you do, but how you do it. But he would have to move somebody around or lay somebody off, and I never thought it was my job to do that. I was supposed to be the good guy.

Ms. Boswell: Is that feeling typical in a state office?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, basically you've always got something happening. There are some hard decisions you've got to make, and you can make them yourself or you can have somebody else make them. Who takes the heat for it? I think it's better if the agency head is more well liked than some of the other people. Or well loved, or respected, or whatever. We would talk about them, but someone had to put them into place.

Ms. Boswell: How did he feel about being in that "enforcer" role?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, I think he also had a lot of power and influence, too. There are trade-offs in all these things. Ralph had to make some hard decisions for me sometimes.

Ms. Boswell: Then, in terms of finances, was there a committee that handled all of that, or would you make the decisions yourself?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, we'd sit down with the upcoming budget and we would say, "Okay, now this is the budget. What do we want to do over the next two years, and where are our pressing problems? Are they bilingual education or are they remediation? Are they set in terms of equity?" I don't know, whatever they are. We'd sit down and figure out where the thrust is that we want and then we put funds in our recommended budget. Someone in the room with us would say, "Okay, we should do this." Now this kind of thing would probably involve everybody in the agency or all the top administrators. Then we would argue and somebody would say, "We have got to do this, and you can't do everything. What's the number one priority you want to do around here? Do you want to build more buildings? Do you want to do something about desegregation? We have got to figure these out." But I would make the final decision.

But that's what you put in the budget that you send to the Legislature. We have to lobby for those things. Then, we did a lot to provide information to the legislators about these recommendations. The priorities were determined, and then we'd go into the budget, and then we might have to get a law passed to implement something. But basically, a lot of priorities are done that way. That's why the budget is so important. That's why you need to have a better handle on it, a good handle on it to keep control and track of it.

Ms. Boswell: Was your budget, even at that time, about half of the entire state budget?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes. All the outside groups that studied government were upset that the governor controlled only half of the budget. One time, Dixy Lee Ray asked me to take a five-percent cut. I said, "Sorry, Madam Governor, I respectfully decline to participate in this activity." So she went to court and she

lost. She was mad at me for a long time because of my refusal. "If I were part of your cabinet when you were elected governor, and you appointed me to be secretary of education in your cabinet, I'd have a different view of the world. I'd have to figure out how to balance the budget for you, help you balance the budget, and you'd have total control of the budget." "But," I said, "that's not the system we're working under." So you have to disagree now and then.

I think my terms were an effective administration, and I think we got a lot of things done. The trade-off is that everybody in the world is not involved in it, so I'm sure that down in the agency, people believe that they know how to run the place better than you do. I'm sure that's a problem. But I was elected and I was responsible, and that's the way it went, folks. That's what old Harry Truman says, "The buck stops here."

Ms. Boswell: Well, you were reelected for four terms.

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, four times. Got elected the second and third time at the primary, they never went to the general. It's a nonpartisan office, like a judge. I worked like heck in those primaries and spent all my money. When you're elected in September, it's kind of nice.

Chapter 7

Chinese Exchange Programs

Ms. Boswell: I'd like to talk about your interest in China, and the various exchange programs that you helped develop with China and how that came about.

Mr. Brouillet: I've always been an English/ social studies teacher, mainly social studies—history and American government. Those and world problems were my majors in college. I've always been interested in international affairs and world problems.

In 1977, when I was state superintendent, the federal government was selecting a national delegation to go to China. Chief state school officers from Connecticut, California, Arkansas, New York and Washington were selected. The national president of the PTA, the national president of the State School Boards Association, some State Department people, the secretary of education went. It was quite a high-powered group.

Ms. Boswell: Who was doing the selecting?

Mr. Brouillet: It was done by the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations out of Washington D.C. They were the ones who were selected by the government to put this together. The president of that organization went also. They put together this delegation which was in response to the Chinese delegation that had come to the U.S. a few years earlier, the ping-pong players. That was the first official Chinese delegation and the Americans reciprocated by sending back a group of educators. We met with educators there and traveled around the country, mainly along the major cities: Shanghai, Beijing, Nanjing, and Hong Kong.

That just whetted my appetite, because in 1982 Governor Spellman signed a friendship agreement with Sichuan Province. This agreement concentrated mainly in the economic area. All that it said about culture and education was these other activities were basically driven by the desire of Washingtonians that wanted involvement with China, particularly Sichuan Province. It was the largest province in China with a population of over 100 million people. I saw this agreement as a good vehicle for us to expand educational ventures, exchanges, trips to China, and this kind of thing. So in 1984 I organized a delegation of educators to visit Chengdu, the capital of Sichuan.

Our purpose was to take one-hundred Washington elementary school pictures over, because the Chinese had given us one-hundred pictures prior to this. We collected pictures from the students and took them and presented them to the Chinese in exchange for what they'd done for us.

Ms. Boswell: On that first visit, were you able to go into the schools?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: Had you made contacts there with anyone?

Mr. Brouillet: Not at first. The Chinese were very careful about where they let you go: This is a good school you ought to look at that. They show you the best and the brightest. We made some contacts which were useful later, because after we went to Sichuan and did some

things, our very first exchanges started in the province of Sichuan, at Number Four and Number Seven middle schools, which are equivalent to our high schools. Later we expanded to Beijing, Shanghai, and Chongqing, where we had made some contacts during earlier trips.

We started in the Sichuan Province, and I signed an agreement with their director of education for the province. We agreed that we'd send teachers back and forth, which they're still doing today. The program we started in 1985, with the Number Four Middle School, is still functioning. This is a middle school that can trace its history back 2,000 years. In 1996, I went back to Number Four to help them celebrate ten years of exchanges with Snohomish School District. Later we sent people to other schools in the province, out to some of the country schools, but again, those were the schools that some of the officials had graduated from.

Then we expanded to Chungqing, Seattle's sister city. I was able to arrive at an exchange between them and Seattle. Then, as I say, we've gone other places. Beijing is now in the exchange program and other major Chinese cities, too.

I estimated that we've sent a couple hundred teachers and students back and forth during this period of time. We also arranged some summer trips where teachers could visit schools, particularly social studies teachers, which was very valuable for them.

Ms. Boswell: What about the funding for these kinds of trips?

Mr. Brouillet: When we first started, the Chinese had very little money—they are more prosperous now. I got the Legislature to appropriate $175,000 to help fund, particularly the teachers that come this way from China. We sent teachers over there and the school district took care of their expenses. But when they come this way, we paid for room and board and other expenses. This was a time when teachers in China were making $100 to $150 a year. And so when you talk about coming to America or the State of Washington or any place, we had to provide assistance to the school districts to pay for that teacher.

Our people basically taught English, and the people that came this way taught Chinese language, culture and art. But they wouldn't have been able to do it without that financial assistance, because when they first started in this business, in the 1980s, right after the Cultural Revolution, the salaries were very low. The teachers are still poorly paid in China today.

Ms. Boswell: How did the superintendent's office organize this? How did you choose the schools and where they would go? Was there an application process?

Mr. Brouillet: I dealt with the superintendents. If the superintendent of a district was not interested then you might as well forget a project like this. You can have all the teachers in the district interested, but if the upper management and the school board were not, or didn't buy into this, it just didn't go. That was the key ingredient. I met the superintendents and talked about what was available and tried to match up districts with Chinese schools. Some were quite interested, and some just thought there were other things that were more important to the district at the time. But it all eventually worked out.

One of the problems now is that there's not a lot of money in that program. Still, teachers in China are making a little more than $100 a year; they're probably making $400 or $500 a year now, but it's still a real drain on their resources to pay for a trip to Washington State.

Ms. Boswell: I understand that it has become

something of a money-making venture for the Chinese teachers, to be able to come here and get some kind of reimbursement that's higher than they would have had.

Mr. Brouillet: Yes. I don't know what we're giving them now, $100 a month or something in that range, which is considerably more than they were making in China. That's the sort of thing we have to deal with in this program. They want to keep their money, which is natural, but sometimes we have to work hard to get them out—not into the school district—but get them to go to the malls or someplace, to see some of our cultural things. But it's worked out pretty well.

Again, as poor as those people are, the people who are making the big money in China are not the teachers. In fact, one of the problems that the Chinese government faces is the loss of English teachers who are joining private joint-ventures and leaving the schools, because right away they can make significantly more money. I saw one situation in Shanghai, in one subdistrict they had lost forty English teachers. This is a city of twelve million people, of course. It is a problem for them because you can go to those private-sector ventures and make a considerable amount of money.

Ms. Boswell: I know it's hard to generalize, but what kinds of experiences did teachers that went over from Washington State have? Did it prove to be a positive experience?

Mr. Brouillet: I would say that of the teachers who went, at least ninety-five percent of them thought it was the greatest experience they ever had. Experience with not only the students, but with the different things they were exposed to. For Chinese students, the education was their future. If they were not successful, they were going to be out on the farm picking cotton or other menial work. The whole structure of society, the family, and everything is quite a bit different. I think the teachers enjoyed those characteristics.

It was different, plus the fact that they got to do a lot of other things while they were there. These people took good care of them and took them to look at such things as the Great Wall and the terra-cotta warriors. It was a tremendous experience.

Almost every one of them had their pet teacher or student they wanted to bring back, and a lot of them did. They vouched for them. In some cases you had to say that you'd guarantee up to $10,000.

Ms. Boswell: This is for Chinese students coming here?

Mr. Brouillet: Students or teachers coming here. There's a whole regiment of foreign teachers and students that have been here because people had met them in school and thought that they should have another opportunity.

To be quite specific, I think most people thought it was really a great, great experience. It broadened their cultural awareness of the world. One out of every five people in the world is Chinese, so you're talking about a lot of people. There's a certain amount of history, and even mysticism, about what the Far East is like. They really enjoyed it. In fact, we tried at various times to encourage social studies teachers, so that when they taught about the Far East and China they could take advantage of these offers. We also sent some teachers to Japan, Korea and some other places, too, but it was basically China. They could really deal with the subject in school if they'd been there and experienced it.

We had a lot of short trips in the summer and vacations where we sent ten or twenty teachers overseas, and then they could interact with teachers there.

Ms. Boswell: What about the organizational part of it? Did you have to handle most of it? As SPI, did you negotiate with the Chinese government?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, we did all the negotiations, at least to start with. The school districts didn't have a lot of experience in this area, and we knew the people. It's an interesting thing about the Chinese: they're hard bargainers. But once they get to the point where they feel comfortable with you and the relationship is established, you can do almost anything. Sure, they'll want to get the best deal they can, I can understand that. We need to do that, too. But they got to the point where, if you wanted to do something that was important to the school district, they'd do it. It took a number of years and everybody had to feel comfortable. They had to see that we were not there to make money, that we were trying to help them and we weren't trying to subvert and convert them to something or other.

We did most of it at SPI. Of course, it was strictly a top-down operation. When I'd get the education director of Sichuan to agree to something, that was it. I might agree to something, but I still had to talk to the school districts and say, "Now look, they want to do this and if you work this way, we can do it." But they make the decision at the top level, and that's the way it goes, right down the chain of command.

Ms. Boswell: I understand they also want to talk to the highest level they can, too—if possible.

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, yes. I, being the highest education person in the state, that meant a lot to them. They weren't dealing with the director of curriculum or somebody else—who might have done just as good a job—but the stature and position were very important.

