

Warren A. Bishop



An Oral History

Washington State Oral History Program
Office of the Secretary of State

Warren A. Bishop:

An Oral History



Warren A. Bishop with Governor Albert D. Rosellini

Interviewed and Edited by Anne Kilgannon

Washington State Oral History Program
Office of the Secretary of State
Sam Reed, Secretary of State

The interview with Warren Bishop was conducted to help document a significant “Turning Point” in legislative history: The Budget and Accounting Act of 1959. To explore this collection, please visit <http://www.secstate.wa.gov/oralhistory/timeline.aspx?t=3> on the Oral History Program website under “Voices from the Post-War Era” timeline.

Published 2006
Washington State Oral History Program
All rights Reserved



Washington State Oral History Program
Office of Secretary of State
PO Box 40243
Olympia, WA 98504-0243
Telephone: (360) 704-7141

Part One: Family Background, Military Experience and Early Teaching Career

Part Two: Graduate School at the University of Washington and Work with the Bureau of Governmental Research and Services

Part Three: Joining the Rosellini Administration

Part Four: The Budget and Accounting Act and the Creation of the Central Budget Agency



Governor Albert Rosellini with Chief of Staff Warren Bishop and Cabinet

PART ONE: FAMILY BACKGROUND, MILITARY EXPERIENCE AND EARLY TEACHING CAREER

Ms. Kilgannon: This is Anne Kilgannon for the Oral History Program. Today we're going to talk with Warren Bishop, chiefly about the Budget and Accounting Act. But before we dive into that subject, let's talk about your life before you became Governor Rosellini's chief of staff. Let's talk about your background first: where you grew up, what you did, what you learned and then eventually how you came into the position to achieve this milestone act for Washington State. If you could just tell me about where you were born and just briefly about your family?

Mr. Bishop: I was born east of Colorado Springs, about twenty-six miles east of Colorado Springs, and as a matter of fact, I was born in a homestead. We lived there until I was about a year old and then we moved into the Drennan schoolhouse, in the basement, because my mother was chosen to be the operator and manager for the telephone system for the entire area east of Colorado Springs. So we were responsible for the El Paso Mutual Telephone Company. There was also one brother in the family, six years older than I. We grew up helping my dad maintain and service the telephone system and take care of the schoolhouse and keeping it clean, and building the fires in the schoolrooms, and so on. My brother shared duties with me. That and working summers on the farms, made up most of my real young life. Later, while in college, I served as Farm Range Supervisor for the Federal Conservation Program (AAA) in El Paso County, Colorado.

Ms. Kilgannon: That's kind of a flat area of Colorado, so you were not in the mountains, right? You were on the plains?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. It was flat cattle country, but it was a beautiful area. Our school was small. I think there were about nine or so who graduated with me from the high school. We had good teachers who probably did not have as up-to-date modern textbooks and equipment, but at least we had good teachers.

One of the teachers took a special interest in my going to college, which I truly have appreciated in years since then. In high school he started putting a good deal of attention on my desire by then to go to college. My cousin grew up about the same time and about the same age and also went to the Drennan high school. We both went to Northern Colorado University in 1939.

Ms. Kilgannon: Were you the first in your immediate family to go?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. My mother was very pleased. She thought that would be wonderful. And of course, having moved out away from the homestead and so on, she really was excited about her career and she sort of became the chief hostess for that area because she ran the switchboard and the post office and it was just one of these things that was a gathering place.

Ms. Kilgannon: She knew everybody?

Mr. Bishop: She enjoyed it. But that really is what started me on the track of getting away from the country and working on farms and so on. So I went to what is now called Northern State University in Greeley, Colorado. I took, of course, education. I had completed three years at Greeley and was about to become a senior when I was drafted into the Army. I would liked to have gotten into the

V-8 program, which was a Navy program for flying, but for some reason the doctors who came around during the examinations felt that I had a murmur in my heart, which I've never had detected anywhere else—no other doctor has!

Ms. Kilgannon: You seem to be fine.

Mr. Bishop: So I was not able to get into the V-8. I would liked to have. So I was drafted and went into the service and spent about two-and-one-half years in the service. I think that maybe I'll just say a little bit about that because that also helped to frame my future.

We were shipped out of where I was inducted in Denver and moved immediately to Palacios, Texas, without knowledge of what that was going to mean for me, but we were part of a cadre of persons who were going to form these officers—the non commissioned group who would start receiving new recruits mostly from the eastern part of the United States. It was a Triple A mobile aircraft artillery, so it was an exciting kind of field of military service to be in. We did our training there and boot camp and so on. We went to Louisiana for the Louisiana maneuvers. After about six months we were shipped out because they were concerned at that stage that England was going to be invaded.

Ms. Kilgannon: What year are we now discussing? Forty-one, forty-two? On your resume it says: Battlefield commission, five campaigns, European theater, October, 1942 to December, 1945. Does that seem about right?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. So I think I went in, in October and participated in the Louisiana maneuvers and shipped out and went to England as a complete unit—a battalion. We were billeted in England to do training and prepare to take care of any invasion that may have occurred in England.

Ms. Kilgannon: How did you feel about all this?

Mr. Bishop: It was a concern to me because England was being sort of invaded with bombs and so on, at that stage. We were not located close to London or those places that were being hit, but we were obviously down in the southern part of England—actually training and getting ready for the invasion of Europe.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did you know that? Did they tell you?

Mr. Bishop: I think we suspected it, but we weren't really given that kind of information. We were there to protect England.

But a lot of things happened as a result of this. We landed at Liverpool when we went to England and we were billeted at the Aintree race track, which was interesting because we were, I think, billeted in the horse barns, probably.

About the same time, they needed to modernize our equipment, especially our equipment that was used to sight planes and their trajectory and so on. Because what we had were electrical sighting mechanisms that required a large engine to generate the electricity and so on, and that was not the right kind of equipment to be going into the battlefield. So I was chosen to go to Scotland to take training in a visual kind of tracking with two gunneries on both sides of the weapon, one for the horizontal and one for the vertical, to track planes and to do it without doing it through telescopes or something like that, which really was an interesting project.

Ms. Kilgannon: Just with the naked eye?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. I learned how they trained for that, and that was the main purpose of going up there because they were the only ones

who had developed that system before we had left the United States.

So that was sort of interesting to go to Scotland. I was there all by myself and stayed in a military camp there. After about two or three months of that, I then came back to Liverpool and built the equipment—or at least gave instructions to persons who built equipment for us to be able to practice doing that. The mechanism had lights and so on. And they were able to do this without having this big engine and of course a big box which a person stood on each side of it for aiming at the aircraft. So that was quite a break.

As a result of that, we practiced a lot on the beach in the gunnery tracking. They would drag targets that were large panels—they didn't really have a name for them—but they were comparable in size to an airplane, in behind the planes so that we could actually fire at something. But anyway, it was a plane pulling a target.

Ms. Kilgannon: So this is just for target practice?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. It was far enough from the plane that we didn't have to worry about... In fact, we really became quite expert—our gunners and others—so that we could actually hit these targets rather well. So that was our training.

All the time this was going on, of course, things were really building up over in France. France was being completely occupied by the Germans. It became very apparent that we were training to go to the landing. Interestingly enough, we saw that this could be organized and commanded in an orderly way. In the landing we were assigned to the Twenty-ninth Infantry Division. The Twenty-ninth Infantry Division came over early, too, but not as early as we did, and they assembled their troops in southern England and that's where we were attached to each other and boarded the landing craft for D-day.

Ms. Kilgannon: In Higgins boats?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. There were Higgins boats. There were LSTs and so on. In fact, we were part of the landing plan on Omaha Beach. There was only one regiment of the Twenty-ninth Infantry Division and only one regiment of the First Division. Our regiment was 116 and the regiment for the First Division was 115. Those two regiments are the ones who made the initial landing. And of course, it was a very unexpected difficult landing.

Ms. Kilgannon: Weren't planes supposed to take care of the gun placements along the cliffs?

Mr. Bishop: They were. But they missed many of them. It did not happen.

Ms. Kilgannon: So the initial troop landings on the beach were under heavy bombardment from installations?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. They were located on higher cliffs. And we couldn't get off because we were with heavy equipment and could not be landed with the initial infantry troops. Even though we were sitting out there. Of course, there was quite a bombardment by destroyers and other Navy battalions that were offshore. It still did not do the kind of job that needed to be done. To be real honest about it, I don't think any of us can tell you how devastating it really was. It was several days before we were able to get our equipment in on the beach. It took at least a couple of days to gain the beachheads and to be able to protect the equipment. So we did participate in Omaha, but not on the day of the initial landing. I know our objective was supposed to be D+5 to take St. Lo, which was a city that was about twenty miles inland.

Ms. Kilgannon: Fighting all the way?

Mr. Bishop: All the way. And of course, the Germans were still heavily entrenched. In fact, they were being added to with reinforcements and so there were counter attacks.

Ms. Kilgannon: I understand there were hedgerows in that area that were very difficult to get through.

Mr. Bishop: Yes. And that's where, I think, that we came into play because there weren't very many planes flying from Germany. They did have dive bombers that would come at night and of course, they would try to hit concentrated areas with troops.

But as soon as we got on the beach or got up on the cliffs ourselves it became apparent that our equipment, because we had a forty millimeter and half-track equipped with quad-mount fifty caliber machine guns that had a height that could just about look over the top of the hedgerow and help with the initial impact of going through the hedgerow, because at that time there were no tanks heavy enough with plows to plow through the hedgerows. So it was just troops who had to jump over and take their chances.

But there we were, with fire power that was helpful enforcement to support infantry in early encounters with hedgerows. So we were just, practically, the front edge of clearing the troops so that they could get across the hedgerows. So that was sort of an interesting development. They did start putting plows on the front of tanks to deal with it, but it was after several weeks. So that's where it started. From that we did take Saint Lo, but it was supposed to be taken on D+5, and it was D+30 or something. So that first initial thrust was very difficult.

Ms. Kilgannon: War never does quite go according to paper plans. Were you a leader of a group? Did you have troops under you?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. At that time I was a section sergeant, so I had one complete unit.

Ms. Kilgannon: How many people would that be?

Mr. Bishop: There were about fourteen in each unit, but that consisted of a truck, halftrack, forty millimeter, and all the equipment and persons who were trained with the equipment in that group. Each section was independent, even though we were in radio contact or telephone contact. We were all separate and initiated our own decisions.

Ms. Kilgannon: I've always heard that the American G.I. was successful because they had a lot of ingenuity and independence. That they didn't need the top-down approach as much as some other groups, perhaps. You could all just be sent off in your smaller units and if you knew what the goal was, you could get there one way or the other. Does that seem true?

Mr. Bishop: That's right. There was a plan, but each section fit in the plan in a certain way so that we would pick out our own sites and knew where everybody else was so that even though all sections participated for the battalion in a movement, we were all independent in the process of doing so.

Ms. Kilgannon: So whatever you came upon you solved it yourselves?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. We ended up in several campaigns across France, into Paris.

Ms. Kilgannon: Were you part of the liberation of Paris?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. In fact, I was one of the first ones to go because our kind of artillery was just excellent to be located in various lo-

cations in Paris, so I went in with the spotters the first day to find out where we were going to put our particular site. It was in the Tuileries Garden. I selected Tuileries Garden! We had spent all those days before. By that time, the Germans were mostly out of Paris, but they were still around.

Ms. Kilgannon: Wasn't there some street fighting? It wasn't that you just walked in and there was nothing, was there?

Mr. Bishop: They were still fighting, but that meant we came out of the trenches, which we'd been in all the way up to Paris and into a hotel, which was right across the Champs Elyees where we stayed at night. Then our men were able to take shifts on the equipment. So that was quite a change for us!

Ms. Kilgannon: What kind of condition was Paris in at that stage?

Mr. Bishop: Paris was not too severely injured because the bombing in Paris did not really take much effect. They were moved out of Paris just to kind of back up and out into the fields to fight because they were in no position to do that in Paris. There were a lot of people in Paris who were attempting to provide protection for themselves and also support France. The troops from the United States moved into Paris very rapidly and then left quite rapidly. I think we only had a site there for about a week and we moved on, into the trenches again. It was quite an experience because the huge infantry divisions would march through Paris, and they would even lose a few in the process! But otherwise, it was a new experience for all of us.

I shouldn't say too much about my military career because it was pretty normal and the kind of service that was put in by most of the men who were there.

Ms. Kilgannon: True. But a very critical and formative experience, I'm sure.

Mr. Bishop: In the early stages, because we were pretty much a self controlled group, our section was invaded and we were successful in getting ourselves extricated and also doing quite a bit of damage. So I got the Bronze Star as a result of that. As time went on, the casualties among the commissioned personnel was really pretty high in those kinds of situations with the infantry. So I also received a battlefield commission, which was sort of exciting because I was discharged in France and for two days I was not in the Army or belonged to anybody. It was interesting to move up the chain and eventually become a commissioned officer. So from that time forward, in the rest of the battle, I had several sections.

Ms. Kilgannon: In the end how many different people would you be responsible for?

Mr. Bishop: I suspect by the time I became second in command of a battery and I imagine there were several hundred people in a battery.

Ms. Kilgannon: So this would involve: moving towards your objective? It would be making sure you had equipment, food, what your strategy was going to be, the whole thing?

Mr. Bishop: And checking on the sections and being sure that they were properly situated and sort of in a command kind of an operation.

The food situation never really became normalized because we were mostly, during the initial stages—through Saint Lo and even for quite a period of time after that—we were on K rations. But then soon after that, we were able to set up small places for a kitchen and then we started preparing C rations.

Ms. Kilgannon: A little bit tastier?

Mr. Bishop: A little bit. You could heat it! That was about the only difference. But that went on that way until we reached the Elbe River. We were always out there pretty close to the front because we were the anti-aircraft for the entire groups when we were moving. There's not as much air fighting as you would imagine in that situation.

Ms. Kilgannon: Weren't the Germans short of airplanes?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. But we were on the very edge of the breakthrough that the Germans made and in connection with that there were a lot of planes. They used a lot of planes, and fortunately we were on the very flank of that and were able to try to help out. But when we got to the Elbe River that's where we stopped, because the Russians were coming the other direction and it was decided that would be the point that we would meet.

Ms. Kilgannon: So you just stayed in one place at that point, or did you move up to anywhere else?

Mr. Bishop: We kept moving around on the Elbe River because we went into the Netherlands, we went into—what's the country next to France?

Ms. Kilgannon: Belgium?

Mr. Bishop: Belgium. We went into Liege, Belgium and that seemed to be the focal point of the front moving towards the Elbe River. Anyway, that's where we stayed and at the end, when finally the Nazis capitulated there, the men that I had been with all along who were still non-commissioned persons, had received points for their days and activities, but unbeknownst to me, commissioned officers did not receive any points.

