William A. Gissberg

An Oral History

Interviewed by Sharon Boswell

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

CONTENTS

Forewords
Frank E. Baker
Martin J. Durkan
Daniel J. Evans
John Fattorini Jr.
Thomas J. Owens
Preface
Acknowledgments
Biography
Introduction: Interviewing William Gissberg
by Sharon Boswell

1. **Family Background**..... 1
Tape 1
Immigration and emigration. Swedes in Washington. Bellingham, WA. Everett, WA. Lumber industry. Wobblies. Everett massacre. Labor unions. Depression. Civilian Conservation Corps. Family. Youth groups. Baseball. High school sports. Politics and education. Democratic Party. Republican Party.

2. **Law School and Military Service**..... 11
Tapes 2 and 3
Newspaper carriers. Weyerhaeuser Company. Lawsuits. Courts. Lawyers. Oregon. Law schools. University of Washington. College sports. Political candidates. World War II. Military service. Baseball.

3. **State Senator: 1953**..... 19
Tape 4
Political campaigns. Washington State Senate. Politicians. Air pollution. Roads and highways. Legislation. Abortion. Elections. Campaign funds. Forest conservation. Legislators.

4. **Lawyer and Legislator**..... 27
Tapes 5 and 6, Side 1
Liquor. Smoking. Anti-Communism. Budget. Abandoned property. Lobbying. Legislation. Press. Ethics.

5. **The Legislative Process**..... 35
Tapes 6, Side 2, and 7
Press. Lobbying. Legislative ethics. Campaign contributions. Labor unions. Boeing. Washington State Bar Association. Education. School superintendents. Schools. Seattle police. Drug abuse. Legislators. Lawyers. Criminal justice system.

6. **Environmental Issues**..... 45
Tapes 8 and 9, Side 1
Conservatism. Budget. Taxation. Democratic Party. Republican Party. Water power. Political caucuses. Pollution Control Hearings Board. Washington State Department of Ecology. Washington State Department of Natural Resources. Washington State Governor. Legislation. Environmental issues and policies. Liquor laws and regulations. Weyerhaeuser Company. Labor unions and politics. Employment. Strikes.

7. **Redistricting: Early 1960s**..... 57
Tapes 9, Side 2, and 10
Labor unions. Lobbying. Legislative redistricting. League of Women Voters. Initiative. Referendum. Judges. Legislature. Salaries. Republican Party. Democratic Party. Legislation.

8. **President Pro Tempore of the Senate: 1965**..... 65
Tape 11
Income tax. Sales tax. Journalists. Libel and slander. Olympian. Women. Ethics. Homosexuality. Abortion. Gambling. Indians of North America--fishing and fishing rights. Religion and politics.

9. **Environmental Policy Formation**..... 73
Tape 12
Health. Health insurance. Environmental issues and policies. Lumber industry. Washington State Shorelines Hearings Board. Pollution Control Hearings Board. Washington State Department of Ecology. Washington State Bar Association. Fishing. Hunting. Lobbying. Family. Lawyers.

10. **Legislative Councils and Committees**..... 83
Tapes 13 and 14
Judges. Veterans. Education. Property tax. Colleges and universities. Seattle, WA. Political caucuses. Democratic Party. Drug abuse. Legislative redistricting. Police.

Appendix A: **Newspaper Articles**..... 93
Marysville Globe, March 31, 1955..... 94
Washington Teamster, February 3, 1961..... 95
Everett Herald, January 18, 1969..... 96
Everett Herald, March 12, 1969..... 97
Bremerton Sun, January 23, 1970..... 98
Everett Herald, January 11, 1972..... 99
Washington Teamster, March 10, 1972..... 100
Everett Herald, July 27, 1972..... 101

Appendix B: **Chronology: The United States, 1900-1995**..... 103

FOREWORD

ODE TO WILLIAM A. GISSBERG

(FORWARD and BACKWARD)

THERE ARE STAUNCH **SEAGULLS** – He Is

THERE ARE LOYAL **HUSKIES** – He Is

THERE ARE ABLE **STUDENTS** – He Was

THERE ARE FINE **ATHLETES** – He Is

THERE ARE EXCELLENT **ATTORNEYS** – He Is

THERE ARE NOBLE **POLITICIANS** – He Is

THERE ARE GREAT **FATHERS** – He Is

THERE ARE SUPERIOR **MEN** – He Is

THERE ARE CIGAR **LOVERS** – He Was

THERE ARE TALENTED **GOLFERS** – He Isn't

THERE ARE SWELL **FRIENDS** – He Is

THERE ARE EXCEPTIONAL **PERSONALITIES** – He Is

The above and foregoing are but a few of the many talents possessed by Bill. His areas of achievement are endless. He is one of the very special people in our community. So please read on.

FRANK E. BAKER
Former Thurston County Superior Court Judge

FOREWORD

I first met Bill Gissberg in 1942 when we were training at the Marines Officers Candidate School. I was from Montana, he was from Washington. We did not seek each other out, but we shared a love of fishing and became friends. We maintained that friendship over the next fifty years.

By the time I was elected to the state House of Representatives in 1956, Bill Gissberg was already serving in the state Senate. A significant number of legislators were World War II veterans who had become successful in business or professions. They came to the Legislature as a fiercely independent group, with a strong desire to make up for time lost. Both Republicans and Democrats were more concerned with issues than with party loyalty. They left an indelible mark and an enviable record.

Bill is a Democrat, and his party was in the majority for eighteen years. This plurality and the independence of his colleagues worked to Bill's advantage. He had been a star athlete in school–now he had another perfect playing field.

His competitive spirit remained and he thrived. He was a "oner" among loners, listening to his own drummer. His theory was not unlike Robert Kennedy's: "Forgive your enemies, but don't forget their names." Bill Gissberg understood that a legislator's dependence upon his district could dictate his vote. He would remember those who made the tough vote, and those who ducked it.

Senator Gissberg became a major player in state government during the fifties and sixties. Perhaps his finest work was as a member and chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. At that time, every

committee member was also a member of the Bar, and legal ability was of more importance than party. Although Judiciary was a small committee, it was a textbook example of how a legislative committee should operate. More bills were referred to it than to any other standing committee. Under Bill's leadership very few ever saw the light of day. He made sure that those that did were expressed clearly. Style, grammar, and punctuation were perfect. The committee was a training ground that produced Supreme Court judges for Washington State as well as judges for the superior and appellate courts and the federal bench.

In addition to being a "oner" among loners, Senator Gissberg was a *rara avis*, or rare bird. He was one-of-a-kind. He could be abrupt or, occasionally, rude. He could seem aloof or uncooperative to other members of the Senate. Those of us who knew him thought little of it, but others, while recognizing his ability, did not want him as the elected leader of the majority in the Senate. However, at the urging of a substantial number of senators, including myself, he did run for the leadership post. Unfortunately, he lost by two votes. Later I asked him why he thought those two senators did not support him. His response: "I didn't want to owe them anything, so I didn't ask them."

Some final thoughts: Legislators' families may suffer. Service to the state can be all-consuming, and family life is affected. Bill Gissberg was fortunate to have two strong, patient women close to him. His mother was a wonderful, caring person. His wife, Helen, was and is a supportive, kind woman with abundant patience and understanding.

In the forty-five years that I have been associated with the Legislature as an employee, a member, and as an attorney representing clients, I have seen hundreds of officials come and go. A few have been good. Others have been poor or mediocre, leaving just their photos on the wall.

Senator Bill Gissberg came and performed his duties beyond reproach. He left on his own terms at his chosen time. He left an indelible stamp. He was the best.

MARTIN J. DURKAN

Former Washington State Senator

FOREWORD

I served with Bill Gissberg in the Legislature and, later, as governor, I had many occasions to work with him in his capacity as a key member of the state Senate.

Senator Gissberg was an outstanding representative of the "Old Legislature." I stress that because in the days of short sessions occurring every other year, it was possible for real leaders of a community to serve in the Legislature. It is difficult today for a senior member of a law firm, for instance, to serve in the Legislature, as many did in the 1950s and 1960s.

Bill represented the finest of that generation. He always provided good, straightforward advice to me while I was governor. I remember vividly the initiation of the new state Court of Appeals. The Senate debated as to whether the governor should be allowed to appoint the initial twelve members or whether they should all seek election. Concern was expressed by the Democratic majority that I might appoint all Republican judges to this new court, and Senators Gissberg and Uhlman were asked to visit my office and ascertain what I intended to do. I told them that I probably would appoint more Republican judges than Democrat, but that I was most interested in judicial capacity and I would pay close attention to recommendations from the Bar Association. I assured them that politics was a secondary concern. When Senator Uhlman asked about numbers, Bill Gissberg said, "Shut up, Wes, we've heard all we need to hear." The Senate promptly passed the bill allowing the gubernatorial appointment. That, to me, was a real measure of Bill's skill, wisdom, and devotion to what was best for the state.

Those who read this oral history will discover something of the candor and wisdom of this fine senator.

DANIEL J. EVANS

Former United States Senator
Former Washington State Governor

FOREWORD

In 1978, Bill Gissberg had completed over twenty-five years of dedicated public service. He had been a state senator for twenty years and a member of the Pollution Control Hearings Board, but he wasn't ready to retire.

The Washington State Bar was seeking a person to represent its interests in Olympia. Fortunately for the judicial system and the lawyers of this state, Bill Gissberg was up to the challenge.

When Bill was hired by the Bar and began to get acquainted with the key staff persons in the Legislature, I began to get a feel for him. We discussed his philosophy and his years of public service during some lengthy luncheons. In 1979, as the attorney for co-Speaker Duane Berentson, I observed Bill use his knowledge of the law and the system to achieve significant goals for the Bar Association.

At that time the Bar was confronted with the threat of a products-liability bill backed by business. This bill was extremely anti-consumer, limiting the rights of those injured by defective products. The Bar was also facing the possibility of the passage of a constitutional amendment to audit the Bar Association. In the 1979 Legislative Session, both issues came to a head. Bill steered a course for the Bar which resulted in the eventual failure of both measures.

In the case of the products bill, there were enough votes in the Senate to pass a harmful measure. Despite heavy pressure from a united business lobby, Bill's behind-the-scenes advice to the Senate

leadership was heeded. The bill was lost in the final hours of the session, without a final vote on the Senate floor. Following that session, the Bar appointed a blue-ribbon committee which worked with the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Phil Talmadge. This cooperation led to the passage of a fair products bill in 1981.

The respect Bill engendered with the House and Senate leadership is best described by an event that happened when Bill was working to defeat the Bar audit bill. Bill came into my office and informed me that the Republican co-chairman of a committee was going to vote out the bill. Bill said he was having problems communicating with the co-chairman and, in fact, the co-chairman kept calling him "MR. GINSBERG" during his testimony. I relayed that story to Duane Berentson, who called the chairman into his office to discuss the committee's agenda. As the chairman detailed his schedule, the co-Speaker looked over his glasses, interrupted the chairman, and said, "The name is G-I-S-S-B-E-R-G, not Ginsberg. He is a friend of ours and that bill is not coming out of committee." Needless to say, it didn't, and the audit bill died.

Later in 1979, Bill decided to retire as a full-time lobbyist and, through his efforts, I was selected to represent the Bar. Bill continued on with the Bar on a part-time basis for four or five years thereafter. Primarily he read bills, at which he was a master. He advised me on the legislative process. That guidance was invaluable, and instilled in me a great respect for the institution and a deep appreciation for the man himself. We are indeed fortunate that he has consented to share his personal observations on his career in this oral history.

JOHN S. FATTORINI JR.

Director of Legislative Programs
Washington State Bar Association

FOREWORD

Known as Senator, William, Bill, and Giss. Certainly one of the best all-round, i.e, complete, legislators I have known in thirty-six years experience on the state and federal level.

A fine bill crafter and a thorough bill reader. He was for years a member of Rules and chairman of Judiciary. To witnesses he would say, "Tell me what the law is now. Tell me how you wish to change the law. Tell me the reasons for the changes," (and then sit down). Under his leadership the committee became the most productive in the Legislature.

Fearless, articulate, brief and selective on the floor. He saved his "shots" and when he took them he was quick and to the point. He knew the Senate. To illustrate, let me cite one frequently repeated Senate scene:

> The big budget has been voted down–reconsideration has been voted. Now, the bill is on final passage for the second time. If it's lost again, the budget process must start all over–two weeks more in session. The vote is taken. Verne Sawyer (the reader) sings out, "Mr. President, 21 yeas, 28 nays." Under the Senator's direction, President Cherberg holds the gavel in the air. Giss goes to work up and down the aisles, and then, "Mr. President, Senator_____changes his vote from nay to yea." 22 yea, 23, 24, and finally, 25. President Cherberg bangs the gavel. "Having received a constitutional, etc.," the bill passes–session ends. Giss goes back to an Everett law practice.

But for me personally, he was above all, a great and loving teacher. The public was well-served by the Senator from Lake Stevens.

THOMAS J. OWENS

Attorney at Law

PREFACE

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

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

When the interviews are complete, a verbatim transcript is prepared. The interviewer and interviewee correct grammar and punctuation. Repetitions are removed, but extensive substantive editing is unusual. The interviewee provides the biography and material for the appendices and suggests friends and colleagues who may contribute forewords.
The Department of Printing prints and binds the transcripts, and they are distributed to libraries and archives statewide. The original tapes, transcripts, and research documents are retained by the State Archives.

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

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

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

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Washington State Oral History Program owes thanks to many.

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

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

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

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

Our interviewer, Sharon Boswell, is without equal. She is adaptable, analytical, objective, and sympathetic.

Senate Docket Clerk Pat Durham is our transcriber. We appreciate her skill and knowledge. Our part-time editor Clint Robbins is quick, proficient, and witty. During 1995 and 1996 our volunteers Rhiannon Hanfman, Judith Loft, Bob Johnson, and Karen Volkman have provided everything from comprehensive research to perfect indices.

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

William Gissberg has our gratitude for his conscientious review of his transcripts. His daughter, Sonja Gissberg, helped us prepare this volume. She is very capable, very charming, and deserves special recognition.

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

BIOGRAPHY

WILLIAM A. GISSBERG

Born in 1922 in Everett, Washington, William A. Gissberg is the son of Swedish immigrants. He graduated from Everett High School. An all-state prep star, he was a member of the EHS state championship basketball team of 1940, known as the "wonder team." That team is still considered by some to have been the best high school basketball team this state ever produced.

Bill's athletic talents earned him a scholarship at the University of Oregon and later at the University of Washington, where he excelled in baseball and basketball. He played the guard position on the varsity basketball team under coach Hec Edmundson. In December 1941, during an East-West coast conference tournament, the Huskies set three Madison Square Garden records. They were national heroes.

During World War II, Bill served as Lt. j.g. commanding officer of the LSM 260 [Landing Ship Mechanized]. He was assigned to the South Pacific theater where he participated in the invasion of Lingayen Gulf, Philippines, and of Okinawa.

When he returned, he entered the University of Washington School of Law. He earned his law degree in 1948 and in 1949 entered private law practice in Everett. He represented clients in all areas of law. He was elected in 1952 to the Washington State Senate, and served the 39th Legislative District for twenty years.

In 1973 he retired from private law practice and the Legislature. Governor Dan Evans appointed him Board Examiner for the Washington State Pollution Control Hearings Board. In 1978, Bill went on to represent the Washington State Bar Association as their state lobbyist.

Bill and his wife, Helen, reside in Olympia. He remains an avid golfer and sports fan.

1

FAMILY BACKGROUND

Ms. Boswell: Let's get started by having you tell me a little bit about your family. How did they get to the Northwest?

Mr. Gissberg: My mother, Esther Thall, had a half brother who was already in Bellingham. My mother was in Stockholm. Axel Lindstrom like all immigrants in those days, wrote great letters back to the old country extolling the virtues of the new land, and the riches that could be found in the streets, and conned a lot of the old-timers to come over to this country, which my mother did when she was sixteen years old. She came to New York and took a train across the country with a sign wrapped around her neck: "Deliver to Bellingham, Washington."

Ms. Boswell: She didn't speak any English?

Mr. Gissberg: She didn't speak any English.

Ms. Boswell: None of the rest of her family came with her, then?

Mr. Gissberg: No. She was all alone.

Ms. Boswell: What a trip.

Mr. Gissberg: She told me that on the way across the country, she just had a sack of bananas to eat. In those days it took seven or eight days to cross the country.

My mother went to Bellingham, then, where her half brother was, where she met my dad, Helmer Albert Gissberg. He was motivated to come to this country because his father, Erik Gissberg, had left his home in Umeo, Sweden, which is up in northern Sweden, to come to this country in search of the riches to be found here.

My grandfather went to Bellingham first, then he went to Alaska where he had a herring fishery, close to Seldovia and Cook Inlet.

Ms. Boswell: What was his family's occupation back in Sweden?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know what my grandfather's father did, but my grandfather Erik, of whom I just spoke, was a contract logger in Umeo and Ubolla.

Ms. Boswell: Is Ubolla another area nearby in Sweden?

Mr. Gissberg: Ubolla is about thirty miles from, not that much, from Umeo. There's a fine university at Umeo, which I visited when I went back to Sweden to visit my ancestral home.

Ms. Boswell: So he did contract logging and then decided he could do better in America?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know what motivated him, if that was his only motivation. I know he left his wife and his seven or eight children behind him in Ubolla.

Ms. Boswell: Did they ever come over, too, or not?

Mr. Gissberg: No, none of his family came over except my dad and an uncle of mine named Erik. He came over just to visit. Both Helmer, my dad, and Erik went to Alaska for short periods of time, and lived with my grandfather.

My recollection of my grandfather is very dim, but I recall seeing him when he came to Everett to visit us. I couldn't have been more than five or six years old at the time. I remember he had a tremendous beard, and he brought a bearskin rug with him, a brown bear that he'd shot up in his homestead. He used to send down barrels of salted herring. Huge barrels, oak-staved barrels full of herring.

Ms. Boswell: About four feet tall or so?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. My mother used to send me out to the woodshed where she kept the barrel of herring, and gave me a pan to go out and get the herring out of the barrel. The barrel was so high I'd have to leap up and grab ahold of the barrel by my hands and shinny up the side then lie on my stomach on one side of the barrel and reach down to get the herring out when it was down low in the barrel. It had such an odor to it, I never did like herring or lutefisk, either.

Ms. Boswell: Really? Now, your dad went up there periodically, but he decided not to stay up in Alaska?

Mr. Gissberg: My dad had already immigrated to this country then. He was living in Bellingham when he went to visit my grandfather.

And my dad's motivation, in addition to the so-called riches to be found in this country, was to escape a compulsory military draft, which was required in Sweden. He was too independent a cuss to go for that, so he got on a ship as a seaman and came to New York and jumped ship in New York. And then from there he came across to Bellingham where he met my mother at a Swedish dance. The Swedes used to always hang out together in those days, and there were lots of Scandinavian lodges and other Swedish social groups. The marriage lasted long enough to have three children. My oldest sister, Vera, my brother, Gus, and myself.

Ms. Boswell: Who was the oldest?

Mr. Gissberg: My sister was the oldest.

Ms. Boswell: And then?

Mr. Gissberg: And then Gus, and then myself. I was the youngest.

Ms. Boswell: Let me just step back for one minute and ask you when was it that he immigrated? About what?

Mr. Gissberg: 1914.

Ms. Boswell: And your mom, then, must have been right about the same time?

Mr. Gissberg: No. I think 1918.

Ms. Boswell: So he had been here and gotten established before she arrived.

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. In Bellingham.

Ms. Boswell: You said she had a brother. Was there anything specific that drew them to Bellingham?

Mr. Gissberg: Drew my mother to Bellingham?

Ms. Boswell: No, drew your dad to Bellingham?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't really know what motivated him to go to Bellingham from Everett. Probably some of his Swedish friends. He worked in Bellingham at Blodell, Donovan Timber Company, I know. And then he came to Everett where he worked in the sawmills.
Ms. Boswell: When did he come to Everett?

Mr. Gissberg: I can't tell you that. It had to be before I was born. I was born in 1922, so he probably came down to Everett in 1919, after the war.

Ms. Boswell: When he was there in both Everett and Bellingham, in the timber industry at that time, it was definitely a very unsettled time in terms of the labor unions in particular.

Mr. Gissberg: The workingman was very much exploited by the timber industry and the logging industry.

To give you an example of what the conditions were like, as far as the political and anti-unionism was concerned, my dad was sitting in the yard of the sawmill where he was piling lumber, and at lunchtime the union organizer for the IWW (Industrial Workers of the World, commonly known as the "Wobblies") came around and gave my dad some literature to read, extolling the virtues of the union, and what the union could do for the workingman if they organized. My dad was sitting there reading the literature and the foreman came around and asked him what he was reading, and he showed him what it was, and thereupon the foreman fired my dad, right on the spot.

Ms. Boswell: And his reason was just reading the literature?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes, because he was promulgating the union line. Trying to organize union members. If the employer found out that there was somebody who was a member of the union, he was immediately fired on the spot. Of course, the IWW was notorious for being solidly organized.

As a matter of fact, in about 1918, the so-called "Everett Massacre" occurred. The Wobblies had a foothold in a sawmill in the timber industry, in the logging industry in Snohomish County. The conditions were terrible in those days in the logging industry, particularly where they worked fourteen hours a day and lived in camps where the lice were thick and the food was deplorable.

Ms. Boswell: Did your dad ever tell you anything about the Everett Massacre? Was he around or familiar with what had happened?

Mr. Gissberg: He was around, and he told me about how Sheriff McCrae, at the instigation of the Everett Chamber of Commerce, would take suspected Wobblies out to Silver Lake and beat them up. The Wobblies were thought to be leaning toward the Communist Party. Somebody accused my dad of being a Communist years later when he was working in Olympia. He knocked him down. My dad was not a Communist. He was a strong union man.

Ms. Boswell: So what kind of impact did the Wobblies, or else just losing his job, have on his politics at that time?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know. Of course he had to be in favor of pro-labor policies and goals, shorter workweek, and minimum wage, or a decent wage.

Ms. Boswell: What lumber company was he working at when he was fired for just having the union literature?

Mr. Gissberg: Canyon Mill.

Ms. Boswell: That was in Bellingham?

Mr. Gissberg: No, that was in Everett.

Ms. Boswell: What did he do then?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know what he did immediately after that, but he became a longshoreman in Bellingham, Everett, and Olympia.

Ms. Boswell: So he actually, after that experience, left the timber industry?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. A short time afterward, I can remember, now that you mention it, I was about five years old, which would have been in 1927. I'm just guessing at how old I was at the time.

I was out on the back porch, my mother was washing clothes, putting clothes through the wringer. My arm got caught in the wringer up to my shoulder. Because my arm started swelling up and got black and blue, she called down to the Canyon Mill and got a message to my dad that I needed help. He was still working in the sawmill in 1927. I don't know when it was that he was fired. It was after that.

Ms. Boswell: So the anti-unionism continued well after all the problems in Everett with the Wobblies?

Mr. Gissberg: Oh yes.

Ms. Boswell: Did he ever become a Wobbly, or not? Do you know?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know if he was a member of the Wobblies or not, but they used to sing songs. I can remember some old Swedes and Norwegians coming to the house, playing poker and pinochle. I can remember them drinking beer and singing Wobbly songs. "Work and play, live on hay–we'll have pie in the sky when we die."

Ms. Boswell: Were most of his friends in the community probably sawmill workers?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes, sawmill workers and immigrants who worked in the timber industry.

Ms. Boswell: You were mentioning that they had dances. What other kinds of activities were there that sort of brought a lot of the Swedes together, or his friends together?

Mr. Gissberg: Oh, the VASA Lodge, which is a Swedish organization. I think all of the Scandinavian immigrants had a tendency to gather together in one ethnic group.

Ms. Boswell: What about living arrangements? Where did they live, either in Bellingham, or in Everett?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know about Bellingham. That was before my time. In Everett, they rented a tiny house on 1810 Highland.

Ms. Boswell: Was it also a Swedish community, or were living arrangements in town not necessarily divided into ethnic groups?

Mr. Gissberg: Everett is still known as a Swedish community. In the early days it was primarily Scandinavians because of the timber industry which sustained the community.

I know they bought their house at 2423 Highland shortly after I was born in 1922. I still visit there when I visit Everett. My sister still lives there.

Ms. Boswell: What about your mother? How did she acclimate to being in Everett, or to being in the United States?

Mr. Gissberg: She was a housewife and a mother with three children. Then my dad and my mother had family difficulties and she divorced him. I was just a youngster at that time. I don't remember anything about the details of it, except that he used to drink too much.

Ms. Boswell: She had a half brother who lived in Bellevue before she came?

Mr. Gissberg: In Bellingham.

Ms. Boswell: In Bellingham. Did any of her family come too, or not, later?

Mr. Gissberg: No.

Ms. Boswell: Did you continue to live with her after the divorce?

Mr. Gissberg: Oh yes. I remember, it was during the Depression, money was hard to come by in those days. She got a job as a waitress in a restaurant uptown, and it turned out she was more than the waitress. She was the cook, bottle washer, waitress, janitor, cashier, the whole bit. She was a good cook. I remember she cried for joy because she got a job for nine dollars a week.

Ms. Boswell: Nine dollars a week. Was this before the Depression that she got the job?

Mr. Gissberg: No, it was during the Depression.

Ms. Boswell: So that was a real find. To be able to get a job at that time.

Mr. Gissberg: Oh yes. It was very difficult. We were able to sustain ourselves as a family.

My brother, when President Roosevelt was elected and established the CCC (Civilian Conservation Corps), was able to get a job with the CCC. He was sent over to Hood Canal at Lake Cushman. They got thirty dollars a month, and twenty or more dollars of it went to my mother, and the rest he was able to keep. So we had a tough time during the Depression. But I never noticed it that much because I was too small to know any different, and didn't really know what was going on anyway.

Ms. Boswell: What about your older sister? What happened to her?

Mr. Gissberg: She lived with my dad up in Bellingham when she was sixteen. She lived with him for several years.

Ms. Boswell: Now what was he doing at that time? He'd been in Everett and then he left the sawmill and went into being a longshoreman?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes, in Bellingham. He worked with Bodell & Donovan, the timber company up in Bellingham, also.

My sister didn't go through the high-school-graduation ceremony because of the lack of money to buy a dress.

Ms. Boswell: When he was a longshoreman, what about your dad? Who was he working with then?

Mr. Gissberg: Who was my dad working for?

Ms. Boswell: Yes. As a longshoreman?

Mr. Gissberg: Well, the practice in the industry was that a stevedoring company acted as agent for the shipowners. The stevedoring company would contract with the union to supply workers to fulfill the needs of the shipping industry as ships came to harbor. There was usually one of those in every community.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me a little bit about your earliest childhood remembrances. Are they of family things, or school things, or what?

Mr. Gissberg: I've got a lot of memories of my youth. One of the best, of course, was when I used to go fishing and swimming down at the river, and crabbing down at the bay.

Ms. Boswell: When you say "fishing down at the river" did you have a special place, or where was it?

Mr. Gissberg: We had a couple places. The Snohomish River used to be full of chubs, and we'd catch these chubs and feed them to the cats. They weren't worth eating. They were always down by the sewer outlet.

We lived on Riverside which was a long way from the saltwater. We used to walk over to the bay and fish for piling perch. We'd gather baby crabs under rocks and use them as bait, and run our line down next to the piling, and hand line the perch back up. Then we'd take them to the Chinaman (one of the restaurants). There were several Chinese restaurants there, and we'd sell the Chinaman piling perch and crab.

We used to get a bicycle wheel and fix that up with bait and catch crabs, too, with them. We'd sell those crabs for a nickel apiece. That was big money.

Ms. Boswell: When you say we, was that other family members or friends?

Mr. Gissberg: Buddies of mine who I had grown up with.

Ms. Boswell: Was there a neighborhood group of friends?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. There were some Finns and Norwegians that I grew up with.

Ms. Boswell: Where do you think your love of fishing came from?

Mr. Gissberg: Oh, I don't know. I think it's ingrained in the genes someplace, because in the old country, they were fishermen too. My grandfather was a fisherman.

Ms. Boswell: Did your dad ever take you fishing?

Mr. Gissberg: No. He never took me anywhere but a ball game one time when I was real tiny. Each mill had a baseball team, which was a member of the industrial league and played at Sievers Park, which was composed of several privately owned parcels of land. At that time, the best industrial team had the chance to compete against traveling professional teams such as the Kansas City Monarchs and the House of David. Those traveling teams were great drawing cards and the baseball field was always sold out when they came to town.

The left-field boundary of the park was a commercial building with a flat roof. Any ball hit onto the roof was a home run and the ball stayed on the roof.

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

Mr. Gissberg: A friend of mine and I would climb up on top of the building and when baseball batters would hit home runs on the top of the building we went home with the baseballs all to ourselves. We used them to good advantage because of the NYA (National Youth Authority), which was another Roosevelt innovation to help kids. The director of the NYA in Everett was a fellow named Ray Hutchinson. He was the baseball coach for the NYA. Most of the kids were older than I was who played on the baseball team, and I wasn't that old at the time. My friend and I would show up at the NYA baseball game playing catch with a brand new baseball. The NYA coach inquired where we got them, and we told him, and he said, "You got any more home?" We said, "Yeah, we got some."

So he said we could be a member of the team if we furnished the baseballs. So, we furnished the baseballs for the NYA, and that's when I first started playing baseball, which I loved.

Ms. Boswell: Did you have favorite players? Was there the kind of allegiance to those teams that there are with minor-league teams or major-league teams?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes, there was. The sawmill teams had some great, old-time players who I caught up with. When I was about fourteen or fifteen years old, I was good enough to make the team, but the old-timers that I used to admire, and, specifically, I used to play for a team called "Lundeens," which was out at Lake Stevens. That's where I had my first beer, out at Lundeens.

I was about fourteen years old, and the other players were guys like Augie Matson who was the pitcher then, about forty-five years old. A fellow named Palmer was the catcher, and the Bouchier boys lived in Snohomish, and Lake Stevens, and around the countryside. They had a whole bunch of boys, and they were all good baseball players. I don't know how I got started with them, but I did–even though I was much younger.

After the games, we'd go underneath the dance hall, where they stored the canoes and rental rowboats, and there'd be a big washtub full of ice and home-brew. They didn't want me to drink the home-brew so they gave me a bottle of root beer. But I was able to feign drinking root beer, when, in reality, I was drinking the home-brew, which tasted mighty good to me. So I was about fourteen when I had my first beer.

Ms. Boswell: Was baseball the sort of favorite community sport in the Everett area?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes, it was. They had a football team, too, called the Everett Wildcats. Our high school produced some good football players who later played for the Everett Wildcats. It was a professional team led by an All-American football player, George Wilson. If you ask any of the old-time residents of the state of Washington who the best football player for the University of Washington was under Enoch Bagshaw, they'd tell you right away that it was George Wilson. He's in all the history books of football players. There was also Devereau and Gutormson. I don't remember the first football game, but I can remember going to see the Everett Wildcats play the West Seattle Yellow Jackets, on a Thanksgiving Day and the field was called Bagshaw Field, after the coach. You had to bring a tin of food, that was the admission price. My mother gave me a jar of canned cherries to take, so I could get in to see the football game.

I played baseball every chance I got.

Ms. Boswell: Baseball was the major sport you enjoyed then? I know you later played basketball, too.

Mr. Gissberg: I was a better baseball player than I was a basketball player.

Ms. Boswell: You were telling me some other highlights or things you specifically remember about your childhood.

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know what you mean by childhood, but probably the best thing that I can recall most vividly was when we won the state championship in basketball. We won the only state championship Snohomish County has ever produced. We won twenty-nine games without a defeat. We are still known as the "wonder team from Everett."

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about that. How did such a good team get put together?

Mr. Gissberg: I was just lucky to make the team. Although, once I made it, I was the only one who started every game. But I was always smaller than the rest of the kids. I first started playing basketball on the back alley, and then I found out about the YMCA. You had to pay to get into the YMCA to play basketball, but they had a fellow there by the name of Arty Whitely who was the manager. He used to let us in when the floor was not in use. Gradually, we worked into a team, called the Everett YMCA Midgets. One of the requirements was that you had to weigh less than one hundred pounds to play in that league. You can imagine how small we were, skinny. I was the tallest of the lot, so I was the center. I remember once we took a long trip down to Seattle, and Arty Whitely got us there by borrowing a car from Bob Sevenich's dad's Chevrolet agency. He loaned the Chevrolet to Arty to drive six of us down, so we all piled in and drove down and played the Seattle YMCA and beat them. Then driving home, we got about halfway between Seattle and Everett and somebody said, "Why don't you step on it, Arty?" He says, "I've got it to the floorboard now." It turned out that he had it in second gear. Someone said, "Take it out of second gear."

And after that I played for the Midgets, the North Junior High School Midgets. You also had to weigh less than one hundred pounds. I remember the longest trip we made was to Eatonville. I was in the ninth grade and I still weighed under one hundred pounds. I was too small, when I went to high school, to make the team when I was a sophomore. When I was a junior I started growing, and I made the second team.

Art Ramsted coached the second team. The first-team coach was named Jay Kempkes. I thought I was good enough to make the first team while I was a junior, but Jay didn't think so. Matter of fact, he never did like me. It was evidenced by the fact that a year later, when I was a senior in high school and had made the team under a new coach, I wanted to take his psychology course which was an elective, and he refused to take me in. He said he was all filled up, but I know he wasn't, because he let other kids in his class after that.

The reason he didn't like me I figured out, was that my brother had played football for him and he had a kidney knocked out in a game down in Aberdeen, and Jay brought him home to our house and he was practically unconscious then, even after driving home from Aberdeen. Blood was coming from his mouth. He was white as a ghost and he left him there overnight. My mother, the next day, got a neighbor to take him to the hospital where he lost his kidney. I think Jay felt so badly about having not taken command of that whole situation, and taken better care of my brother, that he took it out on me, for some unknown reason.

Ms. Boswell: Well, he should have taken him to the hospital, for heaven's sakes. It sure sounds like it. Awful.

Mr. Gissberg: Kempkes got in trouble with the community. He was mean and he used to cuss at the kids. Call them every name in the book. So he was fired for poor sportsmanship. He won second at the state high-school tournament in about '38 or '39. He was such a bad sport, he didn't even go and get the second-place trophy, and refused to let the kids out on the floor to get the trophy. He created a fuss in the community, so they fired him and hired a young man by the name of Jim Ennis out of Buckley, who was about twenty-four or twenty-five years old. Not that much older than we were as seniors.

Jay had had a bunch of kids playing on a basketball team who were his favorite big football players, but not very fast, and not very well-coordinated. Jim Ennis took some of us that weren't even on the ball team before, and put us on the team. We became a very cohesive unit and a lot of the first team went on to college on basketball rides. Some of the colleges wanted to know if we all wanted to go to the same college, but we never did.

Ms. Boswell: So you were that good of a team together?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. I went to the University of Oregon, Boody Gilbertson went to the University of Washington, and Bob Cummins went to the University of Washington. Tiny Arnt went to Washington State. Jack Hubbard went to Western Washington.

Ms. Boswell: What made you choose Oregon?

Mr. Gissberg: Probably for two reasons. One, Oregon had just won the national basketball championship under coach Howard Hobson the year before. He was also the baseball coach, and Joe Gordon was a famous New York Yankee second baseman who went to Oregon as a baseball player and several other Oregon baseball graduates had gone on to the big leagues. I always wanted to be a professional baseball player. So, I think I chose Oregon for those two reasons.

Ms. Boswell: Let's go back for a minute and talk about baseball, because you were on some pretty good baseball teams too, weren't you?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. We were a good high-school baseball team. We won the cross-state championship three years running.

Matter of fact, I'm going to play golf with one of the kids I haven't seen since then. Louie Tedesco, "Louie the Wop" we used to call him. In those days it wasn't thought to be bad to call a guy a Swede, or a Wop, or a Chinaman, or a Jap. It was all right. At least we never felt offended by it. Anyway, Louie the Wop is going to come down and we're going to play golf next Tuesday.

Ms. Boswell: You really haven't seen him since then?

Mr. Gissberg: No, I haven't seen him since 1940.

Ms. Boswell: How did you get back in touch with him?

Mr. Gissberg: "Silk Hat" John Hayes, who was another "ladies man" as you can imagine, that's why we called him "silk hat," became a lobbyist for GE Telephone Company in Everett. I got reacquainted with John after I was elected to the Senate. He was lobbying for the telephone company. He had attended Everett High School and graduated the same year I did. I've seen John off and on over the years since I left Everett. He volunteered the fact that he was going to bring Louie the Wop down to play golf with us next Tuesday.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me a little bit about the baseball team. Was it equally as strong a group as the basketball team?

Mr. Gissberg: Well, we won three state championships, so you know we were pretty good. We had a pitcher named "Iron Man." "Iron Man Jake Martin." He was a big rawboned kid and lived down at Riverside where I came from. We had a doubleheader against Bellingham High School and Jake was so strong that he pitched the first game for nine innings and did so well that we beat them. The coach, Harry Tavenor, put him in the second game and he pitched a full second game. He pitched sixteen innings and won both games.