Ms. Boswell: You mentioned that you began in Sichuan, but you expanded to Beijing and elsewhere. How did that expansion come about?

Mr. Brouillet: That had developed over a period of time. For example, schools in Olympia had been to China, and some of the people I'd taken there had developed a relationship with the Beijing Normal University. These normal universities all have secondary schools attached to them. They wanted to be involved in the program. I said, "Fine." I didn't have to start them all; I was more than happy when the districts took it upon themselves. We then developed some relationships and were able to help them a little bit, but the school districts basically did it on their own. And they're still doing it, because the administration is supportive.

They've got a couple of teachers in the schools that teach Chinese here—Americans that teach Chinese, and they bring Chinese teachers over to help them. Capital High School in Olympia has a strong program. Over a period of time, they bring one teacher a year, and have kept the arrangement going for ten years. Who they send over and who we send over is pretty much their decision.

China has some interesting ways to help make the decisions. They're much more political about who they send. If they've got fifteen people in the English department in the Chinese school, who do they send? The person who speaks the best English or the person whose husband or wife is the chairman of the local party? You have to deal with that. You just work around that and try to help them. After our people go there, they can figure out who in the department are the strongest people.

Ms. Boswell: Did the people from here ever take their families or did they go only as individuals?

Mr. Brouillet: People would take their

families from this side. They don't come with families from over there. They come by themselves. And as you indicated, it's financially more feasible. They have such extended families in China. There are so many examples of people who come over here to study who have one or two children. They have aunts and uncles and grandfathers, great extended families. I've known people that have been gone for five years, haven't seen their children for five years. That's not normal, but a lot of them come for a couple of years without seeing the family. But it's such a great opportunity for them.

We don't think much of it, but to come to an American school, for example, to teach here or go to school here, is something above and beyond anything anybody can imagine. So they make those kind of sacrifices. There's more and more of that going on now, so it's not like it used to be. They'd say to me, "We need teachers. Send us some teachers' names." I'd reply, "It's not quite like that, I can't give you a teacher's name today. I've got to go to the school district and they've got to talk about it." But the Chinese can make a decision like that in five minutes, who's going to be there, because everybody is lined up and wants to go.

It's a different culture, but Americans have taken families. They can and they do. In the Puyallup school district, they're not doing it so much anymore, but they staffed the American schools in Shanghai and Beijing. They sent over both teachers and curriculum people through the State Department. That's a little bit different kind of program.

Another program, and this thing was moving along and expanding, with the people going back and forth. When I retired as state superintendent I said, "There's a lot more to be done with this program." So my wife and I organized a group called the International Culture and Education Program (ICEP). It was made up of retired teachers. I first advertised in the retired teachers magazine for American teachers. We had forty people.

Ms. Boswell: This is from all over the country?

Mr. Brouillet: This is state of Washington only. Later, we saturated the market for Washington State teachers who wanted to go. My wife and I had a nonprofit organization. It took a lot of time. We don't do it now, because it would just take way too much time getting visas, travel arrangements, and other things, which took all our retired time. And we were trying to keep the cost as low as possible, so there wasn't any money, just a little bit for advertising and phones and so forth.

Anyway, we started sending retired teachers. We had forty teachers selected to go in 1989, but then the Tienanmen Square incident occurred. We were supposed to go in August, and June was Tienanmen Square. The Chinese canceled all the programs with America, Fullbright—all educational programs, except our program. So, I got all the people together and I said, "Really, you don't have to go." I've been there. I went over right after Tienanmen and went around to the schools they were going to be at and talked to the administrators and the government people. They wanted our teachers to come, because this was the first time we'd had retired teachers. I got all the retired teachers together and told them, "I was over there. There's no problem, you're not going to get incarcerated and nothing is going to happen to you, but it's your choice." Every one of them decided they wanted to go. They went over there. Over a five-year period, we sent about forty or fifty teachers a year, or more than two hundred.

Since we had pretty much saturated the state of Washington, we started advertising in California. We had a lot of California teachers mixed in with the Washington teachers. We

eventually got people from all around the country. It got to be so big that I finally decided I really had to retire sometime. My wife and I did this for the first five years that I was retired from SPI, 1989 to 1994. That was a very successful program. Those people thought it was great.

I'm not sure why they kept us and threw everybody else out of the country after Tienanmen. But we were all so tied in with some very important people who knew the premier. Plus the fact that we weren't really a threat. We weren't a bunch of young kids who came over there and agitated. We had long talks about the politics of China. If you're up leading the demonstrations, you're going to be sent home. They're not going to throw you in jail, they're just going to throw you out of the country.

These were older people, all retired teachers who'd been teaching for thirty years or more. You had people, fifty, sixty, seventy years old and I think we were acceptable from that viewpoint. We weren't out there to remake the world in the eyes of the Chinese.

Ms. Boswell: How long a commitment did the Washington teachers make?

Mr. Brouillet: We had a program that you could go for either a semester or a year. It cost you the same amount of money because you had to pay your airfare over. The Chinese paid your salary, which was $400 a month or something like that. The point was that if you just went for a semester, it cost you as much to get there as if you went for a year. So Americans, being different, a lot of them didn't want to commit for more than a semester because they were worried about the dogs, the cats, the kids, and grandchildren at home. But some did stay, and some went back again. We had many repeaters. Some people went over and stayed a year or six months or the semester, came home and decided, "Gee, that was a great experience. I want to go back. I want to go someplace different."

Ms. Boswell: Is it still ongoing?

Mr. Brouillet: Not much. My wife got tired of spending all of her time on this program. It was all volunteer work and it was fun. But it was an awful lot of work. Then we got to the point where there were not a lot of Washington teachers left that really wanted to commit to that. You had to go to Michigan and places like that, and I wasn't trying to build a new empire or a new business. So we've phased out. We still sent a few last year. There were people who wrote to us and said, "Gee, I heard about this from a friend and I thought—" We said, "Okay." We sent maybe half a dozen to places that I knew were good locations and I knew the people. So I said, "Yes, we can send you to one of these places."

Ms. Boswell: Who did you end up working with? You mentioned that you had high connections. Did that come from the SPI days?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, the SPI days. On that level you make the connections and they carry over. You meet government officials. One was a fellow whose father lived with the premier in the same apartment house. Another one was the fellow in charge of Chinese students when they were sending them to Russia. He was the head of the organization I was dealing with now for the retired teachers, the Chinese Education Association of International Exchanges. He was in charge of that. More of a figurehead than anything, but he'd had all these government officials. He'd been in charge of them in Russia, where they were staying at various Russian universities. So he knew all these people. When you break into the system, there are so many interesting contacts, people who know people from other places, other towns. I'm not sure it's still

holding up. And there's a whole new bunch of people, a whole new group.

The people I knew—one of my best friends passed away—things like that. And if you get out of it a little while, like any other activity, the characters all change. But there's still some of that floating around.

Ms. Boswell: Was that your influence? Did the program at the state level continue?

Mr. Brouillet: I think it's limping along. Where it is still continuing is in those school districts like Olympia and Snohomish, where we took the whole band one year. Things like that. There's still a commitment. But again, as you run tight on money, this kind of program falls away. People say, "What do you mean, you're paying for a teacher to go to China? We don't have enough money for something in third grade." And so these days, there's a lot more pressure. Things were probably better as far as financial situations go then. I think some of the people in charge in those days were much more supportive.

Ms. Boswell: When it began, were there economic pressures, aside from just paying for the program? Was there a desire to expand what has now become a very significant Pacific Rim trade potential?

Mr. Brouillet: We've always had good support from some large corporations. They would not really give us any money, but I never really went after it much either. Of course, they saw it as this whole issue of economic development. There's also more pressure now on business and opposition to this kind of thing than there used to be. Talking about aliens and illegal aliens. That doesn't do these kinds of programs any good, particularly at the local level. A person in Snohomish may not see the value of these things. He's out there working with his cattle, or wherever he's working, in the woods or something, and he doesn't see that we should be spending money on it. I think there's more pressure, particularly since levies seem to be failing.

And in fact, it was an issue in one of the levy elections in Snohomish. Here's a town where 200 or 300 people had been to China. But there were some people saying that we shouldn't be spending money on these things. Reading, writing, and arithmetic, basic skills, that is where our money ought to go. And it became an issue. In fact, they didn't send a teacher one year to Number Four Middle School. However, some people in the community, who had gone to China and were retired, got together and took turns going to China to keep the program going. They kept the program going and now it's functioning again. They didn't want it to fail. They wanted to keep the teachers going back and forth.

You'd get a Chinese teacher here, but the question of sending an American teacher there is sometimes a problem. So retired teachers in Snohomish took turns teaching in China each quarter.

Ms. Boswell: You were mentioning earlier about the Snohomish band visiting China. I wondered how that came about.

Mr. Brouillet: Snohomish always had a strong music program, one of the best in the country. In fact, they've been invited to presidential inaugural events, and the Rose Parade, the parade down in Pasadena, the Rose Bowl, that sort of thing. So they were interested in doing this. They self-started this. The director and I talked about taking the band. This was really an interesting task.

Ms. Boswell: This was in 1987?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes, 1987. They had a little over 100 students in the band and they took

along the swing choir, another twenty people, and then they took eighty townspeople, for a total of 200 people.

Ms. Boswell: How did they raise the money for this?

Mr. Brouillet: They had a sliding scale—if you could raise some money yourself and you were more affluent, then you were expected to do this. They had work rules laid out. Students could do car washes, concerts, and they raised the money. It was about $50,000. They raised it all, and we were most of the load in one 747.

We went to Canada and worked with Cathay Pacific because they were experienced in this type of endeavor. They had some contacts and they gave the band a good deal on prices and they worked with them. The swing choir even took their risers with them and they took all their instruments, tubas and all. And they took uniforms and a backpack in red Snohomish colors. They had them all especially made. That was all they got to take for luggage because they needed the weight for the other musical instruments and equipment.

We flew into Beijing and went to the Great Wall and had a concert. Then they were going to Shi Shi middle school, because that's where the Number Four middle school was located. They had a couple of concerts there and the kids stayed with Chinese families, a tremendous experience for them. Then later, the Chinese sent over a band, a much smaller one. It was a traditional band of a couple of dozen people; they couldn't match the size the of Snohomish delegation. They didn't have anything like this in China. They had a strong music program, but nothing like this. It was a good experience for the city of Snohomish and for the Chinese.

Ms. Boswell: I believe that sister city programs developed about that same time. Did the schools, or SPI, or you personally work with sister cities, too?

Mr. Brouillet: We worked with them, but we didn't have much to do with arranging sister cities. They were helpful sometimes in contacts, because normally they'd have some contacts in those cities. Our program was mainly through the educational bureaucracy. When you work with the education bureaucracy, sometimes we started at a higher level than the sister cities could because we were already dealing with people at that level.

Ms. Boswell: One other thing, I understand you helped to sponsor an elementary student delegation going to China. How did that evolve?

Mr. Brouillet: That just kind of happened. Actually, Larry Strickland of the SPI was the main instigator of that. It just kind of worked itself out. There were a number of elementary students who wanted to go. Then we brought some Chinese middle school students over here. But we also had to help provide the money for them, too. Something they couldn't do. We got them air tickets, various ways through the airlines and so forth. That was the real breakthrough, because they never sent anyone except college or high school graduates. As I say, there were elementary students, there were secondary students, just a lot of activity. Again, I hope these things continue, but they're so dependent upon somebody with a real drive in these areas and who understands the value of these things.