Ms. Kilgannon: These points, didn't you need to have a certain number to go home?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. So a lot of my men were ready to go home and I remember how disappointing that was to me because I was counting on that as well.

Ms. Kilgannon: Had you kind of had your fill?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. So therefore I was assigned to a new unit and we were put in charge of a prisoner-of-war camp. So I was a provost of a prison war camp.

Ms. Kilgannon: These would be German prisoners of war?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: How long would they have kept those?

Mr. Bishop: We were there for another two or three months.

Ms. Kilgannon: I guess you had to process everybody or whatever they were going to do with them.

Mr. Bishop: We didn't have any trouble because they were in prison and they had a lot of men who were there to guard them and so on, From there, it was decided that some of us would form a cadre, get new equipment and go to southern France and be shipped out for the Asian theater.

Ms. Kilgannon: How'd you feel about that?

Mr. Bishop: I was really absolutely shocked.

Ms. Kilgannon: Were you getting a little weary?

Mr. Bishop: By that time I'd already been through five campaigns.

Ms. Kilgannon: You'd already been fighting for two years of steady fighting. Did you ever get a break or any kind of leave in any sense?

Mr. Bishop: No, I didn't. Nobody got to go home.

Ms. Kilgannon: So, it's once you're there, you're just there?

Mr. Bishop: So they sent me on a four or five-day pass to someplace that I could rest and enjoy and so on. While I was there the atomic bomb was dropped on Nagasaki, and that changed the plan for us to ship out of southern France.

Ms. Kilgannon: Were you able to hear that news? Is that something that you knew right away?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: How was that presented? Was it over the radio—a newscast, or some kind of announcement?

Mr. Bishop: There was pretty good communication among the troops because they had mostly telephone communications and a message would come down through the troops and into the field.

Ms. Kilgannon: I just wondered how much they told you about what it was that had happened. If it was even comprehensible.

Mr. Bishop: Not very much because we didn't really know the nature....

Ms. Kilgannon: Did you even know what an atomic bomb was?

Mr. Bishop: We had very little information about the atomic bomb. And of course, we were all so relieved not to have to ship out again and go to the other theater. So that's pretty much the military, and after three or four months more I was discharged in Colorado.

Ms. Kilgannon: And you came all the way back home to Colorado? Was it hard to come back home after all your experiences? You just come back and pick up your life again?

Mr. Bishop: It was very difficult to resume my earlier activities. The first three years of my college life really, I had had a wonderful experience because in the summers I became a farm range supervisor for the agricultural program which went into effect about that time, which allowed farmers and ranchers certain benefits if they practiced certain conservation measures such as building dams and strip cropping and similar activities like that. So I did that for almost three summers.

Ms. Kilgannon: You would go out and teach farmers how to do this or just supervise this somehow?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. I would go out and determine measures being undertaken—it was all mapped, aerial maps, and I would go out and check up the fields that had been stripped and also check out the dams that had been built. The whole process. And then put a report together and send it in to the county so that they could receive their benefits. That was an interesting experience for me. It helped me to finance my college career.

Ms. Kilgannon: So the whole time you were going through college, you were planning on being a teacher?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: When you came back from the war, did you have the same plan, or did you have to rethink what you wanted to do?

Mr. Bishop: I didn't have much of a choice because I only had three years of education and I thought that I should finish and get a degree so that I could teach and get my certification. And additionally, my father, because I'd been gone all that period of time, was sort of possessive and he started making plans for me for teaching where we lived in El Paso County. And I had no desire or interest in doing that. So my mind was set to get my degree and to get interviews and go. And I did. I got some military service credit, so I was able to finish in two quarters and start making applications. Superintendents from various school districts were coming to the campuses because there was this whole group of persons who had been in the service and they were interviewing graduates. The Superintendent from Yakima County, Highland School district, came to the Greeley campus and conducted interviews and they interviewed me. I decided to take the position, sight unseen.

Ms. Kilgannon: You just really wanted to get started?

Mr. Bishop: I had to beat my dad! He was out there making commitments for me, pretty much. Well, you know how things are.

Ms. Kilgannon: Oh, yes, I can picture that. I imagine, were you a little restless? Your life had been on hold. You've had this big experience and you wanted to get started on things?

Mr. Bishop: Very, very restless. I was anxious to start teaching, even though that was a long ways away. My mother had a sister who

lived in Chehalis, so that encouraged me to a degree.

Ms. Kilgannon: You'd at least have heard of Washington State.

Mr. Bishop: And I wanted to move out of that section of the country and Washington was some place I'd heard a lot about.

Ms. Kilgannon: You were just tired of that area?

Mr. Bishop: There wasn't anything there for me to do. The school districts were small. It would be a repeat of the kind of life that I had lived before going into the service.

Ms. Kilgannon: And you had changed; there was no going back, then. There's not a big population in that area, is there? It's pretty rural.

Mr. Bishop: So I ended up driving out to Yakima County, Highland School district, to teach at Cowiche. It was a small school but it was a lot different than I had experience with. The Highland School district was a large district, just not too far out of Yakima. It turned out that...a couple of things: A young man who was the son of a foreman of one of the very large orchards was having difficulty health-wise and couldn't go to school, so somehow they found out about me and I became a tutor for this young man and therefore my board and room was taken care of on this big orchard.

Ms. Kilgannon: Pretty helpful.

Mr. Bishop: So I did that the whole first year. The home was not very far away from the high school where I taught, so that worked out fairly well.

Ms. Kilgannon: What subjects did you teach?

Mr. Bishop: I taught history, political science in a different form—a high school type form, but mostly social science.

Ms. Kilgannon: Had you always been interested in that area?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. That's what I had taken my degree in. So it was fun. There were nice, young people there and I kept track of them for a long, long time.

The other thing that happened, when I came out of the service and went back to Greeley, I met my wife, Barbara. We both had been there the same period of time at Greeley—I think I knew her but we weren't acquainted until we came back.

Ms. Kilgannon: She had been in the service, too.

Mr. Bishop: She was in the WAVES (Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service). She was a Link trainer in California, training pilots in the Navy. After I had made the decision to go teach, I spent most of that year and the summer on Satus Pass between Yakima and Vancouver. She taught in Vancouver.

Ms. Kilgannon: So she came up to Washington, too?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: Was that because you were in the area, or was that her own plan?

Mr. Bishop: Very fortunate! But it was a fun time and so we spent a lot of time visiting each other that year. And then the next summer we got married. We went back to her home to be married in Missouri. We moved back

to Cowiche. We decided I had to teach one more year in order to make it financially, even though there was the G.I. bill and so on, we still needed to... So I taught one more year and then decided to go to graduate school at the University of Washington.

PART TWO: GRADUATE SCHOOL AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON AND WORK WITH THE BUREAU OF GOVERNMENTAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES

Ms. Kilgannon: This decision to go to graduate school, was it something that kind of grew on you over time? You realized you were interested or that you wanted more than to be a high school teacher? How did you come to do that?

Mr. Bishop: Of course, I became aware of the importance of a higher education and I didn't especially enjoy teaching in the public school system. I just wanted to go and get a higher education, and I wanted to go to the University of Washington. That was one of my...I don't know why, maybe because my aunt lived there and I spent a lot of time visiting with her.

Ms. Kilgannon: Were you familiar with it already, then? The campus or the program or just kind of hoping for the best?

Mr. Bishop: Not really. We moved into wartime housing. I don't know what they called it.

Ms. Kilgannon: Those Quonset things?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. In Kirkland. And we took a bus that was provided—a whole bunch of us were living there—transportation to the University of Washington campus. So there were a lot of veterans who had returned to the University of Washington and gone to school there.

Ms. Kilgannon: It must have been quite a community.

Mr. Bishop: Yes. There were twenty-some political science students who returned to the University of Washington on the G.I. Bill after the war to complete their graduate work in political science. Some of them wanted to pursue a greater interest in public administration and were actually working on their graduate degree in public administration. And probably ten or so of those individuals were actually zeroing in on that approach. So it was really a busy place and it was enjoyable. We had good professors. I was intent on going as far as I could, as you can see.

Another thing: Barbara and I decided to move out of rental housing. We moved to Edmonds because she taught at Shoreline. The closest area we could be was in Edmonds, so we rented an apartment in Edmonds. At that stage, I was still trying to get a teaching job and I remember spending a lot of nights in a phone booth when it was pouring outdoors to follow up on applications. I was so disappointed. There wasn't anything happening and finally—can you imagine this—Great Falls, Montana became interested in me and so I was on their list, but I just didn't hear anything. And I just was so concerned. At that time I wasn't even at the University of Washington as an intern. So one night I went down to this phone booth—we couldn't afford to have a phone—and called the superintendent on the phone to see what was going on. He said, "Well, we've been looking at your background and we noticed that you still would possibly qualify as a reserve officer until 1953, and we do not want to get into a situation where you would come to join us and then have to leave because you'd have to report back to the reserves." And I said, "I'm not even aware of that being the case."

Ms. Kilgannon: How likely would that be?

Mr. Bishop: In their minds, it could have taken me away from the system, you know.

So that fell apart. But within a month or less, I was on the list at the University of Washington.

Ms. Kilgannon: At that point did you become one of these interns?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: So it all worked out?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: I'm glad you didn't go to Montana.

Mr. Bishop: I think even Barbara was. She grew up in Montana—Lewistown, Montana, which is not very far from Great Falls, but I don't think she was any more excited about it.

Ms. Kilgannon: She had made her break.

Mr. Bishop: And then of course, later on, when Barbara and I built a house in Edmonds, within a week the ground buckled in behind the house. And I said, "This is not going to work!" So I got to work on a sewer system and formed an LID and did that. Then we got a sewer system and then I decided, "Why don't I just run for the city council?" So I ran for the city council and was elected and we did all kinds of things, which was good because we adopted a subdivision ordinance and zoning ordinances so that Edmonds would have a chance to grow properly.

Ms. Kilgannon: Was that well received in Edmonds? Were you a popular council person?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. I think so. I really enjoyed it.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did you give speeches? You must have had to campaign.

Mr. Bishop: Right. And go out with the people after the council meetings and get acquainted.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did you enjoy that part, being on the other side of the fence?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. So I think that was a good thing for me to do that.

Ms. Kilgannon: How many years were you on the council?

Mr. Bishop: I was still on the council when I was appointed by Governor-elect Rosellini.

Then things sort of started happening. First of all, I was hired as an intern in the Bureau of Governmental Research and Services while I was still pursuing course work on what I thought was going to be a doctorate, but I never got that far. That was interesting because I did a lot of work in municipal research.

Ms. Kilgannon: I'd like to learn more about the Bureau of Governmental Research, what it was, and more about university life. What it was like to come there just after the war with the huge influx of students coming in from their interrupted educations? What it was like back then—the intellectual atmosphere? Who were the thinkers? What were the philosophies of the day?

Mr. Bishop: The then-existing Bureau of Government Research and Services, which is a function of political science, was the research arm of the Department of Political Science, which was headed by Professor Don Webster. At least four or five of those students, including myself, were selected for internships with the Bureau. And, as it turned

out, the University of Washington also housed the Association of Washington Cities, which became, later, something that obviously was a conflict of interest with the University, so the Association of Washington Cities moved off of the campus and had offices elsewhere.

While we were there, a lot of the Bureau of Governmental Research activity was related to city research and actually served as an organization to serve cities and to answer their questions regarding problems and so on. The Bureau also had an annual Institute of Government on the campus, which many interested individuals and officials of state and local government would attend. It was normally held in the summer. So these same individuals who were brought along as graduate students worked very much in that Institute of Governmental Research. I was one of those who was selected to be one of those interns.

Ms. Kilgannon: Would that be a great marriage of theory and practice?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: That's exciting.

Mr. Bishop: It was indeed a very enriching experience because we held offices in the building and we were consulting with persons who were on the staff. We went to meetings with governmental agencies to participate in discussions. We did research reports on various issues, so it was a wonderful education in connection with the graduate degree that we were working on. In fact, I became so involved in that that subsequently I was actually appointed to the faculty in the same organization and my consulting became more significant and I was sort of the director of the Institute of Government for a while. It was just a very enriching experience, and probably had a lot to do with the experience that I needed, which became, later, of interest to

the Governor-elect Rosellini, when it came time to seek out a person from the University of Washington who could serve as his chief of staff. That's where I met Harold Shefelman and he subsequently became a very strong supporter of me. So it was a good opportunity.

After the Association of Washington Cities disconnected themselves from the University of Washington, the Bureau became even stronger in their official capacity of providing research to cities and counties and the special districts throughout the state. Later, the Bureau became an organization called the Municipal Research and Services Center of Washington. My interest in the activity there became so embedded in this organization that from 1977, which was quite a while after I finished my eight years as Chief of Staff and was then at the Washington State University, I became the president of the board of this organization and was there as president of the board from 1977 to 1992.

Ms. Kilgannon: That's a long time.

Mr. Bishop: Yes. That was really a great experience. So I concentrated most of my attention in local government and I participated in activities consisting of helping—going out and conducting education courses for persons who were going to become city councilpersons. I also worked with organizations in unincorporated areas to prepare themselves to vote on the issue of incorporation. I participated in the Bellevue incorporation study; there were quite a few city-manager cities that were changing their form of government. So I conducted courses for those organizations to learn more about the management of a city under the city-management form of government.

I continued to do those things, but the board was responsible for the individuals who were hired to actually do that. But when

I was still at the University of Washington in 1951, I became a member of the faculty, and participated as a consultant on these kinds of issues. So it was a great experience for me.

Ms. Kilgannon: Was there much overlay? You were concentrating on cities and counties, but did you inadvertently or along the way learn about state government?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: Are they very different from each other?

Mr. Bishop: The state government was so much involved because those local governments operated with enabling legislation by statute, so the Legislature was very much involved in the nature of government of those local organizations. So I had a lot of activity with state government.

I also became a member of the Edmonds city council, not to become a person who would be familiar necessarily with being a council, but it was just an organization that I wanted to work with. So state government became very much involved in my career.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did you have a point of view on how counties and cities got their powers from the state government? Did you think that was a good system or should maybe powers have gone the other way?

Mr. Bishop: I thought, essentially, that there needed to be a greater understanding and relationship between state and city governments. Since all of the authority that these local organizations originated from state legislation, it seemed to me that there was a need for there to be a closer relationship with the state. And there were a lot of state agencies that were actually involved in relationships with cities and counties, especially; they were sort of intertwined.

Ms. Kilgannon: It seems like just in those years, the early 1950s, cities were changing their charters. Weren't they going from having commissions to city councils with mayors, stronger mayors? They were changing their structure.

Mr. Bishop: The city manager type of government had just begun to emerge but there were still quite a few cities that were commission forms of government, which meant that they operated with a three-member commission who were full-time and paid. And it wasn't actually a concentration of a management approach to cities except through these three compartments. There were many cities that wanted to change that. All the others were mayor/council types.