Ms. Boswell: That is quite something.

Mr. Gissberg: Bellingham was our main rival in baseball. They had a fellow by the name of Cliff Chambers, who was their star pitcher. He never beat Everett. He never beat Everett High School, and he never beat the Everett American Legion team which all of us kids played for. He never beat the University of Washington, although he went to Washington State and pitched for Washington State. He was much better than we were, but for some reason we beat him by a fluke or whatever, but we always beat him. He later pitched for the big leagues and was a really successful pitcher. But, we were good.

Ms. Boswell: What gave those Everett teams that sort of drive? To have a state championship basketball and baseball team?

Mr. Gissberg: I guess we all came from poor families and wanted to do well. We were very competitive. Strangely enough, the coach that I mentioned before of the NYA, Ray Hutchinson, later became a state senator from the 39th Legislative District, which was my district later on. He owned a sporting goods store and became well-known in the county. He ran for state senator and served one term. He turned out to be a playboy in the Legislature, but he was a real nice guy. Well-liked by most everyone, but he couldn't get re-elected. So that's when I ran against him in the primary of 1952.

Ms. Boswell: But he was your original–

Mr. Gissberg: He was my first baseball coach.

Ms. Boswell: What about politics? Did he ever talk politics? Did you have any interest in politics in, say, high-school years?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. Matter of fact, my history teacher, who was also my high-school baseball coach, was accused of being a Communist. Whether he was or wasn't, I don't know, but he was extremely liberal for those days. He was a good history teacher. And he used to talk history a lot on all of our baseball trips.

There was another fellow by the name of Acright, who was a speech instructor. I remember when we each had to make a speech on some subject, and, at that time, the Nazis under Hitler were just really getting

started in full bloom in Europe. I was making a speech to my speech class on the dangers of Nazism. Acright interrupted my talk, said he wouldn't have any propaganda spread in his speech class, and ordered me to sit down; perhaps because he was a German.

I guess I became a lawyer and a politician because I used to like to discuss things in current events.

Ms. Boswell: At home or at school?

Mr. Gissberg: At home. I started with my mother.

Ms. Boswell: Did she have strong political leanings? Tell me about that.

Mr. Gissberg: She used to tell me about my dad and how he had strong leanings. I guess I did become a Democrat originally because of what President Roosevelt did for our family. He got the country going again.

Ms. Boswell: Was your family of any different political persuasion before Roosevelt, or were they Democrat?

Mr. Gissberg: I'm not sure they even voted that much. But they couldn't have been of any other persuasion than Democratic. I forgot the point I was making.

Ms. Boswell: You were talking about liking to be home and interested in political arguments.

Mr. Gissberg: Oh yes. I continued that all through junior high and high school. As a matter of fact, I was nicknamed by some of them as "radical" because I felt so strongly; not because I was a Communist or a Nazi or anything like that, but because I was always talking politics and governmental programs. What was good and what was bad. The other kids couldn't care less about it, so they just called me "radical."

Ms. Boswell: What about in high school? Did that translate into involvement in certain organizations or even in politics in school?

Mr. Gissberg: Well, I was elected the senior-class president. That was the first time I ran for office. That was an accident because there was only one person that filed for the senior-class presidency, Carol Smith. Boody Gilbertson, who played baseball and basketball with me all the years, somehow got my name on the ballot for senior-class president. I never did know how he did it, but he did. So I was elected senior-class president. That was the first elective office I held.

But I didn't belong to the debate team or any of those others. As a matter of fact, the debate coach held his class at eight o'clock in the morning. That cured me of wanting to be on the debate team. I used to have to walk from my home to the high school. It was well over a mile. It used to take about one half-hour to walk to school. That would mean I'd have to get up at about six o'clock in the morning.

Ms. Boswell: That's no good.

Mr. Gissberg: No.

Ms. Boswell: At that time, did you develop sort of your own political philosophy? What were your ideas about public service?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know that I had any ideas about public service, but I had ideas about what the Democrats were doing in Congress, and continued to have the same feelings.

I can remember, after I was grown up, when they first started Social Security. That was called "socialistic" by the Republicans.

Medicare was condemned by the Republicans because it would be socialized medicine, supported by the Democrats. All of our social programs were put through by the Democrats and condemned by the Republicans. Now with the health care, they're taking shots at that, now, universal health care.

Ms. Boswell: At that time you were supportive of most of the Democratic programs?

Mr. Gissberg: After I saw what it did for my mother and my brother who were able to get along during the Depression on the income that the Democrats, and the Democrats alone, had provided us, in effect. If it hadn't been for those programs, the country would have been overthrown by other elements.

Ms. Boswell: How did that interest, or did it, translate into academics? Were there certain academic subjects you preferred?

Mr. Gissberg: There weren't that many available. Just the regular academic courses, history and civics were the only two that had any bearing on political programs.

Ms. Boswell: Just in general, what academic areas were you most interested in?

Mr. Gissberg: Sociology. I liked sociology very much. The study of human problems and human aspirations and what motivated people.

I had a very fine teacher by the name of Goldie Mudgett who taught sociology my senior year in high school. Unbeknownst to me, she applied for a scholarship for me to Harvard. I didn't know what Harvard was when I was a senior in high school. I knew it was a school, but that's about all I knew about it. I was awarded a five-hundred-dollar scholarship to Harvard, but I wanted to play baseball and basketball, so I turned that down. But Goldie Mudgett got that for me because I was a good student of hers and she and I got along well.

Speaking of teachers, Henry Jackson was–

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

2

LAW SCHOOL AND MILITARY SERVICE

Ms. Boswell: So, you were talking about Henry Jackson.

Mr. Gissberg: The brother of Gertrude Jackson. She was older than he by several years, but she taught at Garfield Grade School, which is the grade school that I attended. I remember one day just before the Christmas holidays began, we were walking down the steps after class was dismissed, she wished me a "Merry Christmas" and pressed a dollar bill into my hand. I think she felt sorry for our family because she taught my brother and my sister at Garfield School, too. We all had paper routes. A dollar meant a lot in those days.

Ms. Boswell: Was the Jackson family fairly influential in Everett at that time?

Mr. Gissberg: I think that Henry was still in grade school at that particular point. Gertrude was the teacher in the fourth grade.

Scoop ran for prosecuting attorney, the first office he ever held in Snohomish County. He was elected handily, then ran for Congress. He was a Scandinavian, never had trouble getting elected. But the Jackson family was certainly well-known.

Ms. Boswell: Even before his political career?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: You mentioned your paper route. Did you have other jobs as you were growing up?

Mr. Gissberg: The paper route was the first job I ever had outside of selling crabs and perch to the Chinaman. I worked as a paperboy for the *Everett News* on Riverside. I remember we had to pick the papers up at four o'clock in the morning and the bakery shop down on Broadway was always open about four o'clock, and I could stop there with a nickel and buy donuts or butter horns, two for a nickel.

After the *Everett News*, I don't know that I ever did have a summer job. Jobs were not available. What were available, if you happened to know the employer, you got the job, but I didn't know anybody like that.

But I worked in a sawmill. I think the first job that I could remember is getting a job for Weyerhaeuser. That was because of a fellow by the name of Leo Michelson, a left-handed pitcher for the Weyerhaeuser timber ball club. I told you about the timber league sawmill league. He was short a first baseman, and he heard about the fact that I was able to hit well and play first base, so he asked me if I wanted to play ball for Weyerhaeuser with him. Some of the old-timers that I used to admire when I was just a young child still played for Weyerhaeuser. So, I told him, "Yes, but I need a job." "Well," he said, "I think I can get you a job." So he sent me to see the superintendent of Weyerhaeuser Timber Company at Mill B in Everett, a guy named Howard Nickelson. I remember he asked me how old I was. I said, "Fourteen," or sixteen, I don't remember which, and he said, "You mean eighteen." I said, "No, I'm fourteen," or sixteen, whichever it was. He says, "No, I heard you say you were eighteen." So it finally dawned on me that he was trying to get me to say eighteen. So, I said, "Yeah, I'm eighteen." So he smiled and said, "That'll do it."

So he hired me and he put me on the green chain, which is where they put all the Scandinavian guys who had been working there for fifteen to thirty years. They helped break me in to the green chain and showed me how to lever the green lumber that was cut off the logs. I soon learned to hate the smell of the place. I could see myself working there for fifteen, twenty-five years and still be there in the same job and the same atmosphere, so I decided then and there to go to college. I didn't want to make a living at a sawmill.

Ms. Boswell: Were you doing that during the summer, primarily, or were you doing that in conjunction with school?

Mr. Gissberg: It was during the summer. I had another job or two, one summer as a cleanup man at the Eclipse Mill. That was a pretty good job. That's when I had a process server come down and serve me with a summons and complaint for not paying the doctor bill.

Ms. Boswell: Tell that story. That's an interesting story.

Mr. Gissberg: I'd had sinus problems all my life up to that point. I guess I must have been twelve or thirteen years old. I had this surgery from Dr. Murphy, an eye, ear, nose, throat specialist. He opened up a window in my sinuses to help me breathe. Never did a bit of good. My mother didn't have any money to pay him so she

offered to clean his house and do various jobs for him. No one had any money to pay them and they took produce or whatever services somebody could provide them, in lieu of cash.

But, anyway, after about four or five years, he must have turned the unpaid bill over to the collection agency. The collection agency sued me for money. I must have been under eighteen at the time, sixteen or seventeen, and I was working at the Eclipse Mill when a process server came down and served me with process ordering me to appear in ten days before a justice of the peace, which I did. I appeared in my overalls and my work clothing, and the first thing the judge asked me after the attorney for the plaintiff made his opening statement, for a couple of hundred dollars for medical services which had never been paid, old Judge Johnson looked at me and said, "How old are you son?" I said, "I'm sixteen." He got red in the face and he asked, "When were the services performed?" The other attorney said, "More than four years ago." So the judge banged the gavel and said, "This case is dismissed. I'll not have my court made into a courtroom collection agency for the Everett Collection Agency." That was my first brush with the law. I was impressed that justice had been done. Although it was probably an injustice to the doctor, but we didn't have any money to pay it. That was the first inkling that I had that I really wanted to be a lawyer, together with my argumentative nature, a fact which can be confirmed by my friends and my family.

Ms. Boswell: I think you told me earlier that, after that, you used to pay some visits to the courthouse too.

Mr. Gissberg: Every time I was uptown for any reason whatsoever, I'd stop at the courthouse and look at the notices posted on the bulletin board showing what time the sheriff's sales were to be held, what time probates would start and what was to be heard, and if a trial was to be heard, the date it was to start. So I would always make a point to try to come back to the trials particularly, and hear what was going on. It was a good way to learn something about the law.

There were two particularly outstanding lawyers in town. One by the name of Jasper Rucker from Everett, who was the son of a pioneer family, which still has a street named in their behalf. He was a great trial lawyer who represented the insurance companies. Another lawyer from Mt. Vernon, Robin Welts, was an outstanding lawyer for the plaintiff's side. Whenever a trial was scheduled for those two it seemed like the courtroom would be filled to overflowing to listen to those two "golden-tongued" lawyers. I was always impressed with both of them very much, and admired their legal abilities. I think that gave me a feeling that I wanted to become a lawyer, too. I was always fascinated by the courthouse.

When I went to Oregon I didn't know what I wanted to be, particularly, except I enrolled in prelaw. There was another fellow by the name of Wendell Wyatt, a senior, who encouraged me to go to law school. He introduced me to Wayne Morse, who was then the dean of the law school, and later became a famous US senator, maverick as he was.

Wendell would invite me to have dinner with Wayne Morse and other law-school-faculty members. Wendell knew that I had a talent toward becoming a lawyer, so he exposed me to it as much as he could, and convinced me that that was what I should do.

Later on, when I graduated from the University of Washington Law School, I nearly went to Oregon to practice law. Wendell had since graduated and become a lawyer and had gone to practice with former Governor Norblad of Oregon. After I graduated from the University of Washington I was invited to come down to Astoria and see if I wanted to practice with their firm.

In the meantime, the governor had retired from politics and was practicing law, and his son was a congressman. I was fascinated by the thought of going into a small law firm where Scandinavians predominated in the community, primarily Finns who settled in Astoria. I stayed there for three or four weeks with Wendell. To become a member of the Oregon Bar Association would have required that I take the Oregon bar exam after a year's residency in Oregon.

Since I was anxious to start practicing law right away without having to wait another year, I went back to Everett. I actually settled in Marysville and started my own law practice on April Fools' Day, 1949. I knew all there was to know about the law, and trials. I knew all the statutes and case law of the state, but I'd never had any practical experience. Matter of fact, I didn't even know what a deed looked like. Everything I learned about the actual practice of the law, I had to learn the hard way. I didn't have anyone to communicate with or go to for advice.

One story I tell about myself to my friends is when I first started practicing in Marysville. I was in a real-estate office and I paid five dollars a month in rent. It was about a 3-by-3 room with a single light bulb with a string to turn the light on. Somehow, I made a start, and after a couple of months a guy came in and wanted to form a corporation. He wanted to buy a dairy farm up on Getchell Hill. So, I told him, "Yes, I could do that. It would be one hundred dollars, plus a filing fee of twenty-five dollars with the secretary of state's office." So he told me what he wanted and after he left,

I opened up the books and the RCWs (The Revised Code of Washington). The RCWs in those days was Pierce's Code. The RCW wasn't published then.

Ms. Boswell: What was the code then?

Mr. Gissberg: Pierce's Code. I opened up Pierce's Code to see what the requirements for a corporation were. One of the requirements was that the articles of incorporation had to be drawn and filed in triplicate originals with the secretary of state's office. I was so conscientious, and believed everything that I read that I typed–I didn't have a secretary, of course; I did my own typing–the articles of incorporation three times in originals.

Ms. Boswell: That's great. You were saying that your legal training was not practically oriented.

Mr. Gissberg: The legal work in law school was never practically oriented. All you knew was the theory of the law. It was the "case law" method of learning law. When you come out of law school, you can write a brief for the Supreme Court very well, but you can't draw articles of incorporation, or a deed, or a lease, or trust instruments, or any kind of contractual construction contracts and so on; they were just a mystery. In beginning a law practice alone, you didn't have any forms so you had to really find out for yourself and learn it all by yourself. It was a great experience because once you knew it, you knew it. It still serves me in good stead.

When I was in the Senate, my fellow senators used to look to me to tell them what the law was. I could answer most of the questions that came up.

Ms. Boswell: Were there any individuals in the law school, teachers or otherwise, that were particularly influential?

Mr. Gissberg: The dean of the law school was a fellow named Judson Faulkner, who later had the law school named after him. He was formerly a practicing lawyer in downtown Seattle before he became dean of the law school. He taught evidence as well as being dean. He did a good job of teaching evidence.

After the war I came back to finish law school, but I wanted to play a final year of baseball. Faulkner heard about it and he called me into the dean's office and said that I couldn't play baseball. "Why not?" I asked. "Because there's never been an athlete that graduated from this law school yet, and there won't be." He felt that learning the law was more than a full-time endeavor and any extracurricular activities wouldn't be allowed. Whether he thought the law school would go to pot if they let in athletes or what, I don't have any idea.

Ms. Boswell: What was your response?

Mr. Gissberg: My response was: "I'm going to play anyway." Then I went to see Harry Cross, a delegate to the PAC 8 and also an instructor in the law school. I told Mr. Cross what the dean had said to me, and I told Rudy Nottleman, the equity teacher, both baseball fans. They apparently talked to the dean because he called me in again and he said, "Are you still insisting on playing baseball?" I said, "Yes." He says, "Well, I've got a compromise. You can play the home games, but don't go to the away games where you have to travel. You'll miss the lectures." I said, "Okay, I'll do that." So I played my senior year in law school, but only in home baseball games.

Ms. Boswell: How did the coach feel about that? The baseball coach.

Mr. Gissberg: I told him that was all I could play and he didn't argue about it. It was the faculty members that arranged it. I don't know what the relationship was then.

The coach, at that time, was a new baseball coach who came on after Tubby Graves retired. Tubby probably would have turned the law school upside down then if I could not have played full time. The new coach, Art McLarner, wasn't that aggressive.

Ms. Boswell: Now let me just step back for one minute and talk for a minute about how you ended up getting from Oregon back to the University of Washington. We kind of skipped around that. You first went to Oregon as a basketball player, but also played baseball. Tell me what happened.

Mr. Gissberg: I got to Oregon to begin with because the Oregon alumni, Doctor Moore in Seattle, a dentist, contacted myself and Boody Gilbertson and Bob Cummings, who were two of my teammates in basketball and baseball, and wanted us to come down to Oregon and look at the athletic facility. He said that Howard Hobson was interested in having us go to school down there.

The doctor gave us ten or twenty dollars, whichever it was, and my brother-in-law drove us down to Oregon. I gave him the money, or somebody gave him the money, to buy gas to get down to Oregon and back. I liked it so well I never went back home.

The school got me a job working at the ranch of the president of the Eugene National Bank. Out at his ranch. And part of the instruction was, when you get out to the ranch, don't make yourself conspicuous. Don't let yourself be seen too much because you're out there killing time, not to work.

Ms. Boswell: I was going to say, it sounds like the UW.

Mr. Gissberg: Problems are the same. That was a very fine job. I remember I used to sit under the brush pile and read all the editorials in the *Oregonian*. I loved to read those columns.

Wendell Willkie was running for president of the United States at that time. After we were off work in the afternoon, with Hobson being the basketball coach, we'd have the prospective freshmen basketball players scrimmage basketball games with the varsity. We weren't enrolled in school at that time. I was later to learn that all three of those incidents that I just mentioned (i.e., taking money to go to the school, and being contacted by the school first, and taking a job which you were being paid for being an athlete, not a worker) was in violation. Playing basketball and using the athletic facilities before matriculating at the institution were all violations of the Pacific Coast Conference rules. None of us kids knew about it at all. We weren't told about it, so we were sort of innocent victims, so to speak.

The conference that year hired an FBI man by the name of Atherton to investigate each of the Pacific Coast Conference schools to see if they were violating any of the rules governing their athletic kids' admission to that particular school. He came to Oregon and interviewed me and asked me a lot of questions. I told him the truth. He put us under oath with a legal secretary there, and a stenographer to take all the notes down verbatim. That was early in my freshman year.

After basketball season was over and baseball season started, I was pitching a baseball game against Oregon State frosh. In fact, John Warren was our baseball and basketball freshman coach. He waddled out to the mound and held his hand out for the ball. I gave him the ball, and I said, "Now, get me out of here, John, and get me back to first base where I belong. You know I'm a hitter, not a pitcher." He says, "Oh no. That's all right. You're doing great. I've got something here I want to show you." He reached in his back pocket and fished out an envelope. He says, "Here's a telegram I got for you." I looked at it and it was to inform me, and the athletic officials at Oregon, that I was ineligible for further athletic competition at the University of Oregon for violation of the rules that had been cited. I gave the ball back and told him he could shove it you know where. So that ended my career at Oregon.

Ms. Boswell: Could they have fought the rules, or could you have fought the rules?

Mr. Gissberg: No, there was no appeal at that time. At least I don't know of any appeal. Howard Hobson, being the fine guy that he was, told me that, if I wanted to go to any other college in the country, he could get me in on a ride. A so-called athletic scholarship which I always called "a ride." It was more indicative of what it was. Scholarship is a misnomer. Scholarship has nothing to do with it. I still had it in my mind to play baseball, if I could. So I wanted to go to Oregon until I transferred to Washington.

They suspended the Pacific Coast Conference rule against transferring without a year's loss of eligibility. They suspended that rule which would otherwise have meant that a transferee would lose one year of athletic eligibility at the college to which he or she transferred.

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[Tape 2, Side 2, blank]

Mr. Gissberg: There were a number of students at the University of Washington who later on went to law school, and who entered politics. For instance, there was Don Eastvold, who was in my law-school class, and was elected attorney general of Washington. He had high ambitions to be elected to the US Senate, or greater office.

There was Neil Hoff, who was in my class and was elected to the state Senate in 1950. Eastvold was also elected to the Washington State Senate in 1950. Pat Sutherland was elected to the state Senate in 1952, I believe, and later became prosecuting attorney for Thurston County. He ran for the attorney general's office, unsuccessfully.

There was Bill Goodloe in my law-school class, who ran for just about every office there was to run for. He was infatuated with public office, I believe. He eventually became a state Supreme Court member. He ran for governor. He ran for attorney general. He ran for mayor of Seattle. I think he's currently running again for some position in King County. There was Bob Greive in law school at the same time I was, who transferred to Florida. Why he did that, I don't know. He was elected to the state Senate when he was still in law school, probably in 1947.

Ms. Boswell: He transferred to Florida to finish then?

Mr. Gissberg: I think that's what he did. But he was elected to the Senate when he was still in law school, which was quite a feat, I thought.

Ms. Boswell: To what do you attribute all these public servants coming out of that particular class in law school?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know. I've often thought about that, but probably because there were just so many. I don't know if there was a greater proportion of them that did or didn't go on to public service. Because we had such a large class, maybe it was the same proportion that otherwise went on to politics.

Ms. Boswell: And the large class was due to what?

Mr. Gissberg: The large class was due to the fact that everybody would been in the war and had their schooling interrupted. They all came back at once.

Ms. Boswell: When they did that, did they just have larger class sizes, or did they increase faculty?

Mr. Gissberg: They just had larger size classes. They didn't change the faculty in any respect. The same faculty members were there after the war as before the war.

Ms. Boswell: Didn't they have some programs that allowed law students to finish in a shorter time than they normally would have?

Mr. Gissberg: Bob Greive put through a bill in the Legislature, I think, that allowed that to be done. At least he introduced legislation to do it. Whether or not that's what ultimately had the university do it, or they did it on their own, or whether the legislation passed, I don't know. It was a four-year course in law school before Bob introduced his legislation. After that it was three and one-third years to get through.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me how your law-school career fit into that time period. How long did you go before the war started?

Mr. Gissberg: I went one year before the war started. Then I came back after the war in '46, and had two years after that. Two years and a third after that. So I graduated in 1948 and took the bar exam in December of '48, and was sworn in as a member of the Bar Association in 1949.

Ms. Boswell: I want to get into your legal career, but let's just step back for a minute, because I want to ask you, if it's all right with you, about your World War II experiences. Tell me about that. You were in school, preparation for war period. Did that affect your education in any way?

Mr. Gissberg: Did it what?

Ms. Boswell: Did it affect your education in any way, the path you took?

Mr. Gissberg: Well, I was signed up for Marine V-12, which I think I talked about before.

Ms. Boswell: We didn't put it on tape, so tell me a little bit more about that.

Mr. Gissberg: After the war started, the government carried on a program of allowing students to remain in college in lieu of being drafted. And, of course, no one wanted to be drafted as a buck private or an apprentice seaman. They all wanted to continue on in school, so the V-12 program was very popular among the students. The V-12 program was such that when called to active duty, you continued on in the college that you were attending or, in some cases, the Oregon kids had to come up to Washington to go to school. There was the Marine V-12, and the Navy V-12, and the Air Corps V-7. I was in the Marine V-12. So, you were called to active duty, you had uniforms and went to school during the war until there were vacancies in the officer-training schools, then we'd be moved along. But we took regular classes in addition to having mathematics and trig and physics. We were able to continue on the major that we wanted. In my case, law school, so I was in law school at the same time I was in Marine V-12.

Ms. Boswell: Was that hard to do?

Mr. Gissberg: It wasn't any harder on me than it was everybody else.

We studied a lot, and we lived in the barracks in the girls dorm. We took over one of the girls dormitories. By we, I mean the government took over the dormitory. We had to live right there in the dormitory and had a lot of time for studying because we were under Marine discipline. Had roll call at six o'clock in the morning, and calisthenics, and had roll call before the evening chow. After chow you had to be in bed with lights out at a certain hour, so there was twenty-four hours a day in school, you might say.

In my case, I was to go to Quantico or Paris Island after the V-12 at the university. But I wasn't able to do

so because I'd hurt my knee in an athletic event. The captain of the Marine Corps at the university told me that I wouldn't be able to "cut the mustard" at Quantico or Paris Island because of the physical requirements of the program. So they gave me a medical discharge from the service.

Instead of clapping my hands for joy, I tried to join the Navy Air Corps and they turned me down because my teeth did not occlude properly. So then I went and joined the Navy, and they weren't so particular. If you could walk up and down a ladder, that's all they required.

Ms. Boswell: What was the rationale behind the Air Corps' ruling about your teeth?

Mr. Gissberg: I understand it was because when you put an oxygen hose in your mouth, you had to bite down on the hose. If your teeth didn't occlude properly, you wouldn't get any oxygen. That's what I understood. That, later on, turned out not to be true because I know other people who went into the Navy Air Corps after that whose teeth were bad.

Ms. Boswell: But you ended up in the Navy.

Mr. Gissberg: I ended up in the Navy as an apprentice seaman in Asbury Park, New Jersey. I stayed there for two or three months until an opening at the midshipman's school opened up. Midshipman's school was held at Northwestern University in Chicago where I attended. There was also one at Columbia, and a couple of other colleges that escape me at the moment. So I went to midshipman's school at Northwestern and ninety days later I became an officer and a gentleman by act of Congress.

Ms. Boswell: That's how quick the program was? Ninety days?

Mr. Gissberg: Ninety days. We were called "Ninety Day Wonders." We were expected to be able to take command of a ship. In my case I had orders to report to Pearl Harbor, and to report to the commander of the USS Casa Grandé, which was the name for a landing ship dock (LSD). I served on the USS Casa Grandé as an officer of the First Division having a deck crew under my command through the invasion of Leyte Gulf in the Philippines and Lingayen Gulf in the northern Philippines, and at Okinawa. That was the last invasion prior to the end of the war. Then I was given command of my own ship, an LSM-260, landing ship mechanized, which was smaller than a landing ship dock, but was designed to take ashore tanks and personnel through a front-end gate which went right onto the beach and opened up the gate. The tanks would drive right out onto the beach.

After the war, I decommissioned the ship in the Calcasieu River in Lake Charles, Louisiana. Shortly thereafter, I was discharged and went back to college on the GI Bill of Rights, which provided for free tuition and gave us a stipend for books. A monthly sum which wasn't sufficient to take care of your living expenses, but it helped greatly. I worked in the liquor store as a clerk when I was in law school after the war.

Ms. Boswell: On the boat, the landing ship dock, and then the LSM, did they accompany bigger troop ships? I'm not clear on how that works.

Mr. Gissberg: Yes, the LSD, landing ship dock, accompanied the regular task forces into the invaded areas. Our function on the LSD was to act as a repair ship. We were able to do that because of the construction of the ship. It had wing tanks on both sides of the ship from amidships back to the stern, and had a tailgate in the stern. The way you would operate it, you would pump water into the wing tanks, below the depth of the ship in the water, and lower the tailgate and allow the water from the sea to flow into the hold, so to speak, and then raise the tailgate and the smaller ships would come right into the center of the boat. Then you'd close the tailgate and pump the water out and you'd have a dry dock, in effect. We would take aboard smaller craft like LCIs and LCMs, all landing craft, for repair. We would travel in regular task-force formation and be in zigzag courses the same as any other personnel ship or fighting ship.

We had one five-inch gun, and we had at least twelve 40 mm guns, and numerous 20 mm guns. We could put up a lot of fire power in an LSD.

Ms. Boswell: Did you have to use it frequently?

Mr. Gissberg: No. The two times we had to use them were when we went up the Lingayen Gulf. We were attacked by a Kamikaze, Japanese Kamikaze aircraft, which intercepted our task force en route to the western side of the Philippine Islands. The Japanese weren't as successful in dropping their bombs and torpedoes as they would like to have been, so they started flying their aircraft right directly into our ships, thereby guaranteeing damage or destruction of our ships. On that particular occasion, that was the first time that we had seen the Kamikazes. We opened fire on them. The whole convoy opened fire on them and we destroyed several of their Kamikaze aircraft. We came through unscathed, but a carrier which was opposite our station

in the zigzag course was struck and we could see the aircraft being rolled off the flight deck into the ocean, so that our aircraft could land on the carrier again.

Then, in Okinawa, there was considerable Kamikaze activity there, which inflicted great damage to our naval forces at Okinawa. We sailed from Okinawa after April 1st of 1945, which was the date of the invasion of Okinawa. After the first day we were ordered to a place called Kerama-retto, which was a group of islands closer to Japan. We anchored up and repaired the destroyer escorts and destroyers which had been severely damaged by Kamikaze flights out of Japan. There were destroyer escorts, and destroyers acted as a picket line between the islands in Japan and Okinawa. The Kamikazes en route to Okinawa would encounter our picket-line ships first, and our picket lines took the brunt of the attacks. We had terrible loss of lives and ships. We were busy trying to repair as best we could.

There were so many lives lost that one of the officers put a call out for volunteers to take over the destroyers that had been damaged and lost their officers.

Shortly after that, in August, Truman dropped the A-bomb on Hiroshima and that ended the war, for all intents and purposes.

Ms. Boswell: How did you feel about that step? Dropping the bomb? How did it affect your thinking?

Mr. Gissberg: We were relieved, because it was well-known among our crew at least, that the next invasion was going to be in the homelands of Japan, the home island of Japan, which would result in a terrible loss of life. We were well-aware of the atrocities effected by the Japanese upon our troops and the tenacity with which they fought. In fact, they didn't fear death in any respect, apparently. Their religion told them that they would go to their heaven if they died for the emperor who was a deity unto himself and their own religion. We were happy that we had some means of ending the war to save hundreds of thousands of lives, even though it was a terrible thing to inflict upon the Japanese people. But war is terrible.

Ms. Boswell: When you came back from those experiences and got back into school and everyday life, generally, what kind of impact did that have on your thinking? Did some of your goals or thinking change or not?

Mr. Gissberg: No. I don't think the war affected me at all. We were just all happy to be back home. I know the first day I got back to Everett, I was still in uniform, but I had a ten-day leave. My ship came into San Francisco, and I flew up to Sand Point Navy Air Corps Station on Lake Washington, and came home. The first thing I wanted was some milk, because during the war I was so sick and tired of powdered milk, that the first thing I asked my mother was if she had any milk in the refrigerator. But, I don't think it affected my goals in life, if I had any goals in life.

Ms. Boswell: Did you have specific goals at that time? Had you set some goals for yourself?

Mr. Gissberg: Just short-term. I wanted to finish law school, which I did.

Ms. Boswell: How would you describe yourself as a law student?

Mr. Gissberg: I was above average in grades. I still played baseball in the home games. The dean of the law school wouldn't allow us to participate in intercollegiate athletics by going away from the university. Had to just play the home games. But, I enjoyed law school, and I enjoyed the companionship of all the fellows who were there at that time, many of whom I'd known before the war, and many of whom I became acquainted with during the war in the V-12 program.

Ms. Boswell: How would you assess the role that sports played in your educational years?

Mr. Gissberg: I owe everything to sports. I would never have been able to go on to college had it not been for sports, because of financial inadequacies in my own family. Until one starts school in some fashion, you're not able to know what it's like. After the fact, looking back, I think I probably would have been able to earn my way through law school on my own. But it was sort of a mystery as to how you'd do that if you hadn't someone to tell you how to do it. Sports have been my life, next to my practice of law. I still treasure the moments when I get together with my old teammates, who are rapidly disappearing from the face of the earth.

Ms. Boswell: Did you ever consider going on professionally in sports?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. I wanted to go into professional baseball, and probably would have had it not been for the war coming along when it did.

Ms. Boswell: Once the war was over and you finished up your law school, there wasn't the incentive to do it?

Mr. Gissberg: Well, I tore my knee up when I was in Marine V-12 playing baseball, sliding into home plate. Although I played a little semipro baseball after that, my leg was never the same, and so I lost much of my speed. I was always pretty fast, but I lost much of my speed. You've got to have a lot of speed to be any good in the major leagues.

After I started practicing law in Marysville, I umpired some games. I was paid fifteen dollars a game for that, which was mighty handy at that time.

Ms. Boswell: That was a lot of money for that. That was a good opportunity. So that was umpiring for which team?

Mr. Gissberg: I didn't umpire for a team. We'd be assigned. It was the Northwest League, baseball league. I teamed up with a fellow named Jack Spittle, who was also in the Navy, and had played football at Everett High School. He and I were a team and we'd alternate behind the plate and on the base paths. I did that for one summer is all, until my law practice got so that I wouldn't have to help with the umpiring.

[End of Tape 3, Side 1]

[Tape 3, Side 2, blank]

STATE SENATOR: 1953

Mr. Gissberg: The Congressional Campaign Committee was aware of the fact that I existed because of all the efforts that I had made ahead of time. All the Democrats in the state of Washington went back there to talk me up, that I could beat Jack Westland. So they knew of me, and Larry O'Brien, in his parting words said, "Can you win with twenty-thousand dollars?" I said, "Yes." He said, "You've got it."

So, with that, I walked out of the building and I walked to the Potomac River, and looked into that river, and saw a sea of mud running in the Potomac River, and I suddenly faced realistically what I was doing. I give up my home in the Northwest to go to Washington D.C. and the turmoil that exists there, and I thought to myself, "There's no steelhead in that Potomac River," so I decided then and there I wasn't going to do it, even though I'd just been promised twenty-thousand dollars from the campaign committee. I knew I could win the office. I was well-known in the whole congressional district at that time.

I came back to Everett and went up to the courthouse, and the prosecuting attorney at that time was a fellow named Lloyd Meads, who had some ambition to be a congressman, but he knew he didn't have a chance if he ran against me in the primary. I met him in the courtroom and he wanted to know if he could talk to me. I said, "Sure." He said, "Well, Bill, are you going to run, or aren't you going to run? If you don't run, I'm going to, but I know I can't beat you, so if you do run, I'm not going to oppose you. I'll support you." So, I told him that I wasn't going to run, and he was promptly elected that fall and he served for ten years before he resigned.

I owe the Potomac River and its sea of mud for the fact that I didn't go to Congress. I've never been regretful.

Ms. Boswell: No regrets, then?

Mr. Gissberg: No regrets at all. I probably would have made a fool of myself in Congress anyway.

Ms. Boswell: I certainly doubt that. What year was it that you were thinking about doing that?

Mr. Gissberg: 1962 I think it was.

Ms. Boswell: That's a fascinating story.

Mr. Gissberg: That's all it took. There was no steelhead in the Potomac River, and I knew I had a good life where I was. Could do what I wanted to do, go fishing when I wanted to go fishing. I wouldn't be able to do that in Washington D.C. I figured it would tear my family up, too, which it did to a lot of people. But I have no regrets whatsoever.

Ms. Boswell: Even that first day, then, when you walked into the state Senate back here in Washington, were you bit by the political bug, though? Did you really enjoy it?

Mr. Gissberg: I loved serving in the Senate for the first ten years. It was everything I expected it to be. Honorable. People weren't possessed of burning political ambitions to be ahead. You could believe what everyone told you. Politics was not in the same rough, tumble atmosphere that it became later on.

Ms. Boswell: We were talking earlier about your first experiences and impressions of the Senate. Did you have any mentors, or people that you particularly looked to for help or even as a model?

Mr. Gissberg: I admired Al Rosellini's ability as a minority leader in the Senate. I respected his knowledge of the rules, the Senate rules of procedure. I admired his stamina, his physical stamina of being able to go out all night long, in effect, and campaign or socialize and get back up on his feet the next morning in the Senate with great energy and powers of persuasion and argue the themes of the Democrats on legislation that was pending.

And I learned from Al that you had to know the rules if you were going to do anything on the floor, so I studied the rules with great diligence. I felt I could hold my own on any parliamentary debate on any subject at any time, which I did.

Ms. Boswell: Was he the kind of person that would sort of counsel you, or was it more just watching him from a distance and seeing what he did?

Mr. Gissberg: There was no more masterful politician than Al Rosellini. He was a very charming man, something I always lacked. He could charm the pants

off the devil, I think. I learned that you had to put your best foot forward when you talked to people who were your peers in the Senate, and you had to treat them with respect and humility. Governor Rosellini never counseled me directly, but I learned from him by observing how he did things. To this very day, you'd think he was running for public office when he greeted you. He's that charming a man.

Ms. Boswell: Any other people in the Senate at that time that were–

Mr. Gissberg: Well, there was a Republican by the name of Tom Hall who was the majority leader in the Republican Senate. He was a dairy farmer from Skamania County and you'd never know he was a dairy farmer. You'd think he was the finest orator in the world; he used to explain things in great detail. He had a very fine knowledge of state government and all the agencies and their responsibilities and duties. I had a great deal of respect for Tom Hall. When he got up to speak, everyone listened to what he had to say. He always told it like it was, like it or not.