Ms. Boswell: Was there support when you were at SPI for other exchanges around the world? You mentioned Japan. Was it primarily Pacific Rim or did you go the other way?

Mr. Brouillet: Pacific Rim. There was a program before I got there of teachers going

to Australia and New Zealand. About a dozen people go a year as a teacher exchange. They exchange houses and cars and everything else. That's been a successful program.

Then there's a whole series of programs, sponsored by the Rotary and all those people, the Kiwanis. But we basically dealt with the Pacific Rim. The other groups, Kiwanis and Rotary, deal with the whole world. We had to make a decision about what's important. We just specialized in the Pacific Rim because that appeared to me to be the future of our state. Although most people, eighty percent of the students who leave this state to study abroad, go to Europe to study, not the Far East.

The future of the state of Washington, and I think the world, is in the Far East, not economically, but socially and politically. China one day is going to be something. They are now, even. The office didn't do much with going the other places.

Chapter 8

Initiatives and the Legislative Process

Ms. Boswell: I wanted to talk to you about what you have been doing since the last time that we got together. It has been about five months. I understand that you have been working against Initiative 601 and Initiative 602. Tell me a little about that.

Mr. Brouillet: I think about $2,000,000 was spent by the anti-Initiative 601/Initiative 602. The teachers' unions, the WEA and AFT, raised about $250,000. The higher education people organized my job to coordinate and help organize the community colleges, because the University of Washington was doing their thing and all the other schools had to do theirs. But with the community colleges being so widespread, it was hard to coordinate. I was just coming off of being the president of Pierce College, so I knew everybody. I have been spending the last couple months not only organizing, but going around and making speeches, "anti" speeches. Not up in Seattle, they have a lot of people doing that up there, but south of Seattle, in Pierce and Thurston Counties, and so forth. I went to Spokane. I have been down to Vancouver and Clark County, too, but basically in this area.

Ms. Boswell: To what kinds of groups?

Mr. Brouillet: A lot of business groups. I didn't go to many PTAs. There were a lot of calls from PTAs, but I talked to business groups, Chambers of Commerce, a lot of committee forums. We tried to zero in on those because the education groups were generally "anti" anyway, so you spent a lot of time talking to your friends. You hope that they are going to vote right, and they are going to do their bit because they also had their own telephone banks. In addition to our telephone banks, the WEA was running telephones around the state, particularly in the Puget Sound lowlands and in King County. That was where the real bulk of anti-Initiative 601/ Initiative 602 took place. The committee feeling was that King County was the key to it. Not only did it have the most votes, but there was potentially the most "anti" votes there. You go to a place like Spokane expecting them to vote "yes." You go to Garfield County or some place like that in eastern Washington and they'd be a "yes" vote. You like to get as much support as you can over there, but elections are won between Olympia and Everett, so that is where most of the people focus, particularly in King County.

The strategy was to tie the two issues together because it is so hard to talk about them individually. There were some built-in features in Initiative 602, particularly the rollbacks on education and higher education and maybe prisons. But you could see that there were some very specific things you could deal with. The other issue that people did not like—they wanted health care, and in addition, they did not like giving the tax rollback to the cigarette/tobacco people. It was the big issue out there, and it probably cost the Initiative 602 people a lot of votes.

So that was the strategy. The voters seemed to differentiate a little between the two issues. I think that the rollback was, basically, what killed Initiative 602. It wasn't a super-majority and all that, because that was all in Initiative 601. The "bad guys" from the cigarette/tobacco and tobacco/alcohol

companies had put a lot of money into the initiatives, and that became a campaign issue. So Initiative 602 carried a lot more baggage. In fact, Initiative 601 had very little money, $100,000 or somewhere in that range. Initiative 602 had $1.2 million. I think that there was a lot of discussion about that. There were meetings going on all over the state every night. I looked at the person that was handling the scheduling for the anti-Initiative 601/ Initiative 602, and he had to schedule thirty meetings in one night.

Ms. Boswell: Wow!

Mr. Brouillet: Almost all the editorial support in the state, except the Bellevue and Spokane papers, was against Initiative 602, but for Initiative 601, and Bellevue the other way around, which I never understood. I think almost every major paper in the state editorialized against both of them except Bellevue and Spokane.

Ms. Boswell: How would you evaluate the media coverage, generally, of the whole campaign?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, I suppose it was not nearly as good as people who were for it said, nor nearly as bad as people against it. You know how that goes. I think it became not just an issue of rolling back taxes, but I think a lot of people—I think of Father Sullivan of Seattle University— didn't have a lot to gain. Seattle University was going to be there whether it was passed or not, and they would probably get more students because it would be a cutback in public education.

But they looked at it not as a rollback or a limitation, but as a moral issue of how the state was going to be ten years from now, and what you want your children to have. Do we continue to take care of elderly people? Do we continue to take care of people in foster homes, all these kinds of things? I think that they look at it as a higher calling, or a higher issue, than just rolling back some taxes. Newspapers generally took the view that if you pass them, what's going to happen to higher education in this state?

There are still some problems. Initiative 601 actually has stronger limitations than Initiative 602, seventy-five percent votes and things like that. But it doesn't happen right away and voters probably didn't understand that. They said, "We want to send the message. We don't want to roll back taxes and help the cigarette people and hurt higher education, but we want to send a message." Enough people believed that. It's not done yet. They're only a few thousand votes ahead. It will be in the absentees. But if the absentees break down the way they traditionally do, then it will vary.

Ms. Boswell: What happens as we sit here? Initiative 602 looks like it's been defeated and Initiative 601 is really close. But, if as you suggested, it breaks out in the absentees that Initiative 601 squeaks by, what happens then? What does the Legislature have to do in January, then?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, I think the Legislature is going to do something, no matter what happens. If Initiative 601 passes, they are going to have to do certain things anyway. But if Initiative 601 fails, I think that the Legislature is under tremendous pressure. They are getting the idea that if this fails, it will barely fail and all those people out there are really upset with it, and I think there are going to be some strong limitations anyway. The thing about it is, they will be thoughtful and they will debate the kind of limitations you are going to have.

Right now, what is going on with Initiative 601 and Initiative 602 is, nobody really discusses what occurs. I mean: "Yeah, I'm for reducing my taxes, and yeah, I'm for caps and

yeah, I'm for super-majorities," but you don't ever debate it. You say, "Well, what happens if you have super-majorities and the prison population continues to increase sixteen percent a year, which it has been doing the last three years on the average, or fifty percent over the decade, or what if another 50,000 higher education students come in?"

On initiatives, you have got to take what you get and you don't have a lot of choice about alternates. I think some people who were probably for them, even for Initiative 602, don't realize the consequences of initiatives. If they could have made some changes in them, they could have made that palatable. They could have put some limitations in there, given a little more protection to higher education, which a lot of people were worried about. They could have done things like that.

I heard Dan Evans articulate this one time in a meeting. He said, "With initiatives, you don't get the fine tunings, you don't get to debate it, and instead you come out with something that is a little less constructive than a sledge hammer." So I get the feeling, just talking to legislators, that they feel strongly that they have got to do something, but what they do is another thing. If Initiative 601 passes and is sustained, they have got to start tooling down. They are going to have to start making some decisions. It's two years before it takes effect at the next biennial budget. They are going to have to make some decisions before that, such as are they going to continue to do this, are they going to continue that? The "three strikes, you're out" passed. In the short term, that is not expensive, but ten years down the road, when we get a lot more three-time losers, the cost is going to go up.

So they are going to have to start making some decisions. Are they going to continue public assistance the way they have had it? Public assistance is not a big deal, but aid to dependent children is a major driver in the welfare and human services. What are they going to do? It is going to be tough, and they are going to have to make some tremendously difficult decisions. Are they going to say the cities are going to handle their own crime problems with their own money, rather than the state sending the money down for police and these kind of protections? It's going to be difficult.

Ms. Boswell: Now that Gary Locke has won the King County executive race, and he was certainly one of the major architects of this last budget, is there other leadership that is going to pick up all the budgetary issues here that are going to come up?

Mr. Brouillet: The House is going to be strapped a little bit because Gary was there, and Dan Grimm was there before; both of them have now moved on. There are two or three people who could pick it up. Gary had a kind of unique situation. He was responsible for it, but he was also people-oriented. He was concerned with the young and the old. Those of us in between must not be old enough, because we don't get a lot of state services unless we are unemployed or injured on the job. So it is going to be an interesting thing to see if the state is going to continue to provide those types of services.

Personally, I think we need to do that just for our own welfare. Not even just because it is the right thing to do, but we have a lot of dependent children, and we've got to help those people become educated, trained, and productive. In the cycle of public assistance, if they move out of the aid to dependent children, this costs us more than if we spend money now.

And we don't know what to do about crime as a society. The genesis or the basis of the crime, it doesn't just all of a sudden show up when someone drives by and shoots somebody. It is a question of alienation and drugs and those people not having jobs. It's

easy to say we are going to be tough on crime, so we pass Initiative 593, which is not going to solve the problem. It's going to lock more people up; it's going to increase our percentage of incarceration, which is one of the highest in the nation already. Those are poor choices, just talking about crime. Talk about broken homes and battered people and you know what has happened to our society. It's just a reflection of what goes on. I'm reading a book now called *Why Americans Hate Politics,* and they talk about the false choices; that's not a choice. It is okay to be against crime, everybody is against crime, but what do you do to solve the problem? You don't build more prisons. You can lock everybody up in the whole state, I guess! What good is that? You've got to go farther back, back to the roots of the problem. We don't seem to want to put money in those kinds of things because they are intangible in many cases.

Ms. Boswell: This whole notion of anti-taxes, that's fueling this, is this a new direction?

Mr. Brouillet: Historically, people have always thought that they were overtaxed, even though the taxes in this state are not very high in relation to other states. Well, our sales tax is high, but we don't have the state income tax. To answer your question, first of all, it seems to be increasing. Some people are playing on that a certain amount, too, because everybody's taxes have gone up. Now, unless you were a wholesale person who had to pay more B&O tax, most of us don't know what it does. If I buy cigarettes or if I buy liquor, it increases the tax. Basically, if I am a college student, my tuition went up, but taxes have not gone up all that much. But there's an assumption out there that taxes have suddenly gotten out of control.

Well, we spend more money, that's true, but in addition to new taxes, this last session didn't raise much in the way of new taxes on people. But I think that there is a lot of frustration out there—frustration about the national debt, frustration about crime, and frustration about property taxes. Whatever it is, it all just kind of comes to a head and people play on this. One radio station, for example, spends all their time on taxes; they are just demagoguing and getting people excited.

Well, if there is a problem, how do we solve it? If you look at where the increases in spending have been, they've been in prisons, in K-12 education where 55,000 students showed up in this biennium that we didn't count on. That's $800 million. Then, we got a prison built over in Spokane, which we have not opened yet, but which will open next session, and we have another one on the drawing board, and a third one in the planning stages. That has been a sixteen percent increase, or a fifty percent increase over the decade. And you have K-12 going up, because it got way down, it started dropping. Now it's coming back up. You have higher education.

So you look at the areas of increase in spending, where are we going to cut? The environment? We passed two initiatives on clean air and toxic waste. The people passed those, so the Department of Ecology has grown considerably. So, I guess you have got to cut back, which is one of the problems about Initiative 602. They said we are not going to cut back on ecology, we want to take care of prisons, and we don't want to hurt education.

