

Maureen and Mike

Mansfield Library

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

Archives and Special Collections

Mansfield Library, University of Montana

Missoula MT 59812-9936

Email: library.archives@umontana.edu

Telephone: (406) 243-2053

This transcript represents the nearly verbatim record of an unrehearsed interview. Please bear in mind that you are reading the spoken word rather than the written word.

Oral History Number: 396-038
Interviewee: Stan Stephens
Interviewer: Bob Brown
Date of Interview: November 17, 2005
Project: Bob Brown Oral History Collection

Bob Brown: —and was, prior to that, a member of the state Senate from Havre, I believe, for about 16 years, and also served as President of the Montana State Senate. Governor Stephens, maybe you could tell us a little bit about your background, some of the experiences you had growing up, perhaps some person or individual that had a particular influence on you, maybe how you became interested in politics?

Stan Stephens: Certainly, Bob. First of all, I'm very pleased to be able to do this and I hope that we can have some repartee back and forth that proves of interest to people that may want to listen to this tape in a future time. I was born in Calgary, Alberta, in 1929. My mother and dad had five sons. I was the second eldest of the five.

Basically my memories of being a youngster...I was introduced at a very early age to music. My father was a professional musician and he taught his sons, at least the first three, to be involved in music. The instrument that was selected for me was the trumpet. So I started at the age of six as a student of the trumpet and continued that through my young years and eventually, not long after I started—six years later—I was the member of the Academy Symphony Orchestra playing my trumpet.

Continued that through the World War Two war years and had many opportunities to benefit from my musical background. Played in military bands with the Naval Reserve and with the Army as I approached my teenage years. But that was a great asset to me. Something I always look back on as what a tremendous benefit it was to have a musical education that not only taught you how to read music and the nuances of musical composition, particularly the classics, but it teaches you timing and patience and has a lot of attributes that students today in the universities will understand their musical ability came back to really be of great value to them. That's the background.

Prior to the time that I came to America, specifically to Montana, I was in broadcasting. I started in broadcasting, actually, at an early age, kind of as an apprentice. I ended up working for two radio stations in Calgary. At the time that I was in broadcasting in Calgary, it occurred to me as I evaluated what I was doing...I was really fascinated by broadcasting and later that became my life's work, but in Canada broadcasting is adjudicated by the CBC. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is the opposite number of the [Federal Communications Commission] FCC in America. The major difference, of course, is that the CBC actually operates radio stations. They set down the guidelines and the rules and they operate radio stations, unlike the FCC, that does not. And evaluating my broadcast years in Canada, I thought, if I'm going to stay in this business I think I need an opportunity to be in an operation of broadcasting that is a little freer.

It didn't take long to figure out that it's free in the United States, compared to what it was in Canada at that time. So I immigrated to the U.S. in 1949.

BB: So you arrived when you were about 20 years old in 1949?

SS: Right.

BB: And where in Montana?

SS: I came across the border, as a matter of fact, in June of '49, and I came across at Sweetgrass, Montana. That's Coumts, Alberta—those are the two twin cities, or towns. Came into Montana, and actually I wasn't coming down to...I was on a permanent visa. I had gone through the United States embassy in Calgary and became what they call a resident alien with a permanent visa status. But I had to have a job and I had looked into that before I left Calgary. I actually came down and joined a custom combine crew in 1949. This is a group of people, of course, that I engaged in the harvesting of grain. I was retained by a fellow from, actually he was from Texas, and he put me to work driving a truck. I was a city boy. I never spent any time, really, on a farm, so I was looking at the other side of the mountain, so to speak. I started out in Amarillo, Texas, and all that summer we cut grain all the way up to Great Falls, Montana.

BB: And instead of going back into Canada, you arranged to stay in Montana.

SS: That's right. In fact, it was, like a lot of things in life that you don't anticipate, it was a turn in the road that came as a result of...I was having breakfast in Great Falls, and I was on my way back to Canada because I hadn't made any money, of course, as a truck driver, but it was an experience that I really cherish. Nevertheless, I was going back to Calgary and the thought in my mind is I'll probably head out to California. Well, we were in a café in Great Falls, Montana, as I mentioned, and in the newspaper there was an ad that one of my compatriots noticed. He said, "They're looking for a broadcaster up in Havre, Montana—someone that can write for broadcasting and demonstrate some experience behind the microphone. That sounds like you, doesn't it?" I said, "Well, it is, perhaps." So I said, "Where is Havre, Montana?" Of course, I didn't know much about Montana at that time—I lived in Great Falls and Shelby—but they told me, and I made a call to the radio station. They asked if I'd come up for an interview and in August of 1949 I was working for a radio station in Havre, Montana.

BB: Wow. Do I remember...I think, Stan, you're a Korean War veteran?

SS: Right. I was in broadcasting, as I mentioned, starting in '49 and in the year 1951—the Korean War actually broke out in 1950—in 1951 I received, as the veterans will recall, greetings from the United States.