Ms. Kilgannon: Was that just too cumbersome? It didn't work very well? Would your Bureau have been part of helping people look at it differently?

Mr. Bishop: It wasn't a way to centralize the operations of cities because there was one commissioner of public works, a commissioner of public finance, and this type of thing. So these were all separated out in the cities and it wasn't really a good efficient structure. There were still some commission cities.

It was obviously—even the strong mayor/council cities were not sufficiently organized to have a strong administrator, a strong management person, because mayors, most of them, came from normal business activities in that city. There are still strong mayor/council cities but the mayor's position has become full time and there are many expert people appointed by the mayor, like in Seattle or Tacoma. Of course, Tacoma has a city manager.

So the cities started to adopt charters—large cities, first class cities—which would set forth clearly the management func-

tions of the various administrative offices. The City of Seattle's charter, for example, is a strong-mayor type charter which establishes departments and so on. So it's almost like a management type. Tacoma, earlier on, decided they wanted to change from their commission form of government and go directly to a council/manager form of government. Port Angeles...there are quite a few cities that made this change. But the business of municipal management was becoming more paramount and more time and more education was being spent for persons hired into that system. So we actually responded to letters from cities throughout the state regarding various problems in city government, or various legal problems. It was actually a research arm of the Association of Washington Cities.

Ms. Kilgannon: What would be a kind of common problem that you would help them with? Could you give me an example?

Mr. Bishop: Most of them would be sort of semi-legal, about were they allowed to do certain things; LIDs; or able to do certain things in personnel; how could they combine the utilities so that they could finance improvements; issuing bonds. Just a whole range of municipal management. And of course, we learned with them, to a large degree. It was a wonderful education.

Ms. Kilgannon: It seems like there was a lot of ferment just then. Wasn't the population of Washington really growing in those years, so that towns would be kind of straining their systems to contain all these people?

Mr. Bishop: Cities were growing so fast—the forms of government were growing so fast; improvements were being made because of the expansion of population, and so on.

Ms. Kilgannon: Counties seemed to be

changing their structure as well, and then you had the rise of the Metro idea in the Seattle area, where unrelated bodies start to relate to each other in a new way. It seems like an exciting period in city council and local government issues.

Mr. Bishop: Yes. There was a lot of transition that transpired in the fifties.

Ms. Kilgannon: Was that brought on by more population, a more complex society?

Mr. Bishop: Growing populations, and the desire and need to be able to consolidate all these functions into an operating system. There are even now metropolitan park districts which enabled cities and counties to work together to manage parks. Yakima has a metropolitan park district and there are several others. But it's clear that when a metropolitan area is growing rapidly, instead of having separate incorporated little cities, to be able to combine all those activities into one metropolitan form of government so that there's only one police department, one fire department and so on—and that, of course, reflects Seattle's metropolitan form of government.

Ms. Kilgannon: Was that part of the intellectual growth of the times? When you were involved in this field, were there big names who were thinking up these new ideas in these forms of government? Were there professors or different writers who were coming up with these new approaches who would have been an influence?

Mr. Bishop: People who had either legal training or public administration training became more influential in the growth of these communities. Jim Ellis is an excellent example in Seattle. In fact, he is often identified as being the person who influenced the growth of metropolitan government in Seattle.

He was an attorney who provided services to municipal forms of government and firms like that—Shefelman’s firm, and Thorgrimson, and Ellis’ firm. But those individuals came from legal firms who could see that the advantages of developing mechanisms, structures, which would help the growth of those areas. Clearly, there were many, many annexations that were taking place and new incorporations of smaller cities.

Ms. Kilgannon: And the growth of suburbs. That’s a big phenomenon right after the war in this state: housing booms. During the Depression and the war years, things were kind of in a holding pattern and then as soon as the war was over and resources start to be freed up for other activities, you get this big boom in people coming back to the state and needing houses and creating all these new kinds of communities. And they realized that the structure they had had in the 1920s was not working so well any more?

Mr. Bishop: No, it didn’t. That was financing, because financing was becoming a major problem for cities and counties, and laws were being developed and passed without too much guidance. So we would get involved in that. I personally spent a lot of time visiting cities and working with council people and with the management people. Whenever a city would adopt...I would, first of all, go out and attempt to help them decide which form of government they should have. As you can imagine, I was pretty much sponsoring the idea of a city management form of government. But then after that would happen, and a new council would be elected, I would go and visit the council and conduct a course on city government.

It also created a market for persons who were trained as public administrators. And I think that’s why there were so many persons at the same time as I was going to

school who were taking public administration and preparing themselves to move into those cities for management positions of the large departments and of the cities, and so on.

Ms. Kilgannon: Was it a fairly new field, public administration as a discipline?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. It certainly was, because it was happening when I first started graduate school. I commenced doing my graduate work in international affairs. There were several professors, George Shipman among them, who spoke to me and said, “Really, you should change your concentration to public administration,” because the number of professional positions in international relations was not exactly a big market. I think that’s why I shifted. I changed everything. That’s why I spent so many months and years in the graduate school and still I didn’t even get a masters degree because I was headed for a PhD. While I was doing that I became so involved, I was too busy to finish up!

Ms. Kilgannon: It doesn’t seem to have hurt your career any. And you were doing all when you were still a student yourself?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. I admired the career of city management. In fact, I envisioned myself possibly going in that direction. But instead, I got involved in a faculty kind of situation. There was a wonderful group of interns, graduate students, and the Bureau which was on the campus, which was part of the University of Washington. They hired graduate students to staff their operation. I was fortunate enough to be hired after a year, I guess. But then, things developed that happened to be something I liked. I had a certain ability for that kind of thing, especially workshops, and so on. So they decided—the University of Washington put me on a permanent appointment with the faculty—not a professor, but a permanent research position.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did your teaching career help you figure out how to give workshops and how to teach people, because, basically, that's what you were doing, I suppose?

Mr. Bishop: I think so. It was just because of the experience of doing it and working with professors and others, and having taken so many hours that I had a lot of experience in that type of thing. They had an annual Institute of Government at the University of Washington and I became the coordinator of that Institute of Government. That was for citizens who'd come from these various cities to this Institute interested in government.

Ms. Kilgannon: There were all these fresh ideas, this growth, this development. As we often find in history, when you've got a whole new push going forward for new ideas you have a reaction, too. With Metro, which for urban planners must have been an exciting initiative, you had an awful lot of people saying, "This is socialism, this is communism. We can't have super-government. It's dangerous." There was that sort of shadow side of what was going on. And you were saying that during your years at the University also saw some ferment on the other side of the coin. The progression of ideas, but also the reaction. You were at the University during the Canwell hearings that challenged the whole idea of academic freedom and what we normally think of as a university atmosphere. Could you tell us a little bit about that experience?

Mr. Bishop: This all occurred about the same time while I was at the University of Washington. There had been hearings going on in the federal government about un-American activities and that sort of spread out and among the states. And so here in Washington, a legislator, Al Canwell, became very instrumental in agitating this issue and bringing about a committee on un-American affairs in

the Legislature, which he chaired. The hearings were held, especially at the institutions of higher education, where they thought that there were certain professors teaching new ideas and new approaches which were just beyond what could possibly be understood by the general population. The Canwell hearings were a very serious set of incidents in this state. It brought about a vigorous interaction between groups and between individuals who felt differently about those kinds of issues. As a result, he became a very negative person in the educational system and especially in higher education.

There were several professors at the University of Washington, who were called to the Canwell hearings. That caused such a stir on the campus that the president became involved to determine whether there was indeed some un-American activity that was occurring with those particular professors. And all the faculty became involved in conducting their own intelligence on the issue. As a result of this, several of the faculty members were dismissed by the then-president from their faculty positions because this particular movement within the state was such a pressure on the president that he had to take some action.

Ms. Kilgannon: As a student, when did you first hear about this? What were your reactions?

Mr. Bishop: That's while I was a graduate student at the University of Washington when this was going on.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did this fly around the campus?

Mr. Bishop: Students, especially those of us in the graduate school, became greatly concerned by that activity and felt sympathetic towards the professors who were doing an excellent job of teaching. And just because they

had attended a couple of meetings of various organizations which the Canwell committee had already stamped as being communist...

Ms. Kilgannon: And including some that other people did not even recognize as being communist-front organizations.

Mr. Bishop: So, it was a very upsetting situation for us.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did that have a chilling effect on students and professors? Did you feel that if you had certain opinions or promoted certain ideas that you ran a danger of being stamped by this same label?

Mr. Bishop: Yes, I think that the professors became very sensitive about their conduct in the classes and the questions that were being asked about particularly political interests. I know that the professors at the University of Washington in the Political Science Department were very concerned about what they were fearful would be some of their teachings would be branded as a communistic approach.

Ms. Kilgannon: Certainly urban planning was at one time considered socialistic.

Mr. Bishop: Right.

Ms. Kilgannon: So your entire discipline could be considered somewhat suspect, I suppose.

Mr. Bishop: The study of international affairs, other countries where communism was in effect, had its greatest impact there. And those were the professors who were identified as being communist. Some of them were scientists, and so it was extremely difficult. It was an unsettling time.

Ms. Kilgannon: While it was happening, I imagine, that was making headlines. Did it take a while to heal and for the university to rework itself a little bit and get over this incident? Did this go on and continue to have a sort of sour taste in everyone's mouth, or were you able to come together after some point?

Mr. Bishop: It became such a cause to a group of policy makers in the state that Higher Education was threatened, especially the University of Washington, because they were on the leading edge of teaching. And after these professors were released, the faculty who were all organized, were very upset and actually criticized the University's administration for allowing themselves to be affected in order to bring about actions that would be so unrealistic. Releasing these professors was the worst thing that could happen. Of course, they were under a tremendous pressure from certain members of the Legislature to do something about it. And at the University of Washington years later the then-President Gerberding actually made a request for the administration to be forgiven for the way in which they had handled that situation, and made it very public. And that was necessary to calm the faculty and students and others. I think, at that stage, things were really beginning to turn around and confidence was being re-introduced into the system of higher education.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did these events have an actual impact on how you did your own work?

Mr. Bishop: I think that most of us who were in the graduate school joined with the members of the faculty in being very critical about what was going on, because obviously it was interfering with the direction of education, which in order to become great we were interested in not interfering and letting people interfere who were actually doing the injustice to the system.

At the University of Washington there were several faculty members, Phillips in philosophy, Butterworth in English, Ralph Gundlach in psychology, Melville Jacobs, Harold Eby and Professor Melvin Radar. Those individuals were really hampered in their teaching. Several of these individuals were dismissed.

Ms. Kilgannon: And had their careers ruined. It's an interesting period, both full of growth and excitement, and also this much more difficult issue somewhat simultaneously having its influence.

Mr. Bishop: It was good for us as students to come in on the new leading edge with the change in philosophical approach. Actually, the committees, both at the federal level and at the state level, regarding un-American affairs began to diminish very quickly. It gave an opportunity for higher education to move along and for people who were seeking a profession in activities related to higher education and requiring higher education, I think, it became a lot more healthy.

Ms. Kilgannon: Good. So the impact was sharp while it was happening, but then dissipated?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: President Allen left the University after that for different reasons. He got a different position, and maybe that had some mitigating effects. You could have a change in administration; you could bring in new people and put that behind you.

Mr. Bishop: All throughout the structure in government in the United States there were a lot of persons who were changed as a result of their having developed approaches of support of these kinds of un-American charges.

I think there were people in higher education, and no doubt policy members on the Board of Regents, who may have sympathized with that, who were no longer in leadership roles.

PART THREE: JOINING THE ROSELLINI ADMINISTRATION

Ms. Kilgannon: When this new person, Albert Rosellini, ran for the governorship in 1956, the then-Governor Art Langlie had been in office for two terms; he was a Republican and had somewhat of a mixed record on supporting these conservative causes. He certainly employed some of that anti-communist language himself in his own campaigns. But when this Albert Rosellini was running for governor, were you paying attention to this new person coming up? Was he saying things that interested you as a follower?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. I think all of us who were in that particular situation at that time, students and others, I think became impressed with the new approach, the new ideas, the more forward-looking political activity. Of course, Rosellini was on the leading edge of this. Important individuals within the community such as Shefelman and Ellis and others were supportive of these new approaches, new ideas. So, yes, I think that I knew about it and even if I didn't become politically involved, I did develop an interest in his campaign.

Ms. Kilgannon: He'd been on these different commissions and investigations and statewide efforts. So was he a name that you would be familiar with?

Mr. Bishop: Yes, he was. He was very much involved in mental health and corrections. He was a senator who had done a lot of things for the University of Washington.

Ms. Kilgannon: That's true. Yes.

Mr. Bishop: So he was well-known and I was well aware of his background.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did he sound like he was going to bring in a new era in Washington State? That he had some fresh ideas, that he had new approaches, that he was going to perhaps even tap into some of the things that interested you that you had been working on?

Mr. Bishop: His campaign, especially in 1956, was so based on these kinds of changes. The mental institutions had lost their certification; the budget system was obviously not functioning to assist management in financial affairs; adult institutions; his committee on crime hearings. There were a lot of things that appealed to young voters who saw opportunities for there to be some changes. I had followed state government pretty carefully and I knew about what was going on.

I got to know a lot of people on the faculty. Langlie's chief of staff—a position which was then called administrative assistant—was on leave from the University of Washington. Everest was his name and he had come back to be the acting president at the University of Washington. I knew him a little bit, but I got to know him a lot better. So he and Don Webster, who was the director of the Bureau of Governmental Research—and probably some of my professors, I suspect, because they all knew each other...Harold Shefelman was a part of this group. He was an attorney in Seattle, but he was involved in a lot of city things, especially the bonding council. I knew him because of his work with the Bureau of Governmental Research—they are the ones who apparently suggested me. When Rosellini was elected, he went to the University of Washington to see if there was someone they could suggest who could come down to join him as his chief of staff, and I was on the list. There were only two of us.

Ms. Kilgannon: He was looking for an expert, not a political person, but an expert in government?

Mr. Bishop: He decided—and a lot of his advisors, including Shefelman, said he needed somebody who would help to bring the system together and not be politically appointed.

Ms. Kilgannon: Were you active in politics at all?

Mr. Bishop: No.

Ms. Kilgannon: Just as an academic?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: Were you considered non-partisan?

Mr. Bishop: No. I probably leaned in that direction more than another, but that was because of my education in government, I think. You would have more of a tendency to be an activist in government than not. I was very interested in government.

As I say, there were two of us on the list of these people and one of them was Lloyd Schram and myself. Lloyd Schram, I don't think, had any interest. He was more student government related and was actually on the staff in student affairs.

Ms. Kilgannon: A different branch altogether.