Ms. Boswell: Where do you cut down, then?

Mr. Brouillet: All you have left is social and health services. That's mainly aid to dependent children. If you cut that, you cut a dollar here, you cut a dollar off the Feds at the same time, so the whole thing is a false choice. You don't have very many good choices. They say that there is $950 million in waste, in inefficiencies. Sure, there is waste and inefficiency. Every large organization has that,

but $950 million!

Then of course they beat up on state employees. "Every state employee is sitting around drinking coffee, smoking a cigarette and talking. Nobody is working." I'm sure that does happen, that there are a certain amount of people sitting around. I have been around and haven't seen a lot of state employees doing that, during the last thirty years, and I've administered agencies. That is a bunch of garbage. I'm sure we can make some cuts, but they say, "We are not going to cut the workers, we are going to cut all the administrators." Again, these are all false choices that they give people, because if you cut the administrators, seniority will knock the people out below. Maybe we have too many administrators, maybe we do. So, I think Legislature should be looking at things like that.

Actually, the Legislature cut off more than 4,000 state employees last session. Then they added back child support enforcement after the Eli Creekmore case; everybody was excited about that. They added back higher education, community college and four-year schools. They put more than 1,500 more guards out there. They did all these things and they ended up with a net gain of 600 employees. But you know, they put people in ecology, and all these things we just talked about.

But there is a perception out there that people make decisions not on facts, but on perceptions. They have got to do something, they have got to do something very visible. Don't just cut off some employees and not tell anybody. They have got to get a system to do some of these things. They need to try to restore some confidence in the process.

Ms. Boswell: I don't know if this notion is really a straw man or not. I was listening to the returns last night, and I jotted down something one of the Initiative 602 backers said that the Legislature has been functioning in a "cart blanche manner." I think there is a perception that they have done anything that they wanted to do.

Mr. Brouillet: Tax and spend. You're absolutely right. The Legislature somehow has got to get control of that image. They may have to make some significant cuts in some places. But hopefully, they will do it in a rational manner, rather than just because they got an Initiative 602 hanging over their heads. Yeah, they are going to have to do something. Every legislator I have talked to, and I have talked to a lot of them over the last couple months, have all said, "We have got to get down there if this passes or not and do something."

We are also captives of the federal government, too. People don't need to differentiate between state employees and federal employees. They are talking about tax increases. They are talking about how they are going to do something about health care, that everybody is nervous about. Most people understand that it is not free. And so all these things come together. They had the problem of the national debt, all this piled on, and people aren't that discerning. They're discrete about why it happened or what it is. So whom can they lash out at? They can't lash out at Congress.

But, they can get initiatives. Then there are people running around pushing initiatives on term limitations and clean government. People are playing on the fears and the perceptions of citizens, and none of these are going to do anything. Term limitation, we passed it: three terms in the House—six years, two terms in the Senate—eight years. Where is the continuity going to be then? So what is going to happen is just what they are going to be violently opposed to happening. The staff and the invisible people who are just hired and not elected are going to be running the government. You are going to have to have

some continuity some place.

Ms. Boswell: Washington has been an early leader in using the initiative and referendum system. The Initiative 601/Initiative 602 campaign was the most expensive initiative campaign ever. Are we now going to see the initiative becoming a political tool of the media to manipulate voters?

Mr. Brouillet: I think so. If you first start looking at the history of it, the people who were really worried about it were the conservatives. They were afraid that the liberals were going to tax and spend. Now it has moved over not only to the conservatives, but the radicals are using this process. I think if this recent campaign is any indication, we're going to have something coming along called the "clean government" bill, which is another initiative from the people who had sponsored the term-limitation issue. They are going to make everything open, such as the caucuses.

You know, they are going to paralyze government even more. Government has its problems, but in some ways it is more difficult to make a decision now in government because it is so open, there are so many centers of power. You used to be able to go to somebody, or two or three people, to work things out. Now you have to deal with this group, this group, and this group. Everybody is posturing. You can't ever really let your hair down.

You know, these things are not working the way they intended. It is going to shift a lot of power jobs to people like lobbyists and interest groups, which they are all against. What will make it easier for these people? I feel pretty pessimistic about all this going on. There are always the intended results, which are expected, and there are always the unintended results. They say, "We didn't expect that to happen and we didn't want that to happen." Well, they haven't thought these things through very carefully.

I think initiatives, particularly in these times when people are upset, can be used as tools. I don't know how you get people quieted down, you know, so they try to understand. If you don't like what's going on, throw the rascals out. They have to go out and second-guess them all the time and get poorly written things on the ballot, which are very difficult to change.

Ms. Boswell: How much leeway is there in changing a poorly written initiative that does get passed? Is there anything that can be done to change them?

Mr. Brouillet: The Legislature can change them. They have to have a two-thirds vote in the first two years. If somebody passes something, let's say the Initiative 593, the "three strikes, you're out" on incarceration. Even if it is poorly written, you are not going to get anyone to vote to change it. When seventy percent of the people vote for something, which they probably don't understand, all they know is that they are going to lock people up. You can't, politically, vote against it. Nobody's going to touch that with a ten-foot pole. Not even fifty percent, let alone two-thirds. Then you can change it after two years, but there is a lot of rabble-rousing if you try to mess with those things. They are difficult to change, and legislators, being pragmatic people, understand that you don't go around tampering with a lot of the things that the voters have said you should do.

So, from a practical viewpoint, I have heard people say during this debate, "If you pass Initiative 602, we don't like cigarettes and alcohol, so we are going to get the Legislature to fix it." I heard Linda Smith say, "I have six senators who will vote to reimpose this." I think that she is making an assumption that the other twenty-five Democrats are going to go along with it. Initiatives have become

very sacred, and you don't touch them for two years for sure, and then maybe down the road you do something. I've not seen initiatives, even poorly written ones, ever amended after they had passed.

And then the courts look at them, too. The courts look at initiatives. They are not completely unbiased, but if seventy-five percent of the people want this thing, they normally don't tamper with them unless it is so bad. But normally they don't tamper with them because they are elected, too. I am not saying that they do that just for the election, but they understand that if seventy-five percent of the people want something and vote for it, there is no question which way it can go. Why would you rock the boat on that!

Ms. Boswell: Is there a way that the Legislature can head that off before it gets on the ballot, to try to get a better-written piece of legislation in place?

Mr. Brouillet: Yes. There is some talk now about a property tax initiative. The Legislature is also talking about it. "Well, maybe we ought to be looking at it and try to figure out what can work and put that out there as an initiative." I will bet you money that—Initiative 602 is already down—if Initiative 601 goes down, the people will be backing it so close, the Legislature will talk about putting something out there which copies some of these things that they are talking about in I-601. I think there would be a tremendous amount of pressure to do that. But here we have got this win now. We have these residents who want to protect higher education or whatever it is, and we are going to do these kind of things, and throw it out there and let you vote on it. I think the Legislature has got to do something, even if Initiative 601 hangs in there and passes, they have still got to do something. It is a question of image.

You know, most legislators are trying to do the job. We say the Legislature, or Congress too, we say those people are really bad. But then we turn around and elect all the same people. But we say, " Our people are okay and it is the other ones that are bad." All the legislators were on the ballot for reelection yesterday, and they all won. Heck, we do that for Congress, too. We say, "Oh boy, there is gridlock and they are self-serving," and all these things that we say about them, and then we turn around, and, generally speaking, send the same people back. Well, if they are so bad we ought not to return them, right? But we know the ones in our area, so we are more supportive of them. It is an interesting phenomenon.

Ms. Boswell: One historic initiative that comes to mind is the shoreline management issue back in the 1960s. A fairly powerful initiative was brought forth and the Legislature came up with an alternative that went on the ballot, which ultimately was put into place.

Mr. Brouillet: I think it means more preemptive strikes, or whatever you want to call it, to get ahead. I don't know, I don't think the Legislature is bad. There are a few people I would throw out if I had a chance, but most of them are fine people. But they have such a bad image. You have all these reporters and newspapers. You have KOMO and KING beating up on little things. Green River Community College took their people on a retreat to the San Juan Islands. Well, the TV was grinding away, and always chipping away at things. They shouldn't have done it, but it is not a big deal. They could have sent them up to the University of Washington for less money, but that is the kind of money we are talking about. I don't know how, but they need to improve that.

But society gets sort of unglued in general, not just about taxes. Look at people, they are mad about everything and that reflects itself

in the legislative process, school boards, schools, and higher education. Everybody has got a problem, and in problem times it is terrible being a legislator. I wouldn't want to be a legislator now. You know, you're abused on everything, and even when you don't have any control over it. I mean, for example, "Why haven't you reduced the drive-by shootings in Tacoma or Seattle, or wherever?"

Ms. Boswell: What about the attitude toward legislators when you where in the Legislature, was it very different?

Mr. Brouillet: Much better. People elected you, and they talked to you and they wanted you to do things, but they thought you were okay. If they thought you were doing the kind of things that they wanted, they would write you, and let you know. But you didn't have so many one-issue pledges, such as abortion, over-taxation, and that type of issue. People have zeroed in and the media is much more influential. Fewer people read newspapers and more people get their information on thirty-second sound bites, so the whole thing has changed. When I ran, we didn't have much TV, a little bit of radio, and some newspaper. We didn't have walking lists, where you knew who the voters were. You could go down to the county auditor's office and write them out if you wanted, but now I could go to Seattle and buy a mailing list of everybody over sixty-five or every single female or every male or every family.

There are mailing lists of all these kinds—people who voted in the last four elections or three of the last four elections or that haven't voted since they registered. We didn't have any of that available, so you had to rely on doorbelling; you had a lot more meetings. You tried to get the Grange's mailing list or something; mail their members, or Rotary clubs, if you could figure out how to get their members. But you couldn't buy mailing lists, or they were very limited.

So it was more direct contact, a lot more meetings. I had a lot of meetings where there'd be one hundred people, but now when you go to a meeting, there are more candidates than there are citizens listening, because they are all home watching TV, or doing something else. So you didn't have to rely upon TV. There was a lot more contact like that then than now. I have been to Sportsman's Club meetings where there were 200 people. I would go to the local PTA, or Chamber of Commerce meeting in Puyallup, and there would be a couple hundred people. You can't find meetings like that anymore, unless somebody is out to lynch somebody. But you miss those informational gatherings. I think that with Initiative 601/Initiative 602 there was a lot more of that going on this time because it was so hard fought and there was a lot of publicity about it.

Ms. Boswell: You said that people are getting their information in thirty-second sound bites, but do you think people are more or less informed about what the Legislature is doing now than when you were there?

Mr. Brouillet: Well, the public may be informed on some subjects because they have got the computer, they can get your voting record and other things, probably. I remember, when I was in the Legislature, the local Sumner paper published our voting record every week, which was available, but there were so many more procedural votes and citizens couldn't tell the difference. It didn't last very long. They have hotlines now, and I think people have greater access. I am not quite sure that they are better informed, but they have more information; I am not sure that they know more about the issues.

I think it has led to the rise of interest groups and PACs (Political Action Committees). They deal with their own

people. I think also society was a little happier. That would affect the Legislature. We would get in violent arguments about different issues, and then you could sit down and talk to them afterwards. You could sit down and talk to your opponents afterwards, the other party. People are so mean-spirited today, they will hardly talk to opponents anymore.