Ms. Boswell: As a freshman senator, how did you begin, you were mentioning your sign for Ebey Slough, and I think we got interrupted. How did you sort of begin to make a name for yourself?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know that I did. I don't remember all the legislation I introduced. I recall one bill that I introduced on air pollution, creating the Air Pollution Control Authority, and providing for state jurisdiction. I remember the Republicans were in control and it never had a chance of passing, but a fellow by the name of Lloyd Andrews was in the Republican Senate and he lobbied me. That's not the correct term. He explained to me that the Republicans would never support a state authority, but they would support a local authority. So, you'd have thirty-nine different local air-pollution-control authorities. He later ran for governor and espoused the same sort of nonsense that he was espousing to me, but he never made it.

I introduced legislation for a local highways system to take over county roads and put it on the state system, which was a very popular thing, which I campaigned upon. It took me several years to get it all done, but I did get it finished eventually, and I put a lot of county roads on the state system. It greatly improved the transportation facilities in Snohomish County to get one of the projects finished, which was the Lake Stevens trestle from Everett and Cavalero's Corner to Lake Stevens–

Ms. Boswell: From Everett to where?

Mr. Gissberg: Cavalero's Corner. Cavalero was a pioneer farmer east of Everett, and they called the intersection Cavalero's Corner.

I was having trouble getting the Highway Commission to appropriate funds for the purpose of constructing a new two-lane trestle across the flats, across the river and wetlands, between Everett and Cavalero's Corner. It had been traditionally an old wooden bridge with wooden planks on it and a two-lane highway, which was fine for the 1920s and 1930s, but it could hardly be called adequate for the 1940s. So in 1940 they improved the bridge, but it was still two lanes. So, you can imagine in the 1950s and 1960s, early '60s, what the result was of increased automobile traffic and truck traffic and the terrible accidents they had on the two-lane bridge.

A group of us got together and held up a confirmation of Highway Commission members until they promised they would do certain things for the fellows that were instigators of the holdup of their confirmation process. One of the Highway Commission members never did commit to what we wanted him to commit to, so we didn't confirm him. We voted him down on the Senate floor. That goes to show you how extreme some things get when they don't go as the legislators like it to go. But, we were able to get that done.

Ms. Boswell: When you say "we," who made up your coalition?

Mr. Gissberg: Augie Mardesich, and myself, and several of the other rural legislators who, by this time, felt they were getting short-changed by the cities. When I first went to the Legislature, the cities took the back seat and the urban area took the back seat to the counties, the rural areas, in the expenditure of highway funds. By the time ten or fifteen years elapsed, it had just turned around the other way. The urban areas were getting the bulk of the money at the expense of the rural areas.

Ms. Boswell: Certainly there were rural areas on the western side of the mountains, but, obviously, more on the eastern side. Was there also a coalition across the state as well?

Mr. Gissberg: The eastside coalition lost much of its power during the time of the freeway construction in western Washington. But there certainly was a coalition of eastern Washington legislators who were

fighting for funds there, and who got more than their share, actually.

When the Republicans had control of the Senate in the early ’50s, a fellow by the name of Raugust, Senator Raugust, was the chairman of the Highway Committee in the Senate, and he saw to it that eastern Washington did very well, together with Nat Washington, who was a Democratic senator from eastern Washington, particularly Chelan County. He ran the Highway Committee with the same effectiveness that Julia Butler Hansen ruled the Highway Committee in the House. And she and Nat made a wonderful team for dividing up the pie between themselves and their friends.

Eventually Nat was bumped off as chairman of the Highway Committee and they put on another fellow who was more friendly to our desires. There was a lot of politicking going on in the highway budget. Always was.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about committees. As a freshman, for example, and in the minority, too, what was it like to try and get on committees? Did you have any kind of choice?

Mr. Gissberg: I just took what I was given. We were all given a choice. Each senator was given a choice, and you filled out a piece of paper that carried all the committees on it. You checked those that you felt you wanted to be a member of. They had a certain number of committees that you could check, that you had a chance for. I chose Judiciary, and I always served on the Judiciary Committee, but the rest of my committees during all the time I was in the Senate varied from time to time depending on what bills I wanted to get passed. I knew what my projects were going to be for the coming session, and I’d always get on the committee that had jurisdiction on the bill to make sure it didn’t get stuck.

Ms. Boswell: Was that a common practice, or is that something you learned along the way?

Mr. Gissberg: I really can’t answer that. I don’t know what governed the other fellows. I got on the Rules Committee the beginning of my second term of office, because I could see that the Rules Committee members got whatever they wanted. They were able to control the flow of legislation to be considered on the Senate floor, and had a lot more influence among their fellow members than somebody who wasn’t a member of the Rules Committee. So I was fortunate enough to get on the Rules Committee right away when we first took over the Senate in 1956, I guess it would be the ’57 session.

Ms. Boswell: Before that, was it hard for a Democrat to get on the powerful committees?

Mr. Gissberg: No, I wouldn’t say so. All the lawyers who ever wanted to be on the Judiciary Committee were given Judiciary Committee. Matter of fact, a lot of lawyers didn’t even want to be on the Judiciary Committee. At the end, nonlawyers were on the Judiciary Committee, which was sort of silly, I thought. They didn’t know anything about the law to begin with. I was always able to get the committees I wanted to be on.

I never wanted to be a chairman of a committee until I personally decided to get off the Rules Committee when the secrecy was abolished. I was a supporter of the secrecy in the Rules Committee.

Ms. Boswell: Why?

Mr. Gissberg: Because sometimes bad legislation would get passed when it shouldn’t have been passed. I never had a problem meeting the public and describing what went on in the Rules Committee. Although I was criticized for it, I felt it was in the best interest of the public to have a place where a senator could vote his own convictions without having politics seek its revenge upon you if you voted against the so-called popular will of the majority. There were certain pressure groups that were in vogue, and are probably still in vogue in every legislative branch, that it’s best if you don’t follow their dictates. If you were known to oppose them, they controlled enough votes back home where they could make it tough for a member not to vote with them. The Rules Committee secrecy came in handy at times like that. They never knew who voted where in the Rules Committee, although they knew who was on the other committees, and on the Senate floor. But when secrecy was removed from the Rules Committee, I felt it better to be chairman of a committee where I could control at least the legislation that went into that committee.

The Judiciary Committee was a perfect example of that because it was never a committee where many members showed up. Over a dozen members would be on the Senate Judiciary Committee. We used to meet every morning at eight o’clock, and I’d be fortunate if I had three members show up besides myself. I’d be conducting the hearings and deciding what I wanted out without any help from anybody else.

Ms. Boswell: Why was that? Why was there such a lax attitude about it?

Mr. Gissberg: Because there was no political gain to be served by going to the Judiciary Committee. It was just hard work and concerned basic judicial practices and laws which affected the lawyers more than anybody else. There really wasn't that much of a plus to being on the Judiciary Committee and we always filled it up with enough fellows so that if we needed to get something out and somebody challenged a quorum, we could get the quorum in there. It wasn't until the abortion issue came up that the Judiciary Committee became a hot committee.

Ms. Boswell: Is that something that you were presiding over when that issue came up?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes, I was the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and it came up before then on the floor of the Senate when Joel Pritchard, who is now Lieutenant Governor, introduced a bill legalizing abortion. I knew the bill was coming up because I always made myself aware the night before of what bills were in the "hopper" that were going to be read-in the following day. When the bill was introduced I got up and moved that it be indefinitely postponed. That's the toughest motion you can make on any legislation, because it kills it right then and there if you get a majority to vote for it.

I was convinced and held the belief that abortions should not be freely given without certain restraints (i.e., the consent of the husband; in case of a pregnant girl, the consent of the parents). So I moved to indefinitely postpone the bill that was up, which had no restraints on it at all; it was "abortion on demand." I was also upset about the fact that preceding that session in which it was introduced, there was an abortionist in King County, I think it was in Kent. I've forgotten the guy's name, but he had a regular abortion clinic going at that time and it was common knowledge in the newspapers and other places that he was performing abortions with abandon. At that time it was a felony to do so. Certain of the politicians were advocating the continuance of that sort of activity when it was clearly a statute that made them an accessory to a crime, in my opinion. So that had me stirred up that that was going on when there was no legal authority for him to do so.

That prompted me to make the motion that I did. I think the fact that I made that motion probably made Joel Pritchard and his political career, because the word was out all over the state immediately that he was trying to get abortion legalized, which was the coming popular thing to do among the women at least. I think I did Joel Pritchard a political favor by doing that. My motion didn't pass.

The bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee and I held hearings on it and there was a lot of pressure for me to bring the bill out when I could have kept it in committee, but I never felt a bill should be killed in committee at the whim of the chairman only. If the majority of the members of the committee desired the bill to go out, it should go out. I let it out and that was about the only controversial bill that we ever had in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Ms. Boswell: Did the workings of the Judiciary Committee change at all from the time you started until you ended your service?

Mr. Gissberg: I think when I first got to the Senate, the Judiciary Committee used to have full attendance. I gave you a picture of the Judiciary Committee as it existed in '52, or '54, and every morning there was usually 100 percent attendance which gradually fell off more and more. At the time when I left it was as I described it, very sparsely attended. I don't know why.

[End of Tape 4, Side 1]

Ms. Boswell: You mentioned, when you were talking about committee chairmanships earlier, that originally you didn't want to be a committee chairman. What was the reason for that?

Mr. Gissberg: Because I wanted to be on the Rules Committee. I felt that was a place that I could be of better benefit. I could make a greater contribution there than as a committee chairman. [Rules Committee members cannot be committee chairmen.]

Ms. Boswell: I'm still puzzled by how a freshman legislator, if there's no real training, how do you figure out putting bills together and getting people to support them, and all of the maneuvering that's necessary to get a bill through? Was it just a process of experience, or what?

Mr. Gissberg: The process of experience and observation. I think I told you before, when I was first elected I'd read all the bills that were introduced. And I mean that I would read every bill. As soon as it was printed, I would spend my evenings up in the Senate studying the legislation and preparing amendments before the bill had even gotten out of committee. I was able to develop the capacity of glancing at a bill and in about thirty or sixty seconds tell you what was in the bill and in the title and knowing what the bill-drafters had put in legislation and whether it was desirable or not. I became very adroit at doing that and

consequently I offered a lot of amendments on the Senate floor, some of which were merely technical amendments which, if they were adopted, did much to clarify the intent of the Legislature and clarify the meaning. I was able to develop confidence among my fellow senators, but I was doing it to perfect the legislation, not with any ulterior motive in mind. That was part of my learning process.

Later on we began holding classes for incoming freshmen on what the "bill hopper" was; it wasn't a box you threw the bill into, and such simple things as that. Gave them a run-through on the rules, at least the important rules, so that they weren't faced with the "Rube Goldbergs" that some of us were when we first came to the Senate.

Ms. Boswell: Now you had no kind of staff assistance at that time, did you?

Mr. Gissberg: No. As a matter of fact, we didn't even have our own secretary. There were "pool" secretaries and you dictated by your desk. You dictated a letter by your desk. You called the pool for a secretary, and you got back what you dictated.

Later on things became improved upon as far as the facilities. The legislators were given our own offices, which prior to that time we did not have.

Ms. Boswell: Where did you do your work if you didn't have an office?

Mr. Gissberg: You'd try to find an empty room someplace, the committee rooms. The committee rooms used to all be in the Senate, I guess the third floor of the Legislative Building. The committee rooms were also used as the offices of the individual senators, but there would be four or five senators assigned to one committee room. So there was no privacy to it at all. There would usually be one secretary assigned to four or five senators in that committee room.

But as the facilities were improved upon, they started making offices over in the Department of Natural Resources Building, making individual committee rooms over there. Later on, they made offices over there, so the facilities were greatly improved upon as time went by. Then we had our own secretaries, too, from 1960 on. Early in the '50s, there was a very crude way of operating as far as facilities were concerned.

Ms. Boswell: Was there much camaraderie amongst the freshmen senators, or did your status in the Senate not have an effect on who your friends might be or who you might socialize with? I didn't phrase that very well.

Mr. Gissberg: You want to know whether–

Ms. Boswell: I wondered who you generally socialize and/or become friends with within the Senate?

Mr. Gissberg: I became friends right away with Al Rosellini and Francis Pearson. Francis Pearson was a blind senator from Port Angeles. He was a most unusual and unique human being. He knew the "ins and outs" of the Senate as well or better than anybody who had six eyes. I sat right behind him in the Senate, after my first term, and would help him in and out of the Senate floor and help him every chance I got. I'd give him my arm and we just became close friends socially and every other way.

Al Rosellini. I roomed with Al and Pat Sutherland when I first got to the Senate and admired both of those fellows, and became friends with them. Friends are not really made very frequently in the political world, but acquaintances are. I guess probably you hang together with those that are enjoying the same experiences you are. I don't know that I can tell you that I made any close friends outside of the three I just mentioned.

Ms. Boswell: Was there much camaraderie among freshmen senators? Did you feel apart in some way when you first began, or not?

Mr. Gissberg: No. I can't even tell you who the freshmen were who were elected with me.

Ms. Boswell: So that wasn't the kind of thing that took place?

Mr. Gissberg: No. At least not with me, it didn't.

Ms. Boswell: What about party affiliation? Was that a way to bring people together?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes it was, because of the caucuses that we had. That would bring us together and common campaign experiences brought us together, although I guess I had some friends on the Republican side as well as the Democratic side. Neil Hoff was certainly a friend of mine. A close friend of mine. Marshall Neill was a close friend of mine. But there weren't that many cliques.

There was a group of senators that Bob Bailey mentioned when he was here the first day that you appeared. A group of senators who were "do-nothings." We had some of those that were elected who

didn't assume any responsibilities. Apparently they didn't know how to assume responsibility or they didn't seek responsibility. They were few in number, but what there were of them, they would enjoy going into the Senate lounge and sleeping and wait for somebody to wake them up for a roll call. But they were few, but they were there, nevertheless, and sometimes for years.

Ms. Boswell: Was there any way to sort of stir them into any activity or not? Or wait for the voters to do that?

Mr. Gissberg: We tried to stir them out of their slumber most of the time. I told you how one of them avoided a vote for me or Bob Greive when we were both running for the majority leader's position.

Ms. Boswell: Tell that story. That was a good story.

Mr. Gissberg: For some unknown reason I wanted to become majority leader. I guess because I had a group of senators who were dissatisfied with Bob and who persuaded me to run. I really didn't want to run, but they persuaded me to run for it.

Ms. Boswell: This was in what year, by the way?

Mr. Gissberg: I can't even remember what year it was. I don't remember what year it was. But anyway, they persuaded me to run, which I did. Rosellini was governor at that time. He was elected governor in '56, so it had to be in the 1960s. I don't remember what question I was going to address myself to.

Ms. Boswell: I'm sorry. It was my fault for interrupting. It was your decision to seek the majority leader position, and the competition with Bob Greive.

Mr. Gissberg: I knew it would be a close race so I asked Al Rosellini for his help. Bob probably did too. And Al probably said yes to both of us. That put him in an awkward position because no matter who won, he'd have to deal with whoever it was that won. I didn't have any hesitancy asking him for help. I specifically asked him to contact two of the senators from Spokane whose names I won't mention. Al contacted them and reported back to me that he had received assurance from both of them that they'd vote for me. There was one other fellow who said he'd vote for me, but he went to Japan during the time of our caucus, so I couldn't count on him.

At our organizational meeting Senator Sandison was always the one appointed by Bob Bailey to count the votes, and pick up the ballots. I asked him to check with care to see how these two fellows voted. I placed myself in a position right across the table from one of them so I might be able to see how they voted, whether he kept his word to me or not. The first fellow who voted, voted for Greive. According to what Sandison told me, he picked the ballot up and peeked at the ballot and the other senator from Spokane was voting and I glanced across the table which was about three feet across and could plainly see that he put down "B.G." the initials, "B.G." I objected right away. I said, "You can't leave your ballot like that. No one's going to know who you voted for." He said, "Well, I voted for you" and left it "B.G." Well, of course, it was the funniest thing that ever happened. They threw his vote out. So, he was clever enough to–

Ms. Boswell: So that was a purposeful move on his part?

Mr. Gissberg: Of course it was. I had to laugh because it was funnier than the devil because he kept his word to me according to his intentions, but he was clever enough so that I couldn't call him a liar.

Ms. Boswell: What was the final vote?

Mr. Gissberg: Bob won by one vote. That was the only time I ever ran against him. I was urged to do it thereafter, but I never did.

Bob, I thought, was all right. He had the advantage of the rest of us that ran against him because he was the majority leader and he held it for a number of years, years and years. He put into effect what Senator Rasmussen scathingly called the "Greive Fund," which became common practice among latter-day politicians to have a fund in which political-campaign contributions were placed. The majority leader would have a greater sense of rapport or support from the lobbyists than the individual senators. So those who wanted to curry favor with the majority leader would give Bob campaign contributions into the "Greive Fund," which was then disbursed by Bob to his people that he felt would support him for majority leader. During all those years he was able to keep his position, not solely because of that, but I'm sure it had a great effect on some of the senators who otherwise couldn't raise campaign funds or were too greedy to refuse.

Ms. Boswell: I know there was a fair amount of discontent with Greive. What was that based on particularly? Maybe that's not fair to say.

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know. It sounds badly for me to put a handle on it as far as Bob is concerned, except to say that some of the senators felt that they could do better by electing somebody else. That the state could do better by electing somebody else. Whether that was just a misapprehension, I'm not able to say, but he was certainly devoted to the improvement of labor standards and all the causes that labor espoused in the Legislature. Perhaps that's one of the reasons he was faced with opposition as he was. Perhaps he didn't take enough interest in the other major issues that confronted the Senate from time to time. He was content to allow those major issues to develop by themselves, and I can't speak for him and I probably shouldn't say. Perhaps that's why he was content with it, because I don't know what motivated him.

But, I do know that when Augie Mardesich ran for majority leader, I wasn't there at the time. I had left the Senate then. He was elected majority leader because he engaged in the same activity that Greive did. He got his own campaign fund going and contributed to the campaigns of his fellow senators and was able to diminish the effectiveness of the "Greive Fund." Of course, later on, Augie got into some really bad legal problems because of that campaign fund that he established. It was often said that Greive and his supporters "blew the whistle" on Augie's campaign fund, and that Augie was faced with the legal difficulties he was in because of that. As to the truth or untruth of any of those allegations, I'm unable to state because I have no knowledge of them.

Ms. Boswell: But Greive, himself, never had any legal problems?

Mr. Gissberg: No. I have no doubt that Bob Greive was as honest a man that ever walked on the earth. Yet, I was not particularly a friend of his or close to him at all. As a matter of fact, at the last, when I served in the Senate, when I had already made up my mind that I wasn't going to run again, he had a staff person who used to visit me frequently to see if I didn't need some help in my campaigns by sending out polls, which I had never sent out before and didn't know how to work one, if I did. But, to poll my district and see what they thought of certain issues or what they thought about me and whether they could be of any help to me in any way. Of course, that fellow was there at Bob's bidding, and I would respond to Greive by telling him, "Bob, I don't want to run for majority leader any longer. I'm content the way I am. I can get accomplished what I want to accomplish without being in that position, and I don't want it."

Ms. Boswell: When you first started, Langlie was governor. Right?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me a little bit about Langlie.

Mr. Gissberg: I don't really know much about Langlie. I can only remember getting one bill passed that first session that I was anxious to get passed. That had to do with sustained-yield forest. Creating a sustained-yield forest in the Department of Natural Resources in the Everett watershed to keep those waters as clean and pristine as could be. I don't really know. I wasn't acquainted with Langlie that well. Outside of a couple of bill-signings and a couple of ribbon-cuttings, I never spoke more than ten words to him all the time I was in the Senate. All the time that he had left in the Senate, at least.

Ms. Boswell: Was that part of your personality?

Mr. Gissberg: I can't really say because I never asked him for an audience and he never asked me for an audience.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me a little bit more about this sustained-yield forest? Was that part of the Sheffleman Committee? I read about a committee chaired by Sheffleman that was supposed to deal with some management in other issues. It sounded like they got fairly heavily into forest use. That's not it?

Mr. Gissberg: No. The Sheffleman Committee was a later committee organized under Al Rosellini's administration. It had to do with streamlining government. Cutting out government waste, which is always a popular opinion, and still is.

The sustained-yield forest–the city of Everett gets most of its water from the Sultan Basin and the Sultan River which runs out of the Cascade Mountains. As logging progressed, it was known that the quality of the water would diminish in direct proportion to the cutting of the forest. Yet the cutting of the forest was an important economic function. The sustained-yield forest was designed to have a perpetual yield of timber-cutting without hurting the environment. You cut just enough so that you could harvest the mature trees, but keep for future years some of the trees that would otherwise be cut. So in perpetuity you would have timber cut on a rotating basis from that same area. The state-sustained forest was a command, so to speak, to the Department of Natural Resources to administer that sustained-yield forest in a sustained-yield fashion. And

it was that bill that I introduced which passed, and which Governor Langlie signed. That was the only time I can remember being in his office, really. The first four years I was there.

Ms. Boswell: Earlier you mentioned Julia Butler Hansen. Tell me a little bit more about her.

Mr. Gissberg: Julia Butler Hansen was affectionately known as "Madam Queen" to her friends and those who knew her well enough to get away with calling her that. She was a great legislator. She knew the system well and she was chairman of the Highway Committee for years at a time when women hadn't even gotten into politics to any great extent yet. She was a powerhouse in the state Legislature, in both the House and the Senate. She parlayed the necessity for individual senators to bring back home a portion of the highway budget to their districts. With her own skills, she was extremely influential, not only in highway matters, but in every other matter that came up.

Ms. Boswell: What about her being able to do that, especially when there weren't very many women in politics?

Mr. Gissberg: Because the highway budget was referred to her committee and she had enough friends in the Highway Committee through choice and putting the Committee on Committees to work putting the people in who cooperated with her. She disposed of the highway budget, not only on a basis of the needs of the district but on the good will of the legislator who was there. That good will consisted of supporting her and her programs. In other words, she was a political natural and she knew how to–any good politician's got to have a system of rewards. Her reward was consideration of individuals in the budget.

Ms. Boswell: Was Vic Meyers–

Mr. Gissberg: Vic Meyers had just been to his last hurrah. He presided over the Senate the two days between the time the Legislature convened and the incoming executive branch took office. All I had to do was say goodbye to Vic when he was lieutenant governor. I'd heard all the stories that were told about Old Vic.

Ms. Boswell: Were there some good ones? Will you tell some stories? Is that "yes"?

[End of Tape 4, Side 2]

4

LAWYER AND LEGISLATOR

Mr. Gissberg: Victor Meyers was a character in the political scene of the state of Washington, and will be forever, I think. He'll be one of those who is known as a very humorous and well-liked person. He made a joke out of running for public office, and I think that was one of the reasons he was elected for as many years as he was. He made the people laugh at him, or if not at him, at least with him. I know when he first ran for public office he had an orchestra in Seattle. He used to play at the Olympic Hotel. When he ran for office, he dressed up like Mahatma Gandhi and walked in to lead his orchestra dressed like Gandhi in a white robe. His campaign theme was "I can't pay my creditors and I need your help to get a job so I can pay them."

He always had a refreshment in the lieutenant governor's office, so I'm told, although I was able to join him on one of the two days that he held office while I held office. That was a ritual, I understand. After every day's session of the Rules Committee, he would invite the fellows down to his office, much in the same way that Speaker Rayburn used to in the US Speaker's office–he'd invite the fellows down for a "toddy."

Speaking of toddies, that used to be a norm when I was first elected to the Senate. Seemed like any senator that drank would be able to keep a bottle in his filing cabinet drawer. Since his committee room was shared with other members, he'd have to drink in the presence of anybody else and any guests that any of the other senators had at the time. Sometimes the pages were running in and out. We had to put a stop to that, to make an unwritten rule that there would be no drinking in the committee rooms. We established a "Committee Room X" which was a broom closet up on the upper floor where the janitorial needs were kept, and we took over that room and put an old refrigerator in there, and those who needed a "snort" after the session could congregate up there. It only held about ten or twelve people at the most jammed tightly in this small room, smoke-filled room without any fresh air coming in there. And that was Committee Room X until one of the local House members who was having a tough campaign, based his campaign upon eliminating the drinking in Committee Room X on state property. He was elected and he introduced a couple of resolutions to do it, so we had to move out of there. By we, I mean the Senate had to abolish Committee Room X. Then the Senate lounge. That was the next place you were able to get a toddy. But that was operated with care, and there was never any real drinking problem in the Senate as such, during the time that I was there.

Ms. Boswell: But Vic Meyers was also a "tippler"?

Mr. Gissberg: Well, I think most of the fellows who were in the Senate in those early days, used to have a straight snort or two every day. There was "snoose-chewing," tobacco-chewing, old-timers who used the spittoons.

Ms. Boswell: Were there still spittoons when you were there?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes, there were spittoons there. Beside each desk there was a spittoon. A brass spittoon with a white glass bowl underneath it with some disinfectant in it. Cleaned out each night with disinfectant put in there by the janitors. They stayed there for about four years until the old snoose-chewers and tobacco-chewers were defeated or retired from old age, then they were gotten rid of. I bought one of the brass spittoons for five dollars and gave it to my son. He still has it in his law office.

The chairs on the Senate floor were not constructed to enable one to lean back as far as you wanted to lean back. If you leaned back too far you'd tip over and go right back onto the floor or onto the desk behind you. That used to happen infrequently, but it was always embarrassing to everyone to hear a "thud" and look around and some senator was scrambling to his feet trying to get his chair back on four legs.

Ms. Boswell: Did that ever happen to you?

Mr. Gissberg: No, but I started a fire in a wastepaper basket inadvertently. I was lighting a cigar, and couldn't get the match out and threw it in the wastepaper basket instead of the ashtray and started a fire in my wastepaper basket.

Ms. Boswell: Did they have to evacuate?

Mr. Gissberg: No. The story was that my daughter put it out. My daughter, Erica, was about five years old at the time and she was an honorary page sitting in the back of the room. The story was that Lieutenant Governor John Cherberg called upon her to put the fire

out, which he never did, but that was the story that appeared in the newspaper.

Ms. Boswell: Pyromaniac, huh?

Mr. Gissberg: That was a bad habit that I learned in the Senate, smoking cigars. Because that was the custom. There was Rule Forty in the Senate Rules which provided that there was to be no smoking in the Senate during session. That was a standing rule. It was the custom of the Senate. If somebody was to celebrate an event or an occasion which required a speaker to be in the Senate to speak on the holiday or such, or somebody's birthday, or some freshman had just passed his first bill, it was the custom to have that person who was being honored to suspend Rule Forty with penalties. That meant that when the rule was suspended by the "yeas," the successful sponsor of the motion had to furnish cigars to everyone in the Senate. He'd buy a box of 1886s and the sergeant at arms would open up a box of cigars, 1886 cigars which sold for five or ten dollars at that time.

Ms. Boswell: For the whole box?

Mr. Gissberg: For the whole box, yes. Everyone would get a cigar. That's where I picked up the dirty habit of smoking cigars for years, until my wife made me see the light of day, and stopped it.

Ms. Boswell: But you technically, aside from those special occasions, were not really supposed to be doing it on the floor?

Mr. Gissberg: No. If the cigarette-smokers wanted to smoke, they had to get up and move the suspension of Rule Forty. That was usually granted without any argument or delay.

Ms. Boswell: But you never fell over backwards, though?

Mr. Gissberg: Never fell over backwards. Either on or off the floor.

Ms. Boswell: Any other embarrassing moments that you can think of now that we're talking about it?

Mr. Gissberg: I can't think of any at the moment.
Ms. Boswell: We started this by talking about Vic Meyers. Do you have any other stories that you could tell about him, or that used to be passed around?

Mr. Gissberg: No, I can't think of any.

Ms. Boswell: During the time that you were getting started was also a very strong period in the United States when there was the anti-Communist movement. Did that affect the tenor of what people did in the Senate?

Mr. Gissberg: That occurred before I got to the Senate. The so-called Canwell Committee was formed before I got there. It was discredited before I got there.

There was a senator elected from my district, which was the Thirty Ninth Legislative District, some years before I got there, could have been before World War II, even, that the Senate refused to seat because he was a Communist. He was elected in my district and I knew nothing about that until the secretary of the Senate told me about it and furnished me with a transcript of the debate which occurred on the Senate floor, not to seat this man. He was an acknowledged Communist and they refused to seat him.

Ms. Boswell: Is that really constitutional to do that?

Mr. Gissberg: The Senate is the judge of its own members under the Washington State Constitution. At least to my knowledge they have the power under the constitution, whether or not it would be upheld now by the courts is questionable. They could for any or no reason refuse to seat a member. It being the judge of its own members.

Ms. Boswell: So, by the time you were there in '53, there really wasn't much of that anti-Communist feeling. The reason I brought it up was that I was reading one of Langlie's messages, and he was concerned about communism.

Mr. Gissberg: Well, communism was still a political issue in the sense that you had to be against communism. I know that at a Veterans of Foreign Wars state convention in Everett, I was asked to make a speech and I was told to speak on communism, the youth's view of communism or something like that, and I agreed to do that and I spoke for about twenty-five minutes, and it was obviously boring to everybody that was sitting out in the convention hall. The subject matter and everything about it was. I'd done the research and was telling about the economics of Russian people and the starvation they were undergoing, and Langlie was the next speaker. Governor Langlie was to be the keynote speaker at the Veterans of Foreign Wars convention, at which I was still speaking. He probably had another engagement to go to, and the master of ceremonies came up behind me

as I was finishing my speech, and took hold of my shoulder and said, "Thank you."

Ms. Boswell: He gave you the word, huh?

Mr. Gissberg: I still got a good round of applause, and I had a lot of friends out there so they didn't think harshly of me. But I remember the incident because when you raised the question on communism I remember making a speech about it.

Ms. Boswell: What was your perspective at that time?

Mr. Gissberg: It was embodied in the speech. It was a system that couldn't work. It was a system that could work only in theory. There were other examples at that time of other nations becoming communistic and, by looking at them, you knew that it couldn't work. I never had to get into the political debate in public as to what I thought. No one ever asked me what I thought. Except for this occasion that I was asked to make a speech on communism as the youth viewed it. It never became an issue in any of my political campaigns, nor anybody in the Senate that I know of, except that it occurred with the Canwell Committee.

The Canwell Committee was a committee formed by resolution of the House and Senate to look into communism in the state of Washington. The results were despicable. They intruded upon the sanctity of the educational process of higher education in the state, and the mere subpoena by this committee of the people who were thought to be "pinko," or Communist, was detrimental to their right to free speech and freedom of thought. It only took a couple of years before that committee was discredited before the public, and the press took an opposite view of it. I think Langlie had something to do with the formation of that committee. Maybe that's what you read about it, but not to my knowledge.

Ms. Boswell: This was actually later. This was his message in 1955, so I just was curious because it seemed like it was somewhat after the fact to still be worried about that. One of the other issues he brought up in the early sessions when you were there is being able to get the work of the Senate done in the sixty-day session, and at least in both '53 and '55 there were extra sessions. Tell me a little bit about how you could–

Mr. Gissberg: Which was the short one? Was it a short one that lasted a day or two?

Ms. Boswell: Yes, I think so. I'm not sure whether that was, I think that was '53.

Mr. Gissberg: In those early days I don't think there was any necessity for having special sessions. If the Legislature had buckled down to face the issues that it had to face, it was very possible to get the work done on time in sixty days. It became habit-forming to delay the consideration of the Senate budget until everything else was out of the way, which I thought was always a mistake. I was always mad because I wanted to get out on time. Maybe that's one of the reasons I ran against Bob Greive; because he was content to sit there and delay until the last. I wanted to get out and get back to my law practice as quickly as I could, because it was costing me money. The longer I stayed there the more hardship occurred to my partners and my clients, and my pocketbook. So I was wanting to get out as quickly as I could.

But either in 1953 or 1955, I remember there was a special session which lasted about a day or two. The reason that it was called–because I don't remember what year it was, I can't tell you who the governor was, but I think it was Langlie–was because the Legislature had passed legislation which would require the "breakage" at Longacres Race Track to be lost to the owners. The owners made money on the breakage of the bet. The bill, as it passed, unbeknownst to any of the sponsors in the Legislature, would have taken away the breakage from Joe Gottstein and Longacres. So, after the session was adjourned sine die, somebody discovered that, so the special session was called to come back and repeal that law. That was the only purpose for having a special session.

Ms. Boswell: Where was the pressure coming from to do that?

Mr. Gissberg: Joe Gottstein and the horse breeders and the horse owners.

Vic Zednick, I remember, Senator Zednick, was a Republican senator who, it seemed to me, was an accountant, at least he was the accountant, I believe, for Longacres. Zednick got up on the floor and said that horse racing would not be able to function if it wasn't for the breakage. That was probably true. He probably saved Longacres from extinction because of that.

Ms. Boswell: Who had introduced it in the first place? Was it anti-racing–

Mr. Gissberg: No. It was contained in legislation which was not related to racing, as I recall. It could have been that it was in the abandoned-property tax. The Legislature passed a bill that said that abandoned property (e.g., bank deposits and so on that were not

active for a certain number of years) would be forfeited to the state. Or corporate dividends that were sent to the owner and the owner kept sending them back for years and years and years, that was deemed to be abandoned property and it went to the state. I'm not sure of this, but I think it was that kind of legislation that passed the Legislature, and, which when interpreted, would subject the Longacres breakage money to the state, thereby depriving Longacres of the means by which it was financed. I think that's how it came about. But that was a one-day session. It certainly didn't take sixty days. That's one of the reasons I finally quit the Senate, although I'd made up my mind the year before that, that I had to quit because of my law practice.

Ms. Boswell: The issue of the length of time was another thing that caused you to want to quit, or was it just–

Mr. Gissberg: I had wanted to quit because of the length of time. As I said, it was a hardship on me and my law practice. I felt, and I know that with proper leadership, you could get out of there much quicker than they ever did. It was just a question of the individual members having enough political "moxie" to do what they had to do eventually. It's easier in politics to let things go on to a red-hot heat than it is to face the issue when it's not as hot.

One time we had a special session on redistricting, when the federal court had ruled that our redistricting legislation on the books was unconstitutional and contrary to the "one man, one vote" theory of government. We spent an abnormal amount of time, a month or so, on solving that, as I recall.

Ms. Boswell: You mean a month-long special session?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: What did they do about pay when they had special sessions? Did you continue to be paid?
Mr. Gissberg: I think we did. It wasn't enough money to hardly pay our streetcar fare anyway. I think we at the last were getting thirty-six hundred dollars, but I can't remember how much it was. Three hundred dollars a month, I think we were getting at the height of my pay. I started out at one hundred dollars a month, plus five dollars a day per diem when you were in session. So, the pay continued, all right. The first appropriation we always made during special session was for ourselves, for our pay and to run the operation of the Senate and the House.

Ms. Boswell: How could you afford to do it? It must, in fact, as you've mentioned, taken a lot away from your law practice to have to interrupt it for two or three months.

Mr. Gissberg: I thought I had explained that on that earlier tape, but maybe not.

Ms. Boswell: No. Not on the tape I don't think.

Mr. Gissberg: The first six or seven years when I practiced alone in Marysville, during the session I'd have my friend, Howard Kafer, who was practicing in Everett, come over and cover for me three times a week in my Marysville office. I'd leave a sign on the door on the other days to contact him over in Everett. When I got back from session, he'd turn over the files that he'd gotten in that fashion to me, and I'd finish them up. In addition to coming home and working all the weekends, and many times during the week at night, I'd drive back and forth. Sometimes at night and come back the following morning. It worked out, but it certainly was not the ideal way of building up a law practice. To be there part time. That's one of the reasons I was always adamant about ending the sessions as quickly as possible and getting back home so I could take care of my clients. And they could take care of me.

Ms. Boswell: Generally though, you would stay down here in Olympia, wouldn't you?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. The last thirteen years and then when I took up partnership with my friends in Everett, McCrea, Kafer, Gissberg and Wilson, I had three of my partners able to take over my clients while I was gone, pretty much. Although they'd save up all the hard work for me for weekends. I'd dictate up a storm from Friday at four o'clock until Monday morning about ten o'clock. I'd be able to go there on Friday afternoon and all day Saturday, Sunday, and Monday morning and dictate and see clients. It was a pressure-cooker existence. I was hard to live with. My wife will tell you. At least she claims I was. I probably was.

Ms. Boswell: Your family didn't come down to Olympia with you when you were in session?

Mr. Gissberg: Occasionally they'd come down and stay for a week or two before the kids started school. No, they didn't live there all the time.

Ms. Boswell: Where did you live?

Mr. Gissberg: I lived at various places. Sometimes I'd rent a bed in a private home. A couple sessions I did that. Other times I had an apartment by myself. One time I stayed at the Tyee. Wherever I could get a place to hang my hat.

Ms. Boswell: Earlier you mentioned having roomed with Al Rosellini and someone else.

Mr. Gissberg: Neil Hoff. That was over in a building that is torn down now across from the Capitol, across the street from the Insurance Building. That was a private home that Al had rented, and he took in Pat and I to help share the rent. Did I say "Neil Hoff"? I don't mean Neil Hoff, I mean Pat Sutherland. Three Democrats.