Mr. Bishop: But I'll tell you, I was interested. But it came as a great surprise to me. So the first shot out of the box...I remember the first thing that happened was that I was interviewed, and the persons who participated in my interview were his two cousins.

Ms. Kilgannon: Leo and Victor?

Mr. Bishop: Victor, the restaurateur and Leo, who was a doctor. And Pellegrini, who was on the faculty at the University of Washington.

Ms. Kilgannon: Was he any kind of relative?

Mr. Bishop: No. The two Rosellini's were related. And then Hal Shefelman was on this. But he wasn't participating in the interview. He already knew me.

Ms. Kilgannon: So he wasn't present during that interview?

Mr. Bishop: No. I was invited to come to "Rosellini's 410" for this interview. I'll tell you, I absolutely was just beside myself because I didn't even know what to order to eat and I finally ordered spaghetti, which obviously was not the appropriate thing for me to... I think it was lunch. But it was quite an interview and it seemed to hit off very well.

Ms. Kilgannon: What sort of things did they ask you?

Mr. Bishop: They were more interested in my personal life and my career at the University of Washington and my interest in state government.

Ms. Kilgannon: Had you already worked on the Metro legislation? You had something to do with that, I believe.

Mr. Bishop: Yes, I had. I had participated in several incorporations, including Bellevue as a consultant to them, but still from the Bureau. And several other towns: Port Angeles and so on.

Ms. Kilgannon: So you had built up quite a lot of experience.

Mr. Bishop: Yes. Of course, I was involved with this Institute. But anyway, the next interview was with Rosellini.

Ms. Kilgannon: Himself. So they would have been able to check you out as a person. Do you think they were looking for particular qualities? Obviously, you had the knowledge and the background, but was there something else they were looking for?

Mr. Bishop: I can only imagine, but I think they were looking for somebody who would be capable of being independent in terms of not being so influenced by outside forces, because the governor was under tremendous pressure from political people within his party and so on. And with some of his constituents. They wanted somebody who could really...

Ms. Kilgannon: Would you be like a buffer in a sense?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. I think they wanted to have somebody who was not associated with some background-type appointment, you understand?

Ms. Kilgannon: Yes.

Mr. Bishop: It would look better to have somebody coming from the faculty at the University of Washington.

Ms. Kilgannon: It would be a recognized sort of stature?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. So, he immediately embraced me and started asking questions about, "Would I make the transition for him?" because in those days there was no money in the budget for transition and there was no space. Nothing.

Ms. Kilgannon: Could I ask how you felt

about him before we go into the detail of how you actually did this job? You met and you felt a connection to him?

Mr. Bishop: I felt comfortable with him.

Ms. Kilgannon: I would imagine that would be important.

Mr. Bishop: Yes. I really felt that he was eager to do things. He was so upset about the corrections and what was going on. He was so upset about the loss of certification of the mental health institutions.

Ms. Kilgannon: So he was going to be an activist governor?

Mr. Bishop: Right. He was a person who wanted to do something. So that's what I really enjoyed.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did you have to think twice at all about this appointment?

Mr. Bishop: No.

Ms. Kilgannon: You were ready to go?

Mr. Bishop: Right.

Ms. Kilgannon: So then, about moving to Olympia?

Mr. Bishop: I agreed to go down early—it was either in late November or December—I went down to make the transition. That was quite an experience. There was no place to go. They wouldn't let me in an office or have space in the governor's office, and as a matter of fact, the then-assistant would not even give me very much information.

Ms. Kilgannon: So you came down to Olympia and what do you do, just knock on the door

of the governor's office and identify yourself and they gave you the cold shoulder?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. There was quite a bit of news in the newspaper, in *The Seattle Times* that I had been selected to go down, so they were knowledgeable about it.

Ms. Kilgannon: They didn't say, "Warren Bishop, who?" as you walked in the door?

Mr. Bishop: I think they were surprised that he had selected somebody from the faculty at the University of Washington. Incidentally, the Regents put me on a leave of absence so that I would come back.

Ms. Kilgannon: Didn't you also want that as a kind of security and backup for yourself?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. So I thought that was rather nice. But then I came down to Olympia and Barbara stayed in Edmonds because we had to find someplace to live down here. I stayed in a rooming house. I had to solve the space problem, so we started looking around. Earl Coe was the Secretary of State and he had been very active in his own campaign.

Ms. Kilgannon: Yes, he had run in the primary against Rosellini.

Mr. Bishop: Right. So he was interested in us getting situated.

Ms. Kilgannon: It's a good thing he wasn't vindictive.

Mr. Bishop: I went to see him because I knew one of his staff real well who kept records, Ken Gilbert. When I was at the University of Washington, we always had a lot to do with records and things in the Secretary of State's office. I'd go down to see him and ask him if he knew where I could locate something. He

sort of leaned back in his chair like this and said, "Let's see." He had stacks on the floor so he'd start down and say, "Should be right about there."

Ms. Kilgannon: Through these stacks of paper? Oh, my. And he knew he could find it?

Mr. Bishop: It was so amazing to see this happen. But Earl said, "I'm going to move my assistant out of his office and you can take it over." And he said, "We'll do whatever we can." So then the next thing we did was to get Marge Gunderson, who was in Seattle and had worked with Rosellini, to come down and be the secretary.

Ms. Kilgannon: It was really just you two, wasn't it? So when you came down and you found a little corner in Earl Coe's office and you had the legal secretary helping you, did you have to begin to get a grasp of what the governor's office would ultimately be doing? What it was doing under Langlie, and then what Governor Rosellini wanted to do? There must have been a gap in between those two things. What were you able to learn about the Langlie administration?

Mr. Bishop: I think I learned for the first time that there were a lot of things in state government that needed to be examined. From a student's point of view it just looked to me like the budget was one thing, and that the condition of our institutions was really deplorable. Mental hospitals had gone down, lost their certification, and it was difficult to hire people to come in and work in those institutions. I could see a lot of things that I knew the governor would be interested in trying to do something about them. I think that that was the exciting part about it because I knew, or had already learned, that the governor was eager to try to institute some things to do that would improve state government.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did it seem in such a state of disrepair that almost anything you did was going to be an improvement?

Mr. Bishop: As a senator, I think he became aware of a lot of things that he personally would like to have undertaken even in the Senate. He was very loyal to the University of Washington and therefore did quite a few things to improve the medical school and so on.

He conducted a series of hearings throughout the state, which got him a lot of publicity on corrections. So he had a lot to say about those things. He was concerned about the welfare of the poor and disadvantaged. He was concerned about most things that I was concerned about. So we really hadn't had very much time for philosophical discussions when I came down.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did he have a philosophy of government that he brought to the administration?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. He really did. He had some friends like Max Nicolai, an attorney in Seattle, who really had spent a lot of time working on cases involving people who were less fortunate.

He had another attorney who came down for a while. We had more attorneys than I could figure out what we were going to do with. The governor's office normally had not had an attorney at all, except representation from the Attorney General's office. I thought it was a brilliant idea to have an attorney who would actually be in the governor's office and provide legal advice to the governor. So that didn't take long for that to happen.

Additionally, the Governor's Office did not have a press secretary staff position.

Ms. Kilgannon: Even though Ross Cunningham worked for Governor Langlie? He didn't work as a press person?

Mr. Bishop: He was here, but Ross did it like he was a stringer for *The Seattle Times*. He did most of the work as a release to the press. I don't think he worked very much on preparing press releases and things like that.

So the governor hired, very early, a person from the *Post-Intelligencer* who came down. That was before Bob Reed, who later came. They were young people who were eager to work in helping the governor put press releases together, those kinds of things.

Ms. Kilgannon: Was it a different attitude that the public needed to have more participation, therefore more knowledge of what was going on?

Mr. Bishop: Yes, I think so. There didn't seem to be much of that going on with the previous administration. The staff was very small.

Ms. Kilgannon: Yes. A mere handful of people.

Mr. Bishop: We kept most of the women staff and of course a couple more came down from Seattle. We hired a press secretary and an attorney, which I thought was really helpful. It helped to pull together sort of a family of persons who could make observations and influence thoughts that were going on. I know that happened with the attorney and I know that it happened with the press secretary. They have a way of feeling how things are out there and bring it in and of introducing it to what decisions are being made.

Ms. Kilgannon: These would be just the governor's office staff? You were considered an executive assistant, I think, at that stage. I don't really know what your title was when you first began.

Mr. Bishop: When I first came down, I was

the only management assistant of the office. There was a person here by the name of Burt Gibson, who had been there since way early. He was almost ready to retire when we arrived. Gib did all the work related to pardons and would keep records, which really surprised me, how much information had to be kept in the governor's office about parolees and so on.

Ms. Kilgannon: The governor personally did those sorts of things?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. He had to have all these files because, finally, he was the one who could grant the parole.

Ms. Kilgannon: What about, say, capital punishment issues? Would that be in the same area?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. But Gib had everything locked up in the vault. There was a vault in the governor's office. In fact, there were a lot of young people who got their start in that vault—that's where their office was. The vault was a secure enclosed area, eight by ten feet, off the hall between offices.

We didn't gain any additional space until the Budget and Accounting Act, when the pre-audit function was taken away from State Auditor Cliff Yelle; an office right next to our secretarial group was the pre-audit. So we were able to go right straight through. Cliff always complained that we had taken over that pre-audit in order to get that space.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did you have any role in helping the governor choose his cabinet and his agency people and the people he would surround himself with to actually implement his programs?

Mr. Bishop: Those first months before the governor actually took office were really

something, because we had to get used to each other, but it didn't take very long. He immediately wanted a lot of consultation. The office was absolutely jammed with mail. I was trying to take care of the mail before he even came down, and it was difficult for me to do that even with Marge Gunderson to assist, because it was just stacked all over.

Ms. Kilgannon: These were from people wanting jobs?

Mr. Bishop: Jobs or problems about particular functions of the state. I set up a system of referring letters out to the appropriate agencies for a suggested response, and then a letter would go out from the governor's office. We continued to do that. In fact, one of the secretaries—who was my secretary—became really expert at that. And I thought that was better than sending a letter out and then getting an answer back from the Department of Corrections or some other agency.

So we started having meetings at night in Seattle. That's where we worked. There was sort of a steering committee that had been formed. The governor had a group of advisors who were not yet a part of the administration, but who had been trusted persons in his experience. Some of those individuals were the persons under consideration like Charlie Hodde, but Harold Shefelman and friends who had helped him in his campaign and his cousins in Seattle, Victor and Dr. Rosellini, and I, of course, became one of this group because they wanted me to be involved in this kind of a situation. So we would have meetings in Seattle after a day in the office and then be up there until nine o'clock and then come back and be in the office the next day. And that got to be a little hard on all of us.

But every single department head, or potential department head, was discussed in detail. That's where we discussed how we should put the program together, what people

should be considered for the various directorships and so on. The governor had done some of that before he came down, but we had this sort of close group who really passed judgment on these things. And I thought that was good because they brought to the surface some awfully good people in the initial appointments that were made.

Ms. Kilgannon: Was it new, to begin with, that he chose you and not a person he knew at all, but because you were a professional? Did that fact alone give you the indication that his administration would be created on a very different basis—not the political people that had worked on his campaign, but people who were actually known for their fields?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: Was that a whole new approach?

Mr. Bishop: I think that may have made a lot of difference. He had individuals in his kitchen cabinet, or whatever you want to call it, who were professionals in their own right and were known and acknowledged, that he was seeking their advice in helping to select important members of the cabinet. There seemed to be one identifying factor, he wanted to start out with a clean group of managers and give them an opportunity to manage their respective activities. I think most of the potential department heads came as a result of those discussions. And I think this was healthy.

Ms. Kilgannon: Isn't that actually one of the biggest tasks? If you get the right people, it sort of takes care of itself?

Mr. Bishop: Yes, and that's why it was really great, because he had surrounded himself with well-qualified individuals. There were some

maybe that people didn't quite have that much feeling about, like Louise Taylor in Licensing, but they were sufficiently professionally oriented that they themselves were able to get the right kind of people to help them.

Ms. Kilgannon: What was his criterion? I read somewhere that he was anxious to not look like he was hiring cronies, or people of that category. That he was actually looking for something special.

Mr. Bishop: You bet! The first thing he did was find a director of Institutions and he went everywhere for that. He finally appointed Garrett Heyns from Michigan, who was an outstanding, nationally known person in institutions. He did a lot of things to improve the public's understanding of institutions. He hired persons to head various departments that had expertise. George Starland, who was quite familiar with the public assistance program, was the initial person for Public Assistance. He later moved on into other director positions. So he tried to appoint people who had knowledge and had ability related to a given department.

Ms. Kilgannon: When you were looking for the Garrett Heyns, the people that were noted in their fields for their particular ability to administer certain areas of government, was that a departure? Maybe the scale of it; how many of those kinds of people you brought in?

Mr. Bishop: It was a different scale. It was influenced by some of his professional friends and attorneys that there needed to be that kind of an approach to selecting his team. And it was my observation, not having been involved in the campaign, that he was sincerely interested in getting new ideas on management and wanted persons who would be acknowledged as identifiable professional people to head up these agencies. In the case of Garrett Heyns,

the governor immediately went to work with the national organization on institutional corrections to find the most recognized person in the business and of course Heyns' name came to the surface. He had contacted Heyns and it was not a very long time before Heyns agreed to come. Because I think Heyns was anxious to come to a state that was putting together a new team and a new approach, too. I think it was sort of a unique turn of events.

Ms. Kilgannon: It does seem like a big turning point in government. There had been a long line of governors of a certain style, however you want to put that, and then when you read about the different programs and administrations, with Governor Rosellini it seems like there is a change. It's broadly called "modernization of government," where a lot of things are reorganized and a different kind of person is brought in. And it's right there that many historians identify a watershed moment in government. I don't know what it felt like at the time.

Mr. Bishop: I think even the type of persons who were eventually brought in as a part of the team, were also the persons who were helping to achieve this new approach. They themselves were hiring different kinds of doctors to head the mental institutions, different persons to be the various segment groups, like in the Department of Institutions, and prisons—wardens. All of those people just changed the whole scheme of things. It did, I think, have an impact.

Ms. Kilgannon: So it's just not in retrospect that we can see this change? But at the time you were aware that this was new? Certainly for institutions, the governor had the entire idea of transforming the whole situations. What about public assistance? Did he want to do something quite different from Langlie, so he would bring in a person who would share that point of view?

PART FOUR: THE BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING ACT AND THE CREATION OF THE CENTRAL BUDGET AGENCY

Mr. Bishop: Things had really gotten in pretty bad shape in several of the larger agencies. Rosellini really put concentration in certain areas in the first budget, for example, which Brabrook had prepared and Langlie had introduced; he made special requests for certain things that were needed. We put a new item in the budget for the governor's office called "surveys and installations," basically, with the intention of using that for the budget system.