Campaigns have gotten really bad as far as negative campaigning. They figured out during the presidential election that Willie Horton was a big deal. Of course, Governor Dukakis had no control and he wasn't going to make an impact anyway. But, it is the kind of stuff people expect or tolerate, now that they have all this information. You can turn around and mail something out in a matter of hours or days, at the most. You can buy the mailing lists, take them to someplace, have them label them, and stuff them, and everything else. You don't have to even look at it, it's all done for you. So they have instant communications, and people have found out there is so much negative campaigning. There is just so much negative campaigning.

If you take a trip someplace, you are fair game. It might have even been a legitimate trip. I remember in this last campaign, the Initiative 602 people were accusing people of going some places, like Russia and Germany, and it was true, but a private foundation paid for it. But the Initiative backers did not make that distinction. They said they are "jet-setting" all over the world. So you come back with something, refute it, or whatever you do. But there is so much instant communication now, and I think the negative impact has made people dissatisfied.

You know, people really don't like to see candidates throw mud. One starts and the other one follows up, and I think that has done a lot to ruin the image of legislatures and governmental bodies. It took a lot of citizens out of the campaigns because of all the junk that comes out about people, some of which are half-truths. There is probably enough fabrication or misinformation to make it somewhat plausible. Just like saying about the University of Washington that there is one employee to 1.8 students. That takes in all the part-time people, it takes in the hospital, and it takes in the 10,000 people up there, working on outside grants who don't teach. So technically, if you take all the people and add them up at the University of Washington, it comes out that way. But people claimed that those were all state-funded people, implying and that there was a lot of fat that we can get rid of. If we got rid of all those people, we wouldn't save a dime in the state fund. Lots of those people are on corporate grants, federal grants, or are working as a nurse in the hospital or emptying bedpans or whatever. One of the ads that was running during the time put those two figures together. So by doing that, a lot of people believe it and they would be damaging the image of the University of Washington.

You can't keep beating people up without some mud sticking. Even if it is not true—you don't have to be true—it's an old political thing. As long as you are smiling, you can't be sued. Politicians are pretty fair, open game. But all the stuff that flies around and there is so much of it.

Ms. Boswell: It sounds like it is really based on a broader social malaise. There is not much that can be done until there is some reform.

Mr. Brouillet: If you look at all the people that are running on things, many are not crying. Look at the Seattle mayoralty race. One candidate was going to have a curfew and get all the kids off the street. I am not sure if that is good or bad, but the point is, that it is more than just a curfew. Where are these kids going to go, if they haven't got a home? We are just ignoring them, the status of the family, and what goes on in our society. Sure, none of us likes that when there are broken homes

and kids who have no place to go. You have got to do a little more than just a curfew, which is too simplistic. You get all those kids off the streets and nobody will be shooting anybody. They are making the assumption kids are not going to get in trouble if they stay off the street. This is a false choice. You are not really looking at the issue.

Ms. Boswell: Are these strongly partisan issues? I mean is Democratic versus Republican politics so much involved now, or is it much deeper?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, it is a little bit. For example, one of the characterizations of the people who are pushing this issue were the losers in the last election. The Democrats took over and spent some money to do some things. But if you look at the nucleus of Initiative 601/ Initiative 602, they say they are bipartisan, but they are basically Republicans. The initiatives were written in the Republican caucus. There is a certain amount of partisanship in this. They didn't just spring up from the citizens. They were written in the Republican caucus before the budget was even voted on, before anybody even knew what the budget was.

There are some fears that they are playing on, but there is a feeling among people out there that things are "screwed up" and out of control. Except, in trying to figure out why things are out of control, if they are, and how to solve them, they are just going to take a "meat ax" to the problem. You are going to have to say, "You now have less money to spend, spend it wisely."

Ms. Boswell: When you were in the Legislature in the 1950s and 1960s, were the partisan divisions as strong?

Mr. Brouillet: There are always partisan divisions, but the people involved were generally more interested in getting the solution than to seize the issue. There is a group in our society nowadays that probably would just as soon not see a solution to some of the problems that they talk about because that would take the issue away and it's a good issue, because you can get people roused about something. So, I think there was a lot of feeling, more bipartisan, to get something done, to accomplish the task. I think there was more of a feeling among Democrats and Republicans, they would say, "We have this problem, what do we do?" We might argue over it for awhile, but eventually we are going to compromise and do it. It is very difficult. Nowadays, it's either take this or not. Politics has got to be the art of compromise. It is really getting difficult to compromise on some of these issues.

Ms. Boswell: You were able to work and speak out during this campaign on the initiatives because you were out of elected office. There was some controversy during this Initiative 601/Initiative 602 campaign that Judith Billings, as the superintendent of schools, was speaking her mind about the initiative. What do you think about that whole controversy? Was that an improper use of the office?

Mr. Brouillet: We had a memorandum from the attorney general saying that if it is something with which you are involved, like schools, the superintendent should be able to speak out on it. Now, they say that the governor can speak on anything because he controls everything. But the superintendent controls half the money of the state. I think it was a bad decision to prohibit her from expressing her opinion on educational issues. I think that she really ought to test it. If it is an initiative on timber and you say that an elected official, the land commissioner, shouldn't say something, I think that is ludicrous! You say, "If you do this, fine, but it is going to cause this and this, and I don't think that you ought

to do it." It is contrary to the memorandum that we all received early on, at least the people that worked in institutions, saying what they could do and what they couldn't do. It is inconceivable to me that the state superintendent, the elected official who is supposed to be responsible for monitoring all K-12, cannot say something about an issue. I think it is a bad decision.

I think that the PDC, the Public Disclosure Commission, has gotten beat around so much that they're reacting the other way. I think that the PDC and others are so shortsighted. I have been dealing with these community colleges and everybody is so "shell-shocked" about saying anything. "Now make sure you don't do it on company time, and you will take your vacation." Everybody out there in the world is so nervous. The people working in institutions, they won't do anything.

I think that there is a limitation: you shouldn't be using the facility for personal use. But the person in charge of schools, what she did was not the same. One of the classified unions for public-school employees sent her a FAX about an article they were writing, and she wrote back and said, "Yes, I agree with this." She sent it back on the state FAX to the group, and that is what she got hung up on. I think that's a gross misapplication of what you can do and can't do. There was $350 million in the SPI budget that isn't protected by K-12 constitutional protection. So she couldn't say, "Well, $350 million is on the board; it could be cut, and this, and this." That just tells you what is on the board and what could happen if trouble does come.

I think it is a bad decision. I think the superintendent ought to appeal it to the courts, which is possible, to clarify the office and to get the status. I don't think they should let that stand, saying that you can't ever talk about an issue in schools. We are not talking about public assistance, we are not talking about prisons. We are talking about things that she's charged with: supervision of all the schools in the state of Washington. I don't know what she is going to do.

Chapter 9

Thoughts on Education

Ms. Boswell: As the state superintendent, how closely did you work with individual school districts?

Mr. Brouillet: In regard to the program of educational exchanges with China, we worked with the districts because it was necessary. I indicated that the factor that makes these succeed is a commitment by the people at the local level, particularly the superintendent and the school board. We worked with them. We had to find out where their interests were. Some people were greatly interested. Some people didn't care, didn't want to be interested, so we had to work through that.

At different times, if superintendents were interested, I'd arrange things for them to go to China so they could look at the education system there. But in this state, as in most states, it's dependent upon what the local people want to do. You can give them carrots and those kinds of things, but when it comes right down to it, they have to make the decision. We worked with the districts. We had a lot of the knowledge and the connections, so we could find out if they were interested in something. We'd say, "What are you interested in, and where?" Then we could work some kind of deal with them.

You really need to work with them. You can't decree anything from on high, because the districts do as they please anyway. All the state superintendent really does is pass on money that the Legislature gives, divvies it up, accounts for it, and has some rules and regulations. If the school districts adhere to the rules and regulations, they can maintain some autonomy. SPI doesn't have a lot of power, but it has a lot of influence, and you can work with them. But as far as saying, "You're going to have to do this," that's a no-no.

Ms. Boswell: Had it always been that way or was that more of your own management style?

Mr. Brouillet: If you look at our state and then look at some of the strong states, you need a Pearl Wanamaker type, a real tiger, things like that. This idea of being out in front and making statements that can have some influence is only partially true.

I think it's your modus operandi, how you operate, too. Some people bang them right on the head. I always found out that if you worked with them a little more quietly, you got more things done, and it's not a case of somebody wins and somebody loses. If you can make it a kind of win-win deal, you're better off. Everybody's happy.

But there are people who can be difficult in political life, who would rather have the issue than the solution. It's something to talk about, it's a hot issue, and so forth. But if you really want to solve it, sometimes you can't really hit people in the eye. You've got to figure out how they want to deal with it, what the method is, and then get it done.

The problem with this kind of modus operandi is people don't think you're doing anything. You don't see a lot of fire and brimstone and a lot of activity out there. Instead of looking at the results, they focus on the style, the flash. There are people in our society that make a lot of noise, but look at the products—they produce nothing. It's a matter of style. I happen to operate on the more

quiet side without making a lot of noise. I'm interested in results.

Ms. Boswell: Was there more difficulty in working with districts in eastern Washington, than the western part of the state, being located in Olympia? Do the same sectional issues that come up in other areas come up in education at all?

Mr. Brouillet: Oh, yes. If you can use the term big spenders, the big spenders are on the coast. They're not in eastern Washington. The levies in western Washington are higher and people pass more of them. I think they've really got more problems too, and that is maybe one reason why they need the levies.
But they tend to be more conservative on the other side of the mountains. There's a real split at the mountains. The levies aren't as high and the boards are more conservative, which means they have a more conservative administration. I think there is a difference, and you have to recognize that. What Seattle wants is not what Ephrata may want.

One of the problems is large districts need to recognize each other's difficulties because Seattle has different kinds of problems than Spokane, even though they're both large districts. There are a lot of personalities involved and, I think generally speaking, that you can say that today they're much more conservative about school matters and funding there, than they are on this side of the mountains.

Again, just look at where the big levies are—not so much in volume, but in percentages. Around here, the Legislature talked about reducing levies. It affected Seattle, Tacoma, and other large districts on this side of the mountains. It didn't do an awful lot of damage over in eastern Washington because their levies were lower to start with. They have problems over there, but they are different kinds of problems. The question is how to recognize the problems on both sides of the mountains. There's a little different mentality on each side of the mountains.

Ms. Boswell: Looking back over your career at SPI, is there something that you would say, this is my big contribution? This is something I'm most proud of, when having been at SPI?

Mr. Brouillet: First of all, this whole international thing is very important. I think that's a contribution that probably a lot of people in the world don't know about, but I think it was very important for our current school system.

Secondly, I think that we did a lot with the disadvantaged students—the different kinds: the migrants, the handicapped, and others. We probably had more of an emphasis on that than most of the previous administrations had. Again, that's not very visible, but we've got a lot of young people below the poverty line that we have to take care of. We put a lot of emphasis on trying to bring those people into the mainstream so they can succeed, and they can be useful, productive, happy people. From an economic viewpoint, so they can be taxpaying citizens. From a social viewpoint, so they can get along with the other people.