Ms. Boswell: Was there much social life for legislators?

Mr. Gissberg: Well, you never had to buy your own meals if you didn't want to. The lobbyists were active and trying to take you out to dinner to give you the word as to what their function was, and what bills they were supporting. They wanted to get a chance to talk to you. There was a lot of entertaining and dinner parties.

For instance, the commercial fishermen used to have a big dinner and party every session to which all the members of the Legislature were invited. It was a big evening.

The Restaurant Association used to have a big gourmet dinner for all the members of the Legislature which was a big event. There was a lot of that going on, on a smaller scale.

Ms. Boswell: When you were mentioning that there was a fair amount of drinking, and that some people had social problems as well, is it just that sort of short-term atmosphere and all that entertaining that promotes that?
Mr. Gissberg: You're asking me to be a psychologist now. I can't speak for anybody else, but I know that I seldom turned down a cocktail when it was offered at a social event. But I never drank during the day.

[End of Tape 5, Side 1]

[Tape 5, Side 2, Blank]

Ms. Boswell: If you don't mind, I just had a couple of questions as follow-ups from last time. Last time we spent a fair amount of time talking about your freshman years, so to speak, as a legislator, but also about various committees you had served on and things like that. I want to go back for a minute and ask you how you felt about your first session in the Legislature.

When you came home from the session, did you go through a process of assessment of how it went or how you felt things were accomplished?

Mr. Gissberg: Well, after every session, we were always called upon by local organizations to indicate to them what we did during the session, what our accomplishments were and what our failures were. To me, I don't recall what we did do the first session of the Legislature that I was there.

Ms. Boswell: But that reassessment process does go on, and the public sort of forces it then, to a degree?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't think I had any self-assessment. I didn't think about what we had accomplished on my own. The Grange was always interested in what we'd done, and the cities and the municipal governments through the mayor and councilmen wanted to know what we had done. What laws had been passed that affected the cities and counties. And to that extent, any assessment as to the success or failure of the Legislature was predicated on somebody else's interest, other than our own. But I never stopped to analyze whether we should have an "A" grade or a "B" grade or "C" grade or "D" grade.

Ms. Boswell: Do you remember at all, after your first session, did you feel pretty good about what had transpired? About the whole experience of being a legislator?

Mr. Gissberg: That's been forty years ago.

Ms. Boswell: I know. That's not a very fair question. Maybe I'm making too much of this notion of being first here in the Senate, versus later. For some people it sounds like you could sort of fall right into it. How to do it, and what to do.

Mr. Gissberg: One of the things that I do remember that occurred during my first session:

Labor wanted a bill to be passed on unemployment compensation and the Republicans had control of the Senate and were generally opposed to the legislation. Joe Davis was the lobbyist for the labor movement at that time and asked me to move to take the bill away from the Rules Committee. I didn't know any better, as a freshman. It was in the rules that anyone could do that, to relieve the Rules Committee of further consideration of a bill. I made the motion and I thought the chandeliers were going to fall down! It created such

a stir among the leadership, both on my own side of the aisle, and the Republicans. I recall Vic Zednick, who was an older legislator who had a booming, deep voice that echoed throughout the Senate chambers, called me a "whippersnapper." He said that I should not make such a motion. It had been tried before and no one had ever been successful in taking away a bill from the Rules Committee, and it was custom not to do so. My only retort was that it was provided in the rules, and if he didn't want that custom to be followed, they should change the rule in the Senate, abrogate the rule.

When you're a freshman, you don't know what's going on, anyway. I know that I didn't say much my freshman year or my second session, either. To me, it was somewhat of a mystery as to how you got a bill passed. But, after I watched and learned the ropes, I was able to get a lot of bills passed that I was interested in. But, in my first two sessions there I don't think I accomplished much of anything that was noteworthy, at least.

Ms. Boswell: Is that the standard for most freshmen? Can you really expect to get anything passed in your first couple years?

Mr. Gissberg: It would be unusual to do so. It was the custom that freshmen legislators should be seen and not heard. You'd sit in the back row and not be expected to say anything. It was out of place if you did. Those were sort of the unwritten rules of the Senate. Gradually, that changed, however.

Ms. Boswell: What caused it to change?

Mr. Gissberg: Probably because they got smarter freshmen in there in the Senate, elected to office, who were brighter and able to express themselves more clearly. Just a higher caliber of person. Better fit to serve in the Legislature than those who had preceded them.

Ms. Boswell: If that's the case, why is that happening more now? Why are you attracting better caliber people, if you think that's the main difference?

Mr. Gissberg: Because I think there's a greater interest in political activity, legislative activity. Greater interest on the part of the public. Because of the press. In the years gone by they had not paid as close attention to what went on in the Legislature. As time progressed, newspapers had greater representation in the Legislature as to what their activities were. And the arrival of television greatly increased the public's knowledge of what the activity of the Legislature was. So, as the public's knowledge increased, so did the knowledge of the individual persons. That carried forward.

Ms. Boswell: What about the relationship between the press and the legislators? Why do you think the press began to cover it more, and were they giving the public an accurate portrayal of what was happening?

Mr. Gissberg: Well, I can't tell you why the newspapers and press started covering the Legislature in greater detail. Whether the newspapers, or the attention of the Legislature increased on its own or because of demand by the public for that additional service. It was a friendly relationship that existed between the press and the Legislature. In later years it became more critical. The press, individual members of the press at least, could have been accused of being part of the "good old boy" attitude that exists between legislators themselves, and the press.

I recall the Legislature passed a bill that provided for punitive damages for libel, which the newspapers were terribly upset about. I think Al Rosellini had something to do with passage of the bill. The newspapers made an effort to have the bill repealed and were successful in doing so. As I recall, someone came to me, which would never have happened in later days, and asked me if I would vote to repeal the bill and inferred that he would be able to help me if I wanted to run for Congress. Those who sent him would be very happy to reward me for this purpose. I can't imagine anything like that happening in later years or even now. I can't imagine that happening.

Ms. Boswell: What was your response?

Mr. Gissberg: I just listened. I didn't respond. If I did, I told them I'd think it over. I can't tell you if the bill was ever repealed or not.

Ms. Boswell: Isn't there a problem here with ethics in terms of the press's role in covering events for the public, and lobbying here? How was that allowed to happen?

Mr. Gissberg: Of course, I think it was unethical to use the potential power of the press as a reward or punishment of someone who voted for or against any legislation. Although the punishment, the press does that all the time, takes political positions on issues which are not necessarily helpful to the newspaper policy itself, but are just concerned about political policy, if I make myself clear.

Ms. Boswell: Aside from legislation that obviously affects the newspaper in and of itself like this particular one that you've been talking about, but just any issues when they take a political stand. Generally speaking, you were talking about the "good ol' boy" network. The newspaper reporters then, they'd fit into generally a party sort of network and were certain reporters known essentially to have a particular political position or affiliation?

Mr. Gissberg: Well I thought so.

Ms. Boswell: Can you give me some examples?

Mr. Gissberg: No. I can't. It's hard for me to label any of them. I felt that they were all at that time, early on, part of the legislative mechanism. They were not the enemy of the legislators. I felt that later on the press became more and more critical of the legislative process and critical of the individual action of legislators. I don't think that was caused by the legislators themselves, but only because of the newsworthiness of that attitude. It became easier to write critically than positively about things. The public seems to enjoy reading bad things about legislators and their salaries and their perks. That continues on to this day. When I first started in the Legislature, I didn't think that that was the case, but by the time I left, it seemed to be antagonistic.

Ms. Boswell: It seems to me that it could be possible to be more critical without being more negative. Are you saying that you see the trend as being toward negativism rather than for any kind of positive criticism?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes, I would have to say that I thought the press became more negative in nearly everything that they reported. Even though the legislation could be said to be positive, if there was an opportunity to say something negative about it, it was done.

Ms. Boswell: This was exclusive of party lines then?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: In the early years when there wasn't so much criticism, were there instances that you can think of where there wasn't good reporting?

Mr. Gissberg: I can't specifically recall. I'd have to put my mind to it for awhile. You are asking me some questions I've never really looked at before or thought about. They're issues of first impression with me, and what I say just comes spontaneously without any mental reflection about it.

Ms. Boswell: Part of this came out because I noticed in reading through a lot of the newspaper articles about you that have been written, that you really got a lot of very positive press. My implication would be that you did a lot of positive things and you got a lot of positive press.

On the other hand, we talked about Governor Rosellini, and he certainly got a lot of negative press at various times. I know you admired him, so I'm just curious about whether people actually sought positive press, or was that something you even worried about at the time?

Mr. Gissberg: I didn't worry about any press that I got at all. The people in my district were not exposed to that kind of reporting very much by the local papers, at least. The local papers weren't represented in the Legislature. The local papers in my district I'm talking about now. It was a comparatively rural district. The only daily newspaper that had any circulation in my district was primarily the *Everett Daily Herald*. They had no one down here for the first fifteen years, down in Olympia to cover the sessions. It was only the last four or five years that the *Herald* hired a reporter to come down and cover the legislative sessions.

I forgot what I was–

Ms. Boswell: We were talking about positive coverage of some of your career. You just said that the papers in your district didn't cover Olympia.

Mr. Gissberg: They were probably hoodwinked by me.

Ms. Boswell: You didn't see using the press as a tool to get your message out. I don't mean that in a negative sense, but I was curious–

Mr. Gissberg: During the time shortly before I went to Washington D.C. to see about running for Congress, I used the press at that point for favorable publicity and got out press releases which I had never done before. I did that for a year or two. Those primarily went to the rural newspapers.

Ms. Boswell: Didn't the rural newspapers pick up stories or press releases that the bigger papers would publish?

Mr. Gissberg: No. The weekly newspapers only published once a week and very seldom had anything to

say about the legislative activities, or they didn't know what it was, and it would be too late by the time they printed it for the following week, anyway. They relied on what the legislators, themselves, told them. I'd get out a press release about the highway budget or something of that kind which was good news for the local weekly press. I was certainly conscious of what the local press could do. I was a personal friend of the owner of the weekly newspapers. It was very seldom that friends criticized a friend, even if he had it coming, was deservedly so.

For instance, Ward Bowden, who I mentioned before, was the secretary of the Senate. I would nominate him for secretary at the organizational meetings and on the floor of the Senate. He owned a newspaper in Sultan and Monroe. You couldn't expect him to be nasty to me when he was in effect my patronage. He was my patronage to the extent that I nominated him, but he was a good man and he did an outstanding job as secretary. But I never had any trouble getting good press from his newspapers, obviously.

The same way with the *Marysville Globe*. I'd publish all my legal advertising in the *Marysville Globe*, which resulted in revenue to them. So, naturally, they wouldn't criticize me and cut off the source of the funds of legal advertising. I'm not saying that that's the only reason I got along with them, but it certainly was one of the reasons.

Ms. Boswell: Is it fair to say that it was a conscious decision on your part to do that advertising?

Mr. Gissberg: No. I did it because legal advertising is done to provide notice to somebody. Notice to people in that community could be best achieved by using the local newspaper for that purpose instead of a newspaper that wasn't even printed in the district. Absolutely not. It never even entered my mind until you asked me the question. How I got along so well with the local newspapers for many reasons, but that's got to be a couple of self-interest degree reasons for doing things. I never thought about it until just now.

Ms. Boswell: I'm interested because the notion of the freedom of the press, especially now doing a project for the press, is very interesting to me. It seems to me that in a lot of cases, political reporting and others, that there are a lot of other factors that influence how the press acts or reacts to a particular situation. It can be advertising, it can be personal politics, it can be competition with another paper. It seems to me that there are just so many other factors that are involved. It seems to me there has been a change, but I'm really interested because I'm just an outsider, I'm really interested to know, especially in terms of being a legislator, what the press did mean to you. How you evaluated it and how effectively it did serve its purpose.

Mr. Gissberg: Is that a question?

Ms. Boswell: It wasn't a very good one, if it was one. I would just be interested in your comments, generally. Well-spoken by a lawyer. I'm glad I'm not in a court with you.

[End of Tape 6, Side 1]

5

THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Mr. Gissberg: I would be the last to explain what has increased the press coverage of the legislative bodies and the executive. Maybe if you went back historically and looked at what the press coverage was in the early 1900s, maybe it would be significantly greater that what we thought. It depends on your perspective, I guess. But to me, the coverage was not nearly as intensive and concentrated in the 1950s as it was in the 1960s and '70s. What caused that I tried to speculate. There was more public awareness, public thirst for what was going on. The educational process had improved to such an extent that you saw the world and were critical of your government as it is. If we're not critical of it, we're not going to advance properly and do the things that ought to be done.

The press, I think, is a necessary balance to offset the influence of special interests. I think to that extent, the press has done an outstanding job. They're not afraid to take on the special interests nor the causes of special interests and expose those if they occurred. I'm speaking generally, now. I'm lecturing instead of–

Ms. Boswell: I think I do the same thing, so feel free. In case of special interests, now that you bring it up, something else I wanted to ask you about that we didn't talk about on tape was the role of lobbyists. One interview that I did, I was told that lobbyists were very important for freshmen or legislators that had not been in office long because they really could explain issues well, and you learned who were good lobbyists and who were not, or who were at least fairly fair in terms of their presentations and who were not. Would you agree with that characterization of the role of lobbyists for the younger senators or legislators?

Mr. Gissberg: No. I wouldn't because for the simple reason that a lobbyist never approached me when I first went to the Legislature. I wasn't important enough to talk to. The lobbyists in the early days went to the leadership. Whatever the leadership said, they usually went along with.

As far as the role that lobbyists play, they play an important part in the whole legislative process. If legislators are supposed to act in the public interest, and they are, they have to know what the public interest is. The interest that I'm speaking of is the interest, not the best interest, but the fact that there is an interest, the curiosity about what a specific piece of legislation does or doesn't do. If the public interest is represented by many minute interests, it's important the legislators know what the interest of each minute segment of the populous is. To make the total public interest, you have to know what the parts of the whole are.

For instance–doctors have lobbyists, lawyers have lobbyists, accountants have lobbyists, industry has lobbyists, labor has lobbyists, teachers have lobbyists, religious groups have lobbyists–all of which are affected differently by any given piece of legislation or not affected at all. I don't think anyone is smart enough to be able to handle the total effect of any given piece of legislation for everybody in the state. The lobbyists play an important role in the passage or defeat of legislation by informing the legislator of the attitude of their particular interest group. I've heard it said about me that lobbyists were afraid of me anyway.

Ms. Boswell: Why was that?

Mr. Gissberg: Because I was probably too tough on them. I thought that I knew as much as they did about a particular problem. If they awakened me to the fact that there was an interest in something, I might turn around and use it against them instead of for them.

Ms. Boswell: You told me that the role of lobbyists was really important, but in terms of your own assessment of issues, how did you use them? You just said that they were sort of afraid of you and you could turn things against them. Were you not as generally enamored of lobbyists?

Mr. Gissberg: I really got myself into a dilemma, didn't I? I don't know how to answer that. I know that I was, I suppose, harder to reach than others. Harder to reach from the standpoint of being harder to contact about a particular issue. I was very impatient when I was in the Legislature because I thought I knew what the answers were before the lobbyists even approached me, which was foolhardy on my part, because no one's that smart. Nonetheless I very seldom sought out a lobbyist to see what their views were on anything.

Ms. Boswell: I think there's the impression that lobbyists are not unlike some of those newspaper people we talked about earlier that would try to be using their positions for influencing in a not-so-aboveboard manner. Their job is to influence, but there are ways

that you can do that. Did you ever find that there were problems with lobbyists, not necessarily with you, but with anybody around you who tried to go beyond just using the issues to convince people of their side of the story?

Mr. Gissberg: I'm sure there were. A gambling issue was an issue that was probably not a public-interest issue as such. But I never anticipated that the Sunday opening for liquor sales was a public-interest issue as such and that the cartoons that one was liable to see on lobbyists attempting to get that kind of legislation passed was certainly the common thing, and yet not indicative of lobbyists' approach. There were no suitcases full of money or anything of that kind. There were no offers of licentious activities.

Ms. Boswell: So none of those things really happened then?

Mr. Gissberg: The lobbyists used to have a lot of parties. I suppose that's the reason that the lobbyists had a bad reputation because they held a lot of dinners and social activities that were not predicated on friendships, but on results to be achieved. The same way with campaign contributions. Although campaign contributions, in my opinion, are legalized bribery. Anyone that says that the money received from lobbyists is only to gain access is smoking pot. It's impossible not to be indebted to people who do things for you, whether they realize it or not. Fortunately, I never had to rely on going out and raising a lot of money for anything.

Ms. Boswell: That's really interesting. Do you think–

Mr. Gissberg: The only time I've ever been approached to do anything unethical in my life was one time by a representative of the barbers, haircutters. He came to my office in Marysville, and said he had some legislation he wanted drafted. He wanted to pay me for drafting his legislation. I turned him down, because I said I couldn't accept money for that purpose and still have an impartial mind on the merits of the bill he wanted drafted. That's the only time I've ever been approached. I take that back. There was one other time.

During the legislative session, my secretary opened my mail later on in years, and there was a check there for me from the chiropractic association. I don't know how typical that was, but, to me, it was despicable. In effect it was bribery, although the letter that was transmitted with it didn't indicate any specific legislation, but they just wanted to show their appreciation for my service in the Legislature. It was years before any campaign was up, so I knew that was a bunch of "hooey." So I wrote them a letter back and returned the check to them.

But those two examples are the only two that I can remember where it progressed to a finer degree. It could have been called attempted bribery. Neither one would probably warrant a conviction on the facts that I've given you, but if it went on with me, it went on with others, of course. We know it does because every legislative session, someplace in the country they're arresting not only lobbyists, but legislators as well. So I'm sure there are some bad apples in every barrel. But it certainly has an influence on the press and what the press reports.

Ms. Boswell: Something you said earlier I was really interested in. The notion that if you're in a district where you don't have much competition, and where you have a really solid reputation, and you don't need a lot of campaign funds, you're in a better position to fend that kind of thing off than people who are fighting for their careers in a particular campaign or race.

Mr. Gissberg: I don't have any doubt that's the case.

Ms. Boswell: You said something last time that really interested me, too. That was in our last conversation where you mentioned that good politics is being able to give rewards to people, to a degree. If you're a good politician, you can get the legislation that's going to help your district. That's what you're there for. It's part of the political system. Would you say that there's up to a certain line that you can go before the political gifts fall over the line into something different?

Mr. Gissberg: I didn't even understand your question.

Ms. Boswell: We were talking last time about Julia Butler Hansen and her ability to run the Highway Commission–

Mr. Gissberg: Not the Highway Commission, the highway budget.

Ms. Boswell: The highway budget, and that she was a good politician. She was able to utilize that in order to get things done.

Mr. Gissberg: The whole process of politics is a process of rewards and punishment and perceived power of the person who's seeking to get things done. The power of legislators is an illusion. It's an illusion created and amplified by the legislator, himself, who seeks power. Each person has one vote. How many

friends you can influence depends on your own personality and your own ability to dispense rewards and punishment. That's all there is to it. You can't be a loner and expect to be a good politician any more than you can expect to make friends. It's impossible for an individual to make friends if he's always criticizing his colleagues. Politics is the utilization of common sense and the utilization of a personal relationship to the extent that it's possible to create friends who are really only acquaintances.

I told you to begin with that I made very few friends in the Legislature. I still think that's true. I made a lot of acquaintances, but very few friends. I'm talking about friends in the most traditional sense of the word. I could say I was a friend of all the legislators as well as I could say that I didn't have any friends, depending on the definition of friends. I guess I answered your question.

Ms. Boswell: I think so. It seems as though when you're talking about influence on legislators, that if your power is based on ability to give favors to get things done, that, again, the lobbyists, the press even, all that we've been talking about this morning, sort of feed into that. The line becomes blurred as to where and how that's acceptable and how it's not. It's acceptable for politicians to get and give–

Mr. Gissberg: Punishment and reward–

Ms. Boswell: Yes, but not necessarily for these others who are sort of adjuncts and are really integral parts of the process. I mean–

Mr. Gissberg: That's your statement–

Ms. Boswell: I know I shouldn't be making it, but–

Mr. Gissberg: Your statement is that there's something bad about lobbyists, and there isn't. Basically, there's nothing wrong with lobbyists at all, except when it comes to campaign contributions. Campaign contributions are an evil thing. You won't find corresponding activity between legislators per se.

By your question you're equating legislators achieving power through the same devices that lobbyists do. That's not true, because lobbyists attain their power through campaign contributions. The one who gives the most campaign contributions to the Republican Party or the Democratic Party is going to be rewarded. The Republican legislators are going to be more apt to listen to lobbyists whose campaign contributions have totaled a greater amount for Republicans than they give to Democrats. They know what that total is day by day. They know how much money is being given to their party. Individual legislators don't pass out money like that.

Ms. Boswell: I didn't mean to totally imply that lobbyists are bad and I'm sorry if I left that impression. My sense is, though, that there is a public perception of lobbyists as–I think not a full understanding of the role lobbyists play.

Mr. Gissberg: There isn't any doubt about that.

Ms. Boswell: I guess that's what I want you to tell me more about. Who do you think were some of the better lobbyists, in terms of the positive roles that they play?

Mr. Gissberg: There were so many of them. Turn it off for a minute and I'll think about that.

Ms. Boswell: Were there lobbyists from certain organizations or companies who were more effective, or more powerful, perhaps than others?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. By all means. The lobbyists representing labor on the one hand and industry on the other. They were probably the most powerful lobbyists, each in their own right. Lobbyists for an industry weren't strong themselves as individuals, but the organization they represented was deemed to be of primary importance.

Education lobbyists, WEA was very strong. In my mind at least. The agricultural lobbyist was strong on agricultural issues. The larger the economic group that was represented, the more influence they had. The more importance they were deemed to have, and probably did have, in the affairs of the state as a whole. Not only in the Legislature, but in the entire economy of the state. I'm not saying the influence and power extended to the Legislature.

The Boeing Company, as I said before, was, I think, the most influential single industry that represented anyone before the Legislature. Those are the major ones.

Ms. Boswell: In terms of labor, what group or what organization was most effective in terms of lobbying? There are so many types of labor organizations.

Mr. Gissberg: The United Labor lobby was strong. The AFL-CIO and all the individual unions would band together to create their own legislative group. It was an amalgamation to join the forces of the individual unions that came about to make the United Labor lobby, and

only one person spoke for them, and that was Joe Davis for the years I was there.

On the other side of the industry groups the Association of Washington Industries represented all kinds of business and industry groups. They put on a united front called the Association of Washington Industries. That translated into a fellow I used to play baseball with, Gordon was his last name. I can't think of his first name now. I remember him chasing a fly ball at Grave's Field into the cement wall.

Ms. Boswell: Did that show intelligence or perseverance?

Mr. Gissberg: It shows competitiveness. All-out effort.

The individual lobbyist for the unions was Joe Davis. I've forgotten the name of the fellow who preceded him. The Boeing lobbyist was probably the most influential lobbyist of any single lobbyist that I can recall.

Ms. Boswell: During your tenure, what were some of the major issues that Boeing was lobbying for?

Mr. Gissberg: They were usually lobbying against, rather than for things. They lobbied against workmens compensation increases, employment-security increases. They lobbied for modifying the tort liability in the courts. Those were three major issues that they fought for. They also fought for special tax benefits, sales-tax exemption on certain work performed by Boeing.

Ms. Boswell: What was your attitude toward that kind of an issue? Special exemptions and things like that for a company like Boeing?

Mr. Gissberg: I didn't have any problem with it just because it was a special interest, because, as I've explained, everybody had a special interest to the public and had the right to appear before the Legislature and express that interest.

But I represented the Bar Association at the time that they were–

[End of Tape 6, Side 2]

Ms. Boswell: We were talking about some of the Boeing lobbying efforts and your position on them.

Mr. Gissberg: I usually voted for labor, so taking them one at a time, the ones that I mentioned, I always voted for industrial-insurance increases and employment security, with one exception. One session I left the labor camp to propose tightening up some of the unemployment-compensation abuses which were rampant, which I couldn't get anywhere with. The product-liability issue occurred after I left the Legislature. I represented the Bar Association and tried to prevent that from happening. My view on that was that it shouldn't be changed. I was contrary to Boeing on that.

I don't remember how I voted on that special legislation to exempt the Boeing Company from the sales tax on tools and toolmaking, but I certainly wasn't against the Boeing Company because it was the Boeing Company. I wasn't for it just because it was the Boeing Company. It fell into an area in which I had an interest to begin with.

Ms. Boswell: What percentage of the people in your district were Boeing employees? Was employment at Boeing in the greater Everett area still pretty great?

Mr. Gissberg: No. There were probably very few residents in my district employed in Boeing. The only Boeing facility was south of Seattle, and the drive from northern Snohomish County to Seattle would not have attracted very many people to that employment.

Ms. Boswell: Part of the reason for all these questions is that later you did essentially act in a lobbying capacity for the State Bar. How did it feel to reverse those roles?

Mr. Gissberg: Well, simply because lawyers always acted in the public interest.

Ms. Boswell: Is that so?

Mr. Gissberg: The lawyers' interest was the public interest. And that's so.

Ms. Boswell: How did you characterize yourself as a lobbyist?

Mr. Gissberg: I had a good reputation when I left the Legislature so I think that whatever I told the Judiciary Committee, the Judiciary Committee believed. They had good reason to, because it was always the truth. It was the right side to be on.

I did engage in starting some campaign funds for the Bar, which the Bar had never done before. As small as they were, it was a gesture at least. Because the Bar Association was going up against some groups that were determined to change the statutes on negligence and product liability in a way that was not, in my estimation, in the public interest. So, to compete would

at least indicate that we had an interest in their election without giving enough money to make any difference, one way or another. I started a separate campaign fund-raising effort among members of the Bar which still goes on to this day. But, of course, we couldn't compete–we could if we had a lot of lawyers that had any money, but very few of them ever did. They felt like, why should you have to pay campaign contributions for something that was in the public interest? There's a lot to be said for that, but as I said, "Campaign contributions are an evil unto themselves."

Ms. Boswell: But you still thought they were necessary in this case?

Mr. Gissberg: I wouldn't say they were necessary, but they were certainly helpful.

Ms. Boswell: It's justifiable because the goal is in the public interest?

Mr. Gissberg: It's only when the campaign contributions become excessive, habitual, that there's a danger that the legislator will pre-empt his own concept of what's in the public interest in favor of the private interest of the group. That's a fine line, but nonetheless it's one that's used all the time. It's one thing to give a legislator fifty dollars and another thing to give them five hundred. You say in concept there's no difference, but in practicality, there is. Like rewarding a child with a fifty-cent-a-week allowance or a five-dollar-a-day allowance. One way you spoil the child, the other way you teach him thrift.

The same way with the Legislature. But overall, campaign contributions do more harm than they do good because of the public perception of the nefarious influences that lobbyists have on the legislator. Too many cartoons with black bags and smoking cigars in back rooms. It gives the public, themselves, a terrible concept of what the Legislature is all about.

Ms. Boswell: What do you feel about the spending limits that at least some candidates have imposed on their campaigns? I didn't mean spending limits, but contribution limits. Do you think that's the way to go, or do you think legislation is necessary? What would you recommend?

Mr. Gissberg: I thought we were talking about history, not civics?

Ms. Boswell: I know. I thought as long as we were on this topic, I thought I'd ask. You don't have to answer if you don't want to.

Mr. Gissberg: If you could tell me how you could eliminate them (contributions) entirely, I'd be in favor of it. I guess I would be in favor of eliminating all financial contributions to legislators and substituting by private individuals at least, eliminating private individual contributions, and financing campaigns out of the public treasury in some fashion. I guess that's what my view would be.

Ms. Boswell: If it's all right, I'd like to come back again to this issue in this part of your career a little bit later. You're right, we were talking about history, so maybe we should go back to the Legislature for a minute. The earlier years.

I had another question from last time. One of the things that you mentioned was that you essentially stayed on the Rules Committee and away from, at least initially, positions of chairmanships of committees because you thought you could really accomplish more through the Rules Committee. In reading through a couple of these articles, there were a couple in here that called you the "strong man of the Legislature" and that, in fact, you didn't have committee chairmanships but you were still very powerful. Maybe more so than the committee chairs. I wondered if you wanted to comment on that further?

Mr. Gissberg: Did it say that I was "stronger than strong"?

Ms. Boswell: It called you "the strong man" in quotes. I thought that was pretty good.

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know what to say.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about the role that you could play in a committee in terms of being effective. How could you be effective in a committee situation?
Mr. Gissberg: You mean a committee of which I was a member?

Ms. Boswell: Yes.

Mr. Gissberg: By trying to improve the legislation, if I supported it. By clarifying the meaning of the legislation by technical amendments to it. By asking piercing questions that went to the heart of the problem. By generally acting in an affirmative fashion on matters that should pass and acting as an opponent on matters that shouldn't pass. I can't speak for why other people thought I was a strong man. But that's what I did.

Ms. Boswell: In terms of the committees, we talked a fair amount about some of the committees you were on, Judiciary and Rules and Highways. One we haven't talked about and I know that you mentioned earlier was important to you, and that's Education. At least for the first ten years or so you did serve on the Education Committee. Can you tell me a little more about that committee?

Mr. Gissberg: The time I served on the Education Committee, my primary interest was in getting equal funding for the rural and urban areas. There was a disparity of state aid given through the state equalization fund. School districts that were in rural areas and had no industrial base were necessarily short-changed in the amount of money they had to spend on education. I always thought that that was unfair. It didn't provide equal education opportunity. I tried to change the formula by which the state funds were distributed to school districts. I was opposed in those efforts primarily by the King County legislators and the urban school districts in Tacoma and Spokane. So it was Spokane, Pierce and King county legislators that I was up against. I had a few of the rural superintendents of schools on my side, but it was difficult to get anything done because, even before redistricting, the urban areas were in greater numbers than the rural areas in terms of numbers of legislators. It came down to a question of politics, not what was right or wrong. You couldn't expect a Seattle legislator to vote for my equal educational opportunity for financing for schools when it hurt their own districts, so it was practically impossible to get it done. You better ask Buster Brouillet about all that.

Ms. Boswell: Does the state superintendent of schools really lead efforts of school policy? How does the role of the superintendent of schools balance with the role of the education committees in the Legislature?

Mr. Gissberg: I didn't serve on the Education Committee very much. I don't think at all after Buster was elected superintendent of public instruction. I did when Pearl Wanamaker was superintendent. She was the same kind of a woman as Julia Butler Hansen was.

Ms. Boswell: Oh, was she? Tell me more about her.

Mr. Gissberg: She was from Island County, Whidbey Island. She was a very strong, personable lady who fought for increased budgets for the schools, but who gained the animosity of those that didn't want to raise taxes. She must have been superintendent for twenty years or more. She was always a good influence on the school system for the state. In other words, she was an outstanding woman.

Ms. Boswell: What were the peculiar problems of education in Washington at that time when she was in charge?

Mr. Gissberg: Finances. It's ever been thus. There were classroom teachers. Kindergarten was an emotional issue, a political issue more than an emotional issue. It always came back to finances. The total appropriation. That was always an issue as to how much to appropriate for educational purposes. That was the issue.

Ms. Boswell: Is that what the committees in the Legislature would most debate?

Mr. Gissberg: No, I don't think so. The debate for financing education came out of the Appropriations Committee, later on the Ways and Means Committee. But the debate as to the school-apportionment formula occurred in the Education committees.

Probably the most influential person that served on the Education Committee in those days was Andy Hess. He was a legislator from King County who had the welfare of the schools and the school appropriations uppermost in his mind. He followed pretty much what Pearl Wanamaker advocated.

The kindergarten issue was found in both the Appropriations Committee and the Education Committee. The Education Committee had jurisdiction of driver education. That was always an issue, too, as to who was to pay for driver education for kids. Whether the state was to pay any part of it.

I always felt that the reason we needed an income tax was to provide further funds for educational purposes. We really didn't need an income tax for financing another activity of state government. They were able to take care of themselves in a very generous fashion.

Ms. Boswell: Were you and Senator Hess at loggerheads over the rural/urban issues, too?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't think Andy took a vocal position on that even though he was from King County, but Fred Dore did. Fred Dore was the most vocal against reforming the apportionment formula on an equalization basis.

Ms. Boswell: Why did you leave the Education Committee? It seemed like you were there for more than ten years, your first ten years, then not after that.

Did it have to do with the different superintendent, or some other reason?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know if I had a reason. I don't think I did. I probably had some legislation that I had in mind. I always put myself on the committee that was most important to me in terms of legislation that I was going to introduce at the coming session of the Legislature. I put myself on the committee that had jurisdiction on that bill so I could make sure I got the bill out. I didn't leave it to chance. I probably got off the Education Committee to get on a different committee so that I would be able to take care of my bills that went to the new committee. I don't remember specifically, but that's probably the reason.

Ms. Boswell: When you developed every session your personal agenda for bills, how did you come up with what you knew you wanted to pass, and what was lower down on the "wish list"?

Mr. Gissberg: There was never a scientific analysis of it. At one point I served on so many, it must have been eleven committees I served on all at once. I got to the point where you couldn't possibly go to the committees because there were schedule conflicts, and you'd have to spend five minutes in one committee and ten minutes in another, and ten minutes in the third committee, all of which were meeting at the same time. We had to cut down on the number of committees that each person could serve upon. It was difficult to cut down on the number of committees because Bob Greive, as the majority leader, had his followers that had to be on certain committees, so he'd increase the number of committees so he could get his members, the people he felt obligated to support, on certain committees. That's not answering your question.

Ms. Boswell: That's fine. It's fascinating. I know you were very successful in getting your bills passed, even early on. Despite your modesty, there is an article here about your "batting average" in the Senate, you were making the analogy with baseball and saying that you had a .538 average, which was uncommonly high. This was one of your first years in the Legislature. What I'm curious about is, when you made your legislative agenda for the year, could you pretty well predict what bills were going through and what wouldn't? Did you fight for all of them in the same manner? Did you make a mental priority list of what you really wanted as opposed to–

Mr. Gissberg: I'm sure I did. I'm certain that I did. Some of the bills that I introduced were my own and some were given to me by lobbyists. I'm certain that I did make a judgment as to which ones I wanted to speak to the chairman about to get on the agenda, and to get out of the committee.

That's one of the reasons I wanted to be on the Rules Committee at the very first, because I saw that no legislation was going to be able to pass unless it passed through the Rules Committee. If I was on the Rules Committee, I'd be able to get my own legislation as well as others on the floor of the Senate for a vote. I guess it's a mental process that everyone goes through, as to what bills are more important than others. Certainly that was the case.

I considered the bills that came out of the Committee on Governmental Cooperation to be important legislation. Whether it's because they came out of my interim committee, or because they were important, I can't really tell you. But I know I made a special effort to get legislation passed that was recommended by that interim committee. That interim committee was formed because they wanted to improve the caliber of police officers in the rural areas of the state. That came about as a special relationship that I had with the police officers of the City of Seattle. I was arrested for interfering with the arrest of my then secretary, now wife.

Ms. Boswell: Oh really? Tell me about that.

Mr. Gissberg: I won't have to think very hard to tell that story.

I'd been to a Legislative Council meeting and my then secretary (I think we were married at the time, or shortly thereafter became married). was driving her car after the Legislative Council meeting. She made a left-hand turn in front of Frederick and Nelson's and I was sitting in the passenger side looking at some of the papers that had been given me at the council meeting. It was toward evening and I saw a reflection in the window of the car, and red lights flashing. I said, "There's a police officer behind you. Why don't you stop?" She pulled up right in front of the door of Frederick's, which was a one-way street at that time. The police officer came up to her side of the car and said, "You made a left-hand turn." She said, "Last week there was no sign there." The police officer said, "We just put a new sign there making it illegal." He was writing a ticket and handed it into her and said, "Sign this." I said, "Wait a minute, let me see what you are asking her to sign."

[End of Tape 7, Side 1]

Mr. Gissberg: Suddenly, a big hand came through the window of my side of the car and took the ticket out of

my hand and started to the rear of the car. I bailed out of the front seat of the car as fast as I could and reached him and told him that I wanted to see what he was asking her to sign. He says, "None of your business." I said, "I'm her lawyer. I represent her." He says, "It's none of your business." I said, "The hell it isn't!" I swore, and I said, "You guys ought to be in Florida joining George Lincoln Rockwell," who was then the fascist guy down in Florida. He said, "That's it. You're under arrest." I said, "You'd better go talk to the sergeant about this." So they forgot about my wife, and took me in the paddy wagon down to the police station. To make a long story short, the kid that was going through my personal effects said, "Oh, oh. Why didn't you tell me who you were?" I said, "Why should I have to do that? It's a bum arrest and could happen to anybody." I bailed myself out. I had enough money in my wallet to do so.

Next morning there was a headline in the paper, "Gissberg arrested for interfering with the arrest of another person." A terrible article that sounded like I was a felon. So, I determined then and there that I was going to do something about training police officers. There was too much of this hanging a badge on somebody and sending them out on the street when they don't know anybody's constitutional rights or rights, generally.