I was beginning to have some ability to convince everybody that we needed to do something about finances. I was especially activated because my educational interests were in trying to bring about good management. And so for a young person like myself to be able to sit there and be a part of this approach, and to be able to make suggestions... I know that he was interested in doing something about the financial system of the state, but it required persons, I think, to float some new ideas and new approaches on how we might go about it. So it didn't take a very strong kind of suggestion to say that, "We should go to the Legislature and get some money and set up a segment of appropriations for surveys and installations, one of which we would undertake immediately with the budget and accounting." He immediately was attracted with that.

Ms. Kilgannon: And that was the key to the rest of your program? If you could get the budget under control, you'd free up some money for these other programs? From what

I've read, from different comments that he's made, Governor Rosellini seemed to recognize that if he wanted to affect all these changes in these programs and institutions and various things that really were close to his heart, then he had to be on top of the money—where it came from and how it was used and eliminate any waste. Since he wanted to use the money differently he had to be very careful. I've always understood that he was a fiscal conservative and was very loath to raise taxes, so he had to work with the money he had and make it stretch farther. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. Bishop: He was confronted with a tremendous state debt and yet there are so many things that he wanted to do that was going to require immediately some appropriations which would not necessarily be of much interest because the state was in a very tight fiscal situation. I knew we needed to be very sound in our approach. We needed to hire experts and actually make surveys of the financial situation, and then install improvements, so "surveys and installations" was an item the governor included in the 1957 budget for \$175,000. And incidentally, that appropriation remained in each biennial budget for a period of time. I don't think it's still there now, but that helped a lot in the future. While we were there, as well as when future governors came in, to have money that they could go out and make a change in restructuring an agency or program.

So major areas that he allowed himself to put additional money in that budget request at the first session in 1957 were related to some of these major problems, one of them being surveys and installations that would give him a chance to start identifying areas he wanted studies to be made and then installations to be made. And then he requested an appropriation of seven-million dollars for mental health which would get the three mental institutions accredited by the American

Society of Psychiatrists, or whatever. These three institutions had lost their certification and it was critical that these mental hospitals regain their accreditation.

Ms. Kilgannon: Concurrent with this push for better management, there's another movement—and I don't know if it's within the administration or the public and the Legislature, more that end of things—but there begins to be talk about more open government. About what we now call “transparency.” I don't think that word was used back then, but where you could see where the money came from and where it went. Where there was better communication and everybody could open up the budget document, for instance, and understand it. You had some publications that you showed me that were directed at the public to say, “Here's your state budget and here's how to understand it.” Those things struck me as fairly new ideas, too. That bringing the public in and that government is something that should be understood by everyone. Was that part of the new look?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. I think it was, because people—the Legislature included—did not really have a handle on it, not only did the results of finances but what the impact would be in performance of a particular agency. It was so exciting for them when they received this first budget document in '59 which set forth programs in each agency, in which the funds would be directed to perform those kinds of programs and performance reports on those activities to be made available, and would give something to measure against. So, it just had a whole, new awakening to the public.

I remember we first published a little booklet that was for public purposes to say, “Here's how your finances work, and here's how the budget works.” So I think there was a greater emphasis on the public being able to know where their money was being spent.

Ms. Kilgannon: And in a way, it might just be providing the documents in a new way. I've looked at some of the old budget documents and they're just pages of numbers. You can't really tell what they are. I've tried to understand them and completely failed. They are just lists and lists of numbers and there's no narrative. There's no overview that tells the person how to interpret the numbers. I guess you just have to already know.

But I notice in Governor Rosellini's first beautifully-bound budget statement that there is a statement of policy and then there's a narrative describing what the changes are and what the numbers mean. It's pretty refreshing. It gives you a handle on how to approach all these numbers.

Mr. Bishop: And then also a way of measuring performance. I remember it was so difficult, for especially institutionalized kinds of departments like Institutions and Public Assistance and Mental Health to have their various aspects of activity measurable with other activities in other states. Like a food operation at a given institution. That whole program could be compared per patient with other states. So there was nothing like that before.

Ms. Kilgannon: How could you ever wrap your mind around whether you needed to improve or whether you were doing fine, or what?

Mr. Bishop: The old budget was based on objects of expenditures, just salaries and wages, contracts and so on. There were so many objects that you could not relate those objects to a particular responsibility or program or performance.

Ms. Kilgannon: They all seemed isolated in themselves as just a bunch of lists.

Mr. Bishop: But the Legislature became totally aware of that kind of a change when they received the new budget. It was so exciting and refreshing for them, that the budget hearings really became significant. They had something to hear about in the hearings. It was a definite change.

Ms. Kilgannon: I've read that from day-one of the Rosellini administration—from the very beginning—you were talking about reworking how the budget and accounting system of the state was instituted. That this was the foundation of your whole program.

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: Was that mainly you pushing it, or did the governor also see it that way?

Mr. Bishop: He was very aware of the situation. This was a serious, serious problem. He'd been in the Senate and he knew that what they were getting up there was not the kind of information they needed to make policy decisions.

Ms. Kilgannon: I understand the budget was actually somewhat divorced from policy. That the budget information was basically arithmetic and had nothing much to do with programmatic considerations.

Mr. Bishop: Right. It was organized on objects of expenditures: salaries and wages and contracts, and nothing at all about programs or how programs should be changed or improved or how performance related to a program. That was all absent.

Ms. Kilgannon: Was anyone thinking about those questions? If they weren't in the budget, were they somewhere else?

Mr. Bishop: I don't think that most of the

Legislature was aware of the fact that they did not have the right kind of a decision-making mechanism to help shape policy. They couldn't do it with the budget because all you could do was just look at the individual objects and see if it was too much, and if so, cut it off.

Ms. Kilgannon: How would you make those decisions? You either liked the number or you wouldn't?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. So I think that the budget situation became a mechanism for exploring a lot of programs in state government, agency functions, performance, and deciding what new activities were needed, because several agencies were formed as a result of that kind of a review. It was definitely something that was done early and with enough money to hire the experts to come in.

Ms. Kilgannon: I understand that you got a firm from, what was it, Baltimore?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. John A. Donaho and Associates.

Ms. Kilgannon: How had you heard of this group?

Mr. Bishop: We started calling around. And from those states that had already made tremendous improvements we knew that there were some experts out there someplace. Of course, John's name kept coming up to the surface, so it didn't take us long to decide that his firm was what we needed.

Ms. Kilgannon: Were there councils of state government then? Conferences where different states could talk to each other in an easy way? Was there some kind of structure for sharing information?

Mr. Bishop: Not as much as it became subsequently. Now there's quite a bit of that. But we started from the standpoint of looking at budget systems. We knew Michigan was way ahead of the game in talking to those people, to get knowledge about persons who were qualified to come in as a consultant. There was a governors' national organization; they had a staff, but they really were not in that kind of business.

Ms. Kilgannon: There was some rudimentary way of getting this information?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. And the governor also requested in this budget in '57 quite an amount—seven-million—to provide support the necessary steps to recertify the mental institutions. So when Dr. Heyns arrived on the scene he had an appropriation there to do it.

Ms. Kilgannon: To bring in new people and upgrade the facilities, he'd have some wherewithal?

Mr. Bishop: In fact, they regained certification within a year or so. So it didn't take long, just hiring the right people. That's all we could do because we didn't have a way of getting a handle on what else in the budget could have improved things. But the governor did—I don't think at the first session—at the first session, at the same time as the Budget and Accounting Act, he recommended the establishment of the Department of Commerce and Economic Development, which was created. Dr. DeWayne Kreager was the first one to head up that agency. So that was an absolute plus.

Ms. Kilgannon: When the governor wanted these new agencies and appropriations, would it be you who would go down and lobby the Legislature for the extra money? Was that part of your role?

Mr. Bishop: For each particular request that was made by him, we both spent a great deal of time in providing information to committees and legislators to get those appropriations. But there was not much else that we could do with the budget.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did he still have strong allies in at least the Democratic Senate?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: What about in the House? Did you have to forge relationships with those people?

Mr. Bishop: We had a similar kind of political support in the House.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did you try to be a bit bipartisan in the sense that you wanted to reach a lot of people and bring them on board?

Mr. Bishop: I did. Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: Can you remember who your legislative allies would have been?

Mr. Bishop: Frank Foley, Web Hallauer in the Senate and several others. They were all supportive of what he wanted to do. But there were some of them who were really in good positions to do that.

Ms. Kilgannon: Web Hallauer was the chair of Appropriations. That would be helpful.

Mr. Bishop: Yes. And so was Frank during this period. Over in the House, the governor had a lot of support because John O'Brien and Cap Edwards, who didn't know much about budgeting, but was certainly a supporter of the governor and would say, "Whatever you say!"

After the Budget and Accounting Act was passed, of course we—myself and the staff—felt much better prepared and we actually defended the budget before the committee. I would take the staff person who was assigned to a particular area and the director of an agency to go and defend that budget. They knew about that budget! The Legislature didn't particularly want to hear from the individual managers within the agencies.

Ms. Kilgannon: I understood that was the previous method, was that the agencies lobbied and discussed their budgets separately and there was no overall plan. I don't know how that ever came together.

Mr. Bishop: Yes. It was because of the budget structure and there was no staff who was that familiar with an individual agency's program.

Ms. Kilgannon: I just wonder how you ever arrived at one number if you're making decisions on the agency level but not with any overall perspective.

Mr. Bishop: It was really something for us, you know. Just preparing the budget was enough for us all to learn a lot about the agencies. And it also was a way for the directors to know more about the programs they're responsible for and how to place priorities on the elements of programs they wished to make strategic changes. So the whole process of installing the Budget and Accounting Act brought to the surface all kinds of policy changes.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did the agency directors support this development? It in some ways took away from what they had been doing before. Were they in favor of that?

Mr. Bishop: The first session, 1959, the Bud-

get and Accounting Act was introduced and a biennium budget prepared in accordance with the proposed Act, was a frightening situation for the agencies. They helped and prepared and worked on the budgets, and understood how they were being formulated, and had most of the responsibility for describing the various programs. So it was a learning process for them. So the budget part of it, I think they realized that was a much more favorable way they could get their message across and have a better understanding for the Legislature to do it. The Legislature, certainly after they had experience with it, realized for the first time they were involved in really making policy decisions. Of course, the other thing is that what was frightening to the agencies was the change, I think, in the accounting systems and in the auditing process and in the control of expenditures. That sort of bothered them.

Ms. Kilgannon: Can you tell me the "before and after" of how that would work for them?

Mr. Bishop: Most of the new directors were appointed by the governor, but the people who had been there, the professional staff, the next level, really were concerned about the so-called quarterly allotment. That really cooled them off because, instead of having all this money appropriated and themselves planning what would be expended over the course of the biennium, they had to plan it for each quarter, and if it didn't come out right or if they needed to redistribute some of the priorities, they could do it because they would have the next quarter to do that. Higher education was absolutely opposed to quarterly allotments. And in fact, were successful in getting themselves exempt for a while—during our entire time there. But later, I believe, the Legislature put Higher Education under quarterly allotments, also.

Ms. Kilgannon: You had come from Higher Education. Did you understand their point of view or were they just being recalcitrant?

Mr. Bishop: No. I could understand. At the University of Washington they had controlled their expenditures and budget for so long without any executive involvement. They didn't like to even have anybody interfere with their budget. I think you can understand that.

Ms. Kilgannon: Yes. Except that it is tax money, so someone ought to be in charge, I guess.

Mr. Bishop: At the first hearing of the Budget and Accounting Act, I was there, of course, with the higher education staff justifying the governor's budget for the University of Washington. Cap Edwards was the chairman and Cap was an old sea captain, and "whatever the governor says, that's it." But he was impressed with the budget presentation that we made. We always got to be first. And President Odegaard got up and started his own view by saying that the proposed budget did not treat higher education fairly, that kind of an approach. The legislative members were not convinced that the budget process interfered with agency management. It was the President's first budget. He had just been appointed after we came in and was involved in developing the University's budget, and for the first time experienced those kind of changes which we made as a staff. So he was excited about it. Finally Cap rapped the gavel and said, "That will be all, Mr. Odegaard." He couldn't speak. But anyway, it was a learning lesson for Higher Education.

Ms. Kilgannon: Were you able to bring them somewhat on board or did they remain in this hold?

Mr. Bishop: I think that had more to do with

actually having me be the budget director initially, in order to listen to the agency heads and help them be sure that they were installing something we wanted. Because they were very nervous about the new budget and didn't feel that they were sufficiently involved—as they were, of course, because they helped write the programs in all of them. But for us to sit up there and exercise the hearings...

Ms. Kilgannon: That was new? That was a big departure.

Mr. Bishop: The directors of the agencies and executive budget staff were the only ones who were to appear before the committee. None of the institutions, for example, like Northern State or the penitentiary or whatever, could come and appear before the committee.

Ms. Kilgannon: Previously they would have done that, though?

Mr. Bishop: Previously they would have done that.

Ms. Kilgannon: Wouldn't that set up a situation where they're competing with each other? If the person from Northern State is more eloquent, they'd get more money than another place?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: Rather than having an overall program?

Mr. Bishop: And the institutions of higher education were competing against each other.

Ms. Kilgannon: They still seem to be.

Mr. Bishop: So it was a new kind of experience for them.

Ms. Kilgannon: Were you, in part, able to bring the Legislature on board because you were actually giving them more information and more say than they'd ever had before?

Mr. Bishop: That's right.

Ms. Kilgannon: And I understand that they wanted even more say, perhaps, than that. They wanted their own Legislative Budget Committee to have quite a lot of input and involvement in creating the state budget.

Mr. Bishop: They did. The relationship between the Legislature's budget process and what we were trying to do was not at all first understood. Because, when they developed a knowledge of that kind of a budget, together with our involvement in defending the budget and explaining it and going to hearings they had less... They really had confidence in that budget. Even the Republicans—it didn't make any difference what party it was—it was just something that they felt they could depend upon, with reliability. The Legislative Budget Committee had appeared on the scene early with what was involved with the Legislative Council. The Legislative Council was an organization of legislators who made policy decisions all over the place. And made budgetary decisions.

The Legislative Budget Committee came in later to be an audit type agency. To check on whether agencies were actually spending, like a post-audit.

Ms. Kilgannon: So when the Legislature passes a budget and allocates a certain amount of money to someone, they want to know whether that money is spent that way?

Mr. Bishop: Right.

Ms. Kilgannon: And the Legislative Budget Committee would be the people who would check up on them?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. And the persons who—especially Paul Ellis, who was the Legislative Budget Committee director when we undertook this budget—didn't understand. I should say that he felt that we were taking over part of their role, and actually lobbied to include provisions in the initial enabling legislation that would require us to have a Legislative Budget Committee or the director of the Budget Committee, sit in on our executive hearings.