A third thing, we got money into the school coffers. I saw one of my activities as not to run local districts, but to try to provide them with the resources so they could do things. Every year we got more appropriations than the governor recommended for the schools. Now, it's different times and different circumstances. We were successful in some of the programs, such as special categories of funding for disadvantaged. We had an urban-rural racial disadvantage which was not only Seattle special needs, but also to expand to take in some of the migrants, so we broadened the base. We worked hard in apportionment of funds.

The job was really a political job. Talk about the educational aspect! Sure, there are educational aspects of it, but basically it's a political job. It's an educational and administrational and a political setup. Money doesn't fall off the trees, just because kids are out there. I have yet to ever hear anybody say they're against education. But I think you need to look at the record and see what they do. Not so much what they say, but what they do.

The state superintendent, because of being in Olympia, dealing with the Legislature, knowing these people and the governor, one of their tasks is to get the resources to the districts so they can educate kids. Buy books, buy buses, pay teachers, all this kind of thing. We worked hard at that, and I think the appropriations we were able to get for districts were very good—much better than nowadays. I think there wasn't as much feeling that you've got to reinvent schools either, in those days. A lot of people were happy. They weren't running around and saying that schools have failed and all that. I think more people were happy then.

A lot of people are happy today, too. You just don't hear from them, like you do the people who are upset about Johnny who can't read and write and so forth. As long as we have an all-purpose situation where you're going to keep everybody in school, sometimes somebody is not going to be able to read and write. You could do it like they do in China, take the top five percent and educate them, and the rest of the people are going to go to work out on the farm. If they take five percent out of a billion people, you've got a lot of students. We could do something like that, but that's not our purpose. We're committed to provide something for everybody. I think that back then, times were happier. We didn't have a lot of people trying to reinvent schools.

I guess those are the kind of things I'd see that we were able to get done and accomplished.

Ms. Boswell: Given the political nature of the job, as you saw it, what did your legislative background bring to the job?

Mr. Brouillet: I came out of that mix. I'd been there sixteen years, and I knew an awful lot of people—who was who, and what was what, and where the pressure points were. It helps considerably, because being the SPI is a political job. Even if you're dealing with curriculum, it's a political job. The Legislature is always trying to pass something on curriculum, and you've got to deal with that. That's decided in a political atmosphere, even though it's strictly an educational activity.

I think we were very successful. I knew a lot of legislators. Particularly in the early years, I knew everybody. They were friends of mine and so they tried to be helpful. I got some things done, like the money for the Chinese exchanges, things I wouldn't be able to get another time. I wouldn't be able to get it today. Certainly, it was helpful.

Ms. Boswell: In your political career, what was the most challenging or most rewarding to you? Was it SPI or being in the Legislature? Can you really compare them?

Mr. Brouillet: It's hard to compare them. I really enjoyed the time I was in the Legislature. I thought I got some things done, working with both Republicans and Democrats. Nobody works with anybody anymore. They all fight. But in those days we used to talk. I could go to Slade Gorton, for example, about something and say that it was really a good bill. And he'd say, "Okay." I felt that I had a real influence when I was in the Legislature.

I figured that on almost any education bill there were twenty to twenty-five people who would follow my lead. If I thought it was a good bill, they'd vote for it even if they didn't understand it. I didn't understand about

highways and a lot of things, and I'd look at people and decide whether it was a good bill on the basis of who was supporting it, because I didn't know all the fine details. I figured that I always had twenty-five people that if I said it was a good bill, and it was fair, they'd vote for it. That's the kind of relationships you build up in the Legislature. If somebody sitting in Institutions had a good bill, some people would maybe follow that person. We had a lot of things going and I enjoyed it. The people were good on both sides of the aisle.

SPI was a totally different thing. You were more of an adversary in this situation, but you have to get along with those people. They control the purse strings. They control so many of the activities you wanted to do. But, as we knew, being in the political arena, I understood those kinds of things. I knew the people. Sometimes you have to figure out what you can get—you can't get everything. I'd say, "Well, okay, you don't like this, then how about that?" Then you try to back around and get what you could.

A large part of being the SPI was dealing with people. Some educators don't understand this. They said, "My god, why didn't we get that?" I'd say, "We got this, and we'll have to come back next year, the year after next, and try to get that. We don't have the votes to get that and they're not going to give it to us this time around." You shove and push. It's different.

I felt as a legislator that you have more control over the budget and those aspects than the SPI does because you're right there. You can lobby people on the floor.

Ms. Boswell: In terms of having a long-term impact on the educational system of Washington, could you have more as a legislator or more as SPI? Or is it a totally different kind of comparison?

Mr. Brouillet: There's a difference. It depends who you are. If you build up in the Legislature a real camaraderie and some following and some understanding, you can be just as effective. If you were chairman of the Education Committee and you'd been there ten years or something, you could really be tremendously important. I figured in the House, if I didn't agree, it wouldn't pass if it were education. If I liked it, it may not pass, but it had a good chance.

All the bills come through your committee. I worked on two things. I worked on Education and I was the ranking person on Appropriations. You decide in the legislative process early on what you want to specialize in. I have known people who thought they were specialists in everything. As a result, they weren't specialists in anything. I decided early on I liked Education, it's important and I liked Appropriations. So I'm going to spend my time on those two subjects, and I'll have to figure out something about Institutions and Highways. I'll have to rely on somebody else, because I don't have the capacity—nobody does—to deal with all these subjects. I wanted to become the most knowledgeable, the most expert person, in education and appropriations. You make that decision early. That's the only advice I ever gave to young people nowadays, when they go to the Legislature—decide what you want to be an expert in, because you can't be an expert in everything. Now they've got more staff, and I suppose they can do a lot more things. I made that decision early.

My seatmate was Leonard Sawyer, from Puyallup, who eventually became Speaker. He decided he was in on Transportation and Highway appropriations. We talked about these. I talked to him about education things and he'd talk to me about transportation. If I had a question about transportation, I'd go and see him. I think too many people don't understand that in the legislative process and they try to do everything for everybody. That

doesn't mean that for your district you can't represent them in these other areas, but you have to have the information if you're going to make an impact.

I guess, going back to your question, if you enter a situation like that, you can probably be as effective as some state superintendents who understand the legislative process or the political process. They are hard to compare, because you can be a success in both of them. It depends on how you approach it. In some ways, it's hard to be state superintendent because you've got to go to everybody else and get them to do something, and sometimes it's controversial. Not that the Legislature isn't controversial, but when you're on the inside of the Legislature it's one thing; when you're superintendent, most of the time you're on the outside. It's pretty hard to try to figure how to get on the inside. I suppose either one of them could be more important than the other. I think it depends upon the individual, how strong a person they are and how they deal with things. Personal relationships. We've all seen people that can tell you to go to hell and you don't get mad at them. You've got people who say something that is pretty innocuous, and you're really upset about it. The whole thing of dealing with interpersonal relationships is really important.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about the transition from SPI into other areas of your life.

Mr. Brouillet: I'm retired and I said, "I don't know what I'm going to do." So I'm retired, and the president of Pierce College decides he wants to go back East. The board members said, "Why don't you take over while we find a new president?" I said, "Well, that's an interesting idea." Actually my degree, my doctorate, is in community college administration, but I'd gotten away from that because I'd gone to the Legislature and SPI. I said, "Well, that would be interesting," and I went out to Pierce College.

Ms. Boswell: When was that?

Mr. Brouillet: In 1989. I went there and it was a very interesting job. That was really a different job, compared to being a superintendent. Nowhere near the pressure. No levies, no parents. Once or twice a year, a parent comes and pounds on the desk. Kids that get in trouble, they're gone. First of all, the students are somewhat older and more selective; if they are not good students, they don't go to college. So you've dropped off the bottom one quarter, and you don't have any levies, you don't have any parents.

Ms. Boswell: It's a cushy job.

Mr. Brouillet: It's really interesting. I thought, I've been in local schools and I've been doing all these things, and people were always after me. The press or somebody, not pounding, but the parents are upset if you've got certain things in the curriculum. Nobody ever looks at the curriculum in college. And so I thought, this is really good, and I said to them "Well, this is really an interesting job. I'm going to stay awhile." They said, "Okay." That was their search. I was there four years, and then I got ill and I had to quit.

I don't want to pick on the community college people because they're all my friends, but it's no comparison to being a local superintendent. The grief and the abuse you have to take from everybody about something is tremendous. But nobody comes and looks at your curriculum; nobody sees how you're spending your money. I shouldn't say nobody but very few do. It's pretty well regulated. I was over there for four years.

Legislators and some local people got together, and we built the Puyallup branch of Pierce College. We also expanded some

international programs.

We got an exchange going with Korea, with some community colleges there. Did some things in Japan. Now they're doing considerably more than I ever envisioned. The new president is pretty gung-ho on this, and he's going to China and Japan, and he's started some exchanges in that area. So that worked out.

Ms. Boswell: In terms of being a college or community college president, did it require the same kind of skills the SPI did, in terms of sort of massaging the Legislature for what you need?

Mr. Brouillet: Not really. First of all, there is no massaging the entire Legislature. There are thirty-two community colleges in this state. Each one of them is in a legislative district. They have a lot of political support because they're not controversial. You just deal with your own local legislators.

At SPI you're dealing with everybody in the world. You deal with the three hundred local school districts, trying to get them to come on board and understand the program. Community colleges have their own state office in Olympia, and they have their own lobbyist, too. I suppose if you talked to them they'd give you some horror stories about what they had to go through. I don't think it's anything like what the SPI has to go through. It's another level. Legislators have a different view of colleges than they do of common schools.

I didn't have to do that anymore. The biggest things we probably did was develop the Puyallup campus. Building this complex and doing some construction work, those kinds of things.

Ms. Boswell: Getting the funding? Pierce College certainly has very nice facilities in both those campuses.

Mr. Brouillet: Fortunately, the chairman of the Ways and Means in the House was a Puyallup boy and the majority leader in the Senate was a Puyallup boy.

Ms. Boswell: Sounds like a Puyallup monopoly here, a triumvirate.

Mr. Brouillet: It was a helpful situation. But a lot of political support, not only statewide but also local, is critical. In fact, this campus right here, Puyallup, it was never on the state board's priority list. Local legislators got it put in the budget and passed it. We've got 100 acres up here on the hill. The state board was very upset about that for many years.

One of my activities as president was to work back into their good graces and deal with the state Community College Board and say, "This happened and that's the way it went, but we don't want to end run you all the time. It came out that way." This was a political decision. Of course, this is probably one of the fastest-growing community colleges in the state.

Ms. Boswell: I was going to ask you how the numbers compared to the other community colleges.

Mr. Brouillet: When they started community colleges, most of the people lived on the west side of I-5. Now the majority of people live on the east side of I-5. If you can look over on the east side, you've got Pierce, Tacoma Community College, Clover Park Technical College and Bates all there. Auburn is down the road a ways. The greatest growth is on the west side. Puyallup is going to build another high school right out here. We'll have three high schools in little old Puyallup one of these days. So, there's tremendous growth here. The demographics are such that this is going to be one of the fastest-growing areas in western Washington. The only thing that will keep this

college small is if they can't get any money from the Legislature, because they're full up. Yes, some people were upset when it started, but in Pierce County the growth is here. There's a lot of land out here. We'll be growing clear to Eatonville pretty soon. I had to deal with those problems and then see that this got started.

But four years goes so fast, and now I'm retired again.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me what you've been doing since.