BB: Were you a U.S. citizen?

SS: No, I wasn't. I was still a Canadian citizen. I reported to the draft office as the notice required and they told me at that time, "We can't draft you. You're not an American citizen. But it's nice that you've followed the law and reported." I said, "Well, that's fine. I mean, if anybody else is going, I don't mind being subjected to that. I think that's proper." Well, the upshot of the thing was they could draft me. I had the option, actually, to refuse on the ground of citizenship, but had I done that, I felt at that time that that was the wrong thing to do because further on down the line I fully intended to apply for American citizenship, and I thought that might be a blot on my record, having denied the notice of the United States to serve when I was called to do so. So I ended up in Korea.

I was trained, actually, in radio communications. I think the government thought I was a high-speed radio operator working on Morse code, and I wasn't, of course, but I went to school for that in Georgia, and I came out of the school as a high-speed radio operator and I was assigned to Korea. Then once I got to Korea, there was a notice that was passed around where I was that they were also looking for broadcasters in an outfit called the Armed Forces Radio Service. And I applied for that, mentioned my experience, and they said, "We're going to transfer you out of where you are and go work for us." I ended up as a correspondent for the Armed Forces Radio Service.

BB: And so you served there until, what, about 1953?

SS: Right, I served there actually for 15 months. I served there virtually all of '52 and part of '53 and I was a two-year enlistee. So in May of '53 I was released from my obligation at the service.

BB: And you returned to Havre?

SS: I returned back to Havre, continued to work in broadcasting, and at the same time, this new fledgling industry called cable television was coming onto the scene and we developed a cable television system in Havre and then later expanded to systems in Glasgow and in Sydney, Montana. So I was kind of doing dual work, although mainly broadcasting. A good part of my work in broadcasting, in addition to behind the microphone, was writing editorials for our radio station.

BB: Stan, you became a partner then, in the business? You didn't just continue to be an announcer on the radio, you worked your way into the business itself, the television business and the radio station business.

SS: That's right. In the year of '65, with two other associates, we applied to the board of directors of the radio station to purchase the radio station, and they were very understanding and very kind to us, and they sold us the property, and from that moment on we owned the radio station, in addition to the cable TV operations I mentioned earlier.

BB: And you met your wife, Anne, there in Havre.

SS: I met my wife, Anne. Anne was a school teacher in the Havre school system and we were married in 1954 and we have two daughters, both of whom, to our great joy, are still in Montana; one in Billings and one in Missoula. But we've been married since '54 and lived most of our life in Havre, later moving to the Flathead Valley when I got out of office.

BB: And you mentioned that you enjoyed doing the editorials, the broadcast editorials at the radio station, and I think that might have been what whetted your interest in politics.

SS: I started writing editorials in '58 and continued until I sold my interest in the radio station. I enjoyed that work very much. Writing editorials is not a financial thing for the radio station. You don't sell your editorial like you would a sports broadcast or a news broadcast. There's no commercial value. But it does have a great value for the radio station as far as listenership if people tune in. Over the years, I was very nicely treated by the Associated Press and some other organizations.

BB: You got some awards for your editorials?

SS: Yes. In 1975, I was given the award of the Radio Television News Directors of America. It's an international award called the Edward R. Murrow Award, and it's an honor of the late Edward R. Murrow, who most people know as an outstanding broadcaster. I received that in 1975 and then when I retired from politics, I was honored by my associates in broadcasting by being admitted to the Montana Broadcasters Hall of Fame. So I was treated very well and enjoyed my years in broadcasting.

BB: And one of the editorials, if I remember correctly, had something to do with some information that had been brought to you about a possible scandalous kind of situation involving workers comp.

SS: Yes, that's right. There was some scandalous activity going on in work comp and some information was brought to us that a couple of workmen in the Havre area, as a matter of fact, had been awarded compensation for their work comp injuries, but they were kind of short-changed by people that represented them before the work comp board. It turned out to be quite a scandal involving a number of attorneys and individuals. We did a series. Actually that series, Bob, was the foundation for the Edward R. Murrow Award in 1975. It ended up with a couple of individuals being tried and sentenced to...one went to prison, the other one was offered an opportunity to avoid prison by being put on a suspended sentence. But it was really a blot from the standpoint of conduct by individuals against people who were deserving, but who were unable to speak for themselves. So we got involved in that and it turned out to be a very successful effort.

BB: I remember that, just vaguely. I was a young person at the time, but that was the tip of the iceberg on what became a pretty big scandal in the whole workers compensation area, I think.

It extended to the workers compensation judge and court and all that sort of thing. There was a fellow named Jim Carden [Workers' Compensation administrator]...Do I remember that? I don't know if he was involved in that directly or not, but he eventually became implicated, I think, in what started from the evidence that was brought to you in Havre. I think that's right.