Ms. Kilgannon: Isn't that a bit of mixing of the branches of government?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. So we had a little trouble with that while the act was actually being discussed. Because the Legislature didn't think that was a bad idea. But it was something that we just felt was inappropriate, and so they did not participate in the hearings.

In one session, the governor vetoed the appropriation for the Legislative Budget Committee, and I think, the Legislative Council.

Ms. Kilgannon: Was that in 1963?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. That just really raised holy terror with members of the committee and their directors.

Ms. Kilgannon: Weren't they allegedly politicizing their studies?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. Using that committee process to criticize all kinds of things. And, as you say, it was becoming a political tool.

I remember I suggested—and of course we did—I put Paul Ellis on our payroll in the budget office and gave him a job in terms of Higher Education and writing faculty formulas, which became a part of the higher education budget, incidentally. Higher education management participated in that process. They knew what was going on, but we decided that Higher Education should develop faculty

formulas for budget purposes for various course levels, various course types, and so on, so that the faculty would be distributed to more efficiently handle each of the programs. And it worked.

Ms. Kilgannon: And the universities didn't resent that level of management?

Mr. Bishop: They just felt that that was interference from us, but really it was an aid for them to have better understanding of the faculty formula. People in the Legislature could understand faculty formulas and why we needed to have them. So, I think they've kept that practice up. But Paul worked on that. He helped write the formulas and participate in meetings so that when he did get his appropriation back he became a good supporter of that.

Ms. Kilgannon: You brought him into the fold?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: You did have Web Hallauer with you. You did have different members, like John O'Brien. You also had some pretty strong legislators who were not pleased with what you were doing. For instance, Julia Butler Hansen mightily resisted having her Highways budget put under the governor's control. Wasn't she even successful in the end with that resistance?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: Can you tell me about how you dealt with her?

Mr. Bishop: It was one good way for me to learn about legislative interrelationships with the governor. The Highway Department had traditionally had submitted their own budget.

It's the Highway Commission and the legislative committees on Highways...

Ms. Kilgannon: They had their own revenue stream, didn't they?

Mr. Bishop: And the fact, it governed the input for a budget and the decisions made legislatively on the budget. The executive was really not involved, didn't even have the authority to appoint the director of Highways. The director was appointed by the Highway Commission.

So, a long time had gone by with the chairman of the Highway committee—particularly Julia Butler Hansen—being the advocate of all kinds of appropriations for Highways. She took the recommendations made by the Highway Department to her committee. The Highway Department knew about her level of authority and so they just dealt with her, entirely. But I thought—I could see—that that was not a good situation, even when I was still at the University of Washington.

Ms. Kilgannon: This was something you already knew about?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. So when putting together our philosophical approach to budgeting, we suggested that the Highway Department, like every other executive agency, should be a part of the governor's budget. And therefore we should review it, and be sure that the executive point of view was being reflected in the budget. That we do it in such a way that we counsel with the Highway Committees so that we wouldn't give them the impression we were depriving them of that. But that it was still the governor's budget instead of a separate budget. The governor said, "It sounds like we should do that." He said, "That's been something that I've been concerned about for a long time. Why don't you go up and talk to Julia about that?" With a twinkle in his eyes! And I did, and I was...

Ms. Kilgannon: How far did you get into your speech?

Mr. Bishop: I got through her door. She was very concerned about that and expressed herself very well about us interfering with the legislative process. She as much as said, “You’re not going to do this while I’m around here.” And things demeaning the budget and me. So I sort of limped back downstairs and told the governor and he laughed and smiled and said, “Well, we got the message!” But anyway, we did it. We went ahead with it.

Ms. Kilgannon: The governor had such important transportation initiatives on his desk: the Lake Washington bridge, the Hood Canal bridge, the Astoria bridge. He had a lot of things that he was trying to do, so I would imagine that he would want to have some say in the Highways budget.

Mr. Bishop: He was a great supporter of the freeway when it started down in the southern part of the state, but I think Julia Butler Hansen actually appreciated what Rosellini was doing. She just didn’t like to have the change in the legislative decision process. And of course, Bugge, who was the director of Highways, wanted to be cooperative both ways, both with the governor and with Julia. The fact that the governor appointed members to the Highway Commission, but he wasn’t able to select the director of Highways, so there was a distance there. I think eventually that it worked out like it should be. I think now, today, that the legislative process is very important for Highways, but a lot of the decisions about it are made in the executive office and by the Highway Department. I think that was an important change.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did you take the long view with some of these issues that you would, maybe, in 1959 get a big chunk of what you

wanted but maybe not everything, and that it would take a few years?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: But so long as you had the basic mechanism you could at least get a start?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: So even though you didn’t get all the pieces, did you see it as a work in progress?

Mr. Bishop: We didn’t get it all. You just couldn’t bite off as big a part as we were trying to and do it all at the same time. Take, for example, Higher Education, who did not want to have us interfering with their quarterly allotments—or with their allotments at all. But that, I think, eventually settled out and the Legislature recognized those things as being important.

Ms. Kilgannon: Was it the case that after the new act was in existence for a while people could see how it worked, that then they could come on board?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: Before the bill was actually introduced in the House and the Senate, you had had some steps before that. You had hired the consulting firm to come in and do the survey. Did they also give presentations to the Legislature?

Mr. Bishop: No.

Ms. Kilgannon: They just worked it out with you and then you gave presentations to the Legislature?

Mr. Bishop: Right.

Ms. Kilgannon: In 1957, you had gotten the appropriation for this study to do the survey. Were you gradually bringing the Legislature into the picture, that this change was coming?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: Even before you had the Budget and Accounting Act in place, you began to present the budget in a different way, maybe a kind of interim way; you were moving towards where you wanted to be. Could you have continued to do that without the Budget and Accounting Act, or did you want the authority in law to do it that way? I'm not sure how much the executive could just change its course, or would you need legislation to do that?

Mr. Bishop: It really required a major change in the legislation. Because the process for budgeting was not well described, legislatively, before. And so all the elements of this budget and accounting system had to be contained within provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act. And that's where we did a lot of work with agencies to be sure they could understand why. Actually, with the installation process, Donoho and his associates were the ones who did a lot to describe what that meant. How it would be more efficient than what the agencies had been doing—not necessarily the persons who were in charge, because they were all new. So I think it was a process of them learning, as we did, in the budget office. The mechanisms were a vast improvement over decision-making policy, the formulation.

Ms. Kilgannon: When the governor first came in, in his inaugural speech he discussed how he wanted to do this—he mentions it

several times—and before you introduced the Budget and Accounting Act, he came in to the Legislature—again, I couldn't tell if it was in person or just a letter to them—and he again went over why you wanted the Budget and Accounting Act. And then you presumably came in with these hearings and presented your information. Then the actual bill was written. Who wrote that? Who wrote House Bill 373?

Mr. Bishop: It was a combination of the consulting firm, the Budget Office, and attorneys that represented the governor's office, because it took the guidance of the consulting approach to realize what kind of elements needed to be set forth in a statutory way. So it was them making recommendations about legislative improvements. And then the policy understanding of that so we could get it incorporated in the legislation. While all this was going on, we had a committee composed of several members who were working with us from the Legislature, and agency directors, which helped a lot, because they were learning at the same time as we were.

Ms. Kilgannon: You had a kind of combination citizen group, plus legislators involved in this process. I understand you were the chair. You had Speaker John O'Brien; Charlie Hodde; Professor George Shipman, who you had an association with; and Ed Munro, who had been a legislator and then was on the King County Council.

Mr. Bishop: He'd been in the Legislature and was an influential member of the Legislature. But he was also a strong person in King County.

Ms. Kilgannon: Yes. And then Peter Giovan, whose name I'm not familiar with.

Mr. Bishop: Peter Giovan had been the

director of Employment Security during the Langlie administration and he continued to serve in that position during the Rosellini administration. I don't know when Peter came in, but he was very supportive of the new administration and the things we wanted to do and was actually a person who'd been educated as a management person.

Ms. Kilgannon: You also had Senator Neill Marshall and Representative Joe Chytil, both Republicans. There was an attempt there to be bipartisan. So this group, they helped you formulate how it was going to work?

There had been various budget bills since probably day one, but the one that is most often referred to was brought in, in 1921 by Governor Hart, and then subsequently amended and tinkered with over the years. Did you start with that bill, or did you start brand new, with a clean slate?

Mr. Bishop: Brand new. Clean slate.

Ms. Kilgannon: And got rid of all the language from the past organization?

Mr. Bishop: The Budget and Accounting Act adopted in 1959 a completely new financial management process.

Ms. Kilgannon: Probably easier to start fresh than jerry-rigging from some old legislation that had a different point of view?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did you ever look at that original 1921 budget act to get a sense of where all this had come from over time?

Mr. Bishop: No. Personally, I didn't really pay any attention, because whatever provisions were in that original enactment were just completely inadequate. So we decided

to start with a brand new enactment, which got a lot of attention.

Ms. Kilgannon: Pretty radical in a sense. Is that unusual for legislation? It seems like a lot of legislation is just kind of adding on to what had already been done.

Mr. Bishop: No, This was a very abrupt, new approach. There just wasn't anything there that could have been used to build upon.

Ms. Kilgannon: A different approach all together.

The governor came in, like you said, on February 3 and outlined the Budget and Accounting Act and then that same day House Bill 373 was introduced in the House by Representative August Mardesich, who was both the floor leader and the chair of the Ways and Means Committee. That's certainly a good person to sponsor your bill. It was also co-sponsored by A.E. Edwards, who was this Cap Edwards, who had been in the Legislature since 1933. He was the chair of the subcommittee on Appropriations. Just a real old-time hand.

Eventually, in the process it went through the Ways and Means Committee. They created a substitute bill. Was it much different from what you had proposed?

Mr. Bishop: No.

Ms. Kilgannon: Just some tinkering? Finessing around the edges, but the same concept?

Mr. Bishop: That's interesting because it may have been that, for example, this introduction of this Legislative Budget Committee into the hearing process and, of course, the removal of the institutions from the quarterly allotment process of Higher Education.

Ms. Kilgannon: That was one of the sticking points, wasn't it?

Mr. Bishop: And a few things like that, I think, eventually brought forth the necessity of a substitute bill.

Ms. Kilgannon: A substitute bill is different enough from the original bill that you have to kind of rework it, not just amend it?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: There were, of course, amendments, but they seemed to be friendly amendments.

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: Was Representative Mar-desich a good supporter of this bill? Was he on the same wavelength as you, for instance? He understood why you needed this?

Mr. Bishop: I think most of the amendments were ones that came up during the process of the hearings and that we would approve of and would actually benefit the members who had suggested it in the Legislature, so we incorporated those into amendments.

Ms. Kilgannon: There were some somewhat unfriendly sounding amendments, but they were usually voted down. It seemed like you had enough people behind you to get this to come out the way you wanted.

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: It was sent to Rules, then came back to the floor, and was discussed. There were people who were trying to—sabotage is too strong a word—but they were trying to kill this bill, and “lay it on the table” and postpone discussion and that sort of thing. But your supporters just kept pushing forward and it never did totally grind to a halt. They kept moving it.

Mr. Bishop: Cliff Yelle, the State Auditor, was able to stir up a lot of legislative attempts to sidetrack the measure.

Ms. Kilgannon: I understand he went to the Senate—that he was working the Senate and trying to stop it there. It passed the House quite quickly, March 7: seventy-four yeas, twenty-three nays, two absent. That’s pretty good. It was sent to the Senate, where it was marshaled by Senator Hallauer, certainly in league with you. Senator Gissberg, Senator Bargreen, and Senator Sutherland were all part of that committee that originally looked at that. They had a few amendments but they seemed also to be friendly amendments.

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: There was a discussion about the Higher Ed issue—whether or not they should be brought in and it seemed at that point they were allowed to go their own way a bit. Senator Hallauer said something about “it was a mechanical problem of basically accounting,” and that they had different systems and couldn’t fit the state system because of the way their year worked, or something to that effect, and that seemed to take care of it. It’s hard to tell, the Journal is not too fulsome in its description. Was that a good interpretation of what happened there?

Mr. Bishop: It was not any kind of a significant change for anybody and any agency except the ones that were reviewed and determined to be more workable for that particular institution. The one that was not ever resolved was the quarterly allotment, which remained to be a serious issue even in the legislative process and in final passage. Actually, Higher Education got an amendment that passed, which exempted them from the act. And there were some changes made regarding the Legislative Budget Committee and their authority.

So some of those we were really favoring to be changed because the original proposal was amended—slightly—in the House and had to be brought back into line. Especially with the Legislative Budget Committee.

Ms. Kilgannon: I understand at this stage that the Auditor, Cliff Yelle, was very active and you ran into a danger where the Senate was maybe not going to go with this plan. Governor Rosellini, I understand, went down and had dinner with—I don't know—all the senators or some group of senators, and personally convinced them that they needed to do this.

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: And then whatever it was he said, he countered the Auditor and the whole thing went forward again and passed.

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: It went to the House, they concurred in the amendments, and it passed.

Mr. Bishop: It was necessary, I think, for the governor to do that because there were some loyal supporters of Cliff Yelle in the Legislature, because he'd been there a long time. It was essential that he not be personally aggrieved. That would harm the relationship of the Auditor and the governor's office. So the governor went, actually, and met with legislators and convinced them that this was a change which was absolutely necessary because the State Auditor had authority to perform both pre-audit and post-audit.

Ms. Kilgannon: Yes, There was some quote about that "being a mixed authority." That you can't both do the pre-audit and then come back and check your own work and say, "Well, good job." That there was something fundamentally wrong with that.

Mr. Bishop: You see, post-audit was a function that was appropriately lodged with the Auditor. Pre-audit was the agency's responsibility because it was then that it had to be required to comply with the budget provisions and so on in their audit. And to audit the payrolls, and so on. This was all being done over in the Auditor's office. So it just was not appropriate.

Ms. Kilgannon: The State Treasurer, it changed his role, too, didn't it? I didn't understand all the ins and outs of this, but it seemed that the Treasurer was brought into the process in a different way, because it seemed like the Auditor was also somehow responsible for dispersing money. Doesn't that sound like the Treasurer's job? There was some change in the relationship there as to how all those things were handled.

Mr. Bishop: The warrants: this is interesting. I think that the Treasurer's office—I would almost have to go back and read the provisions—but I think that they were required to prepare the payroll, which they hadn't been.

Ms. Kilgannon: Further, the Act created a central budget agency which is a full-blown agency, correct? Before it had just been sort of an office in the governor's office?

Mr. Bishop: It was not even identified as a part of the governor's office. It was a separate staff-type function, like personnel.

Ms. Kilgannon: Whom did they report to?