Mr. Brouillet: I've been to the University of Washington, Tacoma branch, as a volunteer. I started the Pacific Rim center there. I knew the dean, who has left since and gone to Alaska. I was retired and not doing all those things, and he said, "Why don't you come on out here? We need something in international education here." So I went up to Tacoma and here I am. They don't pay you any money, but I go out there a day or two a week and organize and help students, internationally.

Two years ago we sent a group of students and faculty members to China. Last year it was to Vietnam. This year it's Thailand and Laos. I tried to help them out with some of my contacts. The one going to Thailand is this year; I'm dealing directly with the Thai travel agent. I don't want to be anti-middleman, particularly, but it cuts out the middle person and it saves the students $500 or $600 apiece. If you go to an American travel agent, they're going to have to contract with the same Thai person or somebody like them. When we went to China last year, I dealt with these same people when I was there. I got hold of this guy and I said, "Who is good?" They arranged it all and again saved several hundred dollars for the students. I'm not going to do it forever. I'm just doing it because I want to get them started and help them with some of detail things.

We do some other things, too. Bring speakers in now and then.

Ms. Boswell: Are there a lot of differences working with the University of Washington system, as opposed to Pierce College and the community college system?

Mr. Brouillet: Sure. Again I'm a volunteer, so I kind of do what I want. The higher you go in the system, the less structure there is. Down in K-12, you've got all kinds of rules and regulations, and then you get to the community colleges, a little bit less. You get to the university level, and I don't want to say that they're completely unstructured, but people do their own thing. You'd never let a K-12 teacher do what they do at the university level. Yes, it's pleasant. I enjoy the people, and it's a lot of fun.

I'm trying to get a Pacific Rim Center started. It's not institutionalized yet. I've got a commitment from UW Tacoma when they move their new campus downtown that they're going to institutionalize it a little more. They don't put any money in it. We're all free; everybody there is a volunteer. I'm not going to spend my whole life working on this, I'm retired. I want them to get institutionalized—get somebody who can do some of these things and deal more with the students and help them more, and deal more with the faculty. They'll do it eventually. That's my latest activity—my contribution.

Ms. Boswell: To institute those kinds of changes, is that an area that the Legislature would ultimately come in and support, or this much more an internal matter?

Mr. Brouillet: That's much more internal. They get a certain amount of money. The University of Washington has the Jackson School of International Studies in Seattle, a huge operation, a lot of money, local, federal,

and everything else. You can tie faculty members to this. Faculty members teaching classes in, say, Chinese, or Tibetan, or whatever you want. That supports the center, but also helps the students. Seattle is much bigger, and they'll be able to do a lot more things. UW Tacoma will get bigger, too. It's a question of how much money.

New quarters in Tacoma have now been built, part of their urban renewal.

Ms. Boswell: Yes, it's wonderful. I think the concept is just fabulous.

Mr. Brouillet: It's going to be great. Things are going well.

Ms. Boswell: I went to the museum there and with all of the different exhibits that are there, I think it's going to be a really vital and wonderful area.

Mr. Brouillet: That's a political decision. The Speaker of the House was Brian Ebersole and he was interested in Tacoma, and so Tacoma ended up with the museum. They were already committed to be there, but then they had to get the resources. How do you get the resources? Again, it comes out of the Legislature, and at that point in time, the speaker was from Tacoma and the majority leader was from Puyallup.

Now they're from other places, and so I noticed that one of those people is from Vancouver, Washington. I see that the Vancouver branch campus got a big chunk of money.

Ms. Boswell: How can we assess that? As citizens of Washington, is that a good thing?

Mr. Brouillet: You've got a lot of desires and demands out there. Where do you put your money? You can put it there, you can put it over here. Again, that's the way some legislators can have a lot of influence about who gets what, where, or when.

I'm on the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB), and we put out recommendations. You can come pretty close to them, but you can't expect them to be exact. Most of us on the HEC Board aren't pushing for anything specifically, although a lot of us are interested in branch campuses. Not just Tacoma, but all of them, because I think that's a good organization. We put our recommendations out there, and they come pretty close to them. So they get an extra building here or one less here; that's how the old system works, and I don't think that's particularly bad. The whole system is politicized in a way because it's a political decision. They'll come in with recommendations pretty close to what they asked for. If we get too far off, people get upset. You have to deal with that. That's just one of the anomalies of dealing with the Legislature and the political processes.

Look at the federal Congress. Robert Byrd, when he was chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, got some of the internal revenue activity moved to Wheeling, West Virginia, from Washington D.C. He took several thousand people and moved them to West Virginia. That was pretty gross, I thought. While that is not always the way it's done, you have got to expect it. As long as you've got people being elected, and they're supposed to bring home the bacon for somebody, you've got to expect those kind of things to happen now and then.

Somebody did a profile of legislators one time, and they talked about "the Arab traders" that always had to bring something home, and they classified this group as that and they classified that group as this. It's human nature and human activities. What's the alternative? To get a group or committee that's completely immune from all this and let them do it? Then people get upset, because they don't have any

say in it. They're upset because big government is running all over them. This takes a certain ebb and flow. I can think of some bad decisions that were made, and I can think of a lot of good decisions that were made. I may even have been involved in some bad decisions. But I think on the whole it works out okay.

Ms. Boswell: Do you have any regrets? Is there a specific program or direction that you didn't take, that with hindsight you might have changed?

Mr. Brouillet: I can't think of anything in the Legislature that should have been different. I think in SPI, I have done a couple of more important things.

For example, we were talking about graduation requirements. I didn't really anticipate there'd be so much disenchantment with schools. I would have liked to have figured out how to help with that. What we could have done. I'm not sure that we could have done anything, but you've got people running around calling for charter schools. I'm not particularly opposed to charter schools, except they want to fix the Washington State system by creating charter schools. That's going to allow a lot of people to go to charter schools, but it's not going to fix the system, if the system is broken. I just wish I could have done something in that respect.

We raised graduation requirements one year in math, another year in science, and another year in English. I got more flak on that from school people, not from the public. The math people were upset that we were going to make those kids all take more math because they teach only gifted or the ones that do better in school. They didn't want us dumping all these other kids in their classes to fill a requirement. I didn't think it was a very significant thing. That was the first time we started doing anything like graduation requirements. And then we looked conservative, because we raised one year here, three more years in high school. We looked radical to start with, and we ended up being the conservatives of the bunch because people were then talking about how much harder school should be.

I don't know. I look back with hindsight, and I think I should have done this or something, but I think we did enough. We did a lot of things, and I think we tried to do some significant things.

Ms. Boswell: If you were to look ahead now, and try to predict, what would you see as the biggest challenges or issues that schools in Washington State will face?

Mr. Brouillet: Always money. Initiative 601 is just going to screw the lid down on everybody, and schools are going to be in competition with prisons and welfare and everything else. They say that everybody is in favor of education, but I notice the Legislature came in a couple of hundred million under the lid this year that they could have given to schools. They could have given more money to schools and significantly reduced levies. I think that's always going to be a problem. The problem is going to become more difficult under our present restraints.

The second problem they're going to have is how to cope with the new standards the Legislature and the state office are establishing. They're not bad; they're good. I'm looking at the fourth-grade tests and they're pretty good. What do you do if only half the kids pass them? I'm not worried about the half that passes, but what do we do with the other half? It means that they've got to start thinking about how to help these kids that fail. You can't throw all these kids out of school and say, "You can't graduate." That's not acceptable politically or educationally to the people of this state. So what do you do?

We put these new standards in line. They're well thought out and they've been field-tested and everything else, and they're very rigorous. If they're rigorous, then somebody's going to fail. If they're not rigorous, then everybody is going to pass and people are still going to be upset. For example, I was at a school years ago and the superintendent said, "We have a graduation test we give everybody, and you can't graduate unless you pass this test." I said, "How many kids fail?" He said, "I think we had six or seven kids fail." This is a major school, they had several hundred kids graduating each year. I said, "Gee, that's interesting. In the school district where I live, they had more kids that didn't graduate because they didn't pay their library fines than that." That doesn't mean anything. That was all show-and-tell.

If you make it so rigorous, many are going to fail. The Legislature has not come to grips with how to remediate these people who don't pass and bring them up to speed. That's expensive.

I think the whole question of getting these on-line, and the fallout you're going to have from this, is going to be the real question. Are you going to require everybody to have this, or just some? I understand there is some talk about dropping the certificate of mastery for graduation. Some have figured out that a lot of kids aren't going to get it. Is it acceptable in Puyallup or Tacoma to have thirty percent of the kids not graduate? I think these are more rigorous.

And then you roll into this the fact that in this country and in this state, we want everybody to go to school. Some kids are going to have trouble. We're committed to that, so I think there are just a lot of problems with the new standards and what we do with them down the road. Generally speaking, the people are for them. There are intended consequences and there are unintended consequences, and you'd better think about the unintended consequences. We haven't thought about that enough.

Oregon had kind of a thing like this. Everybody was going to have a chance to either graduate from an academic or vocational institution. That implied that you've got to have a lot of vocational facilities. They haven't built any more, so the whole plan has floundered. Everybody is back in the old academic side where some students shouldn't be. But that's cheaper than building all those new vocational schools.

All this I'm talking about, this is not cheap. It's expensive. I don't know if the Legislature is willing to put the money in to make people succeed. To say that we'll just take our money and spend it in a little different way is not going to work, particularly when a high percentage of kids are born below the poverty line. You've got to deal with those kids; you've got to help make them successful.

Finances will always be a problem. I think the next largest problem we face is how are we doing with all these standards and everybody's good intentions? I think that's a significant K-12 problem.

Ms. Boswell: There are some predictions that the Puget Sound area is going to increase by so many million more people in the next few years. Has that pressure been accounted for in planning for schools?

Mr. Brouillet: There is going to be an initiative to take education and institutions out from under Initiative 601. You can't do what you imply—increase all these facilities and hire teachers and do all these things—under the present tax structure. It's always been difficult, but now we've screwed the lid down on purpose, so if you get the schools, you're not going to build a new prison. You've got "three strikes and you're out," and all these things that will create a need for greater numbers of prisons. Somebody had a bill for

"two strikes and you're out." I think somebody had a bill for "one strike." We're doing all these things, then there is the question of police and fire protection and all that. I don't see how we're going to do it under Initiative 601.

I haven't dealt so much with the K-12 anymore, but I'm on the Higher Education Coordinating Board, and we've got these statistics that show how many kids in school right now have maintained the same percentage of school attendance. But these numbers are going to be out of date in five, six, seven years.

Of course, that's one reason why branch campuses were created. Even if you've got branches and you've got community colleges and you've got four-year people, if you don't provide some resources for that, they're not going to succeed. Some people think we're going to do it all with distance learning. It'll help, but if they think we're going to start educating everybody with distance learning with computers, getting college degrees, there's a little more to it than that. So, I think the future down the road is going to be tough, and the Legislature will find it difficult. They didn't do badly for higher education this session. They did pretty well. They didn't do all that well for the K-12 system, but they did pretty well for higher education. The real need is probably at the lower level, in K-12, to get these kids prepared so that they can succeed in college.