I created a committee, interim committee, and one of the recommendations that we had after hearings was to create the Police Officers' Training Commission to give an incentive to the cities and counties to have their officers trained at a training school, which is still in existence today. We investigated the drug scene at that time when pills were just getting popular and made recommendations strengthening the penalties for pedaling dangerous drugs. We created the teletypewriter system which was a modern way of communicating with police agencies throughout the state. They had no means of communicating except by telephone or by letter. Just modernized a few things. Why did I start all this narration?

Ms. Boswell: We were talking about, I guess–

Mr. Gissberg: You've forgotten, too.

Ms. Boswell: We were talking about your various committee assignments and–

Mr. Gissberg: I considered those to be important bills. I'd see to those I'd sort of dreamed up myself on the top of the list, and I'd spend more attention to getting them passed.

Ms. Boswell: Before you go on, you'll have to tell me the outcome of the case with the policeman and your wife.

Mr. Gissberg: That went to trial. I was acquitted, and I called the *P-I* editor and asked him to give me the same space that he did when I was arrested. He said, "Oh, we'll give you notice, but it's not as newsworthy." They put it on the back page of the paper.

But, I have to admit that the judge who heard the case was an old friend of mine. He played basketball for Santa Clara and Gonzaga. He was then a municipal court judge, but he later became a federal district court judge. I hasten to say that he didn't know my case was coming up before him, and I didn't know the case was coming up because there were several district court judges in those days. It was just by accident, but his name was Wally McGovern.

Ms. Boswell: You had merit to your side.

Mr. Gissberg: Merit. Obviously so.

Ms. Boswell: Did some people introduce bills just for show? So they'd satisfy their constituents that they'd introduced it, but they didn't really work for it.

Mr. Gissberg: That's true. That's the case. Matter of fact, I would say the majority of legislation that's introduced is not that of the legislator, but that of the lobbyist who wants to pass a particular bill. The only connection the legislator has on it is his name appears in the title as a sponsor of the bill. Once he's introduced the bill on behalf of the lobbyist, he probably forgets about it. He's done what the lobbyist wanted him to do, namely introduce it, so he doesn't have any personal interest in seeing it passed. Or political interest either. Much of the business of drafting legislation falls in the lap of the lobbyist instead of the legislator. That could fall in the same category as the one you just mentioned, where the legislator doesn't have any particular belief in what's there, but does it as a favor to the lobbyist to get the bill in.

The same way with introducing "hero" legislation, which he knows is not going to pass anyway, but pleases somebody that it's been introduced.

Ms. Boswell: What did you call it?

Mr. Gissberg: "Hero" legislation.

Ms. Boswell: H-E-R-O?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: Is that your term, or is that a common term?

Mr. Gissberg: That's my term. It describes it accurately.

Ms. Boswell: In terms of the language of a bill, I know there are offices where they draft the language for the bills for you, but how much fine-tuning work did you personally do on a particular bill? Did you write any of your own bills? How did that process work for you?

Mr. Gissberg: I didn't write my own bills. I always used a bill-drafter, but I'd change them around in two or three drafts and do my own amending before I got the final draft to what I wanted to introduce. I was quite an "amender" anyway. I amended a lot of the legislation that was on the floor. Even though I didn't have any particular interest in it, I always read one bill ahead of what was on the calendar all the time to make sure it was written correctly. I was quite an amender. But the bill-drafter performed a valuable function.

Ms. Boswell: Did people know bill-drafters as individuals? Were some people better bill-drafters than others, or was it sort of a group?

Mr. Gissberg: They were all lawyers. As you know, there are some better lawyers than others. Same way with bill-drafters. Some bill-drafters were better than others. Had degree of skills in different areas.

Ms. Boswell: It seems as though there's a fairly high percentage, I don't know, I guess I'm talking off the top of my head because I don't know this, but my perception would be that there's a fairly high percentage of lawyers, maybe even higher when you started, than now of lawyers in the Legislature. You're a lawyer yourself, but what are some of the advantages and disadvantages of being a lawyer-legislator? Having that background?

Mr. Gissberg: The advantage is, you get some clients. That's the big advantage of being a lawyer-legislator. Being a legislator and at the same time being a lawyer.

When I first came to the Legislature there were more than there are now. That's for sure. At one time there were twenty-four lawyers in the Senate. I've never really been faced with the question of why so many lawyers, or why not so many lawyers. But the advantage of being a lawyer in the Legislature was, if you were any good, your name became known as a good legislator and a good lawyer. That's the obvious advantage.

Ms. Boswell: Within the job itself, obviously your expertise and understanding legal matters, and being able to assess legislation and make sure that it reads as you want it to read so that it will accomplish the purposes that you have. How easily can somebody with no legal training do that?

Mr. Gissberg: Not nearly as easily as a lawyer. When you're a lawyer or a legislator, you have to train yourself in reading bills, too. That doesn't come just naturally to a lawyer. I told you, to begin with, that I used to, when I was first elected to the Legislature, I used to read every bill that was introduced. And I did. That gave me a lot of good training to see how bills were constructed.

By reading the title, in most instances, I could tell what the bill was about. I could tell what was a special-interest bill and what was a bill deemed to be in the public interest. I could see that things needed to be amended just to clarify them. Whether I was for or against the bill was quite beside the point. I could see what needed to be amended to clarify the meaning or what somebody was attempting to do. But being a lawyer certainly helped in understanding the legislation. We had some great lawyers that were in the Legislature.

Ms. Boswell: Who in particular did you admire?

Mr. Gissberg: Jimmy Anderson, Perry Woodall, John McCutcheon.

Ms. Boswell: What made them great?

Mr. Gissberg: What makes a great president? What makes a great person?

Ms. Boswell: What were your criteria?

Mr. Gissberg: Their ability to speak up when they needed to speak up–and forcefully. And come down on the right side of the decision-making. Serious about their duties as a legislator.

We had a few lawyers there that were a disgrace to the Legislature. If the people back home knew what they did, they'd have never been re-elected. Obviously, those weren't great people. The same qualities that make a person great in his private life are the same attributes that make a person great in his public duties. You know that as well as I do. Whoever reads this transcript would know as well as I do. It's something

intangible when the attributes are all taken together to make a person great. Great in what he's doing, at least, if not great in the public mind.

Ms. Boswell: I was thinking more in terms of what aspects of their legal abilities made them great legislators.

Mr. Gissberg: Jimmy Anderson was a great legislator because he had been a deputy prosecutor for years, and he understood crimes and punishment. Anytime a criminal-law bill came across you could always depend on him to tell you whether it was good, bad, or indifferent, and you believed what he said because he knew.

I know one time there was a scandal up in Snohomish County with our sheriff. The grand jury was called. The prosecuting attorney didn't want to step aside when the sheriff was having difficulty with the grand jury. I felt that there was a conflict of interest there by having a prosecuting attorney of the same county in which the sheriff was being indicted. The prosecutor was called upon to prosecute the case against the sheriff when they were the same political party and so forth.

So that prompted legislation. At the next session of the Legislature I introduced a bill to quote, "reform," unquote. I detest the word "reform." Anytime you've got to change something, it doesn't necessarily mean that you're going to reform it, but that's the vogue today to call any change a reform, and it might be the worst thing in the world that ever happened. Reform implies improvement, these so-called reforms are not necessarily improvements. But this was truly a reform.

Jimmy Anderson helped me with that. He'd had a lot of experience with the grand jury, and we created the authority of the governor to step in, and the authority of the attorney general to step in in a case involving a judge. The governor could step in and remove the county's jurisdiction and give it to the attorney general. Jimmy was of particular help in that. Something else we did–at one time the grand jury was a law unto itself. The grand jury was sometimes stacked for political purposes. So we created a new method of calling a grand jury. The prosecuting attorney would go before the judge and take testimony under oath of suspected lawbreakers without having to call a grand jury. That's still on the books today. Jimmy helped me on that so I suppose that's why I think he's great. Those two reasons. He was a good, tough prosecuting attorney who you could rely on.

McCutcheon was great because he was such a great orator.

Perry Woodall was great because he was an orator and humorist at the same time. He told funny stories on the Senate floor. I always enjoyed listening to him.

Ms. Boswell: It's getting late, and–

[End of Tape 7, Side 2]

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Ms. Boswell: I want to start by asking a few questions about specific pieces of legislation. First, let me ask you a question. I was reading an article about you in one of the papers. They called you a "conservative." I wanted to hear your comments about that. Were you a conservative?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know if I was a conservative, liberal, or a radical, or whatever. I suppose I was a conservative when it came to appropriations of funds by the Legislature. In social matters, I never considered myself to be a conservative as such. Probably I was a conservative on fiscal matters, except as it related to education, where I was a liberal. It's hard to put labels on a person because of their political views unless you analyze the legislation said to be liberal or conservative. I suppose I was a conservative, maybe because I didn't immediately say "yes" to legislation. I had to look at it and study it and see what its effect might be before I would be for or against it.

Ms. Boswell: When you are talking about conservative, how would you define that term? I don't know that you would even want to, but it seems like kind of a vague term in and of itself.

Mr. Gissberg: I said I was a liberal on social matters. I guess a liberal is one who is looking for improvements in society, generally, and who is not afraid to announce that he is for improvements in a particular segment of our society, who is ahead of the pack, so to speak, and changes the policies of government, and who is for the underdog. I guess that's what I would call a liberal.

A conservative is just the opposite of that.

Ms. Boswell: When you became a fiscal conservative, how did that evolve? You started out as a "New Deal" supporter. How did you evolve into a fiscal conservative?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know that I evolved into it. I used to vote "no" on the budget, but "yes" on taxes, even though I didn't want the tax to be imposed. It was our responsibility to come up with a balanced budget, and ordinarily it took new taxes to balance the budget.

Ms. Boswell: So balancing the budget was really an important goal for you?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes, it was. We had to balance the budget, otherwise we'd be back in session again. Over the years, I said that I'd vote against the budget. There were political reasons for that, too.

Ms. Boswell: Which were? Tell me.

Mr. Gissberg: When you went back home you could say you voted against the budget because it wasn't high enough, or you could say it wasn't low enough. You always had an answer for political groups that were unhappy because they didn't get the money that they wanted, or, on the other hand, for other groups who got their money, but they had to vote for taxes to get it. It was an explanation as to why you had to vote for taxes.

Ms. Boswell: But you generally did support tax measures?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. I did. There was one session, before the session started, I indicated that I wouldn't vote for any taxes. And I didn't. I don't remember what session it was, but it was later on.

Ms. Boswell: Why did you take that stand at that time?

Mr. Gissberg: Because they thought the governor was spending too much money. The only way to hold down the increase in the budget was to vote against taxes. Without the taxes, they couldn't balance the budget, and it would have to be lowered.

Ms. Boswell: Did that tactic work?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't remember whether it did or not. Probably not, because I think every session they raise taxes somehow or other, in some fashion.

Ms. Boswell: One of the reasons I was asking you about the label of being a conservative is that, during some of your earlier years there was quite a lot of squabbling amongst the Democrats. It seems as though there was a lot of differences of opinion over leadership, but also sort of political stance. Wasn't there a fairly good-sized revolt of conservative Democrats in the Democratic Caucus in the late '50s, early '60s, that period?

Mr. Gissberg: It was earlier than that.

Ms. Boswell: Earlier?

Mr. Gissberg: As a matter of fact, the revolt of the Democrats had a "splinter" group before I got to the Senate.

Ms. Boswell: Oh, I thought it was in the late '50s. Tell me about that.

Mr. Gissberg: Since I wasn't there, it's all history as far as I'm concerned.

The eastern Washington Democrats were very conservative. Not only on budget matters, but in labor matters. They typically represented large farm areas, with such people as Senators James Keefe, Rod Lindsay, and others from that area; they were always against increased appropriations of any kind. They were anti-labor, anti-public power. They were anti-everything the Democrats stood for. At least what I thought they stood for.

That led to the occasion when the Democrats had a majority of senators in the Senate, and certain of the Democrats from eastern Washington supported the Republicans in organizing the Senate, and elected their own president pro tem, and otherwise organized the Senate when the Democrats had a majority. The Democrats who revolted from the party joined the Republicans in organizing the Senate and determining the committee chairmanships, memberships on the committees, and so on.

By the time I got there in 1953, there were still bitter feelings about that between the Republicans and the Democrats, generally. It took several years before that animosity depleted itself.

Ms. Boswell: During that time that the animosity began to subside, is that when Bob Greive came in to being the majority leader?

Mr. Gissberg: No. Bob Greive didn't become majority leader until 1955 or 1957. I suppose that it was at that time that feelings began to smooth over. I don't remember when Bob was first elected as majority leader. It had to be after Al Rosellini was minority leader. The Democrats were in the minority then. It was after Rosellini ran for governor and was elected that Bob Greive became majority leader and Democrats were the majority party.

I know that one of the things that Bob had to do to procure the votes of the conservative eastern Washington Democrats was to sacrifice Democratic traditional support of public power and see to it that these conservative Democrats who had supported Spokane (Washington Water Power) were on the committees that had jurisdiction over the private-power issue. I suppose he had to do that although he was from a public-power district, i.e., the city of Seattle, which was a municipally owned power. He nonetheless had to see to it that the committees were well-represented for private power.

That's one of the reasons that the Rules Committee got so large. In theory, the number of Rules Committee members and all the other committees of the Legislature in the Senate were supposed to be in proportion to the number of Republicans or number of Democrats in the Senate. Whatever percentage that was, was supposed to be carried forward into the committees, so that the same percentage of control or lack of control was represented in each committee. But that rule had to go by the board because if they did that, private power, for instance, would have control of the legislation, which was a great issue in those days. In order to protect against the private-power interests controlling the Rules Committee and the Utilities Committee, we had to increase the number of committee members so that we could get the regular Democrats to offset the number of conservative Democrats and Republicans who were on the committees.

That's how the Rules Committee got so huge. There were sometimes seventeen or eighteen members on the Rules Committee, which was very unwieldy.

Ms. Boswell: Who engineered that expansion of the committees?

Mr. Gissberg: Bob Bailey and Bob Greive had the most to say about what was going to happen. That was all decided before the session even began. At our first organizational caucus, Bob Bailey would appoint the Committee on Committees. He would always see that the Committee on Committees had sufficient membership on there so as to allow the regular Democrats to have control of the appointments to the standing committees. That's how it was done. He would appoint the ones who were representative of public-power views on the Committee on Committees. There was always a struggle within the caucus as to who was going to get what committee. That was another reason that the committee sizes were expanded. Too many people had to serve on committees because the so-called conservative Democrats, of whom I only mentioned two, there are others there as well, so it was, you might say, stacking the committees or the Democrats wouldn't be able to get their programs through.

One of the things that the majority leader had to do when he sought election as majority leader was to promise his people that were going to vote for him that he would see that they got on a committee of their choice. That was oftentimes a struggle, too, because there weren't enough places on the committees to seat everybody that wanted to be on them. I think Bob Greive was able to usually get his people on the committees that he wanted them on.

Ms. Boswell: He was or he was not?

Mr. Gissberg: He was–sometimes by enlarging the committees. But the public/private power committee was the most sensitive to that whole thing.

Ms. Boswell: How long did this Democratic/conservative coalition last?

Mr. Gissberg: I think it started in '49 and was in some form or another until, probably, '57 or '59. Much the same thing took place in the House when Bill Day became Speaker through a coalition of Republicans and private-power Democrats.

Ms. Boswell: Was it at all involved in the struggle that you had with Greive over the leadership? Was that part of the issue?

Mr. Gissberg: No. There really were no legislative issues that persuaded one to vote either for me or for Greive. The specific legislative issues, I don't think, had anything to do with it. It was just a question of personalities and the Greive Fund, which was later adopted by Augie Mardesich. That's how Augie beat Greive for majority leader.

There was a certain group in the Senate, a certain number of Democratic senators, who would vote against Bob on every occasion, every session. That was true even though the candidate against Bob hadn't done any work ahead of time. Hadn't even inquired of his fellow senators whether they would vote for him or not. Somebody would always put up a candidate against Bob at the last moment. I recall Web Hallauer was one of those who ran against him at the last moment.

It was usually those senators that voted against Bob who were not participants in the Greive Fund. Although I thought the Greive Fund was bad, I recall one time that I defended Bob on the floor of the Senate, because Slim Rasmussen got up on the floor and made a motion for the Senate to investigate the Greive Fund. I thought it smacked of everything that we didn't want to air in public, on the Senate floor at least. I thwarted Rasmussen for that reason, in debate on the Senate floor.

Later on, after I left the Senate in '72, my last session, Augie Mardesich became an opponent of Greive. He used the same tactics that Greive used, i.e., raised money through the Mardesich Fund. The purpose of which was to assist, financially, the senators who indicated they would vote for Augie, or whom he thought he could get a vote from. That led to a lot of trouble for Augie because he was indicted by the grand jury for allegedly "shaking down" the garbage interests for twenty-thousand dollars which he used for campaign purposes. It was to help him get elected as the majority leader. And he was elected, but after that the grand jury indicted him. That was all after I left.

I was urged to run for majority leader, myself, on numerous occasions. But I never wanted to become majority leader after that. I was content with my role in the Senate the way it was. I was able to get everything done that I wanted to get done without being in a position of so-called leadership.

Ms. Boswell: What was the difference in the time that you did run for it? What had persuaded you to do it?

Mr. Gissberg: The group of senators who were anti-Greive persuaded me to do it.

Ms. Boswell: What were the reasons for their dissatisfaction with Greive? Was there anything beyond not being part of his fund?

Mr. Gissberg: I'm sure there was. I'm sure that they thought someone else could do a better job than Bob Greive. I doubt the religious affiliation had anything to do with it.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think that could have been an issue?

Mr. Gissberg: Could have been without ever surfacing. But I think that was just coincidental. The Catholics, for the most part, voted for Bob. I don't think religion was the factor. I think it was just happenstance that those who supported Bob were Catholic.

That's not true in the case of Frank Foley, I know. Senator Foley always voted against Bob. I'm not going to say how I voted the last few sessions I was there.

Ms. Boswell: You mean on the issue of majority leader?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: Why not?

Mr. Gissberg: Because some of the people are still alive today, and they might look askance at–

Ms. Boswell: Well, you were just expressing what you were thinking.

Mr. Gissberg: Gordon Sandison was another one who usually voted against Greive except in later years he voted with Bob because he was able to get accomplished what he wanted.

I think the whole issue of majority leader was greatly exaggerated. The importance of it was really exaggerated, I found. Bob would very seldom take a strong issue on the floor about anything. He was content to see that those who supported him were on the committees of their choice. He didn't really get involved in substantive issues of legislation on the floor of the Senate, except when it came to labor legislation. He was always in the forefront of pro-labor legislation. He was content just to make such motions as, "I now move that we consider Senate Bill No. so-and-so," and whoever was the one that wanted Senate Bill so-and-so voted upon would have to carry the burden of the debate on the bill. Bob very seldom got involved in the scuffle and debate on specific pieces of legislation. Maybe it was felt that he should have done more of that. That may have caused a large group of senators to always vote against him.

Ms. Boswell: There was an article that I read in the paper, by Ed Guthman, analyzing that particular period, and his analysis was that Greive had not always stayed as loyal as he might to Rosellini, and he said something to the effect that you had really taken up the ball and got Rosellini's major revenue bills, in particular, enacted. So that's why you had strong support amongst that group. What do you think of that analysis?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't believe it. Greive accepted what the Ways and Means Committee did at all times. He knew he had little to say about what was going on in the Ways and Means Committee. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee was never a Greive supporter. Web Hallauer was the chairman of Ways and Means for a couple of sessions. Frank Foley was a chairman of Ways and Means, and they did not support Greive. I worked closely with both Foley and Hallauer and had a fine relationship with them. Many of the press and senators felt (and even said) that I was the real leader in the Senate and that Greive was leader in name only. It is my opinion that this was so because I engaged in much of the debate that occurred on the Senate floor while Greive did not. On the occasions when Greive and I took opposite positions on bills and issues on the floor of the Senate, I was more likely than not to prevail. I think Ed didn't know what he was talking about. He was just writing a column.

Ms. Boswell: What was Guthman like as a reporter?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't think he was there that much. A political analyst, but I don't think he covered the Legislature–

[End of Tape 8, Side 1]

Mr. Gissberg: Ed was primarily looking for scandals and sensational-type things to write about.

The hardest-working pressman in my opinion was Leroy Hittle, who was with the AP, and knew state government very well and wrote news stories, not stories that were dreamt up, which attacked the sincerity of a legislator. But some of the other guys did.

Mike Layton was just the opposite of Leroy Hittle. If Layton could say something bad about the Legislature he loved it. At least it was apparent to the legislators that he loved it. I can't speak for him, but he was certainly never a supporter of the Legislature as such. He was critical of everything we did.

Ms. Boswell: We were talking earlier about the letters you received when you retired. The one from Jack at the *Spokesman Review*?

Mr. Gissberg: Jack Fisher.

Ms. Boswell: He was saying that the press called you "Senator Mean." Tell me about that?

Mr. Gissberg: They never called it to my face. I think that was started by the gal reporter from Bremerton.

Ms. Boswell: What was her name?

Mr. Gissberg: Adele Ferguson. She used to hang nicknames on senators, and I always got along fine with her. Being of Swedish descent, I probably look meaner than I am. I don't smile that frequently, and I don't joke. I'm serious most of the time. At least that's the appearance that I give. She got to calling me Senator Mean. Not to my face, but in her column, she referred to me a couple of times as Senator Mean, and I suppose the press, being the buddies that they are, probably nicknamed everybody something like that, or whatever was appropriate to lay on each senator. I always called a spade a spade. If I didn't like something I said I

didn't like it. Therefore, I was "mean." Adele was always a good friend of mine. She always gave me good write-ups in her columns.

Probably fits me better today than it did before, because now I have Parkinson's disease, and one of the symptoms of Parkinson's disease is that your face becomes a mask. You don't show any feelings, outward feelings. Your animation is gone. You notice I just sit here and don't use my hands any more when I talk. Stone-faced is one of the symptoms of Parkinson's disease. You may wonder why I look so mean all the time.

Ms. Boswell: I don't think you look mean at all.

Mr. Gissberg: I don't smile any more because I'm stone-faced. But that's a typical Swedish reaction, too. Swedes are somewhat shy and introverted. That has a tendency to have people think that I'm mean, too, perhaps. Maybe I was mean, I don't know.

Ms. Boswell: I've had people say that they wished they had been able to get to know you better as a legislator. That they respected you and admired you, but didn't feel that they had gotten to know you. I wondered if that was also part of your plan?

Mr. Gissberg: No. Part of my personality. It had nothing to do with a plan. I'm not an outgoing person. As I said when we first started these interviews, I didn't make many friends in the Legislature. I made a lot of acquaintances, but few friends. Friends are somebody that you have to cultivate and be outgoing with, and share in their moments of happiness and sadness, and so on, which I never found time to do, or the inclination to do.

Ms. Boswell: Doesn't it also make it somewhat easier to take a stand, vote your conscience, do what needs to be done, when there aren't a lot of personal friendships in the way?

Mr. Gissberg: It certainly does. I know it's harder for me to vote against some senators than others. You might fall into a mold if you get too close to your fellow senators. They may ask you to vote for something for friendship's sake, and not on the merits. Looking back on it, that was a good by-product of what my personality was.

I mentioned that one of my closest friends was Francis Pearson, who was a blind senator who overcame his handicap and became one of the outstanding senators, in my mind, that I ever served with in the twenty years I was there. He later was rewarded for his ability by being appointed chairman of the Utilities and Transportation Commission by Governor Rosellini.

Incidentally, that book that you gave me about Rosellini had my name in it a couple of times. It had to do with when he was running for the third term. He was asked something about whether the "old-time" Democrats (including me) supported him. The questioner didn't mention my name, but Al mentioned my name along with Luke Graham, who was then the state Democratic chairman. He said, "Bill Gissberg and Luke Graham wouldn't support me, because they were supporting Durkan. They told me not to run." I'm quoting Al now, in the book. He said that, I'm not searching for words now, I'm searching for my train of thought.

Ms. Boswell: So Rosellini thought you did not support him in that third campaign?

Mr. Gissberg: He knew I had, because he was relating the instance over in Hawaii when Hubert Donohue and I had gone over to Hawaii on a vacation. Just coincidentally, we met Al Rosellini at the hotel we stayed at, in the dining room. Naturally, when I saw him there I went over to say "Hello" to him, and see how things were. We had heard rumors that he was going to run for governor. This was when he was running for his third term. He excused himself from the table and came with us into the bar to talk, and I told him that I was supporting Durkan because I was serving with Durkan and he was a senator. I had no idea that Al was going to run. This was late for a guy to announce that he was running for governor. So, Rosellini said, "That's all right. I wouldn't expect you not to vote for Durkan because you're his friend in the Senate. But, after I win the primary, I'll expect you to help me."

He indicated that we tried to talk him out of running, but it wasn't like that at all. His recollection is bad on that. My recollection is good because I know that I told him that I couldn't vote for him, couldn't support him in the primary, because I had already committed to Durkan, who had already announced.

Ms. Boswell: If Rosellini had announced earlier, would you have gone with him for a third term?

Mr. Gissberg: That's a hypothetical question and I can't answer.

Ms. Boswell: You seemed to be a strong supporter of Rosellini, so I just wondered whether you had become somewhat disaffected by the end, or whether you felt–

Mr. Gissberg: I just thought that he'd had his opportunity there, eight years of being the leader in the state, and it was time for somebody else to take over the reins. It would have been more difficult for me to go with Al over Durkan.

On the other hand, I had a personal relationship with Durkan, too. We were apprentice seamen together in the Navy at Asbury Park, New Jersey. We were in the Marine Corps (V-12) together at the University of Washington. So, I had a lot of friendship for Durkan, too, on a personal basis. The same way I did with Al. It would have been a difficult choice for me to have made.

Ms. Boswell: What characteristics did Durkan have that would have made him a good governor?

Mr. Gissberg: He was a strong leader, for one thing. He was a fiscal conservative. He ran on the basis that the budget had gone wild, and that corresponded with my views. He was an environmentalist in the sense that he voted for environmental legislation. I don't know that he was an environmentalist, but he voted right, politically, in my mind. I remember one time when the state Environmental Policy Act was up for consideration. The act was such that it provided that on any major issue affecting the environment, one had to provide an environmental-impact statement. That's a shortcut way of describing what it was. The legislation was on the floor, and I hadn't even heard of the state Environmental Policy Act before. It was something very new. I was reading ahead on the Senate bills on the Senate floor, on the calendar. I always tried to stay one bill ahead. It was a short act, and while Durkan was getting ready to make his pitch for the bill, I said, "Martin, I realize you have to get the support of the environmentalists, running for governor, but have you read this bill?" He assured me he had. I wondered if he knew all the consequences to it. In any event, he supported the environmental legislation that I asked him to support, and he never hesitated in that. So, that's another reason I thought he would be a good governor.

Ms. Boswell: What was it that you had hesitations about in terms of the Environmental Protection Act?

Mr. Gissberg: I hesitated because I didn't see how writing an environmental-impact statement was going to affect the issuance, for instance, of permits to Scott Paper Company and the Weyerhaeuser Company to stop their polluting. I thought that we had plenty of water and air pollution, anti-pollution legislation on the books the way it was, and all we had to do was enforce the laws that were on the books, which we could never seem to do. It was just adding another layer that would work in favor of the polluters rather than against the polluters.

Ms. Boswell: In what way? What do you mean it would work in favor of them?

Mr. Gissberg: We had somebody deciding what was the major impact or detriment to the environment, and that decision would work both ways. Whoever was writing the impact statement could say that it wasn't of any major detrimental effect on the environment, as well as say that there was. So I thought that the agency which had control of the environmental affairs of the state, i.e., the Department of Ecology, could do that directly, without laying another layer of red tape on the books.

Later on, when I left the Senate, I was appointed by Dan Evans to the Pollution Control Hearings Board. After that legislation was passed which created the state Council on Environmental Policy. The statute named the members of the Pollution Control Hearings Board on that council. Our function was to flesh out the barebones act in the state Environmental Policy Act into a workable, manageable tool, by writing the rules and regulations that affect when an action was a major action, and what actions were subject to the act, and write exemptions to the act. I think that's one of the reasons I got a heart attack. It was an awful job to do. It was a big job. After we had written the rules and regulations which took us over a year to do, interspersed with the rest of our duties on the Pollution Control Hearings Board–what was I going to say?

Ms. Boswell: You were talking about how it had taken a physical toll on you.

Mr. Gissberg: It was very frustrating to me because I couldn't always get my way on the votes in the council on certain issues which I thought were important, and it was really frustrating to me to be chairman and not be able to get what I wanted. For instance, the state Environmental Policy Act, in my mind, was supposed to warn the policy decision-maker on the effects of major actions that were taken by that agency. The detrimental effects on the environment, and to write an environmental-impact statement on that. I always interpreted the act to mean just that: the effects on the environment. The decision-maker was to write a report on what the major impacts were on the physical environment.

Walt Woodward, who was a former reporter for the *Seattle Times*, who was also on the board with me, insisted that social actions were required to be covered

by an environmental impact statement as well. You had to write about social effects, which I didn't deem to be an environmental effect.

And the same way with the economic decisions. The things that affected the economy had to be written up in the environmental-impact statement. I disagreed strongly with that. But I'm wandering away from what we were talking about.

Ms. Boswell: No. I'm interested in your legislative and environmental interests. Generally speaking, was the Department of Ecology supportive of your position? Could they publicly say that?

Mr. Gissberg: They did in a roundabout way, but not directly. We didn't have any staff when we started out, so I called up the hill and got some money appropriated for the council so we could hire a secretary and a lawyer we hired away from the Department of Ecology, a fellow by the name of Chuck Lean, who was a magnificent attorney. Very skilled. He had been working for the Department of Ecology, and we hired him away. He usually expressed the view of the Department of Ecology without expressing it publicly. He wouldn't comment about the substance of what we were doing. But, without him, we wouldn't have been able to do the good job that we did. After we wrote the rules and regulations, on which we conducted hearings throughout the state, our function was transferred to the Department of Ecology, and now they have the total responsibility for writing the impact statements. Our function was only to write the rules and regulations that governed them.

Ms. Boswell: I want to come back to other aspects of the environmental policy. Is that kind of relationship fairly typical, by that I mean between state agencies and state legislators or legislative committees? Generally speaking, do the agencies not publicly express their ideas, or do they have other ways of letting you know about particular legislation?

Mr. Gissberg: As a legislator, I can answer that. The agencies never had any hesitancy in expressing their views on proposed legislation one way or another. That was always to the good. But, in this instance, we were writing the rules and regulations that affected not only the Department of Ecology which would have the handle on the whole environmental movement, but the Department of Natural Resources. I know they took a strong stand. Usually, I disagreed with the stand of Natural Resources. You'd think that they would be strong environmentalists, but they turned out to be, in my mind, in bed with the polluters. One of the things we tried to do was to require environmental-impact statements to be written where at least the Department of Natural Resources would have to go through the steps which the rules and regulations that the Council on Environmental Policy stated. The Department of Natural Resources was fighting that tooth and nail, that they'd have to go through the state Environmental Policy Act procedures. We felt, rightfully so, that timber cutting had an enormous effect on the environment. One of the things that the Legislature charged us to do was to indicate what actions were exempt from the act. We were trying to narrow down the acreage cutting that was subject to the act. The smaller the acreage, the less likelihood that they'd have to go through the act. We wanted to cut that loophole down as much as we could by limiting the acreage that was subject to the act as small as possible. The Department of Natural Resources always opposed us on that, and just about everything else that we proposed in the Environmental Policy Act.

Public Lands Commissioner Bert Cole and our lady governor, Dixy Lee Ray, were not the environmentalists that I'd been led to believe they were. I know Dixy Lee Ray was never an environmentalist from the things that she expressed to me. I was disappointed in Bert Cole because he took the position of the timber companies just about one hundred percent.

To give you an example of Dixy Lee Ray, I remember when she was running for governor. I think this was in the primary. The Thurston County Democrats had a meeting at which they invited her to appear to give the Democrats a pitch on what she thought about the affairs of state and so forth. After she made her talk, I wanted to give her an opportunity to direct her comments on specific things, so I asked her whether she thought that the present environmental laws that were on the books for water and air pollution, and other matters, were sufficient, or whether she thought they could be improved. Well, she thought that I was trying to trap her in some way I guess, because she berated the Shoreline Hearings Board and the Shoreline Hearings Act, Shoreline Act, and the state Environmental Policy Act. She berated those.

To give you an example as to why she was opposed to them, she said she had recently visited a mill down in Shelton where a "SEPA man," she referred to this person, whoever he was, as a "SEPA" man. Well, there's no such thing as a "SEPA man" to begin with, but she showed an appalling lack of knowledge of the statutes and the state Environmental Policy Act, which doesn't require anyone to be employed by the state at all. But, she said that the "SEPA man" came around and the only thing he could find wrong was the water fountain–

[End of Tape 8, Side 2]

Mr. Gissberg: –which was running all the time into the bay. And that he had written up a cease-and-desist order for the mill, because it was polluting the waters of the bay. It was so ridiculous that she obviously made up the story like she makes up most of her stories about the environment, which are just despicable.

But, for the most part, the state agencies that commented on our proposed rules, and as we were promulgating them, did so in good faith. Other agencies cooperated as much as possible, as much as they could, on a subject that was foreign to them.

Ms. Boswell: You said that Evans had appointed you originally, right?

Mr. Gissberg: To the Pollution Controls Hearings Board, yes.

Ms. Boswell: What was his feeling on all this?

Mr. Gissberg: He was an outstanding environmentalist. Still is. The reason I got into it was because, like a lot of things, the legislation was–let me start all over. The Washington State Environmental Council proposed an initiative regulating the shorelines, developments on shorelines for the state. It was pretty well understood by anyone who had an ounce of practical sense that the initiative was too far-reaching. It would hinder all development that was conceivable in the state. It would prevent residential development, even of single-family residences within five hundred feet of the water. Even those on a hillside or no matter what, it was just too difficult to expect the public to comply with. I didn't think the initiative had a chance.

Ms. Boswell: Was that Initiative 43?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know the number on it. So, most people in the Legislature thought that the Legislature should pass their own. The Republicans had control of the House at that time, and the House passed their own version of the Shoreline Act. Between those two acts, the initiative proposed by the Washington State Environmental Council, and the one that passed the House. The one that passed the House was too much the other way.

Ms. Boswell: When you say "too much the other way," in what areas, generally?

Mr. Gissberg: It turned loose the Department of Natural Resources, for instance, all by themselves. They wouldn't even be subject to the act. There were other features of it. It would have been an act in title only without a meaningful review of developments to be constructed near lakes, streams and waterways.

Ms. Boswell: So you thought that the House bill essentially didn't put enough restrictions on things?

Mr. Gissberg: That's correct. I took ahold of that, and the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, to whom the bill had been referred, was a very fine fellow from Concrete, Washington. He'd been chairman of the Natural Resources Committee for years, but I had always helped him. He was the kind of guy who couldn't act very well on the floor. It was difficult for him to make motions, he didn't know the rules, and he always looked to me for help. This was one of the things he asked me to do for him–take over the bill and form an ad hoc committee of which I was the chairman without being designated the chairman, I just took over. I worked it out with Dan Evans, who was then governor, the amendments to the House bill, which made it acceptable to environmentalists and industry and timber interests alike. Both of them were on the ballot that fall. The legislative version passed hands-down. But that was the closest that I ever worked with Dan in environmental matters. We agreed on the wording, and went into great detail on it.

Ms. Boswell: Was the House bill essentially put together by Republicans, the one that you amended?

Mr. Gissberg: The Republicans and industry put it together.

Ms. Boswell: In that sense then, Evans essentially veered from the party line?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes, he did. Dan has always been criticized by his own party as being more a Democrat than a Republican, anyway.

Ms. Boswell: Would you say that the Democrats, the sort of mainstream Democrats at that time, were they supportive of the initiative, or were they more supportive of your compromise?

Mr. Gissberg: They were supportive of my efforts. What we were doing. They were not supportive of the Washington Environmental Council initiative. Very few legislators were, because it was so extreme. It would never have had a chance at passage.

I know that something happened when the bill was up for consideration. I was asked a lot of questions on "voir dire" (under oath) by other senators as to what my intention was with certain amendments. They'd give me hypotheticals. I must have been answering questions for an hour or two. Consequently, most of that colloquy is in the Senate Journal. We had numerous amendments, and I talked about the amendments when they arose, when I was questioned about them. We were getting short on time and I had been on my feet for well over an hour in the Senate, but I think that's the bill I made a motion on that the rules be suspended and all the other amendments on the secretary's desk be adopted. The fellows trusted me enough that they passed that motion and, in effect, gave me a blank check in all the amendments that were still pending on the desk that I put up there. I thought that was a great tribute to the trust that I enjoyed in the Senate.

Ms. Boswell: Absolutely.