Mr. Bishop: They reported to the governor, but not in a manner that would say it was a part of the executive branch. It was a part of the executive branch that was obviously there for the advice of the governor. The statute for the first time identified the Central Budget Agency as a fiscal management function of

the executive office. It never had that kind of identification before. It was clear that the governor was in charge of the budget. We still had some steps to take with the Highway Department, but even then they became a part of the executive budget. So, yes, it brought about a whole shaping of executive responsibility.

Ms. Kilgannon: And it created this rather large document every two years, the budget, which became the chief policy document of the governor's office. Is that correct?

Mr. Bishop: Right.

Ms. Kilgannon: Where the money is, is where the interest is.

Mr. Bishop: Spelling out responsibilities and what they were going to accomplish in each program.

Ms. Kilgannon: And tied for the first time to programs, so that you could actually see what the programs were? I've heard the previous budget document was an "administrative type" document and that this was a "program type" document; that's the distinction that is made over and over of the difference between what you were bringing forward and what had been in place.

Mr. Bishop: Yes. The first title of the agency was the Central Budget Agency, but I think that was because the act wanted to identify that it was the governor's central budget office for which he was responsible.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did you have a little session where you named the agency, or did you have to throw around some ideas as to what you wanted to call it? That choice of name cements it, but did you have other ideas?

Mr. Bishop: I think so. But later, the budget

office was called Program Planning and Fiscal Management.

Ms. Kilgannon: It's gone through quite a few name changes.

Mr. Bishop: Which really indicated what the nature of the office was. And then, of course, it became later OFM, the Office of Financial Management.

Ms. Kilgannon: Yes. Was it, in the first days, the chief policy office as well?

Mr. Bishop: It seemed to me that agencies, when we first started out, didn't acknowledge or recognize that the budget reflected a policy direction for the state. It was sort of an allocation of funds for a department to identify themselves as how they would use those funds instead of having some kind of a policy direction to achieve certain goals.

But, I think that was one reason why we were concerned when the new Budget and Accounting Act was adopted, that agencies would really respond in an aggressive manner to recognize that. That's why I was given the double task of budget director, so that they really had a person who was chief of staff and also the budget director to give direction to the agency. I think that was important, because agencies were not exactly too happy about the Budget and Accounting Act because it required a lot of policy decisions to be made in a way that the governor could identify. For example, the funds were allocated only on a quarterly basis and they had to be spent according to the plan in the Budget Act. So we actually anticipated that some agencies would not, and it would be implicated as strong as they should, unless it had some strong direction from the governor's office. They didn't have any place to go to appeal.

Ms. Kilgannon: So before that they had been

a little bit more autonomous? And were they given lump sums of money and they figured out what to do with it and set their own policies?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: And that kind of went away?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. The Budget and Accounting Act clearly identified the areas of responsibility.

Ms. Kilgannon: Were you seen as an extension of the governor, the sort of right hand of the governor and what he wants, that if they are bucking you, then they were actually bucking the governor?

Mr. Bishop: Right. And of course, the budget office was organized in such a fashion with program directors that they were able to constantly, daily, monitor the activities of the programs of an agency. The directors knew that.

Ms. Kilgannon: And that was new, wasn't it? Where you brought in budget analysts who were assigned to particular areas and they learned those areas and became experts, and as you say, monitored what was going on there?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. Because the budget persons were normally looking at how well they were doing on objects and whether they were staying within the budget on salaries and wages and this type of thing. But there were persons who occupied the positions in the budget office who actually were guiding and monitoring how well they were doing in the programs. Was their performance carrying out the nature of the directions?

Ms. Kilgannon: And the direction is coming from the governor?

Mr. Bishop: Right.

Ms. Kilgannon: So it was kind of top-down rather than agency-centered? It was governor-centered—from the executive office?

Mr. Bishop: Right.

Ms. Kilgannon: And these budget analysts, they are brand new people, weren't they? You recruited bright, young people to come in and fill these positions? You created that office.

Mr. Bishop: Yes. Some persons in the existing budget office had good experience and had worked with various agencies. So the persons who were qualified—I say that gently—but who had actually had experience with the kind of budgeting we wanted to do, were retained. But there were only a few. The budget office was terribly understaffed and it was actually not a good accounting division because it wasn't an accounting function being carried out in the budget office. And so persons were brought in as budget analysts who were actually either graduate students or interns or persons who had come from other agencies that had the right kind of experience.

Ms. Kilgannon: When you were recruiting and looking for these people, you had in mind these new responsibilities, this new approach. Were these people hard to find?

Mr. Bishop: Yes!

Ms. Kilgannon: Because this was a new field, wasn't it?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: So would you have had a

kind of mentoring situation where you would find promising people and basically teach them how to do it, or set up structures where then they would sort of take hold and learn how to do it?

Mr. Bishop: We sought people who had the right kind of background. But you see, they had a year and a half. Most of them were appointed within the first six months, so they had a year and a half to put this new budget instrument together. And it was their responsibility, if they were a program director to prepare the language, to work with the director and the administrators or the budget officer of an agency to interpret these programs. To write the program that they were attempting to develop. And so that gave them an excellent basis for training. They were trained right on the job. Because the first budget was presented in 1959 that had to have all of these features included, including programmatic kinds of interpretations, performance standards, et cetera. That was a real challenge. The budget staff really learned tremendously.

Ms. Kilgannon: I'm thinking it over: The governor comes in and he gives his inauguration speech and his budget speech to the Legislature and it's full of big ideas. "I want to go in this direction, I want to do these things," and it's somewhat idealistic and meant to be inspirational. "We want to go in these directions." How do you take that language and get it down into the nuts and bolts of writing instructions to agencies? "Okay, we're going to take this vision, this political vision of where the state's going to go, and translate that into budget numbers." How do you get from that to that point?

Mr. Bishop: It was a tremendous challenge.

Ms. Kilgannon: What role did you play in all this?

Mr. Bishop: During those initial years, the consulting firm that was hired to do the installation, we conferred a lot. And it was they who could help to prepare a budget definition which would, indeed, go from executive policy to reflection of the budgetary approach that we required to carry out those kinds of policy directions. So I think we all learned together.

If it hadn't been for the installation portion of the budget—because we had consultants during that period, and they were good—and they worked with the budget staff; they taught program leaders how to do this function. So I think that's how it occurred.

Ms. Kilgannon: You must have been in the thick of things, though?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. We had a committee of some directors who sat with agency directors. That sat with me to discuss a lot of this implementation.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did that help bring the agencies into the process in a way that was more positive?

Mr. Bishop: I think so. And of course, the persons who were brought in were individuals who had quite a bit of experience, Pete Giovan and Hodde. Even O'Brien was involved, because the accounting portion of the budget was something that was absolutely new.

Ms. Kilgannon: John O'Brien, the Speaker?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. And he was an accountant by profession and we wanted a legislative point of view on the accounting aspects of a public agency.

Ms. Kilgannon: Besides him, were other

legislators involved? Did you bring in other legislators?

Mr. Bishop: We had other legislators whom we met with periodically. We wanted to be sure that the persons who appeared to be leaders in the Revenue and Appropriation committees would have a grasp of what was going on.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did you make that a bipartisan effort?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: John O'Brien is a Democrat. I have seen Web Hallauer's name as being involved, but what Republicans were you able to bring in?

Mr. Bishop: There was a budget committee—the Legislative Budget Committee, and it was that committee that we spent most time with. It was the director of that Budget Committee who made great strides to try to put the Legislature in the executive's role. I don't know how to describe that, but actually the first draft of the Budget and Accounting Act, which was prepared by our attorneys and our consultants, was amended at the request of the director, Paul Ellis, to include the Budget Committee staff in executive hearings on the budget and we just couldn't condone that. I absolutely refused to let that go in. It took a lot of understanding because the Legislature didn't think that was a bad idea!

Ms. Kilgannon: Government is supposed to be based on checks and balances; that would have kind of muddied up the whole thing if you're all on the same side of the discussion.

Mr. Bishop: They got a lot of education from their own committee, because fortunately Ellis

agreed with everything we were doing. So he was able to explain it.

Ms. Kilgannon: Now, I understand that there's the outgo of the appropriations system and where the money goes, but there were also some changes made in the incoming money that I was a little confused about. It went into the Treasury into all these different little funds—it sounds like there were a large number, more than thirty, and there were all these different little pockets of money that then were earmarked, I guess, for different programs. Didn't you reform that part of the system, too? It sounded very complicated.

Mr. Bishop: It was a very complicated. There are still some individual functions; like various segments of Agriculture have their own funds because they charge fees. But most of the other so-called local funds were not continued. There was a lot of consolidation of activities, which were to begin with so-called local funds that were incorporated into the normal flow.

Ms. Kilgannon: Was there any problem making those changes?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. There were some agencies that depended on those kinds of things, and there are still identifiable funding sources, like Labor and Industries, like Employment Security, and those funds had been looked upon as belonging to those agencies by the directors. And they do, they become revenue to that agency, but they're given program direction through the budget process.

Ms. Kilgannon: And before that, they were "just money?"

Mr. Bishop: To a very large degree. The fiscal people in those agencies had more freedom. But we tried to reduce the number

of local funds and I think we did, and they're still in the process of doing it, I think.

Ms. Kilgannon: You still hear about dedicated funds. "We're going to have this special—say the lottery money—is going to go to a certain thing," and there are all kinds of strings attached to everything. So it's probably a continuous issue.

The whole relationship with agencies seems to be changing where there's a different kind of accountability and bringing things in. Were you also giving them more resources in other ways? You were taking away some of their autonomy, but were you giving them something in return so that they could do their jobs better?

Mr. Bishop: I think so, because it was more easily identified where they were having difficulties in achieving certain goals. And when that could be identified, then the next go-round was an opportunity to create a force in that program in order to get additional funds. There was no way for them to do that before. But that became very clearly demonstrated and so the legislators in the hearings process and so on could learn about some of those things and that money was going to be moved here to that, or if there was going to be additional money put into certain areas of activity. So it did help them. Agencies realized that that was a boon to them as well.

Ms. Kilgannon: How many years do you think it took to make this transition? This is a very big change.

Mr. Bishop: I think they were still making a transition even during the first eight years.

Ms. Kilgannon: Certainly. It was a big institutional cultural shift.

Mr. Bishop: And it continued in future staffs

of the agency because they were good directors and good program people, and so they just kept intensifying and the agencies became more understanding of what was going on.

Ms. Kilgannon: Once they got over the initial shock and saw how it worked? They could see the benefits?

Mr. Bishop: We were disappointed when Higher Education was successful in getting the Budget and Accounting Act amended to exempt them from quarterly allotments. But, as I told you, I think—and I would have to do some research to determine this—but I believe at a given point the Legislature recognized that that was not absolutely a good idea and re-imposed the quarterly allotment process. I'm not sure when that happened. In fact, it may not even be today, but at least there was a period in which they... It's hard for Higher Education to realize that they can't have a greater control.

Ms. Kilgannon: I think there may still be some tension there. For the first time—and this surprised me—there was a law that you had to balance the budget. The Budget and Accounting Act required a balanced budget.

Mr. Bishop: That was even difficult for us.

Ms. Kilgannon: It kind of set the bar pretty high, because you had a deficit situation that you had to correct rather quickly.

Mr. Bishop: But at least the debt had to be addressed by itself. It was a debt that had accumulated over many years. But each budget for each biennium had to be a balanced budget, and there had to be a plan for developing an amortization of the debt.

Ms. Kilgannon: And then I read that the governor had to present a balanced budget, but that the Legislature could unbalance it.

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: So, if that were to happen, how does the governor then deal with an unbalanced budget when he is the administrator who has to implement it?

Mr. Bishop: Interestingly enough, the Legislature interpreted their responsibility very efficiently. In other words, they didn't adopt unbalanced budgets. If they wanted something that was important enough to them, they would actually fit that somehow within the total resources that were available.

Ms. Kilgannon: Even though they weren't by statute required, they complied with the program, too?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: That's helpful. Did you as budget director work closely with the Legislature, with the committees to pull all this together? Or did they work on it separately and then just bring it to you? How much interaction was there?

Mr. Bishop: A great deal. For the first time—and I went to most hearings, which was really quite a responsibility because I had both jobs going. But during the budget session I was there with the program people and the agency directors. And together we would present in detail the budget and what its intentions and goals were and so on. I remember, I think maybe it was the first session or the second session after the Budget and Accounting Act was adopted—it must have been '61, Frank Foley was the chair of the Senate Ways and Means Committee. For the institutions—mental health—it had been requested by several legislators for the institutional superintendents to come to the hearing, which had not been unusual for them. That was something that

they were pleased to see reintroduced because they had done this before. And Frank Foley said to the director of Institutions, "Who are those people?" They said they were superintendents of Northern and so on. And Frank Foley said, "You're not supposed to be here. So would you please leave."

Ms. Kilgannon: Some legislators wanted them, but he didn't?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. Well, it was important because we had told the Legislature that we were going to defend the budget. It was an executive budget and we'd bring directors to join us to be more specific about the budget. And even a budget officer in an agency, if necessary. Certainly not the individual institutional kind of people, who were actually politically motivated in many cases.

Ms. Kilgannon: They competed with each other, too. Didn't they used to come in, previous to all this reform, and vie for money individually? Isn't that the way it used to be?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: I understood that they would come in and lobby for their own budgets and not have a coordinated effort at all, but as individuals. So that stopped?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. With the help of the committee chairman, really.

Ms. Kilgannon: So he recognized that that era was over.

Mr. Bishop: Highways was always a different kind of a situation because the Highways Committees and their chairs wanted to hear from them. It was okay because they eventually understood that it had to be a governor's budget or else it would be difficult to sustain. So eventually the process was okay.

Ms. Kilgannon: Maybe it was a case of you had to see it in operation before it really could be obvious how it was going to work and what that would look like. Sometimes things go like that.

Mr. Bishop: I think also the new director of Highways, who even though the commission appointed the director, the governor had an understanding with the commission, many of whom he had appointed, that the director reported to the governor. So that has been up and down. It hasn't been a smooth...

Ms. Kilgannon: No, no. That's always been a complicated thing.

Mr. Bishop: At the same time this was going on, the accounting division had to make a tremendous change. The whole accounting of the financial activities of the state: the payroll, the vendor payments—because the Auditor—the pre-audit process, all those things previously had originated in the pre-audit section and went to the Treasurer. That was a hard change for people to understand. But it was quickly understood the State Auditor was pre-auditing everything and then would go back and post-audit their activities instead of the agency's activity.

Ms. Kilgannon: Like being a watchdog for yourself?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. But it was an important change for agencies because for the first time they were responsible for pre-auditing every dollar they spent. So agencies had to completely revamp their accounting divisions and so did the budget office. We brought Jake David from Licensing who was a trained, professional accountant to head that division in the budget office, and gave him the opportunity to hire good systems accountants.