You're right, the statistics on growth are really tremendous, and the thing about it is not all of them are estimates. I don't have the figures right here with me, but a lot of them deal with the number of students who are in the first grade and the second grade now. There are all kinds of alternatives. Not as many will get to go to college. You siphon them off onto something else, like the community colleges, but then you've got to do something for those people. A lot of unanswered questions, and it seems to me that we're going to have a lot of problems before we resolve it. I don't like to keep beating up on the tax structure, but it's really tightened up. It's going to be more and more difficult to find the money to do the things people say they want.

The tax load is not bad in this state compared to other states. I read an article which said, "I don't know what those people in Washington are worried about, reducing all these taxes. They've got one of the better levels of taxation—not maybe the system—but the levels of taxation."

I also notice some of the people are saying, "What's in it for me?" That's so much more the attitude than it used to be. It seems like people are worried about taking care of themselves. There's a whole group out here that need help or can't function in our society, and we need to somehow take care of those people, whether it's education or whatever. It seems to me that one of the things that's happened all around the country is that there's less empathy and interest in helping other people. I think it's a bad situation because there are people in our society who do need help. Everybody can't function in a college, and everybody can't function in the K-12 system without some help.

Ms. Boswell: You've been involved with virtually every level of education in this state throughout your career. What would you tell voters is most important about the Washington State education system?

Mr. Brouillet: I think Washington State has a good education system. I think it could be better, we could always improve. I think some of these standards we're talking about have the potential to improve it. I think that they're doing well in this state. Most national tests, if you want to compare, show our students are doing better than most states. However, as long as we say everybody is going to go to

school and get an education, that implies certain things. It implies that you've got to get those people through school. People subscribe to that psychologically maybe, but I'm not sure that they follow through with the will to provide the necessary support.

Because as more and more people come from broken and abusive homes in our state, it is going to mean different things. I'm not saying that there's anything wrong with single parent families, but many of them have the potential to not function as well in society. These are good kids. I'm not picking on the single parents because there are more and more single parent families, but our demographics are changing. More and more people can't speak English. We have to be more receptive toward minorities. Whether it's Ebonics or Spanish or whatever. I don't think most of us who come from a fairly sheltered, quiet experience understand a lot of this. I don't believe that the average citizen understands this. I don't know how you make them understand it, but it's important that they do.

I once had a person who worked in my office tell me, "We waste money in government, but if we're going to waste money in government, let's waste it in education." I said, "Yeah, we'll go out and tell people that." Everybody gives so much lip service to education. Really, it's a way, whether those people are in poverty or wherever they are, the way they can get out of that is to have some marketable skill or some education. We all talk about it, but we have trouble with it.

This last session of the Legislature cut taxes for a lot of people—great. I'm not sure they all needed to have their taxes cut because our tax system is not that stringent, but at the same time, the Legislature says they're for education. The governor called them back and got a few million more. But they didn't do it willingly, and they didn't do as much as they should have.

I tend to be a little more pessimistic sometimes, as I go along. Maybe it's because I'm getting old, I don't know.

Ms. Boswell: And what's Frank Brouillet's next career in retirement?

Mr. Brouillet: I don't know. I want to stay active whatever it is, because I think that's important to your retirement, to your life, and to my grandchildren. I'll have to look around and find something else. I don't have any special plans.

Washington State Educational Relations with China
1977-1998

1977 — Superintendent of Public Instruction Dr. Frank Brouillet, six other state superinten dents of schools and several national educational leaders are invited by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs to visit Chinese schools. This is the first officially invited educational delegation by the government of China.

1981 — Dr. Brouillet leads a delegation from the Washington State Board of Education to China. They visit schools in Chengdu, Shanghai, Xian and Guangzhou.

1983 — The Washington State Department of Public Instruction collects 100 pieces of artwork from Washington State elementary school students for their gifts of 100 pieces of art brought back to Washington State by Governor John Spellman in 1982.

1984 — An education delegation lead by Dr. Brouillet visits Sichuan Province to present the collected art work to the Department of Education. Dr. Brouillet meets with Dr. Ren Guilu, Director of Sichuan Department of Education, to discuss educational exchanges with the Washington State. They sign an agreement calling for the exchange of secondary school teachers for the 1984-85 school year. The Washington school districts of Ferndale, Snohomish and Longview are selected to exchange teachers with Number Four, Number Seven and Number Eleven Middle Schools in Chengdu.

1986 — Dr. Brouillet visits China and arranges for Chongqing to send a secondary Sichuan teacher to Seattle.

Dr. Brouillet leads delegation of local and state political leaders to China to visit schools and look at possible exchanges. Mayor Bill Daley of Olympia, Senator Marc Gaspard, Senator Gerald Saling and Representative Dan Grimm are among the members. Schools in Chongqing, Chengdu, Shanghai, Xian and Beijing were included in the visit.

1987 — Dr. Brouillet assists and leads Snohomish High School in sending their 120-member marching band and swing choir to China on a ten-day tour. Eighty other towns people and students also accompanied the group. The band and swing choir performed at the Great Wall, the Civic Center in Chengdu and in southern China.

The first exchange between America and China of secondary school students is facilitated by the Washington State Department of Education. Six Chengdu students come to visit Snohomish High School and several American students visit Number Four Middle School in Chengdu.

1988 — Dr. Brouillet visits China and arranges for the Puyallup School District to exchange a teacher Nankai Middle School in Chongqing.

1989 — Dr. Brouillet meets with the Chinese Education Association for International Exchanges and they agree to assist in placing retired Washington teacher in Chinese secondary schools and colleges for the purpose of teaching English. As a result, forty retired teachers journey to fifteen different provinces and cities to launch this program. To date, more than 160 retired teachers have had this experience in China.

Between 1989 and 1993, more than 200 teachers under the sponsorship of the Washington State Department of Education visited China for short-term visits.

1990 — Dr. Brouillet visits schools in Chengdu, Shanghai and Beijing. He is accompanied by Representative Gary Locke and State Senator Eugene Prince.

The Puyallup School District, under the direction of Superintendent Herb Burg, is selected by the U.S. State Department to operate the American Schools in China. Mr. Mike Williams becomes principal of the American School in Shanghai. Norm Aune assumes a similar position in the American School in Guangzhou.

1991 — The Puyallup School District begins a teacher exchange with Number Three Girls School in Shanghai.

Dr. Brouillet takes newly elected Superintendent of Public Instruction Judith Billings to China to meet education leaders in Sichuan Province, Shanghai and Beijing.

1995 — Dr. Brouillet leads a delegation from Snohomish and Olympia to celebrate ten years of educational exchanges between Snohomish High School and Number Four Middle School (Shi Shi) in Chengdu.

Dr. Brouillet organizes and leads a University of Washington, Tacoma faculty and student group to China. They visit Tacoma's sister city, Fuzhou as well Shanghai and Beijing. In each city they meet with other college students and faculty.

1998 — Dr. Brouillet takes University of Washington, Tacoma and Bellevue students and faculty to China on a Chinese historical/cultural journey. They visit Beijing and other cities along the Silk road leading to Kashgar.

INDEX

A

Adams, Brock 44, 45
Agriculture Committee 43, 52
American Legion 23
Andrews, Lloyd 81
Appropriations Committee 51, 81, 115

B

Bailey, Mona 89
Beck, Dave 12
Beijing 92, 96
Brouillet, Frank B.
  classroom style 37
  college
    degrees 27
    University of Puget Sound 25
    Washington State University 25
  early personality 19
  family 1
  first teaching job 35
  personal education 18
  retirement 123
  upbringing 13
  voting record 13
Brouillet, Margé 44
Bruno, Louis 73, 74, 81, 86
Budget Committee 52, 60, 81
Bush, George 8
Butler, Julia Hansen 66, 67
Byrd, Robert 119

C

Campaigning
  Legislature 43, 44, 84, 109
  Issues 45
  Superintendent of Public Instruction 43, 84
Capital High School 95
Chandler, Joe 41
Chengdu 92
China 112, 117
Chinese exchange programs 92, 112, 118
Chongqing 93
Civil rights 11, 59
Clinton, Bill 47, 56, 77
Committee, Education 50
Community colleges 61, 73, 78, 117
Counter-Intelligence Corps (CIC) 29

D

Daley, Bill 89
Desegregation 87
Dore, Fred 63
Drafting legislation 70

E

Education Committee
    56, 62, 68, 71, 73, 80, 81, 115
Educational standards 121
Eisenhower, Dwight D. 47
Eisentrout, George 87
Evans, Dan 34, 44, 45, 46, 51, 54, 70, 103
Extended school year 64

F

Finance Committee 69
Flat-rate income tax 51
Fort Wright College 88

G

Galloway, Shirley 72
Gaspard, Marc 66
Goldmark, John 49
Gorton, Slade 114
Gregory, Carol 42
Greive, Bob 58
Grimm, Dan 103

H

Haley, Fred 63
Henry, Mildred 65
Hess, Andy 61, 73
Higher Education Coordinating Board 119, 122
Highway Committee 62
Hong Kong 92
Hurley, Margaret 66
Hyppa, Elmer 45

I

Initiative 593 104, 106
Initiative 601 and 602
    79, 101, 105, 106, 110, 120
  media 102, 107
Initiative 602 77
Interim Committee on Education 52, 60, 70

International Culture and Education Program 96

J

Joint Committee on Education 57
Julnes, Ralph 62, 63, 89

K

Kline, Bill 49
Korean War 29

L

Labor Council 86
Langlie, Arthur 44, 52
League of Women Voters 63
Legislative Budget Committee 52
Legislative Council 52, 60, 68, 70
Lobbyists 71
Locke, Gary 103
Lowry, Mike 54, 77, 78
Lynch, Marge 74

M

MacArthur, Douglas 47
McCarthy, Terry 81, 87
McCormack, Mike 49
Merit pay for teachers 64
Military service 29
Minnesota 1
Moore, Jim 86
Murray, Patty 44, 45

N

Nanjing 92
Navy 24
New Deal 9, 12
New Republic 28
Nuxel, Carla 42

O

O'Brien, John 49, 50
O'Connell, John 45

P

Pacific Rim Center 118
PACs 71, 109
Party-line voting 34
Pierce College 76, 79, 101, 116
Preston, Josephine Corliss 82
Public Disclosure Commission 82, 111
Puyallup
  Japanese internment 9, 24
  racial history 9
Puyallup Education Association 41
Puyallup High School 2, 16, 35, 44
Puyallup Presbyterian Church 15

R

Ray, Dixy Lee 45, 55, 91
Reagan, Ronald 47
Redistricting issues 58
Reinventing schools 114
Roosevelt, Theodore 8, 12
Rosellini, Albert 44, 45, 52, 54
ROTC 29
Rural Electrification 9

S

Sawyer, Leonard 115
Schmidt, Monica 88
School levies 113, 120
Seattle 5
Senate Education Committee 69
Shanghai 92, 94, 96
Sichuan Province 92, 95
Snohomish School District 93, 98
Spellman, John 45, 55, 92
Stevenson, Adlai 33
Strickland, Larry 99
Sumner High School 16

T

Tax reform 51, 70, 104
Term limitations 52, 106
Tienanmen Square 96
Transportation Committee 52, 60, 115
Truman, Harry S. 47

U

Uhlman, Wes 63

V

Veterans of Foreign Wars 23
Vietnam 29

W

Wanamaker, Pearl 66, 81, 82, 112
WEA 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 56, 72, 84, 101
West Point 24
Western State Mental Hospital 51
Wobblies 28
World War I 1, 3, 6, 9, 24, 29
World War II 3