Mr. Gissberg: It was either that bill or another one. There were, literally, more than four or five amendments that were still on the desk, that they didn't even want to hear about. I said they were good amendments, and that's all it took.

Ms. Boswell: That's pretty unusual, isn't it?

Mr. Gissberg: That's the only time it ever happened when I was in the Senate. They were just sick and tired of hearing me talk.

Ms. Boswell: I don't think it's bad. It's obvious that you had great respect.

In terms of your perspective as an environmentalist, where do you think that your philosophy in terms of that came from? Would you call yourself an environmentalist? How did your views get shaped?

Mr. Gissberg: I think my views became shaped because of the fact that I loved the outdoors. I loved to go fishing in the mountain lakes at a time when there were hardly any trails leading to the lakes. I started doing that when I was a youngster. I loved fishing and I loved the rivers. There's no more beautiful thing in the world than a river. I saw what the Weyerhaeuser pulp mills were doing to the waterways in Snohomish County. They were destroying them. I did everything that I could to cure that kind of problem by strengthening the water-pollution penalties, and giving more authority by creating the Department of Ecology. I consider myself an environmentalist, yes.

But, too frequently, the environmentalists aren't practical and try to bite off too much at once. For instance, at this time in our state's history, I would think that more people call themselves anti-environmentalists, not anti-environmentalists, but they would say that they would look with scorn and ridicule upon people who call themselves environmentalists. That's a bad word. That's caused because of the lack of understanding of what an environmentalist is. It's adoption by a lot of people of the Dixy Lee Ray philosophy that there's not a problem. But there is a problem. It still needs a lot of work to be done on it.

The first bill I ever introduced on air pollution was in the '50s, when Lloyd Andrews was in the Senate. That had to be in '55, '53 or '55, my first session. I introduced the legislation which created the state Air Pollution Control Authority. The Republicans, particularly Lloyd Andrews, who had an interest in that, didn't want the state to be involved in it. He wanted the local authorities to be the ones that had the say-so in the state. He was successful in getting the bill passed which created the local pollution-control authorities. I've always felt that the state had a better handle on it all and was happy to see the Department of Ecology get the ultimate control of the local air-pollution-control authorities. For instance, the Department of Ecology could now write rules and regulations that are more stringent than the local air-pollution-control authorities. The local authorities will have to obey the rules and regulations of the state rather than their own rules. I guess that's about all I have to say on that.

Ms. Boswell: What about your constituency in terms of that kind of legislation? Were they fairly supportive, not only anti-pollution, but other environmentally oriented legislation?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't think they knew what was going on. As I say, my district was a rural, farm area. I know after the Shorelines Management Act was passed, I was called upon, as I usually was, to report to my constituency through various speeches and so on. There was a meeting of the Association of Washington Cities that occurred at Cedar Crest Golf Course, and I was called upon to talk about the Legislature, and I chose to talk about the Shorelines Management Act. I put them all to sleep, discussing in great detail every facet of the act. I never got any flack because of it, but I wanted them to know what was going to happen, that they had substantial responsibility in it. I don't think they understood it then, and I don't know if they understand it now.

Ms. Boswell: So you didn't have much organized opposition there?

Mr. Gissberg: I never had much opposition to anything that I did in my district except the "blue laws." Opening up the state to liquor by the drink on Sundays, any part of Sunday. That was about the only real opposition I ever had to anything.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about that. In Snohomish County that was not approved? How did you vote on that issue?

Mr. Gissberg: I voted the way my constituents wanted me to vote.

Ms. Boswell: Did you really?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. I think I mentioned this in another tape, but whenever the bill came in to authorize the liquor board to license cocktail lounges for the purpose of serving liquor after twelve o'clock on Saturday night, I would literally be inundated with messages and post cards within twenty-four hours. I would get, literally, hundreds and hundreds of them. Petitions. They must have had them already to go, stamped and addressed and everything else, because I'd get them right after the bill was introduced. The garden clubs, library clubs, the church groups. Man, they were all over me asking me not to vote to liberalize the liquor laws. That was really the only bill that created such a fuss in my district.

Ms. Boswell: It sounds like it was across-the-board. It wasn't just a certain religious group, or whatever.

Mr. Gissberg: It was across-the-board.

Ms. Boswell: I was thinking, though, that in terms of some of the environmental issues, that especially, say, pollution, that might affect some of the big timber companies, that it would come down to an issue of jobs versus environment. But that didn't seem to happen?

Mr. Gissberg: No. The Weyerhaeuser Company was probably the leader from the standpoint of power. As contrasted with the Boeing Company, Weyerhaeuser had a lot of power in the Legislature. But they were never able to stop the environmental statutes. Of course, the Weyerhaeuser Company was not in my district, anyway. The mills were not in my district. Some of the workers were.

But, the unions never took an anti-environmental stance, either, which they could have done, being an employee of the employer who was going to be affected by the environmental legislation. There was never any great hullabaloo about us passing the environmental legislation on the part of industry that I know of. It just wasn't that hard to get things done.

Ms. Boswell: Then. I don't know about now.

Mr. Gissberg: I think it's all together a different climate nowadays. People are very informed as to what's going on in Olympia, more than they ever were when I was there. Most of them thought I was back in Washington D.C. I'd see them on the street, and they'd say, "Bill, when did you get back from Washington?"

Ms. Boswell: What did you say?

Mr. Gissberg: I said, "Oh, the other day."

Ms. Boswell: What about labor? In terms of your attitudes toward labor, how does that affect the legislation you were involved in?

Mr. Gissberg: It didn't affect it. I voted most of the time, ninety-eight percent of the time, I voted for labor legislation. By labor legislation, I have in mind employment security and industrial insurance. I was particularly supportive of industrial-insurance increases because it was so terrible that the state could get away with such small awards in terms of lump sum settlements to injured workmen. Cutting your hand off, for instance, might be worth a thousand dollars. All those awards were in the statute. Labor's function was to try to increase those awards as years went by. I never voted against something like that.

Employment security was another matter, however. There was room for abuses in the Employment Security Act. People turning down opportunities to work so that they could continue to draw unemployment compensation. I sometimes voted against labor on employment-security issues, but very seldom.

Ms. Boswell: I was reading about one instance, I don't know if it's a minor or major instance, but where some labor-reform legislation had been proposed primarily by the Republicans, and it essentially had to do with giving labor the opportunity to sort of clean up its own act. To be able to have recourse to the courts when problems existed within the union. A bill had been introduced by the Republicans, but you joined forces with another Republican, Harry Elway, and "aced" them out by introducing other legislation first which was somewhat broader?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't have any recollection of what kind of issue you're talking about, but if it was labor

legislation, Harry Elway was a great labor supporter. He was one of the few Republicans that supported labor on a consistent basis. If I introduced such legislation, it was for Harry, knowing that he would be for the labor side of the issue. I can't imagine a Republican, in those days, introducing legislation which was pro-labor. Reform would be a misnomer.

Ms. Boswell: That's sort of my impression from this. Their notion of reform is that every union had to file who their officers were, and what they were doing. They had to give an annual accounting of all the things that were going on. So, rather than truly reform from labor's perspective, it was probably more of a watchdog of what labor was doing. Did you find that happened fairly frequently with labor legislation? That there would be these bills that were sort of couched in labor reform which were, in reality, sort of anti-labor measures?

Mr. Gissberg: No. I never saw that much legislation introduced by the Republicans. They used to introduce the Republican version of employment-security and industrial-insurance bills, too. They introduced their own legislation and the Democrats would introduce the legislation desired and worked for by the labor lobby. I don't think the Republicans ever got any of those bills passed. Their bills.

Ms. Boswell: What about the labor lobby? Generally speaking, were you supportive of most of what they had to argue for?

Mr. Gissberg: I would say so. I think I mentioned employment security and industrial insurance. On one occasion I drifted away from them on employment security because of the abuses I thought were inherent in the statutes.

Ms. Boswell: What about collective bargaining?

Mr. Gissberg: I was a strong supporter of collective bargaining. I was not in favor of the right to strike on the part of state employees. Nor was I in favor of the right to strike on the part of teachers. But I wanted to give collective-bargaining rights to both those groups.

Ms. Boswell: Is one effective without the other? If you don't have the right to strike, doesn't that ultimately cut off your best negotiating tool in terms of collective bargaining?

Mr. Gissberg: That was the argument that was put forth. No doubt about that, but I always felt that certain activities of the employees for some employers were so vested in the public interest that it overrode the interest of the individual and the individual's organization. So, the interest of the state and the public became greater and stronger than otherwise would be the case. So, in order to enjoy collective bargaining, which was certainly a necessity as far as labor is concerned, or employees are concerned, and certain types of employment, you had to give up the right to strike. I've just enunciated what my test would be.

Ms. Boswell: Which would be what?

Mr. Gissberg: To look at the type of employment that was involved.

Ms. Boswell: Are you just saying public service?

Mr. Gissberg: Police, firemen, public safety, teaching. Those are the main ones.

Ms. Boswell: Is that a position main-line Democrats would generally support?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't really recall whether that was an issue. I don't know if that was an issue or not. I just don't remember.

Ms. Boswell: What about some of the labor leaders of that era? Did you have much contact with them?

Mr. Gissberg: The labor leader that I called a labor leader was Ed Weston and Joe Davis. After Ed Weston retired, Joe Davis took over. They were the heads of the United Labor Lobby. I didn't have too much to do personally with them.

Ms. Boswell: In terms of interaction of labor with the Legislature, at least on the state level, the lobbies were really the representatives of labor.

Mr. Gissberg: Yes.

Ms. Boswell: In another context, where I've been interviewing, names come up like Dave Beck, for example. In the Legislature, the actual leadership of unions didn't really interact much with the Legislature at that time?

Mr. Gissberg: You mean the president of the locals and that sort of thing?

Ms. Boswell: Yes.

Mr. Gissberg: No. There was never any reaching down into the rank and file of the union members at all. It was all through the designated lobbyist. Dave Beck was all through by the time I got there, anyway. He was no longer president of the Teamsters Union. Smith Troy was their lobbyist. Smith Troy was the former attorney general. He was defeated for attorney general and he went back to private practice here in Olympia and represented the Teamsters Union.

[End of Tape 9, Side 1]

REDISTRICTING: EARLY 1960s

Mr. Gissberg: About the time Joe Davis was head lobbyist for the United Labor Lobby and I was a newcomer to the Senate, he asked me to go on as a sponsor to one of the important labor bills, which I did. It got stuck in the Rules Committee and couldn't come out, so he asked me to move that the Rules Committee be relieved of further consideration of the bill, and it be placed on the second reading calendar. I knew that the Senate Rules provided for that, so I did it. You'd think I'd fired a cannon in the Senate, because the chandeliers just shook when Senator Vic Zednick, who had a booming voice, called me a "whippersnapper." He said that it was against the tradition of the Senate for such a thing to be done–"It's never been done before, and this is no time to start now!" He put me in my place, and, in effect, told me that I was supposed to be there to listen and not talk.

Ms. Boswell: Had Joe Davis set you up, or did he not expect that to happen?

Mr. Gissberg: No, he wanted to test votes. It did get some votes to take it away, all right. He was just making an issue that he would be able to use in the campaigns against the Republicans who had voted against the motion. I'm sure that's what motivated him.

Ms. Boswell: Had most of the labor lobbyists been rank-and-file members at one time, or not?

Mr. Gissberg: I have no idea. I haven't the slightest idea.

Ms. Boswell: Let me ask you about a whole different area of issues. And that is redistricting. I know that redistricting was a big issue at various times during your career, although I suppose, most particularly, in the early-to-mid-sixties. Tell me a little bit about the whole redistricting issue.

Mr. Gissberg: As far as the Senate was concerned, Bob Greive was the leader on redistricting matters. He did an outstanding job on it, in my opinion. I came from a rural district, as I said, and I believed in the federal system, i.e., that in the federal system, as everybody knows, the US Senate is given two senators, each state is given two US senators, regardless of population. And I felt that the federal system could be imposed upon our state government as well as the federal government. So, it was always a struggle to get any kind of redistricting legislation passed. As a matter of fact, we hadn't done so for twenty years, although the state constitution requires it to be done every ten years after the federal census was taken. It was always a struggle, a bitter struggle, not only between the Republicans and Democrats, because whoever won was going to control the Legislature, it was also a struggle among the Democrats themselves, as to who was to get what portion of the new territory depending upon whether it was Democratically oriented or Republican oriented. It could effect or create a victory, whichever way the bill went.

We had a federal district court judge by the name of Beeks who was reputedly Scoop Jackson's campaign treasurer. Jackson had him appointed to the federal district court. Beeks, at the request of the League of Women Voters, issued an order prohibiting the Legislature from passing any legislation, except an appropriation bill, until the redistricting was accomplished. He also entered an order saying that when the redistricting bill passed, that the newly elected senators would only serve one year. I guess that included all the senators, because everybody would have to be up for election again. I don't remember just exactly how that worked, but that was his order in any event, that certain of the members of the Senate, when elected, would only serve one year.

That incensed me, so I wrote Beeks a letter, and pointed out that I was sworn to uphold the Constitution of the State of Washington and that the state provided for four-year terms for senators, state senators. I said I agreed with everything else that he ruled upon, but I was going to disregard his order, and urge my fellow senators to do likewise, which I did. I wrote to all the senators and the governor and, needless to say, I wasn't in good grace with Beeks.

He wrote me back a letter and said, "Sir. You are in contempt of this court, and I shall take it up with my colleagues and see what your punishment shall be." I got ahold of Scoop Jackson, who was my friend, and the judge never punished me. I don't know whether Scoop did anything or not, but I presume that he did. I was never held in contempt of the federal court.

Ms. Boswell: It was a threat, but nothing ever materialized?

Mr. Gissberg: No. Probably because we passed legislation that met the federal test of one man, one vote.

Greive would use that as a lever to reward his friends and punish his enemies. Probably "enemies" is the wrong term to use. I don't think it was ever that strong, but those that disagreed with Greive.

Ms. Boswell: You mean he'd use redistricting–

Mr. Gissberg: As a weapon. To punish or reward his friends and those who opposed him.

Ms. Boswell: Did you see that as appropriate?

Mr. Gissberg: I didn't butt into it. I just looked to see what my district looked like. That's what everybody did when the redistricting bill came out. They looked to see what precincts you inherited or subtracted, and you'd know what precincts were liable to hurt you or help you, so it was every man for himself. So, those who were hurt were mostly people who hadn't supported Greive for one reason or another.

Ms. Boswell: Where did you fall, then, having run against him for the majority leader?

Mr. Gissberg: I had a secret ballot then, and I still have a secret ballot.

Ms. Boswell: If you were the other candidate, it would appear that–

Mr. Gissberg: I was the other candidate, but that was just on one occasion. Sometimes I voted for him and sometimes I voted against him.

Ms. Boswell: So you were never on his "hit list" to get rid of, then?

Mr. Gissberg: Well, I wouldn't say that. Not to the extent that some others were. In the later stages, I told him I didn't have any desire to run for his office, and spent some more time on issues rather than running for office.

Bob was never an enemy of mine, as such. He was a good Democrat, and he did what he thought he should do. My trouble with Bob was that he didn't engage in substantive issues very much. He did not do that because, I presume, I can't speak for him, but I presume he didn't do that because he was afraid he was going to offend one group or the other, and he might lose. So he just engaged in procedural activity like he was always– whenever I think of Bob Greive on the floor of the Senate, the lieutenant governor pounds the gavel, the Senate will come to order, and Bob would come running from his office, after everybody else was in there, he'd be on the phone or busy with somebody. He'd come running, literally running, onto the Senate floor to his desk, so that he could make a motion: "I move that the reading of the Journal of the previous day's business be dispensed with, and the Journal stand approved." He would never miss that motion, because that was symbolic of his being majority leader. I think he thought more of making that motion than he did of any other motion.

Ms. Boswell: That's a great story. Going back to redistricting for a minute, you said it was the League of Women Voters that really prompted Judge Beeks.

Mr. Gissberg: I don't think they prompted Judge Beeks to do that, but the League of Women Voters were in the forefront, and pushing for a redistricting bill. The first redistricting bill. That was one of their projects that they wanted done, because the rural areas were overrepresented in the Legislature as contrasted with the urban areas, contrary to the provisions of what the US Supreme Court had already ruled in its only redistricting case, where it enunciated the state rule of one man, one vote. That trees and farms were not entitled to be represented, only people.

Ms. Boswell: How had that imbalance come about?

Mr. Gissberg: Because it's so difficult for a legislative body to draw lines for its own members, because of the inherent conflict between members and parties. It was very difficult to get done, so, consequently, it wasn't done, although the mandate of the state constitution provided that it had to be. So the League of Women Voters took that as one of their issues that had to be done, to pass redistricting. They did it.

Ms. Boswell: I'm curious about something that's not directly related to this, but if a particular constituency wants something done, whether it's the League of Women Voters or the conservation league, or whomever, and let's say that they get enough support to develop an initiative, or for that matter a referendum, how does that whole system, initiative and referendum, impact the legislative process in your mind?

Mr. Gissberg: It initiates a legislative response toward the subject matter that is spoken of in the initiative or the referendum. The Shorelines Management Act is a good example. The environmentalists had an initiative started for a shorelines-management act, and that

stimulated the interest in the Legislature in providing action on that subject. The same way with redistricting. So I think that there are undoubtedly other issues that I could come up with, if I thought about it. But that's a result of an initiative or referendum that forces, doesn't force them legally, but it forces the Legislature to act for political reasons.

Ms. Boswell: Did legislators generally see them as positive, or as nuisances, or what was the perception?

Mr. Gissberg: It depends on the issue. I don't think you can–

Ms. Boswell: Can't generalize.

Mr. Gissberg: Generalize on something like that.

Ms. Boswell: It just seems like in some years there would be a number of initiatives. There might be ten or more, and it would seem to me that it would require, whether they were passed or not, so much attention from the Legislature that it might deflect attention from other important issues.

Mr. Gissberg: I never found it that way. Washington is one of the few states that originally adopted the initiative and referendum process, and Washington was always known as a populist state, although, logically you would think, that in view of my answer, there would be a lot more controversy about initiatives and referendums. I don't think there was. Sometimes it was used for political purposes, too. The referendum was.

The Legislature would pass a bill and put a referendum on it, referring it to the people before it could take effect. If the Democrats, for instance, got ahold of a subject matter that they wanted passed, and there was a good political move to do so, in their judgment, if it was something that would be supported by the people, but would be opposed by the Republicans, sometimes the Democrats would put a referendum on that legislation to refer it to the people. It put the Republicans on the spot. That they voted against it, and how were they going to support it or oppose it during the election. That was always a threat. We did it in the shorelines act, we referred that to the people.

Ms. Boswell: Wasn't there, if my memory serves me correctly, a tremendous amount of confusion over the shorelines act? Didn't they have two different ones that they could–

Mr. Gissberg: I thought I tried to explain that. I probably didn't do a good enough job.

Ms. Boswell: I understand. So, when it came down to a ballot, they had both the original initiative and then the–

Mr. Gissberg: Alternative.

Ms. Boswell: Alternative. Wasn't there a third, too, or something, where you could vote for either/or, or both, or something like that?

Mr. Gissberg: You could vote for either one, or both.

Ms. Boswell: I guess that's what I was thinking of. When you get into that kind of a situation, as you did in the Shorelines Management Act, did your job become a lot of public relations trying to explain, beyond the Legislature, to people, the differences? Did you end up having to go out and constantly explain the differences between–

Mr. Gissberg: I never had to get out of my district. I wouldn't go out of my district. I was too busy practicing law. I was too jealous of my time and making a living. I never had any ambition for higher public office, although now I regret that I didn't do it. I should have run for the state Supreme Court, or got an appointment to the state Supreme Court, or trial judge. I regret that I didn't do that, now.

Ms. Boswell: Why?

Mr. Gissberg: Just looking back. I think it's a hollow spot in my legal career that I could have filled very easily if I'd wanted to. I think I could have been appointed by any governor. I know I would have had the support of the Bar Association in Snohomish County. I was responsible for the appointment of two of my partners as judges. I suppose if I'd wanted to get appointed myself, I could have.

Ms. Boswell: But at the time, why didn't you seek that?

Mr. Gissberg: I thought I wouldn't like to hear domestic cases, for one. I thought they were a pain, and I hated them. As a lawyer I hated them, but I used to try a lot of them. I never faced the question of capital punishment. I still haven't, to this day, faced it. I've never had to vote on capital punishment.

Ms. Boswell: What more could you have accomplished as a judge, do you think?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't think I could have accomplished anything. Except as self-gratification as going to the top of my profession. I think the top of the legal profession is being a judge.

Ms. Boswell: In terms of these other activities like the Pollution Control Hearings Board or working on the Shorelines Management Act, you saw that as something you were willing to devote time to but only up to a point?

Mr. Gissberg: No. I was full time on those.

Ms. Boswell: That's what I thought.

Mr. Gissberg: That was full time. In 1972, let's see, I'm trying to think when my partner died. I was tired of the Legislature; the sessions became so long and burdensome, and my partners became disenchanted with my being gone, and not really putting in my share of the financial burden that it caused, that I had to give up the Legislature.

The fact that we had passed a pension bill that rewarded state legislators by increasing their formula on their pension by entering state or government service was certainly a factor, too, as to why I went into state government. But, I never sought anything like that and it came as a surprise to me when Jim Dolliver called me on the phone in my office and told me the governor wanted to appoint me as a member of the Pollution Control Hearings Board. That came as a surprise to me, and after I thought it over and conferred with my wife, I thought I'd like to do that so I could someday retire and go fishing. I wanted to go fishing. Not have to go to the law office every day for the rest of my life. I think those were the two factors that entered into my decision to quit the Legislature and to accept a state appointment. I know the increased pension certainly was a factor. I had a lot to do with passage of that legislation, too.

Ms. Boswell: I think in some of the newspaper articles you also said that you didn't think that legislators were adequately compensated.

Mr. Gissberg: I know they weren't. I said they weren't. The same way judges weren't adequately compensated either. But to get one hundred dollars a month that was increased to three hundred dollars a month, that was ridiculous. That's the maximum I ever earned was three hundred dollars a month. It's a disgrace to treat public officials in that fashion. We treated ourselves that way, but anytime we'd pass a bill increasing the salary, it would be immediately subject to initiative, and be voted down. So, financial consideration was one of the reasons I had to quit the Legislature, too. I either had to stay with my law firm or get out of my law firm. And I couldn't get out of it. Getting paid three hundred dollars a month, I couldn't support anybody on that. When I announced my retirement, one of the things that I said was that if the Legislature was going to get decent, competent people to serve, they were going to have to pay more money for their services.

Same way with judges. It was easier to get a lawyer to take on the bench than not, because most lawyers feel as I do, that that's the top of their legal career, to be a judge. Even if they have to make financial sacrifices to do so, they usually do.

Ms. Boswell: Shouldn't it be the same way with the Legislature?

Mr. Gissberg: Oh sure. It was. It was for me for twenty years. The Legislature was good to me, too. Everybody in the county knew I was a lawyer, then. That helped.

Ms. Boswell: Did things change for you, though, in the Legislature that may have prompted your decision? I don't know, I think it was the first interview that we did, you made a comment that you really enjoyed the first ten years of being in the Legislature. It sort of indicated to me that maybe you didn't enjoy the second ten years as much.

Mr. Gissberg: Actually, it got to be the same problems expressed over and over again. I got so I lost my enthusiasm and the awe of being a legislator. The chambers diminished, and there was no longer the excitement, and I lost my enthusiasm for it, in other words.

Ms. Boswell: You learned the ropes, so you certainly introduced more legislation and did more things in the second ten years.

Mr. Gissberg: Sure I did, but, nonetheless, that was my feeling that I needed a fresh face. I was becoming cynical about the whole process. I think that's true about anything. You stay in too long and you become disenchanted with what you're doing, and to some extent, cynical about it.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think there's been a change in the climate of the Legislature, itself, and the people who were there that lent itself to this sort of cynicism?

Mr. Gissberg: Not as far as the individual members are concerned. The membership is such that it never made me change my attitude. But the attitude of the public, my perceived attitude of the public, certainly had a bearing on it at the time. We were rascals. As Bob Bailey said in that letter, when he was talking to us here in that first visit, he felt like he'd been away visiting a house of prostitution, instead of being a servant of the people. The attitude of the public, generally, is to be critical and disappointed with their legislators. It's the same attitude that lawyers, quote, enjoy, unquote, on behalf of the public. I know why lawyers "enjoy" that reputation. Maybe it's because every litigant is represented by a lawyer and so, whatever the judge decides, in favor of one person and against the other, half the litigants hate their lawyer or the judge.

[End of Tape 9, Side 2]

Mr. Gissberg: It's hard to get the public to understand that. I think it's the same way with legislation. We're a partisan system, Republicans and Democrats alike. You very seldom hear of a Republican praising a Democrat or vice versa. It's always the critical part that you jump on.

Bob Dole has changed his attitude now about intervening in foreign affairs because we're down in Haiti. His experience with Bush. Bush didn't hesitate to help with troops and everything else to foreign countries when democracy was in danger. But, now, Dole, because the Democrats are in power, criticizes Clinton for doing that. This constant harping and the press picking it up and joining in the criticism weakens our government. I'm not saying that the government is perfect and shouldn't be subject to criticism, but there's a line there that should be watched closely.

Ms. Boswell: What about this notion of partisanship? Certainly there's a lot of it on a national level, and you just gave a good example. Did you really see it strongly in the Legislature, too? A really strong partisanship that sometimes defied reason?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. It used to be prevalent on certain issues. On the budget, for instance, there was always a fight over the amount of the budget, regardless of merit. I have a feeling that even though a fellow agreed that the budget was proper, that he'd vote against it just because the other side was for it. Or vice versa. The same way with labor.

The big difference between the Republicans and Democrats on the state level was labor legislation, in my view. The Republicans were always opposed to labor legislation, with certain exceptions, like Harry Elway. The Democrats were always in favor of labor legislation. In ninety percent of the matters that came before them, there was no difference between a Republican and Democrat at all. I was probably involved in that type of issue more than anything else.

After I read this book of letters, I got more rewards, after reading those carefully, which I had never really done. But I enjoyed the respect of my fellow legislators because they agreed with what I was doing with the issues that I spoke out on, which weren't earthshaking issues by any means. Just the practical workings of government. There was no partisanship displayed on many of those matters. It was a question of appeal to reason. It was like a debate on who's right and who's wrong. But, as I look back on those letters, it's rewarding to me now. I was surprised that people said what they did about me. I probably didn't deserve it.

Ms. Boswell: No, that's not the case. I wonder, is it difficult, based on the reprobation of your fellow party members, to cross over and be nonpartisan? Was pressure put on you to follow a party line more closely, or not?

Mr. Gissberg: Most of the issues I'm talking about that I was engaged in didn't have a party line. Most of them didn't have a party-line division. But, certainly, some of the major issues that were in the platform, the Democratic platform, were capable of being denominated as political issues. If you strayed too far from that document, you were not a good Democrat or a good Republican. You wouldn't want to be a traitor to your own kind.

Ms. Boswell: What about in sponsoring bills? Was it unusual to join with, in your case, a Republican, to sponsor a bill, or not?

Mr. Gissberg: It was never unusual for anybody at that time. As a matter of fact, if you wanted to get a bill passed, you always tried to get a Republican on it who had some influence, or was at least respected, who wasn't just a drone, who could help you get it passed. That was always the case. Although, at the last, I would just introduce bills myself, which was unusual, because the custom was to get a Republican and a Democrat or two on the same bill. At the last, I was introducing a lot of legislation with just my own name on it.

Ms. Boswell: Why did you change? Was that a change, and why did you do it that way?

Mr. Gissberg: I'm trying to articulate an answer. I suppose I felt that when I did that, it was my own legislation I dreamed up, rather than some interest group that dreamed it up. I was responsible for it and I was proud of what I was introducing. As contrasted with an interest group. When they introduced legislation, they'd come to me and they'd say, "Would you act as sponsor?" I'd look a bill over, and I'd say, "Yes." I'd sign it and they'd take it, and the next thing I knew, there'd be four or five other people on it, too. The matters that were introduced by interest groups usually had several names on them. The most I ever had on legislation that I'd have drafted myself was one or two fellows.

Ms. Boswell: Were there certain people that you were more likely to work with, generally, than others? Were there some that you would automatically go to first, or did it vary from issue to issue?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't think I went to individuals as such. But, I know I'd be a darn fool if I had a bill assigned in the Judiciary Committee that I didn't ask Marsh Neill to go on with me. He was a wonderful man (a Republican from eastern Washington), who was highly respected in the Senate, and whose opinion I valued. There were others on various committees. There were good legislators, and there were bad legislators, and I always tried to pick a good one to go on a bill with me.

Ms. Boswell: I noticed, just going through a list of some of the bills that you sponsored, or cosponsored, that it seemed like certain names kept coming up on a fair number of them. Bargreen, Rasmussen. There were a lot with Thompson.

Mr. Gissberg: I don't remember a single bill that I introduced with Bargreen on it. Not as a lead sponsor, anyway. I don't remember anything I did with Slim Rasmussen, either.

Ms. Boswell: There were quite a few listed in here, but, again, it doesn't necessarily clarify that you had initiated them, or whether they had them and got you. It works both ways. Obviously, other people are planning legislation and they want you to be on theirs in order to lend your credibility to them. The lists I have don't differentiate between who started them and who didn't.

Mr. Gissberg: I can't remember well enough to help you establish a pattern to it.

Ms. Boswell: I'm curious about the whole process of developing a bill. You have an idea for a bill, can you generalize about the process you'd go through in order to get that bill through?

Mr. Gissberg: The interest in the bill usually originated with people on the local level. County officials, judges. The bills that I appeared on by myself were initiated in that fashion. The vast majority of legislation that I introduced was at the request of somebody. Either a fellow legislator or a lobbyist. A representative of one of the state agencies would come around with a bill and ask you to sponsor it. You'd look at it to see whether it was a decent piece of legislation to introduce. I would try to make a judgment as to the chance of it passing, and whether it was in the public interest to do so. And what effect it might have on you personally, from the political standpoint. I suppose those are the parameters of what you look into.

Ms. Boswell: Once you made that determination that you wanted to go ahead, what would you do?

Mr. Gissberg: I'd have the bill-drafter draft the legislation. I'd introduce the legislation. I don't know what you're trying to get at.

Ms. Boswell: I just meant the process of going around to get other people to support it. Or, the decision making, in terms of who else do I want on this bill? How am I going to approach it so that I can get it passed?

Mr. Gissberg: Where you put your name on the legislation was not very precise. I could take a bill and walk up and down the aisle and get ten people to sign it just by asking them to sign it. They wouldn't even read it. I'd tell them what was in there and what it was generally, and they'd sign it. That occurred most of the time.

After I introduced a bill, I would see to it that it got to the right committee. If there was a doubt as to where it was going, I would go to the secretary of the Senate, or the lieutenant governor, and ask that it be sent to a certain committee. Privately, I would make that request. Usually, I would speak to the committee chairman before I did that to make sure that he was not opposed to it after he got it. I neutralized him at least. Thinking about the subject matter to get a commitment that he would give it a fair hearing and give it a chance to get out of committee, which I could usually get done. I usually could get it to the committee I wanted it to go to, and have the committee chairman move it along.

In the Rules Committee, I'd take care of it myself. The procedure in the Rules Committee was that each member had a turn to suggest a bill for a vote of the committee. That's one of the reasons I stayed on the Rules Committee. I was on the Rules Committee, and stayed on it. The Rules Committee had so much power in those days, the secret ballot, and all. Then, after I got it out of the Rules Committee, I just relied on the good will of the legislators to get it passed.

Ms. Boswell: Somebody that I interviewed told me once that they thought that sometimes it was better not to be a sponsor of a bill that you really wanted in order to be able to speak up more vocally for that bill, and to be taken seriously. If it was your own bill, everybody figured you'd be arguing for it, but if there was something you really wanted that maybe you'd be better off to not actually be a cosponsor and, therefore, be able to speak up more loudly about the bill. What do you think of that?

Mr. Gissberg: I think that's not true, but I think the reverse of it is true. That if you want to kill legislation, you sign on the bill and then get up on the floor and say that you were "hoodwinked." That you thought it was good legislation when you signed on, but you've now learned it was terrible. That was certain death to a bill.

Ms. Boswell: Did that happen very frequently?

Mr. Gissberg: No. But that's what the feeling was.

Ms. Boswell: Did you ever have that happen to you with a bill?

Mr. Gissberg: No. If I had, it would have been "deader than a doornail." The reverse of what the legislator told you is more true than the actual way he put it. Matter of fact, if you were afraid to get on a bill because you thought it was going to be heard of, you can't be much of a legislator and have much confidence in your ability to persuade people in how to be supportive. Matter of fact, you shouldn't be supportive, if that's the case.

Ms. Boswell: It seems to me it's not a very good reflection on an individual though, if you sign on a bill, and then come back later and say that I made a mistake, this isn't what I thought it was. It must mean that you hadn't read it very carefully in the first place, right?

Mr. Gissberg: That's right. You're asking what the best thing to do to get something passed or killed. That's the surest way of killing it.

Ms. Boswell: I can see that.

[End of Tape 10, Side 1]

[Tape 10, Side 2, Blank]

8

PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE: 1965

Ms. Boswell: There are some areas that I would like to cover that we haven't in the past. They are not necessarily in chronological order, but let me get started. They are more issue-oriented, I think.

You were president pro tem of the Senate in 1965, and I wanted you to talk a little bit about that. How you came to that position, and what it was like.

Mr. Gissberg: I came to the position because I was nominated in by a majority of the Democratic members and subsequently the entire membership of the Senate.

Ms. Boswell: Is that a position that you seek? How did you become interested in doing that?

Mr. Gissberg: Because I ran for majority leader and didn't make it. The next best thing to do is to take the second choice, which is president pro tem of the Senate, which is typically an honorary position. It doesn't really have much more to it than the compliments given by the other members. Compliment in the sense that it's an honor to preside over the Senate, and, at the time that I was elected, John Cherberg, the lieutenant governor, had left the state for three or four weeks. He took a trip to Europe for some reason or another during session, and I was called upon to preside during all the time he was gone. It was certainly an enjoyable experience as far as I was concerned.

Ms. Boswell: Why? What made it enjoyable?

Mr. Gissberg: The mere fact that you're presiding over the most important group of men and women in the state. Making all kinds of decisions on parliamentary rules, which gave me a feeling of satisfaction of knowing all the rules and not having to ask the secretary of the Senate how to rule, and what the rules were. I always prided myself on knowing Reed's Rules on Parliamentary Procedure and the standing rules of the Senate. It gave one a sense of power as well, which is a flattering position to be in. Asked to rule in matters that were of substantial importance, one way or another. Your ruling could affect the course of the legislation, whether it would pass or not pass. Also, you presided over the Rules Committee, which was a very enjoyable experience, as well.

Ms. Boswell: How long were you in that position?

Mr. Gissberg: Just two years, then I gave it up.

Ms. Boswell: Why was that?

Mr. Gissberg: Because Senator Al Henry from White Salmon had a great desire to be president pro tem, and I didn't think the position should be held by one person for any lengthy period of time. It should be spread around to other members of the Senate. So, I bowed out when Al came to me and told me that he wanted to run for president pro tem. I said, "Go ahead. I won't stand in your way." So Al was president pro tem. He made a big deal out of it. He got himself a big office built next to the Senate floor, and exaggerated the importance of the position. The physical surroundings that he made himself and he had a secretary. But, Al didn't give it up after two years, as he said he was going to do. He kept it for two or three sessions.

Ms. Boswell: During the time that you were president pro tem, were there any unusual situations that you found yourself in?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't remember any particular issue, as such, in terms of the legislation or the subject matter of the legislation that we were considering.

Ms. Boswell: Was there anything that you were called on to rule that was a hugely decisive vote?

Mr. Gissberg: There was always parliamentary debate, but I don't remember the specifics on them. Points of order were raised frequently that I had to rule upon. I don't recall the specifics of any of them.

Ms. Boswell: I have some questions about specific issues. There's one that's always been hotly debated. What about the state income tax? What has your position been on that through the years?

Mr. Gissberg: I have always supported an income tax. In my early days I always preceded the term "income tax" by "graduated net income tax," feeling that was the fairest tax. Based on the ability to pay. Notwithstanding the fact that our state Supreme Court had held it to be unconstitutional.

Certainly, the sales tax was never a fair tax, and still isn't. It's very regressive. It strikes lower-income persons much more severely than any other segment of our society. I recall one session, when Dan Evans was governor, he was supporting a flat income tax. I think it was something like a seven-percent tax with a lid on the sales tax and the B&O tax. For some reason our leadership wasn't taking the strong position that I thought they should take, so I jumped into the fray and took up the fight for the tax. As I recall, we passed it that session and submitted it to the people, but it was voted down. I'm still for a net-income tax. I doubt that we'll ever get it.

Ms. Boswell: Why?