Then there was a good interplay be-

tween the program leaders and the budget and accounting divisions so that they worked together. It also changed the role of the budget office because all of these agency warrants and billings and so on were approved by them and then went to the Treasurer's Office. But they had to be cleared so that the warrants would all be paid with the authority from the budget office. So quite a few changes were made in the process of payment.

Ms. Kilgannon: I understand that the original budget office was just a handful of people.

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: Within a few years, how many people worked there, do you think? With all these new accountants, these new budget analysts, and different people?

Mr. Bishop: I'm sure it more than doubled in size and then it was pretty slim.

Ms. Kilgannon: It's not like it is now, but still it was a measurable growth?

Mr. Bishop: I think it's even grown more. Each year it has to.

Ms. Kilgannon: I read that you used the Tax Commission and the economic forecast from the Department of Employment Security for forecasting so that you could try to project government services—how many people would need state services, and therefore how much money would be needed for those programs. Had there been forecasting before, or was that a new activity?

Mr. Bishop: There was an agency established to do forecasting, the Forecasting Council. Now, revenue forecasting is done by an agency with a well qualified director, Chang Mook Sohn, who incidentally has a sharp op-

eration; I hear him quoted quite a bit. That's new. The Tax Commission, which is now the Revenue Department, did most of that in the earlier years and continued to do it even during the initial years of the Budget and Accounting Act. Employment Security, I think, became more significant in their projections because there was an improved way to build those into the budget process. Labor and Industries became more involved because they had to make their estimates based upon their programmatic approaches and what was going on. So things meshed a lot better than they had.

Ms. Kilgannon: So there had been forecasting, but this kind of took it to the next level?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: When the Legislature proposed in those days a new initiative, a new program or some new activity, they did not use fiscal notes. I can't think of the date of when fiscal notes came in, but it's surprisingly late in the process. Certainly not in this era. How did you guess what new activities would cost? Did you have some other mechanism?

Mr. Bishop: The program people had to work with the agencies because normally those kinds of things came from agency requests. Or if it didn't, it had to go back to the agency for the impacts to be measured and costed. So the budget office, the program people, and the agency would be involved in bringing about a realistic estimate of what those costs would be. Thank goodness, in most cases, quite a few of them originated from the agency anyway, and with the budget office's knowledge, so the estimates were ready to go.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did you occasionally have the situation where a legislator came in with a brand new idea, a pet project, and said, "Let's do this," and got it through the legislative process and handed it to you as a new law?

Mr. Bishop: There was increased cooperation from the budget committees of both houses and the budget office and frequently the governor, to know when those kinds of things were going to happen. There were still surprises, but I think legislators themselves wanted to know, "What's that going to cost?"

Ms. Kilgannon: Was there a great increase in that cross communication between the Legislature and the governor's office in these years?

Mr. Bishop: I think so.

Ms. Kilgannon: I've heard complaints of previous administrations where there just wasn't much going on in between the two branches.

Mr. Bishop: Yes. It was just an open street from agency heads to the Legislature. There was no involvement in analyzing or approving of requests. That didn't happen after the Budget and Accounting Act.

Ms. Kilgannon: So almost everything would start to be routed differently and go through a different process? It's interesting that in those years of the Budget and Accounting Act, you also had civil service reform; you had a change in how the government purchased supplies, with Charlie Hodde working with General Administration to create a new system there. You had a lot of changes in the structure of how government operated day-to-day. It went through quite a big change in those years. Even realizing that the Department of General Administration was newly created in 1955, that there had been nothing like that before, is an astonishing fact.

Mr. Bishop: I suspect that one of the things that strengthened that at least, the first director of purchasing was not fully qualified and

the operation was not well organized and functioning.

Ms. Kilgannon: It's hardly the background for such a large activity.

Mr. Bishop: So that became a problem for the governor.

Ms. Kilgannon: Right. I believe *The Seattle Times* got on top of that story.

Mr. Bishop: He made a quick change to that. I suspect that was one reason why Charlie found himself in that department.

Ms. Kilgannon: I've always read it that way. So you were heavily involved. How involved was the governor in these problematic changes? Did you have a great deal of conversation with him, or did he supply the initial vision and you carried it out? Did he continue to have a hands-on role in how this was implemented?

Mr. Bishop: There was a good deal of consulting with the governor. For example, he sat in on quite a few of the budget hearings, especially for the larger agencies. And then when we were ready to go with the budget, before we could put the finalization on each of the departments, we would have a meeting with the governor and each program and the budget director had to report in detail what each agency was going to do. They were called executive hearings. The governor was actually involved in the budget process. I don't think that had been the case before.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did it help that he had been such a long-time legislator? That he would be very familiar with the process?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: I don't recall if, as a senator, he was involved in Appropriations or not. But he would have been familiar with the process, in any case.

Mr. Bishop: Sure. He was close enough to know what was going on. After all, he was involved in so much of the developments at the University of Washington that even with that he had to play ball with the committees.

Ms. Kilgannon: It's one thing to be a legislator; it's quite a different thing to be the chief administrative person of the state. Was the governor able to go from being a legislator where you just make the laws to being the person who actually implements them? Did he have enough vision to play that role?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. He wouldn't mind calling down the legislators for a little chat, even on occasion and in important moments of bill consideration up on the floor. The one incident I can really remember is with Vic DeGarmo, who was the senator from Thurston County. Vic DeGarmo worked for the brewery. The governor was attempting to readjust the tax situation and, of course, part of the proposal was a tax on beer. And Vic had put his foot on it and wasn't going to let it go anywhere. So the governor went upstairs while they were in session and got Victor off the floor and told him to "do it."

Ms. Kilgannon: How did that go over?

Mr. Bishop: Vic said, "I work for the brewery, I can't..." "Do it!"

Ms. Kilgannon: "You're not here as a brewery worker, you're here as a senator."

Mr. Bishop: And then Victor was defeated, I think.

Ms. Kilgannon: Well, he paid a price! So far, the work has progressed, but, yes, there was opposition. Probably your most fierce opposition was from the State Auditor who, in fact, lobbied hard against this bill and almost succeeded in sidetracking it, but not quite. As we've said, the governor intervened and met with the legislators and reinvigorated them. But in the end, Auditor Yelle took you to court over his lost powers. Could you tell me a little bit more about that court case and how that transpired?

Mr. Bishop: The Auditor, Cliff Yelle, was extremely upset about what had happened and made a lot of other people unhappy with him. He absolutely decided to go to the Supreme Court to challenge the constitutionality of having the pre-audit function removed from his office. And he took the joint case against me as the budget director and the State Treasurer.

Ms. Kilgannon: Tom Martin.

Mr. Bishop: Yes, it first went to the Superior Court, at which time I had to testify whenever the Superior Court would have testimony. I had to go clear up to Shelton because the judge who was the Superior Court judge was from that district. The important thing is that Harold Shefelman became our attorney. I think I gave you a copy of the brief.

Ms. Kilgannon: Yes.

Mr. Bishop: And I think it's an absolutely superb brief. It was actually prepared by one of his staff, Bill Robinson, who was the son of Supreme Court Judge Robinson. But the Superior Court upheld the justification and the constitutionality and it went to the Supreme Court.

Ms. Kilgannon: So Cliff Yelle contested it again?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. It was still handled by Shefelman. And of course the case—I don't know if you've looked at the case or not—but it's also beautiful. And it absolutely stamped everything we wanted to do right in that court decision. So it was an excellent decision and it helped reinforce most of the elements of the Budget and Accounting Act.

Ms. Kilgannon: Even though it was a bit grueling, was it a good thing in the end to have it all laid out in law?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. It had to be done. Not just for Cliff Yelle's point of view, but for other people who weren't too sure about the Budget and Accounting Act. So that was the end.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did you go into that case with confidence, or were you worried?

Mr. Bishop: No, I was confident because even the case in the Superior Court was pretty well documented. I think the Supreme Court was a unanimous decision.

Ms. Kilgannon: How involved was that? How much time would you have to put into that court case?

Mr. Bishop: Not very much into the Supreme Court. That's all mostly handled by the attorneys.

Ms. Kilgannon: They don't really hear all the evidence again, right? That was interesting. It was covered in the press. Did you ever have a sense of the public's reaction or how this was playing outside the halls of government? Do you think the public understood that something important was happening?

Mr. Bishop: I don't think they did initially. But it certainly became clear. I didn't see a whole bunch of clippings and things like that,

but it became very evident that this had happened when meetings were held and people started talking about it and agencies were able to advertise what an impact this had on them. So I think the public became very supportive.

Ms. Kilgannon: So within a few budget cycles, was most of this new approach in place and it was happening and you could see this?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: You stayed in the Rosellini administration for eight years. Certainly, by the end of eight years you could see your legacy. You had transformed this area of government and I imagine it transforms almost everything that happens in the administration because it's the starting point. You've kind of kept tabs on the budget office over the years. Has it continued in a direction that you began?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. I think that the budget division has grown steadily over the years and they hire good people. And of course, what helps to strengthen it is the legislative committees have established good career staff persons. In fact, Victor Moore, the present budget director, came from being staff director for the House Ways and Means Committee. So I am very happy with the support they have gotten and the fact that they've had good directors. Only the first director after me was the only bad point in the...

Ms. Kilgannon: There can be a faltering and then a regrouping, I guess.

Mr. Bishop: But that only happened for a month or two.

Ms. Kilgannon: You talked about the rough

start with the transition between the Rosellini administration and the Langlie administration. When Governor Rosellini was going out of office and Governor Evans was coming in, were you part of the transition team for him?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. At least we had made provisions in the budget for the transition team to have its own offices, its own staff and we would consult with them whenever they wanted to consult with us. It was not a difficult situation.

Ms. Kilgannon: So when the new governor, Dan Evans, who had been in the Legislature during this change, when he came in from a different party, this structure that had been set up, it held and was adopted and continued?

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: And from administration to administration after that?

Mr. Bishop: Right. Except for the first budget director—but it got back on the track. The interesting thing, I thought, was before I had announced what I was going to do, or even knew what I was going to do, I got a letter from Governor Evans—or I saw in the newspaper, I think—I'm not sure whether I had his letter first, but he was going to request me to stay as the budget director. Not as the chief of staff, but as the budget director.

Ms. Kilgannon: Governor Evans? Would you have done that?

Mr. Bishop: No. I couldn't do that. I had to write a very difficult response because some of the people who had been so loyal, they looked upon me as some foreign being when I came in, and it took a long time for them—the political elements of the system—for them to accept me at all. Then, if I had stayed I think it

would have been a mistake. So I had to write him and tell him.

Ms. Kilgannon: A compliment, nonetheless.

Mr. Bishop: That was a compliment. And then I was on leave of absence from the University of Washington...

Ms. Kilgannon: A very long leave, yes.

Mr. Bishop: So then I was notified by the then-president that I could come and return as an associate dean of public affairs. Brewster Denny was the director and I wasn't sure the faculty could accept me. I never did complete my degree.

I think Marshall Neil and Frank Foley then called Dr. French and told him he'd better get on his wheels. So he called me on the phone and told me he'd meet me in Seattle.

Ms. Kilgannon: This is the president of Washington State University?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. So on my way back from that appointment in Seattle I had to make my mind up, but I had to tell Barbara. I was glad that Dr. French did that because he needed to have some strength in his agency. And I enjoyed that.

Ms. Kilgannon: You've had a fascinating career. Were you the only joint chief of staff and budget director? After your time, did those become two different positions? Was there ever again those two very huge roles combined into one person?

Mr. Bishop: Not to my knowledge.

Ms. Kilgannon: What was that like for you? I can see how that worked when you were first implementing the Budget and Accounting Act

because you would be the central spokesperson. You would be *the* person. But that's a big load to carry. How many years did you do that?

Mr. Bishop: Six of the eight years.

Ms. Kilgannon: Did it continue to work well for you or did it become really burdensome at some point? That's a lot to hold on to.

Mr. Bishop: I think I was getting burned out. When my wife had to start calling the budget office during budget preparation for the Legislature at one o'clock in the morning and saying, "Where are you and when are you coming home?" But I want you to know I had some tremendous support. In 1957, when we got the appropriation for surveys and installations, we hired John Donaho and consulted with him constantly. We kept some of the better staff: Ray Berlin, Ed Salts, Buel Brodin and Gordon Barnes. But then we started recruiting personnel and brought in new staff to be trained and begin the installations. We brought over Marv Ruud, Fred Johns, and Ed Giesecke from the Department of Personnel and George Van Meighem from the Department of Transportation. Initially, there were no lay-offs, but Ernest Brabrook retired then; he was eligible. We recruited Grinstead Leach from Employment Security to come over and oversee the budget operation for about six months while we made the transition. He was able to return to Employment Security when I brought Jim Ryan, the research director from the Tax Commission, to be chief of the Budget Division.

Ms. Kilgannon: Was he your deputy, then?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. Ryan was deputy director of the Budget Office and Jake David was manager of Accounting. Both divisions had complimentary functions very different from the previous budget office operations.

Ms. Kilgannon: Having the right people makes a huge difference.

Mr. Bishop: Yes. Jim Bricker was also one of the early recruits. He came as a graduate intern from the Public Administration program at the University of Washington. We started the first graduate internships in the 1960s in the Budget Office and then the program spread to other agencies. Roger Bassett came in as a graduate intern a few years later and Jim Sainsbury in 1966 after I had left.

Jim Ryan was really the honcho. I went over there a lot and spent time with him, but he ran the show.

Ms. Kilgannon: So you actually had two physical offices, right? Your main office would be right in the governor's office, right in the Legislative Building.

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: And the budget office, was it always housed in the Insurance Building?

Mr. Bishop: Insurance, yes.

Ms. Kilgannon: So you would run back and forth between the buildings?

Mr. Bishop: Yes. The budget director's office was in the basement. But they moved up to the second floor.

Ms. Kilgannon: How much of your time would you spend, proportionally? Half and half? I suppose there are seasons. The budget season would be so intense that that would pretty much take over your time?

Mr. Bishop: The budget office, except during budget time when we were preparing the budget—I attended every one of the hearings during the Legislature and when we were having

executive hearings. Of course, I had to spend a lot of time consulting on the recommendations of what would go into the budget.

But I was able to function. I think I could have done a better job in the governor's office, but I was the chairman of the group. I was the enforcer, mostly. It was a wonderful time!

Ms. Kilgannon: Yes. Is there anything else you want to say in conclusion about this tremendous legacy?

Mr. Bishop: When I would come back over from WSU—because I also covered the Legislature for the University. Talk about a dual job. I really...

Ms. Kilgannon: From one fire to another!

Mr. Bishop: But the budget office was always very good to me because they would always set me up a desk so that I had some place where I could work.

Ms. Kilgannon: You were like the honorary member? I imagine it's with some pride that you've watched that agency develop over the years to the institution it has become, so central to government.

Mr. Bishop: Yes.

End of Interview