Mr. Gissberg: Because of the propaganda that's put out against the state exercising its fundamental responsibility of taxing people in a fair way. Large business interests are always against the income tax. It's very easy for them to propagandize and convince the public, no matter what the income of the individual might be, that it's a terrible thing to do to tax income. The blue-collar worker gets sucked in on the propaganda. It defeats the ability to get the votes to put it on the ballot consistently.

Ms. Boswell: We are one of how many states that don't have a state income tax? Two or three? There aren't many other states that don't.

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know what the statistics are now.

Ms. Boswell: Do you see that as being sort of a peculiarly Washington kind of politics? We talked earlier in other interviews about the sort of populism, or the supposed populism, of Washington. Is that part of it? This anti-income-tax sense?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes, I presume it is, because it's been voted down by the people on at least two occasions that I know of.

Ms. Boswell: In the year that Evans proposed the flat tax, wasn't there some Democratic support for that measure, too?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes, there was. That's one of the things I meant when I was talking about it. Many of the Democrats didn't vote for it, and I jumped into the debate and tried to drag some Democrats with me, but some of the Democrats were probably opposing it for political purposes. That's the trouble with trying to get an income tax passed: Politics rears its ugly head. I know that I can recall making a speech on the Senate floor congratulating the Republicans for voting for the tax. I said that I congratulated the Republican members of the Senate who voted for it, even though they were dragged screaming and hollering into the twentieth century. I remember Shelby Scates came up after the Senate recessed and congratulated me on the effort that I'd put forth. I don't remember very many of those kinds of incidents happening, but I do remember that. Shelby Scates was the political writer for the *Seattle P-I.*

Ms. Boswell: When you say you don't remember instances like that, do you mean you don't remember compliments from the press about speeches, or from him particularly?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't remember specific incidents like that at all. But that stands out in my mind. I can remember it just like it was yesterday. He came up to my desk and put down his pencil and congratulated me. Probably because I said that the Republicans were dragged screaming and hollering into the twentieth century.

Ms. Boswell: How did you regard him as a reporter or commentator?

Mr. Gissberg: A commentator is the correct description of how he handled himself. I thought that he criticized the Legislature too frequently. However, he was a nice man, still is a nice man. He was along the lines of Mike Layton on some issues. Mike Layton, I thought, was a poor excuse for a newsman.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me more about Mike Layton. I don't know that much about him.

Mr. Gissberg: He would assume too much. He would assume that he could label a legislator by the tenor of the legislator's vote on a single subject matter. He knew how to get a guy riled up, I'll tell you that. I know that after I left the Legislature, he and Dan Evans, and four or five other people, Joe Brennan, I think, was one of them, there were about ten of them, got together and they were going to write a book about the Legislature. Each of them was writing on a certain subject matter in their field of, quote, expertise.

And somebody showed me the proofs of the chapter of the book Mike Layton wrote about me. It was a terrible, scathing, attack on–at least I took it as such–a scathing attack on my integrity as environmental matters were concerned. I couldn't take that lying down, so I wrote him a letter and pointed out the error

of his assumptions on a factual basis. I sent a copy of the letter to all the other members of the group that were engaged in making contributions to this book, and told them that he now had the facts as they occurred, and, if he persisted, that it would constitute malice, which is libel in this state. Actual malice involved in a statement of libel is actionable. I sent a copy of that letter to all the other members of the group, and I never heard anything more about the book or anything else. If it's ever been published, I don't know.

Ms. Boswell: I'm not familiar with it if it has. I'll look into it, but I don't know that it ever was. That was in the '70s?

Mr. Gissberg: Late '70s I presume.

Ms. Boswell: Let me look into that. I'm not familiar with it.

Mr. Gissberg: After I left the Legislature. Shelby Scates never did anything like that. I recall Layton used to write for the *Daily Olympian*. The *Daily Olympian* was notorious in those days for criticizing the Legislature about their per diem, raising it from five to twenty-five dollars a day, and whatever else they could smear the Legislature members with. Layton used to write those yellow-dog articles. But, that was unusual for members of the press to act like that.

The only other time that I know of where a legislator and a reporter got into it was before I was in the Senate. There was a very famous incident that occurred. Bob Cummings, who used to have a little *Olympia Report* newspaper that he'd sell on private subscription to people who were interested in the political process, was a very astute guy. Everyone who had anything to do with the political process subscribed to his little news report. He was asking Rosellini about something having to do with liquor licenses, and Rosellini "decked" him on the spot.

Ms. Boswell: Why?

Mr. Gissberg: Because he was accusing Rosellini of dishonest activity. Rosellini didn't give him a chance, he just hauled off and knocked him down. They later were good friends. It just goes to show you what a tough hide you have to have sometimes to be a legislator, or to be a reporter for that matter.

The man with the toughest hide that I know of in the Legislature was a fellow named Slim Rasmussen. Slim was an outstanding senator. He could take a blow and return it without even flinching. You could call him every name in the book, and he'd just lower his head like a bulldog and charge. Slim was a good legislator, even if he did give the legislators themselves, and what they were trying to do sometimes, holy hell.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think that that brand of politics, essentially the name-calling, was it more prevalent or less prevalent than it is today?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know about that. It's not a productive way of proceeding to get things passed. I know that. It creates internal dissension and dislikes and hatred sometimes, among the members. But, you have to have a few people like that, to keep the place operating on a positive scale. It's sort of like having a watchdog in your own house.

Ms. Boswell: So, you mean beyond the press acting in that way, you really need an internal check. Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Gissberg: Yeah, I think you do by the nature of the process. I think every legislature has that because it's prompted and promoted by the ones who want to be that way because of the outstanding press they get when they attack the system, itself, or how the system is working or isn't working. The fellow who does that certainly makes himself unpopular with his fellow members, but he does the public a service by exposing facts that could lead to worse than that if they were unchecked.

Ms. Boswell: Is there a danger, or, from your knowledge, did it happen that many reporters covering the Legislature got sort of filtered information? It seems to me that, ultimately, their information comes from the legislators. It seems to me that there are certainly ways where a guy could give them advance information or not, that you could really alter the course of some piece of legislation. Is that sort of manipulation of the press used very often?

Mr. Gissberg: I give the press better grades than that. They certainly weren't dummies, aren't dummies. It doesn't take long for a reporter to ascertain who is seeking self-aggrandizement and who is not. Who's sincere, and who's insincere, and who's a phony, and who's a realist.

I was complimented once by Jack Fisher, who was a reporter for the *Spokesman-Review* in Spokane. He wrote that when I got up to talk, he would listen, as contrasted with certain other members who got up to talk, he'd put his pencil down. When I got up to talk, he'd come to attention because he figured I always had something pertinent to say, and important to say, which

is a great compliment to me. I don't know if I deserved it or not, but that's what he said. So I didn't try to disabuse him like I tried to disabuse Mike Layton and his thoughts.

Ms. Boswell: Were there certain people in the Legislature that when they stood up you did the same? Generally speaking, they were more hot air than they were substance? Were there certain people that were sort of notorious for that?

Mr. Gissberg: Well, I wouldn't mention their names. Matter of fact, one fellow had a reputation of that very thing. When he got up to speak, it was mostly hot air. He later on became a state Supreme Court justice and ran for a lot of political offices, but his brethren in the Senate had him pegged. But he had the hide of a rhinoceros, too. No matter what kind of a beating he might take on the Senate floor, he would come back with more hot air. But that was an unusual circumstance, by no means did the majority of the members act in that fashion. They were responsible, hard-working legislators trying to do what was the right thing to do.

Ms. Boswell: What about the other instances? Were there people in the press who were pegged as being mouthpieces for certain legislators, or certain positions?

Mr. Gissberg: No, I don't think I can say that.

Ms. Boswell: Were there some that didn't really do their homework?

Mr. Gissberg: Mike Layton didn't do his homework when he wrote about me. On that one issue, at least. The press is like any other organization, composed of different personalities. Some people take their jobs more seriously than others, and get their facts straightened out before they bellow, while others are a little more prone to investigate and come up with the truth before they write about it. A free press is indispensable to the operation of a democratic society. They have to be able to say what they want to say.

[End Tape 11, Side 1]

Ms. Boswell: Another area that you got some fair amount of press on, yourself, were issues having to do with women's rights.

Mr. Gissberg: I did?

Ms. Boswell: Yes. There are quite a few articles about that. I was curious about your perspective on the proliferation of women's issues, particularly in the early seventies, late sixties.

Mr. Gissberg: I didn't know I was viewed as being a supporter of women's rights.

Ms. Boswell: I'm not sure you were, but I was curious what your perspective on it was.

Mr. Gissberg: My perspective on the constitutional issue of women's rights was a legal one, only. Out of necessity, a student of the law would have to support equal rights for not only women, but any minority or majority group. The reason that I was stuck on women's rights was the fact that it was the only right thing to do. To try to make women equal under the law, even if they weren't equal any other place. That's about all I can say.

Ms. Boswell: But you did oppose a constitutional amendment that was fairly simply phrased as for equality of sexes based on legal issues? Do you remember that controversy?

Mr. Gissberg: No, I don't. I remember I was opposed. Nat Washington was a supporter of equality among the sexes, and he was advocating on the Senate floor one time that persons of the same sex should be able to be married. I don't believe in that equality. Equality of the sexes is fine, but when it comes to a man marrying a man, or a woman a woman, I don't cotton to that at all. We were all saddened by Nat Washington even proposing such a thing, because Nat was a fine legislator.

Another matter that came up on the floor, unbeknownst to me, I didn't have any advance notice of it, was a bill to give the women equal managerial rights of property, community property. The bill came out of my Judiciary Committee as I recall, and Bob Twigg got up and amended it considerably. He wanted to amend the devil out of the bill, and it wasn't that difficult a question, but I agreed to it on the Senate floor and it passed. I don't know if that makes me a supporter of women's rights, or not.

Ms. Boswell: One of the issues I was thinking of was, in 1972, there was a proposal for a constitutional amendment that was proposed by a state women's council. Actually, all the senators from Snohomish County were against it, but at least you were quoted as saying that what would happen is that if this amendment for equal rights under the law was passed,

that special rights that women had been given because of past discrimination would therefore be abolished, and so you didn't think that it was a good idea.

Mr. Gissberg: I think I voted for that amendment before the session was out.

Ms. Boswell: Did you? Okay.

Mr. Gissberg: There were certain labor laws that were discriminatory in a sense that they protected women and not men. We were fearful that if the constitutional amendment passed, it would take away the special benefits that women were recognized to need under the law. Somewhat similar to when women want to go fight in a war, engage in combat. The reason men are opposed to that is because of the special status that women have. They're kinder, and gentler, and more lovable than men are. They deserve special attention and protection. I still believe that.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think the women's movement was going about seeking political change for women in the right way, or in an effective way?

Mr. Gissberg: It must have been effective, because they achieved everything they set out to achieve. Even to the extent that two women living together in a so-called marriage can adopt a child, which I think is a poor condition for a child to be put into. That's my conservative view.

Ms. Boswell: How much do you think that personal ethics should enter into decisions like that, as a legislator? Or, can you really avoid that?

Mr. Gissberg: You have personal views on every issue that ever comes up. You can't separate out that condition from one piece of legislation to the next. Either things are right or they're wrong based on your own personal experience and your own beliefs, your own views, your own philosophy, your own environment, your own upbringing. All of those things put together determine what your views are on any sociological issue.

Ms. Boswell: But don't you think opinions are more heated or more pressing in issues that reflect on moral values or religious values, or not? Maybe not.

Mr. Gissberg: I don't understand your question.

Ms. Boswell: It seems to me that your personal life and background are going to influence any piece of legislation, but it seems to me that the strongest controversies and the place where you see a person's background really reflecting more heavily is on the notion of ethics and religion. In certain issues, you represented your constituency. If your constituency had been the part of Seattle that was very supportive of homosexual rights, for example, where would you draw the line between your personal ethics and the constituency's desire for a particular kind of legislation?

Mr. Gissberg: It's hard for me to put myself in that position thirty or forty years after the fact. I would hope that I would vote my conscience and not be swayed to the point of giving up my own psyche, my own personality, my own beliefs because of political pressures. You take a hard vote and let the chips fall where they may, politically. At least that would be my hope that I would do that.

Ms. Boswell: Let me throw out an example. What about abortion? Abortion has certainly been a controversial issue over time. I think there were some abortion measures proposed during your tenure. I'm not sure, but is that an issue that, again, comes down to a personal value system, or not? You can politicize it then? Is it an appropriate place for legislation?

Mr. Gissberg: I know it's an appropriate place for legislation because it's been done all over the country. I was always against abortion, but I knew there were a lot of people who weren't. I think I told you in an earlier interview that I had made a motion to indefinitely postpone a bill liberalizing the abortion laws in this state. It went into my committee, the Judiciary Committee, and I could have sat on the bill and killed it, but I didn't because of what I knew to be an overwhelming vote of the Senate that had already refused to kill it when I first made the motion. So, all I wanted to do was to see if I couldn't make some amendments to the bill, which I did in committee before it came out. I'm still opposed to abortion. Not based on any religious concept, but just a philosophical view of it.

I was appalled during the interim (before the session which took up the issue of abortion) by the fact that a doctor from Kent, some place out in the Kent Valley, was performing abortions with abandon. Notoriously and publicly doing so, when the statutes of our state made it a felony to do it. I was disappointed in Dan Evans' position before the abortion law was passed, the law liberalizing abortion was passed. He supported, at least my recollection is, he supported the activities of this doctor out in the valley. It was clearly unlawful to

do so. It left a bad taste in my mouth on the whole abortion issue.

It's such a personal matter, whether you're for it or against it; it's like arguing religion or politics. You don't get anywhere with it. At least you don't make much headway with converting somebody to another view. You either have one view or another view, or you don't. Both sides have their arguments. My beliefs are such that I disagree with the thought that abortion on demand is a proper thing to do. But that's neither here nor there, because it already is an accomplished fact throughout the country now, so my views don't make any difference.

Ms. Boswell: They did in the seventies when it was being debated in Washington State, though.

Mr. Gissberg: At least one senator, who was a strong believer in making abortion procedures legal, was Fran Holman. Fran was originally against putting the bill in the Judiciary Committee, but after it was all over with, and I made my amendments to the bill, he was happy. He looked over and told me that he was glad that I had done that, because I'd fixed the bill up so it would be more easily passed, he thought. Particularly, some of the opposition to it, and some of the opposition which I think I mentioned before, which centered around the husband's–quote, right, unquote–to consent to the abortion by his wife and requiring parental consent to a minor child's abortion. Those two things were put on the bill before it passed the Senate, and Fran was happy that we had done so.

Ms. Boswell: Another issue that has tinges of the same debate, is gambling. I wondered, a little bit about your stance and experience with the issue of gambling in the state.

Mr. Gissberg: I'm trying to remember what gambling bills we had. We had a constitutional amendment which was originally designed to allow bingo to be played in nonprofit and church groups, primarily, which was used by the gambling interests for much broader purposes. So we had several institutions in the state which wanted to allow limited forms of gambling. I think Slade Gorton was the attorney general then, and I recall that he was opposed to that, as was our prosecuting attorney in Snohomish County. Gordon Walgren was the lead senator who wanted to pass that legislation, the constitutional amendment. I don't know if it was ever passed or not. I presume it was.

Ms. Boswell: What about your constituency generally? What was the feeling about allowing bingo or specialized gambling? You had a rural constituency.

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know that my constituents had a view on it, particularly. The Catholic Church was highly supportive of it because that's how they raised a lot of their money, on bingo. I don't know whether personal feelings had anything to do with it or not. Personal ethics.

Ms. Boswell: What about Indians and special rights that Indians may have for bingo or other things? Was there a division within your district over that issue, or not?

Mr. Gissberg: At that time it wasn't as heated an issue as it later became. But, certainly, it was an issue when it came to fishing rights. There were very spirited, deep feelings about Indians being able to net fish wherever they wanted to in their usual and habitual grounds, fishing grounds, but the Legislature didn't ever get into that directly, in terms of legislation. But it was certainly a debatable subject that was of interest to people in your district. I had an Indian tribe in my district, which is probably the largest tribe in western Washington. But, since they used to let me fly-fish on their usual and accustomed places of fishing, I guess I would have been looked on as–I don't know the word for it. That I should reciprocate by allowing them to fish where they wanted to fish.

Ms. Boswell: Did you do that?

Mr. Gissberg: Nothing ever came up where I could do that.

Ms. Boswell: Other than fishing rights, were there any other issues that divided the Indian part of your district from the non-Indian segment?

Mr. Gissberg: I can't think of what they were, but I know that I played politics, myself, when I was getting ready to run for Congress. I was making a play for the Indian vote and I advocated the establishment of an Indian Affairs Commission which would be composed of Indians throughout the state who would act as a conduit for the promulgation of Indian views and Indian desires to be transmitted to the governor and the legislators. Strangely enough, the Indians, themselves, opposed that.

Ms. Boswell: Why was that?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know. I never could figure out why they opposed it. They were afraid that the people who would be appointed weren't the proper ones, but I never did figure out why they were opposed to it. Maybe they knew that it was a too blatant attempt at politics, because I was sort of motivated by that, at that time, that one two-year period when I was going to run for Congress.

Ms. Boswell: Did the Indians represent a significant voting bloc? Could they be counted on as a bloc vote?

Mr. Gissberg: The Indians in my district always voted heavily for me. And, as far as that's concerned, every splinter group or minority group or whatever is important in any political activity. You've got to woo those people onto your side if you're going to be a successful politician. I don't know that I did any wooing, but I did something right. Probably because I was from Marysville, and the Tulalip Indian Tribe was just outside of Marysville.

Ms. Boswell: Were there any particular Tulalip leaders or individuals that you worked with in particular?

Mr. Gissberg: There were several families of Indians who were leaders in the Tulalip Indian Tribe. The Hatches and the Joneses were two of them. To this very day, their children and grandchildren are leaders in the tribe. I formed a fire-protection district which encompassed most of the Tulalip Indian Reservation and I got to know their leadership in that fashion, too. They ultimately ran the fire-protection district, that gave me a personal acquaintance with many of them.

Ms. Boswell: You mentioned religious-interest groups as well. Were there identifiable religious coalitions in the Legislature that pushed certain types of legislation?

Mr. Gissberg: I always felt that there was but I can't put my finger on any such legislation. I always felt that there were sympathies toward a person who had the same religious views as you did. That there was an inclination to vote that way. I can't put my finger on anything concrete, but I always had that feeling at least.

Ms. Boswell: Were there particular religious groups that seemed to be stronger than others?

Mr. Gissberg: There was the Protestant group, and the Catholics were another. The Catholics always stayed together on issues more than the Protestants ever did. That may be a pipe dream as far as the facts are concerned, but I'm trying to express my feelings about things, and that's how I felt. It could be one thousand percent wrong.

Ms. Boswell: Were there ever any Jewish interest groups at all in the state, or was that not a strong factor?

Mr. Gissberg: No, none to my mind. I was often mistaken for a Jewish person, myself. Not Jewish background, because of my name. Many times I'd be called "Ginsberg," G-I-N-S-B-E-R-G, rather than "Gissberg." I'd have to tell them the story about how my family got the name Gissberg.

Ms. Boswell: I don't think you told us that on tape.

Mr. Gissberg: My ancestors were from, on my father's side, northern Sweden. Somewhere near the Arctic Circle. There was a river called the Giss, pronounced with a hard g in English, "Giss." That was the name of this mountain river. Berg meaning mountain in Swedish. The inhabitants put the name Gissberg together, meaning a mountain on the river. I've been led to believe that's how I got the name Gissberg, and there were not any Jewish people up there at that time that I know of. I might be a blue-eyed, Jewish person for all I know, but there certainly weren't many Jewish people in the Legislature that I was even aware of. I wouldn't even stop to think whether they were Jewish or not. There could have been a lot of them, but I never separated the Jewish people from anybody else.

[End of Tape 11, Side 2]

9

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY FORMATION

Mr. Gissberg: Another task force I was appointed to was, President Eisenhower had created a task force on education and I was appointed to that because I was chairman of the Legislative Council's Education Committee at that time. They had one meeting that I know of in Washington D.C., and the president, himself, couldn't speak. He had more important things to do than to speak to a bunch of people from the states.

That was my first look at "tricky Dickie Nixon." He came and spoke to the group. Nothing came of it. Those national task forces were usually stacked one way or the other and didn't have any independence and were primarily for political purposes as well. Unlike Mrs. Clinton–

Ms. Boswell: The health care?

Mr. Gissberg: Yeah. But I want to wish Jim McDermott all the luck in the world because he's got a far better plan than the national plan.

Ms. Boswell: You think so?

Mr. Gissberg: Oh, I know so. They'll never get it passed because he's going to abolish the health-insurance companies, and their lobby will never see to that, and the doctors will never allow that to become law. But that's the best plan.

Ms. Boswell: By having introduced that plan, will he have some more clout when they begin debate?

Mr. Gissberg: I have no doubt that he'll have a lot to say about what's finally in the bill. When he was elected to the state Senate here, he took an interest in health-care insurance, and introduced legislation on a state level, too.

Ms. Boswell: Was health care much of an issue when you served?

Mr. Gissberg: No. It wasn't at all. All this is extracurricular activity, this conversation that we're having now. It has nothing to do with when I was a member.

Ms. Boswell: I was just curious because I hadn't read about much in the form of health care.

Mr. Gissberg: There was none. The only health-care legislation that I had anything to do with was establishing liens on behalf of the health and welfare payments that were delinquent by employers. So, I introduced legislation which was passed, which created a fund. The health and welfare fund could file a lien on the assets of the business, and was assisted in the collection of the premiums which were due. That's the only thing I can recall.

Ms. Boswell: We talked a lot last time about environmental issues, but there were a few things that I wanted to go back to, if you don't mind, on environmental issues, and particularly shoreline management.

You had mentioned last time about the Washington Environmental Council and their introduction of the initiative that set off the whole Shorelines Management Act. There had been attempts prior to that in 1969 and 1970 to get shoreline bills. Why hadn't earlier attempts to get some kind of shoreline management been successful in the Legislature?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't even remember that being a fact. I guess it didn't get anywhere because it didn't have the votes to get there. But I remember one piece of legislation which Representative Martinis from Snohomish County was pushing, and that was the wild-rivers bill, so called. Maybe that's what you have reference to. The wild-rivers bill would have affected about every river in the state, and it certainly went far beyond the realities of getting it enacted into law. It usually takes one or two sessions in any event before any meaningful legislation is passed because it takes that long to drum up the public interest in it and peak the interest of the Legislature, itself. To pass legislation which is at the least controversial usually takes one or two sessions in advance of being able to get it passed. That's what happened with the Shorelines Management Act. But the act itself, that ultimately passed, passed the House first and came over to the Senate, and the environmentalists didn't like the House version at all. Neither did Governor Evans.

I think I told you I took ahold of it because the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, Lowell Peterson, just was not the type of guy who would get

involved in that sort of thing to lead the way out of a maze of conflicting thoughts and views. He was good at taking a piece of legislation that was perfected and getting it through, but as far as providing for constructive amendments which were acceptable to more than one side, he was not that skilled at that. He used to look to me for help in running the Natural Resources Committee, which I was happy to do. Somehow or other, he appointed me as the chairman of the ad hoc subcommittee of the Natural Resources Committee to deal with the issue.

Charlie Rowe was then an assistant attorney general assigned to the Department of Ecology, who represented the governor's views on the Shorelines Management Act. My role was thrashing out the feeling of the governor and the Department of Ecology that the House bill was not strong enough, and getting industry to agree that there was something that needed to be done in the area. The bill that passed was a compromise between the environmentalists and industry. The industrial group that had lobbyists active in it more than anyone else was the Weyerhaeuser Company.

Ms. Boswell: Was it difficult to get those two groups to compromise?

Mr. Gissberg: I imagine it was because it affected the timber interests. Anything that was cut within 200 feet of a body of water having certain capacity and volume would be required to get a substantial-development permit before cutting their timber, which was a new concept in this state. But certainly one which was necessary if the degradation of our environment was to stop.

Ms. Boswell: One of the big issues that seems in looking back at that issue was regional versus local control. I wanted your perspective on that. The initiative that the Washington Environmental Council had essentially proposed really shied away from any local control over management.

Mr. Gissberg: I think that's right, and I think that my recollection is that the act provided that each county jurisdiction and each city, each municipal corporation, would have to provide its own master program for the environment and for the issuance of substantial-development permits. To do that you had to engage in planning, as such. Not zoning, but close to zoning. Whereas the Environmental Council wanted it to be on a regionalized basis.

Bob Bailey was one of those who felt that each municipality should have its own say on their own master program. The Bailey "feedback" amendment which he's so proud of talking about, and rightfully so, was a compromise by which, after the local government had passed its master program it was reviewable by the Department of Ecology. At that point, the bill provided that the Department of Ecology could override the local government's master program by substituting a master program of its own. Bob Bailey came up with the feedback idea that it would have to go back to the local government once and give the local government an opportunity to either seek a compromise with what the Department of Ecology was advocating, or go along with it entirely so that the local government would have two shots at coming up with a master program that was agreeable to the Department of Ecology whereas, originally, they only had one shot at it, and that was their own shot.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think that was the key to passage, that additional local comment?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know. I think all the amendments were a key to getting it passed. I know that all the amendments that we came up with had to be agreed upon. Didn't have to be, but were submitted to the governor's office in advance. As the process went on and we came up with an amendment on a sticky issue, the governor had the last say as to whether or not he was going to agree to it or not agree to it.

Ms. Boswell: You're a Democratic committee and you have a Republican governor, why allow the governor such a close review?

Mr. Gissberg: Because he had the "veto" pen. The Legislature wanted to get something passed because the Washington Environmental Council's initiative was on the ballot, and the Legislature wanted to get its own version, which the House tried to do, but the House had such a restrictive bill that it didn't receive any support in the Senate at all. Our function was to amend it and get the House to support it and, hopefully, industry and the Environmental Council would support it. Industry, I don't think, ever did support it, but the Environmental Council did.

Ms. Boswell: Did local governments generally support it?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't think at that time there was that much knowledge about local governments to even know that it was in existence.

Ms. Boswell: I'm just curious why Democrats like Bob Bailey would be so concerned about local control. Is that just a Republican issue today, or was it then, too?

Mr. Gissberg: No, it's not just a Republican issue. Frankly, at that time, I thought that statewide control was the way to go. I thought that applied not only to the Shorelines Management Act but to gravel pits, mining, gravel-mining permits. The state should control that.

Ms. Boswell: It seems like you took that position, too, on pollution control. That that should be handled better at the state level than at the local level.

Mr. Gissberg: It depends. Everything used to break down at state control or local control. Depending on who you talked to, the person would say that it's better for the county to do it, or local government to do it, because they would be more strict. I always thought the state was stricter than local control.

Ms. Boswell: Another big change that came about, based on your committee's work, was a narrowing of the amount of shoreline affected by the act. I think that the initiative originally said 500 feet, and your committee brought that down. Was that a big issue?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes, it was an issue. The Environmental Council also had many more bodies of water involved in the act which was eventually passed. That is, little trickles of water which were little more than a ditch, that was believed should be covered by the Washington Environmental Council which had gone all the way overboard and it would be defeated. I think that was a big issue as well as the number of feet back. Wasn't it 200 feet back?

Ms. Boswell: Yes.

Mr. Gissberg:. Every development costing over $500, you had to get a permit for. That was a controversial thing. There was no exemption at all under the Environmental Council's act. Any substantial-development permit, regardless of whether it cost less than $500, was covered by the act. My whole responsibility, it seems to me, on the environmental Shorelines Management Act, was to broker a compromise between the committee's four contending groups: local governments, state government, industry, and environmentalists, which required some doing to do that.

Ms. Boswell: How were you able to come up with an effective compromise? I know that's hard to say in a few words, but was there a particular strategy you had?

Mr. Gissberg: I never went into anything with a strategy prearranged. I had to see what the issues are first, and who's for and against the issues, and what is possible. What was the question?

Ms. Boswell: I was wondering how you were able to affect this compromise from seemingly such diverse and opposing forces. It seems a rather daunting task. I wondered if you had a strategy and what you found most effective in bringing those–

Mr. Gissberg: I think the Democrats were more closely aligned to the Washington Environmental Council's efforts than the Republicans. I found the Republican support, Dan Evans got. I think had it not been for Dan Evans, there wouldn't have been any act passed. The Republicans would have held fast for nothing, and there wouldn't have been enough Democrats to join the Republicans, so I don't think anything would have passed. It was Dan Evans' leadership that was really responsible for passing the act, although my ad hoc committee smoothed the way for something to be passed that was acceptable to all the groups.

Ms. Boswell: Was there at least a semi-bipartisan nature to the bill, then?

Mr. Gissberg: When it passed it was certainly supported by bipartisan effort.

Ms. Boswell: Part of the bill created a Shorelines Hearings Board and you served on that, didn't you, for a while?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. The act said that the Pollution Control Hearings Board, that the members of the Pollution Control Hearings Board would be members of the Shorelines Hearings Board, and added three other members. I think the Department of Natural Resources designated somebody, and the counties had a member to be nominated by the counties, and the cities, I think, had a member to be added by the cities. Plus the three members of the Pollution Control Hearings Board made it a six-member committee. But the Pollution Control Hearings Board was established long before the Shorelines Hearings Board.

Ms. Boswell: Was that by your design, that the same people should be on the Shorelines Hearings Board? How did that come about?

Mr. Gissberg: I think that was in the act that was passed by the House, I'm not sure. If it wasn't, it would have been one of Charlie Rowe's thoughts to have that done. Charlie was the spokesman for the governor's office and the Department of Ecology in the development of the compromise bill.

Ms. Boswell: How did the Department of Ecology feel about the issues? They would have had more power under the initiative, wouldn't they, than they did under the compromise?

Mr. Gissberg: The Department of Ecology I don't think had an independent position from that of the governor, and Charlie Rowe was an employee of the attorney general, but he was assigned to the Department of Ecology, and he was the liaison between our subcommittee and the governor's office. He would come back and report that, "Yes, that amendment is satisfactory to the governor," meaning the Department of Ecology and the governor. Or he'd come back and say, "No, that's not acceptable. Probably have to have different language."

Now that I think back, I remember the session before, that there was a shorelines bill that was introduced. I don't know whether it was introduced first in the Senate or in the House, and I remember that the only thing that was holding up the bill's passage was the Department of Natural Resources. I remember meeting in the old Rules room in the Senate, with Harry Lewis and the Environmental Council's lobbyist, Miller, who later became a congressman, and Charlie Rowe, and Bert Cole's number one man in the Department of Natural Resources. That was an ad hoc committee acting on its own, just three or four people who were interested in getting something done. The sticky point at that time was the Department of Natural Resources' role in the whole scheme of the Shorelines Management Act. This was the session before, and it was right down to the last part of the session, and I was successful in getting the Department of Natural Resources to agree to what I thought the position of the Environmental Council was. There was only about twelve or thirteen hours left in the session, and I called the group together, and with some happiness I announced that the Department of Natural Resources had agreed with the committee's view of what it ought to be. One of the two parties backed out of the agreement at the last moment, and that's why the bill didn't pass before it did. That led to the Environmental Council's lone initiative on the subject matter, because they thought they couldn't get something passed through the Legislature as a result of that experience the session before.

Ms. Boswell: Who's idea was it for the Shorelines Act itself to designate the particular waterways that would be covered, rather than leave that to the discretion of the Department of Ecology or some other group?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't know. It could have been in the original bill, for all I can remember.

Ms. Boswell: Are there any parts of the bill that you had particular ownership of, that you really pushed for yourself?

Mr. Gissberg: I pushed for all the amendments that our subcommittee came up with. They're all in the Journal. If you look up in the Journal, they'll all be in the Journal, but I can't remember what they were.

Ms. Boswell: I just thought maybe there were one or two in particular that you had really pushed for. Maybe that wasn't your role, as chairman of that subcommittee, to really push for any particular perspective.

Mr. Gissberg: I don't recall that I did, no.

Ms. Boswell: Did you ever find yourself, given that you got a reputation for being a leader on environmental issues, on the other hand you had certainly an affiliation with some sportsmen's groups, and I wondered if the interest of sportsmen's groups ever conflicted with other environmental issues that you might be involved in?

Mr. Gissberg: Well, there are different views on everything. I remember Tom Wimmer, a very fine Democrat, was the head of the Washington State Sports Council. As the Shorelines Act was being put together, with its various compromises, he was in close contact with us, and the last person I heard from before the bill was put out on the floor for voting, was from Tom. He called from Seattle and said, "Bill, we want you to fix it up so that all streams are affected by the Shorelines Management Act." I turned him down flat, because I knew that it had no chance. If that were to be part of the act, it just wouldn't have a chance of being passed. The interest groups would jump all over it and throttle it. So there was an instance where the Sports Council and I were in conflict.

I was in conflict with them when I balanced the Game Department's budget. The Sports Council–

[End of Tape 12, Side 1]

Mr. Gissberg: –always supported the Game Department, and the Game Department policies and views, because the Sports Council, in effect, ran the Game Department.

Ms. Boswell: You were instrumental in balancing the budget, you said, of the Game Department?

Mr. Gissberg: Oh yes. The Sports Council was supporting a fee increase for hunting and fishing licenses. I balanced their budget on the Senate floor. I was certainly in conflict with the Sports Council on it. I called them professional sportsmen. But they're not the sportsmen who frequent the taverns and have a glass of beer after they catch a steelhead. The ordinary "Joe Blow" kind of guy was not in favor of raising the fees for the hunting and fishing licenses. I became a strong supporter of that, myself, as it became apparent that if the department was to progress, and protect our fish as the fish became scarcer and game became scarcer, that's when you want resources devoted to that wildlife. And I supported them.

Ms. Boswell: Looking back over your career, are there certain issues that you look back on, like that one, and see a change in your position? Over time and with experience you sort of changed your ideas about things?

Let me ask you about another issue, and that's essentially, after the Shorelines Management Act, you went on, ultimately, to be a lobbyist for the State Bar Association, and I wondered what prompted your decision to do that?

Mr. Gissberg: A couple factors. My term of office on the Pollution Control Hearings Board had just expired, and I'd submitted my resignation to Governor Dixy Lee Ray, and was in effect, unemployed. I'd already cut my ties with the law firm up in Everett, and it meant starting a new practice of law by myself, or going in with somebody else, and I didn't want to do either. I was pretty well burned-out as far as the practice of law was concerned. Somehow, I read, in the Bar Journal I think it was, that the Bar was looking for a lobbyist. So I picked the phone up and called Eddie Friar, the executive secretary, and told him I might be interested in it. They hired me. I don't know if I've answered your question or not.

Ms. Boswell: Yes, I think so. What differences, or what issues of the lobbyist ultimately did you experience?

Mr. Gissberg: As far as the Bar Association itself is concerned, the big issue was contending against the state auditor on whether or not the State Bar Association should be the subject of audit, within the jurisdiction of the state auditor. That meant that the Bar Association would have to conduct its own affairs in accordance to all the state regulations concerning expenditure of funds, and would have to hire its employees through the Personnel Board, and all the other red tape that went along with being a state agency as such. The Bar has been always under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, and this has been amicable to the interest of the Bar Association as an independent agency of its own, responsible only to the Supreme Court. So that was the issue that they needed a lobbyist for, primarily, was to defeat that attempt by the state auditor to audit the books of the State Bar Association.

Ms. Boswell: Was it a hard transition to go from representing a broad constituency to representing one interest group?

Mr. Gissberg: That was five years after I left the Legislature, and I never approached anybody on a personal basis on anything that was done at the Bar Association. Matter of fact, by that time, a younger generation had pretty much taken over the state Senate, at least, where I had devoted most of my time.

Phil Talmadge was the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and I first met him during the campaign where he was first elected. I never put any personal pressure on anybody for the Bar Association's affairs. The Bar Association was always in the public interest. [Phil Talmadge is now a member of the state Supreme Court.]

Ms. Boswell: I was thinking, too, personally, did you find it to be a personal change that was easy or difficult to make?

Mr. Gissberg: It was difficult for me to make it. I found that I had to ask more than common sense told you that you had to do. As a legislator, you had much more independence of being able to do what you wanted to do, without having to explain every bit of it to somebody else. But, as a lobbyist, you had to walk a fine line between getting things involved in political issues between the two parties, and explain how everybody on the committee, when before all I had to say was the Legislature thinks it's a good bill and it ought to pass. When I left, it was a different role I had to play. But I must have done a good job on it because the Bar Association awarded me an award of merit, of

honor and merit. There's only been twenty of them given out since the Bar Association was founded. I still cherish that award.

Ms. Boswell: You were also named one of the top ten lobbyists as well, by a vote of nonlobbyists, so that seemed to be an accolade, too.

Mr. Gissberg: I never heard of that. They were probably still fearful of my days in the Senate.

Ms. Boswell: Didn't becoming a lobbyist entail you coming to live in Olympia?

Mr. Gissberg: I came to Olympia in 1973 when I was first appointed to the Pollution Control Hearings Board. It was five years after that, that I took the lobbying job.

Ms. Boswell: Why were you willing to move to Olympia? You'd been a lifelong Everett or Marysville, Lake Stevens resident. Why make the change?

Mr. Gissberg: Because I didn't want to drive back and forth like the other two members on the Pollution Control Hearings Board that lived in Seattle and Vashon Island did. They'd show up to work about ten o'clock in the morning rather than at eight o'clock. I couldn't see myself driving from Everett down to Olympia and conducting hearings starting at ten or eleven o'clock in the morning. I wanted to be close to my place of work, so I bought this house and mandated my family to come here and live with me, which they were happy to do.

Ms. Boswell: Were they?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. Although, after I left, the more I wanted to move back to Lake Stevens, which had a soft spot in my heart, and still does. But, by that time, my children were in public schools here, and it wouldn't have been fair to them to disrupt their lives, so I stayed here.

Ms. Boswell: What about the effect of a political career on your family? Can you make some general assessments about its effect on your family, for example?

Mr. Gissberg: I'd rather make some general comments about it, but my observation is that politics is not a healthful thing for a family.

Ms. Boswell: Why is that?

Mr. Gissberg: Because you're gone too much of the time, especially when the children are smaller. Not that you're gone more when they're small, but it's harder on smaller children to be without their father for sixty or ninety days at a time. Where if you're in other politics, you equate politics with importance, and spend more time than you should in political endeavors, rather than devoting it to your family. It's just a tough thing to do. I know I had to be tough to live with when I'd come home after the sixty-day session or a ninety-day session. I'd be wound up like a top. Make fifty decisions a day, and under pressure all the time, and I know I was short when I got home. My wife would want to know something about what I did today, and I'd say, "Well, what do you think I did?" instead of trying to sit down and explain. Use a couple hours to talk about it. I just assume that that happens to other people as well. A lot of partying went on, and social drinking was more involved than it should have been. That certainly is not helpful to the establishment of a strong family life, either.

Ms. Boswell: You have children who've gone into politics, or are interested in politics, right?

Mr. Gissberg: I have no children that have gone into politics, no.

Ms. Boswell: That are involved in politics, as a career, but not necessarily running for office?

Mr. Gissberg: No.

Ms. Boswell: I thought some of your kids worked in the government.

Mr. Gissberg: Oh, well, that's not politics.

Ms. Boswell: Okay, I'm sorry. It's a matter of definition.

Mr. Gissberg: My youngest daughter, yes, she still works for the governor's office. I guess she's there because the job was available, more than any other reason.

Ms. Boswell: You don't think your example was there, to a degree?

Mr. Gissberg: I never inquired whether I had any input.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think it was more, or less difficult, on a family, that you were far enough away

that you didn't go home every night? That you were here for most of the session, and your family was elsewhere. Some people moved their families here for the session, which I imagine was fairly difficult, too.

Mr. Gissberg: Give me your question.

Ms. Boswell: The question was, was it more or less difficult on your family, if you weren't able to commute home, or you were gone for an extended period, rather than just daily?

Mr. Gissberg: You'll have to ask my wife that.

Ms. Boswell: When you retired from the Senate, ostensibly a major reason was to devote more time to your law practice, but very quickly you got out of your law practice. Why did that happen?

Mr. Gissberg: It was twofold. When I got a telephone call from Dan Evans, from Jim Dolliver, I should say, who was Dan Evans' administrative assistant, that they wanted me to take the position on the Pollution Control Hearings Board, I was motivated by two things. Number one, my partner had just died and I had taken an inordinate burden in the law firm. Not only handling my own files, but all of his files as well. His estate was in financial troubles and it was a horrendous struggle to salvage assets from his estate for the benefit of his widow and children. As I say, I was under a lot of pressure and stress in the law firm and he was my best friend when he died. My other friend in the law firm was Tom McCrea, who had left the law firm to become a judge. The remaining members of the law firm were not as close to me as the other two were. So, it wasn't a difficult choice. My law practice did not hold me back from saying yes.

The second thing was the practicality of increasing my pension. My salary as a legislator was thirty-six hundred dollars a year when I left. My salary as a member of the Pollution Control Hearings Board was something like twenty-three thousand, and that would at least triple my state pension. What I get now, my net pension after health and welfare is taken out of it is eighteen hundred dollars a month, which is certainly a big increase from one hundred and eighty or ninety as a legislator. So that had a bearing on it as well.

A lawyer never quits. He keeps going to the office forever. After thirty years of it, I'd had enough.

Ms. Boswell: When you came down to Olympia, not only for the Pollution Control Hearings Board, but then as a lobbyist as well, was that enough difference in terms of your daily routine to mitigate the burnout you felt about being a legislator?

Mr. Gissberg: No doubt about it. With one exception. With the exception of creating our rules and regulations under the State Environmental Council. That's not the name of it. Council on Environmental Policy. That created a lot of stress for me. I was chairman of that committee, and the reason we got that work was because of a Republican legislator who had something to do with the Shorelines Management Act. The bill creating the Council on Environmental Policy was introduced by him to flush out the bare-bones direction of the State Environmental Policy Act by implementing regulations. He called me on the phone when I was out at the Pollution Control Hearings Board and wanted to know if I could handle that. I said, "Yes, if you give me enough money to hire a good lawyer to help." So, with that, they made the Pollution Control Hearings Board the Council on Environmental Policy.

I had an awful time with a fellow named Walt Woodward who was on the board and who opposed about everything I wanted to do. In my mind, he was going way too far. He was too strict an environmentalist, in a sense that, once again, you had to have compromises between the cities and counties who were seeking to issue permits. You had this additional layer of duties that was imposed on them by the act. I remember one incident where he wanted to create not only a review of the environmental effects, the physical effects, on land and air and water, but he wanted to have the environmental-impact statement written for any project which involved a change in the economic well-being of the community, or the social well-being of the community. I thought that was going way beyond the scope of what the Environmental Policy Act was meant to achieve, i.e., the education of the decision maker on the effects of substantial developments on air, water and land usage. That is, the environmental effects, not the sociological effects and the economic effects on the community. He was determined to do that, and I was just as determined he wasn't going to do it. We disagreed on just about everything that came up on that subject and elsewhere.

Ms. Boswell: What was the result of that disagreement, or those disagreements?

Mr. Gissberg: I won.

Ms. Boswell: How?

Mr. Gissberg: He threatened to get a campaign going sponsored by himself and using the facilities of our

board. I denied him the use of any secretarial help or any physical help by our board, stenographic, or the use of our typewriter or anything else, of our funds, to stir up trouble. When he told me that's what he was going to do, I said, "How are you going to do it?" He said that as a member of the committee, he'd be able to do it. And I said, "You're not going to use any of our assets to do it." That's one of the reasons I won.

Another reason was that the third member was a lady named Smith, whose first name I should also remember, and she was a very smart, intelligent, go-getter type of a person who was engaged in political activity in one of the communities outside Seattle, I think it was Bellevue. Although she was an outstanding environmentalist in my mind, she had common sense and knew when to cut off an issue, when to stop. Whereas Woodward would continue pushing, regardless of the consequences. I was able to get her to vote with me in promulgation of the regulations. When push came to shove, she'd go with me.

A fellow we hired as our attorney, a fellow named Chuck Lean, was also an outstanding environmentalist lawyer for the Department of Ecology, who had had many hearings before our board. The Department of Ecology always had outstanding young lawyers assigned to it by the attorney general's office, but Chuck Lean was particularly outstanding. If it hadn't been for him, I don't think we ever could have been able to put together the substantial regulations that we did. And I had his assistance when push came to shove.

Ms. Boswell: How long were you involved with the Council on Environmental Policy?

Mr. Gissberg: For probably about two years. We were just given the authority to come up with the rules and regulations, define exemptions from the act, what constituted a major decision, and all the various and sundry hundreds of items that had to go into the regulations so that the cities and counties knew what to do in order to prepare an environmental impact statement. Who was to get notice of it. It doesn't sound like much, but it was just a terrific task.

Ms. Boswell: Let me just ask you one or two really general questions and then we'll call it a day. It's hard, since you've had such a long and varied career, but are there any high points? Looking back, what do you see as the high points of your career?

Mr. Gissberg: The high point of my career is I found a scrapbook with all those letters in it. That made it all worthwhile. To receive the approval of one's peers is probably the highest honor that can be paid to a person. I don't recall any specific thing that occurred during the legislative years.

Ms. Boswell: Were there any special issues or pieces of legislation that you were particularly proud of?

Mr. Gissberg: I was proud of the amendment I put on the Senate floor, without giving anybody any notice that it was coming, prohibiting the sale of shorelines and tidelands by the Department of Natural Resources, which was rapidly divesting the public of the ability to utilize those areas. It happened that I was able to do that just with no notice to anybody, and I think it's going to last for generations to come.

Ms. Boswell: What about regrets or disappointments? Anything in particular that you would like to have done differently?

Mr. Gissberg: I suppose if I were to do it all over again I would probably have run for the state Supreme Court. Or attorney general. It's easier looking back than it was at the time.

Ms. Boswell: In terms of qualities that make a good legislator, what would you say would be the key qualities?

Mr. Gissberg: Integrity, openness, friendliness, political awareness, understanding of the legislative process, and ability to communicate. All of which are indispensable for anyone who wants to be successful politician. When to incite fear, retribution, if they don't agree with you.

Ms. Boswell: What about legal training? How necessary and important is that in being a good legislator?

Mr. Gissberg: To be an all-around good legislator requires one to be a lawyer. Whereas, to be a good legislator without being a lawyer, to have a knowledge of some of the laws that you're dealing with, whether it's an amendment to the adoption statute or attorney-fee statute or judiciary, all the myriad, mundane statutes that are on the books that people are trying to amend or get on the books every session, it certainly is helpful to a legislator to have an advanced knowledge of the issues that are involved. How the existing law works, and what are its deficiencies.

A layperson doesn't have that background. That doesn't preclude the layperson from being a good legislator. On the contrary. It's just in a different field. I hasten to add that as an all-around legislator, a lawyer has an advantage over a layperson, but that doesn't mean he's a better person or a better legislator.

Ms. Boswell: What, exactly, advice would you give, based on your career, to convince a young person to get involved in public service? Is there anything in your career that you could use as an argument for anybody thinking of going into public service?

[End of Tape 12, Side 2]

LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES

Ms. Boswell: Related to that, there is something I wanted to ask you about. We talked a little bit about this before, but when a group of people came into the Legislature, were there times when there were more people of a common political belief or vision that you sort of felt like you were part of a class or group of legislators that had kind of a common purpose? Did that ever happen?

Mr. Gissberg: You had it all the time as a lawyer. It was the judiciary that I felt a kinship for. Most of the lawyers could be counted upon to support legislation that directed themselves toward the courts. That's the only class that immediately comes to mind that's distinctive in itself.

Ms. Boswell: When you came into the Legislature, there were a lot of people who came in at the same time, I think you mentioned to me, from the law school at the University of Washington. Did you generally have a common notion of the judiciary then? Is that what held you together as sort of a group?

Mr. Gissberg: It held us together as a group because the judiciary is a workplace. And whatever we could do to improve the judiciary was done. Secondly, as a practicing lawyer, you couldn't very well vote against the interests of the judiciary. That's the arena where you made your livelihoods. You couldn't very well make an enemy out of judges. It wouldn't be in the public interest to do so in any event.

Ms. Boswell: Were there any other experiences though, say, when you came into the Legislature, that tied you with other new legislators?

Mr. Gissberg: The fact that I had known a few of them before. Prior acquaintance is a bond in itself. It enables one to speak to another legislator. I know that Senator Neil Hoff and I were personal friends before we got to the Legislature, and he was minority leader of the Republicans when I got there. We were friends in law school. Don Eastvold and I were friends in law school. He was a Republican attorney general. Pat Sutherland and I were friends in law school. He's still prosecuting attorney in Thurston County. Bill Goodloe and I were friends in law school. He was a senator when I got to the Senate. So, yes, I had an acquaintance there, not a friendly relationship, but knowing people at least. I certainly didn't know any of the others when I got there.

Ms. Boswell: What about common experiences? In particular, because you came out of law school after World War II, did that form a common bond?

Mr. Gissberg: The fact that you were a veteran?

Ms. Boswell: Yes.

Mr. Gissberg: No. Not at all. Matter of fact, most of us looked at some people as being "professional veterans." A fellow who was always talking about his war experiences, or whatever, was called a "professional veteran." He didn't hold the respect. You just did your job and shut up about it. I don't know of any professional veterans who were in the Legislature, however.

Ms. Boswell: I knew of a professor who was very keen on the notion that war experience changed the thinking of that generation, and that, essentially, people's interest or involvement in public service came out of their war experiences. Would you agree with that, or not?

Mr. Gissberg: As applied personally to me, I don't think that my war experience had anything to do with my entering politics. Certainly, all a young kid out of the military could do was have little or no effect on federal policies or state policies which might involve an inclination to go to war or not go to war. I don't think the defense industry is built upon support by young persons out of the military.

Ms. Boswell: There was, however, a large group in your law-school class who did go on to the Legislature, who were war veterans, were there not?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. Certainly. The fact that you were a veteran was helpful in getting elected to office as well. You, to coin a phrase, come to the aid of your country at a time when everyone was expected to do their duty, and if you weren't a veteran, people wondered why. Certainly, you didn't keep it a secret when you ran for public office if you were a veteran.

Ms. Boswell: What about the role of the GI Bill in terms of influencing career directions for people?

Mr. Gissberg: Without the GI Bill, the country probably wouldn't be where it is today. We would have lost a whole generation, so to speak, of students who were able to go on to college who wouldn't have been able to have done so were it not for the GI Bill of Rights. The fact that those people were able to go on and get an education contributed greatly to the maturity of our society, in my opinion. I'm speaking as one who benefited by that. I know that I probably wouldn't have been able to go on to college after the war, and my ball playing days were all finished by then, because of the injury I sustained on my knee. I doubt that I would have been able to go on to law school had it not been for that governmental payout.

I didn't have any trouble voting for the bonus bill that Neil Hoff introduced giving a bonus to veterans who served during World War II. It was passed in about 1953 or '55. Neil used that piece of legislation as a campaign tool to try to get elected lieutenant governor, but he never made it.

Ms. Boswell: So the veterans weren't a solid enough voting constituency to take you over the top then?

Mr. Gissberg: What's that?

Ms. Boswell: Is the implication that the veterans were not a strong enough voting bloc, per se, to enable you to win on an issue like that?

Mr. Gissberg: I did pass a veterans' bonus, and I did win.

Ms. Boswell: I know. But I meant for his personal, political career, that he couldn't count on the veterans as a bloc to help him to election?

Mr. Gissberg: No, I don't think the veterans voted as a bloc in any event. It was one of the things you said you were, but it didn't get you elected, per se. Certainly it kept a lot of people from voting against you, that you were a veteran.

Ms. Boswell: Didn't you tell me that a huge number of your particular class in law school did go on to be in the Legislature?

Mr. Gissberg: I just named a lot of them.

Ms. Boswell: Yes. So the ones that you knew before were basically the ones that–

Mr. Gissberg: That I was in law school with. All the ones that I did name were in law school when I was in law school.

Ms. Boswell: Education has always been an area that you've been a strong supporter of. Were there any particular issues in education that you felt were most important in terms of the state of Washington?

Mr. Gissberg: I think I mentioned before, in another interview, that I felt that equality of educational process was something that needed to be addressed. Under our system of property taxation fifteen mills of the forty-mill levy were dedicated to, set aside for school use, and fifteen mills of property tax was allocated for local use, by the local school districts. But the income that's generated by fifteen mills in the City of Seattle is certainly a far cry, and many times greater, than fifteen mills of property tax would generate in rural areas of Snohomish County. There was a disparity on that and the competition between the so-called poorest school districts and the richest school districts. There was always controversy between the larger, urban school districts and the rural school districts which centered around the formula by which state aid is allocated to school districts, and centered around equalizing the property values in urban areas. I took an interest in that area of education particularly.

Ms. Boswell: Do you think the state superintendent of schools, that office, functions fairly effectively to push for educational changes or reform in the state?

Mr. Gissberg: Under Pearl Wanamaker and Buster Brouillet I think they did. They were leaders in educational issues. Recently the office of superintendent of public schools is confined more or less to leadership among the schools themselves rather than the public. Pearl Wanamaker and Buster were always aggressive in using that position to further the interest of the public in supporting higher appropriations for educational purposes. Those were later days. Maybe because I'm out of it now I don't know what the superintendent of public schools is doing, but I don't hear the advocacy that used to be prevalent under those two persons. I'm getting too old to notice.

Ms. Boswell: You had some occasion to work with Buster Brouillet, didn't you, in the Legislature? He was in the House.

Mr. Gissberg: I don't think that Buster and I ever did get together and talk about any school issues. But I

know he was always chairman of the House Education Committee. I never did really go over to the House and do much lobbying for anything. My legislation was always so good, it had to take care of itself.

Ms. Boswell: Did some legislators or senators do that? Do a lot of lobbying in the House for their interests?

Mr. Gissberg: Oh yes, I'm sure they did. I did too. Bills just don't have momentum of their own. They have to have somebody pushing and hauling on them. If you got your bill through the Senate, you had to go through the same procedure in the House. The least you would have to do is talk to your seatmate who was from the same district you were from, and put the onus on them to see that your bill got through the House. Sometimes you could depend on that, and other times you couldn't. Depending on who your seatmate was and how effective you were in convincing him that he or she should act in your behalf, on the bill's behalf, that you were pushing.

Ms. Boswell: Another education issue that you were supporting and I wondered about, was a bill for a four-year college in Snohomish County. Was that something that you really thought was necessary, or was that more of a political move?

Mr. Gissberg: It was political in the sense that my constituency in Arlington, when they heard that there was talk about there being another college created, got together and decided it should be in Arlington. As a senator, I couldn't tell them that they shouldn't have it in Arlington. That would be committing hari-kari. I did what I could, but the people who were on the commission which was created to choose the site, and recommend a site to the Legislature, none of them thought that Arlington was the proper place for it. I had some good friends on that commission, too. There was Gordon Sandison, for one, and I think Andy Hess was another. John Ryder was another and I don't remember whether Fred Dore was on it or not.

I recall the people in Arlington were very steamed up about it and they came down for a hearing in the House chambers and they introduced–whoever was presiding at that meeting–I don't even know which group it was that was conducting the hearing, but they introduced the legislators from each of the districts that were concerned about acquiring the college in their vicinity, and I remember that Harry Lewis was on that commission, too. I recall that when they introduced Bill Gissberg from the Thirty-Ninth Legislative District they all screamed and hollered and yelled and clapped and I was just flabbergasted. It was a great ovation but it wasn't for me, it was demonstrating for the school, support for the college. I felt like I was done in by my colleagues on that issue, but it was too important an issue to succumb to pork and, besides, I was fighting the governor who wanted the college to be located here in Olympia. I certainly introduced legislation to put the college in Arlington because of the politics involved in it. I wouldn't be truthful if I said otherwise.

Ms. Boswell: When you said you were done in by your colleagues, I'm not sure what you mean by that.

Mr. Gissberg: My colleagues voted to have it someplace else, that's how I was done in.

Ms. Boswell: I see. Okay. Were there other issues like that where you thought you had to support them because they were meaningful to Snohomish County?

Mr. Gissberg: The two o'clock closing, I thought I had to support that. Liberalization of the liquor laws. I was a hypocrite when I came to that. I certainly enjoyed my cocktails. After twelve o'clock, midnight, it didn't bother me to take a cocktail until two o'clock and I always voted against it because of the overwhelming feeling in my district not to liberalize the liquor laws. That's certainly a good example of politics, if you can call it politics: The desires of your constituency leading you to take a certain position.

Ms. Boswell: Before we go on, I want to go back for a minute to the discussion we had about feeling part of a group in terms of your notions about how to vote, not about how to vote but feeling part of a coalition or class.

Do you remember about a group in the Legislature that was called the "urban seven" or the "urban six" that were essentially urban legislators? It was in the early '70s, and I'm not sure it was before or after you left the Legislature.

Mr. Gissberg: I never heard of them.

Ms. Boswell: It was a group of urban senators who were sort of regarded as being a kind of a bloc or a common vote. I think mostly Seattle people. I just was curious whether that was something you were aware of?

Mr. Gissberg: I know that Seattle had a deal when I was there–there was a Seattle-King County group that usually could be counted on, or castigated, whichever way you want to view it–for voting on the same side of an issue, particularly when it came to school issues or when it came to issues that affected the economic well-

being of the community. In things of that kind, the King County group held together.

Ms. Boswell: Who was part of that group?

Mr. Gissberg: Fred Dore, Wes Uhlman, Ed Riley. Ed was before the ones in that line-up. I've forgotten their names. John O'Brien.

An example of that would be in the highway appropriations. The rural group always outvoted the urban group when it came to highway appropriations. I think the Seattle group you're referring to got together primarily to rectify that situation when the traffic became so bad in the City of Seattle. They had a common bond. Those are the only two examples that I can remember.

Ms. Boswell: On a different subject, I wanted to ask you–just for my own clarification–in terms of the Democratic Party or the Democratic members of the Legislature in particular, when the Democrats were the majority party, we've talked a lot about Bob Greive and his role as the majority leader, tell me more about the Democratic Caucus and the role that they played in terms of the Legislature.

Mr. Gissberg: It's got to be separated into two different periods.

Ms. Boswell: Okay.

Mr. Gissberg: In the early times when Howard Bargreen was the chairman of the Democratic Caucus, I don't think he asserted the kind of leadership and policy direction that later on became the hallmark of Bob Bailey. Bob Bailey was an outstanding leader in the Democratic Caucus and had support from both the Greive supporters and the anti-Greive supporters. Bailey was in a position of being able to say what he thought, which had to be meaningful to everybody in the caucus. He chose his issues with care, I'm sure, and didn't speak out on any trivial piece of legislation, of which there was an abundance. He was able to exercise his good common sense on many issues.

[End of Tape 13, Side 1]

Mr. Gissberg: I remember one time, a single occasion, when Bob Bailey would quote the Democratic state platform as being a reason to vote for or against something. You'd think that that would be the case, but it never was the case. Luke Graham, Democratic state chairman when Rosellini was governor, would appear at the Legislature and urge us to vote for or against one thing or another because it was on the Democratic platform to do so. But that was never really a successful argument in the minds of some of the legislators, particularly the eastern Washington legislators who were very independent of the Democratic Party as such. Stemming back to the time when they bolted from the party and joined with the Republicans to organize the Senate and its committees. The fact that the state chairman came and asked you to vote for something because it was in the Democratic platform, to me was not a–

Ms. Boswell: You don't think so?

Mr. Gissberg: No. That doesn't look like me.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me what that was about?

Mr. Gissberg: February 13, 1969.

Ms. Boswell: It's a political cartoon in the *Everett Herald*. You're shaking down the committee chairmen.

Mr. Gissberg: I'm shaking the bills out. There's a difference. I'm shaking the bills out of their pockets. I'll tell you how that came about.

Ms. Boswell: Okay, tell me.

Mr. Gissberg: Have you got the question on tape?

Ms. Boswell: Yes.

Mr. Gissberg: It came about as a result of the debate on the Rules Committee becoming secret. I was an advocate of keeping the secrecy in the Rules Committee and not opening it up to public scrutiny for the reasons I've attempted to articulate prior to this time. And during that same debate, I tried to point out that if the Rules Committee were to be open, that there wouldn't be any area for killing all the bad legislation that might wander through the committees. The chairmen of the committees at that time were just a sieve and they'd go on into a committee and they'd see the scrutiny that they might otherwise get because the chairman of the committee wouldn't say, "Well, the Rules Committee will kill that. I don't have to. I don't have to take the political heat. I can go ahead and pass it into the Rules Committee and the Rules Committee will kill it and no one will know the difference." So, the argument was then that the committee chairmen, with the Rules Committee open, would become more responsible instead of just opening the floodgates to run all the bills that came to his committee to be passed to the Rules

Committee. They'd make an effort to hear them and kill them if they were not in the public interest.

So I sought to eliminate the "pocket veto." The committee chairmen, if they were strong chairmen, would say that "I'm not going to let the bill out. I'm not going to put the bill up for hearing." It was always the committee chairman's prerogative to schedule a bill for hearing or not. So there was no requirement to have a vote on the bill, even after they had a hearing. That was the "pocket veto." So I proposed an amendment which provided that on any bill that was in committee, any member of the committee could circulate a petition for the chairman to release the bill to the second reading calendar in the Senate by a majority vote of the members of that committee on the petition. That's what that was all about. Giving the members of the committee the opportunity to get a bill out even if the chairman didn't like it.

Ms. Boswell: Were you portrayed in other cartoons? We talked about the press a lot, but what about political cartoons? Was it something you found yourself in on occasion, or not?

Mr. Gissberg: No. I don't think so.

Ms. Boswell: We were talking a few minutes ago about the Democratic Caucus and I wanted to go back for a minute and ask you also about the Democratic Council, and how that differed.

Mr. Gissberg: It wasn't the Democratic Council, it was the Legislative Council. Is that what you're talking about?

Ms. Boswell: I thought there was a separate Democratic Council, too, but no, just the Legislative Council?

Mr. Gissberg: The Legislative Council was a nonpartisan, supposedly nonpartisan, interim committee which studied legislative matters during the interim between sessions of the Legislature. The Speaker of the House was usually the chairman of the Legislative Council by virtue of the organization and because of the statute which said that there would be one more House member than there was Senate members on the Legislative Council. That gave the House Speaker more votes than the Senate had. The Legislative Council was not a particularly effective body. It never did get involved in any controversy as such, and any heavy legislation.

Ms. Boswell: Why was that? Just because there were stronger leaders elsewhere?

Mr. Gissberg: I can't venture to guess. I never really thought of why. Probably because anything that was controversial wouldn't get anywhere because the Democrats stuck together with a few exceptions, and the Republicans stuck together and it would create animosities that would stop the functioning of the council in a meaningful way. I don't know and never heard of the Democratic Council before.

Ms. Boswell: I had read about a Democratic Council and I wasn't familiar with it either, but, particularly in 1965, and I think it was mentioned in regard to some of the struggles in the Democratic Party and the competition with Greive. I didn't know whether it was just a particular group that got together during that time, or whether it was just dubbed the Democratic Council, in reality it didn't exist as an entity or not. So that's why I wanted to ask about it. It was specifically in some of the articles referred to it as, quote, Democratic Council, so I was curious what it was, because I wasn't familiar with it.

Mr. Gissberg: They might be referring to the Legislative Council when it was governed by the Democratic members.

Ms. Boswell: That could be.

Mr. Gissberg: Democratic as an adjective. Democratic Legislative Council.

Ms. Boswell: I think Martin Durkan's name was mentioned in relationship to it, though.

Mr. Gissberg: Well then, that wouldn't be it. Martin was never on the Legislative Council.

Ms. Boswell: Tell me about Martin Durkan.

Mr. Gissberg: What do you want to know?

Ms. Boswell: In relation to the Democratic Party.

Mr. Gissberg: He was almost governor, and would have been governor, in my opinion, had Rosellini not chosen to run for a third term. When he ran for a third term, that destroyed Martin's chance of being governor.

Ms. Boswell: There was a whole time there when you essentially supported Durkan. We talked a little bit about this, before you knew that Rosellini would try to run again. Right?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. It was natural for me to support Durkan. He was a colleague and I had known him before he was elected to the Senate, and I worked with him on the Ways and Means Committee, and I supported him when he told me that he was going to run for governor. He wanted to know if I'd support him and I told him "Yes" without hesitation. Martin certainly ran the Ways and Means Committee as a leader of that committee should, and got his way on whatever he wanted to do in the appropriations field. Matter of fact, he hired Mike Lowry to work as clerk in the Ways and Means Committee. That's where Mike Lowry got his start. He was the chief clerk of the Ways and Means Committee. Martin could have practically carte blanche authority to do anything he wanted to do, even if the Republicans opposed it. Democrats held a majority of the committee, necessarily, and if he lost a vote, all he had to do was give the high sign to the Democrats, and the Democrats would change their votes to how he wanted us to vote in committee.

Ms. Boswell: Let's talk about the interim committees. First of all, let me ask you a question that has been bothering me. What is the difference between an interim committee and a task force?

Mr. Gissberg: A task force is usually created by the governor. An interim committee is a tool of the Legislature to operate between sessions. That's the way it used to be. Now, modern times, I guess the standing committees have authority to operate during the interim as well. The standing committees have operating authority during the interim. The time that I was in the Legislature, the standing committees lost all their authority after the Legislature adjourned sine die. For any committees to function, it required either a special statute as in the case of the Legislative Council and the Interim Highway Committee and the Judicial Council or committees that had authority during the interim. That authority was vested in them by virtue of a statute.

Well, now those interim committees have gone "bye-bye" and the standing committees of the Legislature continue to operate during the interims, providing for more continuity and a much better way of doing it now that the Legislature's getting to be more and more full time.

Ms. Boswell: Did that change begin to come about when the Legislature went to an annual session, or was it just sort of an evolution?

Mr. Gissberg: I think it probably started after. The standing committees got authority after I'd left the Legislature in '72. It was probably a necessity by virtue of the fact that the Legislature was meeting annually and there were shorter periods of time to look at legislation by an interim committee and provide for continuity of interest in membership as well.

Ms. Boswell: You were on a few different interim committees. One that I read the most about was Governmental Cooperation. I wonder if you'd want to tell me a little bit more about that.

Mr. Gissberg: Didn't I tell you how that got started? The run-in with the Seattle police officers.

Ms. Boswell: Is that really how that whole issue got started? I remember the story about the ticket, right? So that actually led to that committee then?

Mr. Gissberg: It was one of the factors that led to it. At least it led to studies in all the police departments. But, more than any other factor, however, that had to do with its creation was my thought that I wanted to run for Congress. I wanted a springboard to give me some publicity statewide. Some acquaintance with people statewide that I otherwise wouldn't be able to obtain. So I convinced my colleagues in the Senate and in the House to pass a joint resolution providing for the creation of the Committee on Governmental Cooperation. That functioned for one interim, two-year period, and part of the next biennium. It never did finish all of its work because during the second biennium Rosellini vetoed all of the appropriations for interim committees. There was a problem that occurred between the governor and the Republicans. The Republicans had control of the House at the time, and Governor Rosellini was fearful that the Legislative Council would be used for political purposes and he therefore vetoed the appropriation, and to be consistent he vetoed all the appropriations for all interim committees including mine. So we weren't able to finish our work, all of our work that we wanted to have done the second year of the biennium.

I served on the Legislative Council for years. I was vice chairman of the Legislative Council. It's the only time I beat Greive on a vote. I think he was as surprised as I was that I had the votes to make it for vice chairman.

Ms. Boswell: When a governor decided to appoint a task force, would those also serve between sessions? Were they paid positions?

Mr. Gissberg: No. They weren't paid positions, but I think they received per diem allowance for the members.

Ms. Boswell: That's essentially the same way the interim committees work, too, isn't it?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. The task forces were more oriented by public membership rather than legislative membership. The task forces represented various segments of our economy and interest groups in the state to pound out positions on matters of substantial public interest, which for one reason or another, the Legislature hadn't dealt with themselves, and the task forces were usually a gubernatorial device by which legislation could be drafted and the need for it demonstrated to the public by virtue of its diversity of membership. Task forces are still utilized more on the federal level than they are on the state level, but there's a task force for just about anything you want to pick the papers up and read about at the federal level.

Ms. Boswell: You were on one, I think, on correctional institutions that I saw.

Mr. Gissberg: Was I?

Ms. Boswell: Yes.

Mr. Gissberg: I didn't have much stock in those task forces anyway.

Ms. Boswell: You had been fairly vocal, and maybe this is the reason for it, earlier about some trouble they had at the Monroe Reformatory, I think. There'd been a riot or prison rebellion at Monroe.

Mr. Gissberg: Yes. There was. A riot occurred in Monroe which was in my legislative district and I was not on the Legislative Council. That was about in 1955, I think. My friend, Neil Hoff, whom I have spoken about several times, was the Republican chairman of the Institutions Committee of the Legislative Council and it was his job to look into the affairs at Monroe to ascertain what could be done to prevent a reoccurrence of the riot. I don't remember being vocal about it but I think I introduced a couple of bills which came out of that committee, one of which, as I recall, was to expand the use of prison labor to manufacture furniture and license plates so as to give the inmates more of a task to perform rather than sitting around in idleness and dreaming up ways to raise hell.

Much the same fashion as Perry Woodall saved the herds of cattle, cows, at Monroe and one of the mental institutions as well. They had their own dairy farm and supplied the inmates with cows and milk-manufacturing devices. Bottling devices is what I'm trying to say. Perry Woodall, great guy that he was, funny a man as he was, great debater that he was, got up and put the Senate in stitches by saying that not only was this a good economic venture to provide for the cows, it was a therapeutic value to the inmates as well in drawing the milk.

Ms. Boswell: Did he get some applause for that?

Mr. Gissberg: He brought down the house at least once a week.

Ms. Boswell: On a more serious topic, another issue that I know you had some involvement in was regulation of dangerous drugs. Was that part of that Governmental Cooperation Interim Committee?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes, it was. That's where it came from. That was the first occasion that there was any public attention drawn to amphetamines. We found that there were several pharmacies in the City of Seattle which were abusing the state law, state pharmaceutical law which required prescriptions to be written for those. We found that at least in one pharmacy in Seattle, the pharmacist was making a living out of selling amphetamines to unauthorized persons. And they uncovered one doctor who charged for the prescriptions and gave several prescriptions a day, even. We got out an extensive report on it which I gave–I gave that book to you or Dianne. With very little investment, the Legislature got a lot out of the legislative Interim Committee On Governmental Cooperation. We made numerous recommendations which became law.

Ms. Boswell: What first got you involved in the issue of the drugs, in particular? Was there some incident?

Mr. Gissberg: I don't recall specifically what precipitated it, but certainly it was an issue that was a good political issue, good for a politician to be involved in. Just like the Kefauver committee was a great committee for Senator Estes Kefauver on the national level, as the Legislative Council was for Al Rosellini on his investigation on crime in the State of Washington. Perfect way for a politician to become well-known on the right side of an issue. That whole committee was my idea and Bob Greive was happy to go along with it to get rid of me on the Legislative Council, I'm sure. Bob and I were friends, not close friends or anything, but we had no animosity, at least I had no animosity toward him and I don't think he did to me either. It just so happened that we were on different sides of some issues.

Ms. Boswell: You were fairly strong rivals in terms of power relationships?

Mr. Gissberg: Yes, we were.

Ms. Boswell: You were on at least one national committee, too. I was thinking about a committee that US Senator Everett Dirksen started on redistricting. I think it was on redistricting. How did that come about?

Mr. Gissberg: Was it Dirksen?

Ms. Boswell: That's what I have down here. That's my memory. I read about it a week or so ago, so it's not real clear in my memory.

Mr. Gissberg: The one man, one vote issue was not only prevalent in the state of Washington, but was an issue in all the states. There were many that had the same problems as we had here, i.e., that the Legislature had not redistricted in accordance with one man, one vote, and it was Dirksen on a national level who was advocating that a federal system be established in the states. I don't know that he had legislative authority for the creation of his committee, or whether he had just done it on an ad hoc basis. I don't think they ever met, at least I was never informed of any meeting of the committee that I can recall.

[End of Tape 13, Side 2]

Ms. Boswell: What would you say to somebody who was considering public service? Would you encourage them, and if so, what would you tell them about politics as a career?

Mr. Gissberg: I'd encourage them by saying you can make a difference. If they believe they can make a difference, they can make a difference. That's sweet, and that's short.

Ms. Boswell: How can we attract better people into public service? Is there something that the people or the state or whatever can do to attract people more into public service? Good people.

Mr. Gissberg: I think we have good people there now. It's just a question that if they belong to the wrong party.

Ms. Boswell: I thought you weren't that partisan.

Mr. Gissberg: I'm not, but I had to finish my remarks by saying something.

Ms. Boswell: Is there anything else you want to say or add to this?

Mr. Gissberg: I'm sorry that I can't recall specific instances or legislation more clearly than I have, but to get an idea of what went on that many years ago is difficult for me. I regret that I haven't been able to be of more help in doing that. You asked me what I was proud of. I think I told you what I was proud of. I'm also proud of the creation of the Police Officers Training Commission, which I think has become even more important nowadays with educating the police officers, considering the terrible things that are going on in our streets now.

As I see the future of our country, one of these days there's going to be a strong leader who is blessed with the oratory skills of a tyrant, who's going to be able to appeal to the more basic instincts of the population as some people are doing now.

To educate police officers out there to protect the constitutional rights of others as well as to enforce the law. But a tyrant always looks to the support from the police before he does anything else, and to keep the police vigilant against that occurring. The Police Officers Training Commission did have in the statute creating it an admonition along those lines which required training to be given on constitutional rights of citizens as well as the laws that they're expected to obey. I'm proud of that, too.

Ms. Boswell: Thank you very much.

[End of Tape 14, Side 1]

[End of interview series]