SS: Right. There were a lot of individuals. I don't want to necessarily go into some names now, but there's a well-known attorney that actually lost his license and was convicted and was sentenced. There were some other individuals that faced similar situations. Several other people, some of them are attorneys, were kind of dusted up in it, although it didn't result in the incarceration of as many people as thought. A grand jury was involved. They were empaneled and they brought forth some indictments. So you're right, it was really a major scandal affecting the state, and carried over for about two years before it was settled.

BB: And it was at about that time that you became a Republican candidate for the State Senate, is that right?

SS: That's right, about that time. During the time I was writing editorials. Of course, you can't avoid getting involved in some political affairs when you're in a small community, especially when you're in that line of work. I was helping a number of candidates who were candidates at that time for the legislature. I had actually stepped out and helped some people that were running for statewide office like the late Jim Battin, who became a U.S. congressman and later a federal judge. So we were involved in assisting some people with the Republican Party in Hill County. Hill County is a very Democrat stronghold, if you will, much like Silver Bow County and Butte, although there was a smattering of Republicans. There are more there today than there used to be. But I was working on Republican candidates and then eventually, after not being too successful in getting other people elected, I thought I'd give it a try myself, and in 1968 I filed for office for the Montana State Senate.

BB: Now Stan, your roots were in Canada but you were a businessman in the United States in the 1950s. You're in this heavily Democratic area. If you wanted to serve in the State Senate, the path of least resistance would have been to run as a Democrat. What was it that caused you philosophically to become a Republican?

SS: I should mention, too, the time we were talking about. I had since become an American citizen in 1954, mainly as a result of my service in Korea with the military. But to answer your question as far as my interest, I was always a Republican in the sense that I believed in smaller government and the free-market system and the rights of the individual. I just felt more comfortable following the values and the creed of the Republican Party, and therefore aligned myself with that. As you say, probably the popular choice of someone that didn't have any political affiliation would have been to run with the majority party, but I chose to run as a Republican. And in '68, we were rewarded by being elected.

I think I was the first one in about 20 years from that party, from the Republican Party, to serve out of Hill County. A great part of it was due to the fact that my name was fairly well known because of my broadcast work in the community, and that helped me a great deal because name identification, as you know, is a major factor in any kind of a race. I got a lot of support, and a lot of it crossed over. A lot of individuals that knew me, not politically, but as an individual, were kind enough to support me. Off I went in 1969. Actually, the election was '68 but '69 was the first session.

BB: So you served during the...I know during that period of time there was a big controversy in Montana in the '67 session, just prior to your arriving there on the sales tax. Governor Tim Babcock was an advocate of the sales tax and that might have been a factor in his defeat in 1968. That surfaced again in 1971, that same issue did, and you were there during that. What are your recollections about the sales tax controversy?

SS: It was a real controversy, and I think it was really the first time in recent years, at that time, that a full-fledged effort to introduce a sales tax for consideration in Montana was made, in '72. It went to the legislature, of course, and there were lines drawn. Eventually the movement was knocked down and it has been subsequently ever since in other different elections. One of the major occurrences in Montana in 1972 was the Constitutional Convention. That convention was very interesting too, and looking back legislators were not allowed to be candidates, and that—

BB: For the Con Con?

SS: For the Con Con. They could not be in the Con Con because they were going to presumably be the adjudicators of the work of the Con Con. But the Con Con was very controversial in itself. When it finally came up for the public vote, which it had to do to be ratified, it was defeated in 43 [it lost in 44 counties] of the 65 counties in Montana.

BB: Fifty-six counties.

SS: Fifty-six, excuse me. Fifty-six in Montana. Forty-three counties voted no. And it was carried by a popular vote by a slim margin. It was later challenged in court. At that time the Montana Supreme Court had five members. After being adjudicated by the Supreme Court, it was ratified by a vote of three to two in the court, which, in effect, when you're boiling that all down, one person passed the Montana Constitutional Convention. Now the Con Con, as it's referred to, is the law of the land now, and it's the guideline for all things that happen in Montana from a judicial and a legal standpoint. But it has a couple of requirements in there that to this day have proven to be very, very difficult to produce. For example, there are some rather subjective terms in there, such as the desire to provide schoolchildren with "a quality education." That in itself on the surface sounds very good. But when you try to define quality, you have a variance of opinion from all over. What is a quality education? What should it contain? As a result of that inability to define specifically what a "quality education" should be in Montana, it ends up in the court and it continues to go through court battles and legislative inquiries to this day. The

other part of the Con Con that proved to be a little difficult to produce was the requirement for a “clean and healthful” environment. Again, on its surface, very laudatory. But again, very difficult to specifically produce in legislation and in rules and regulations.

BB: Those two provisions, of course, have been litigated and continue to be. In fact, as we conduct this interview, there’s a strong possibility the special session of the legislature to implement a recent meeting by the Montana State Supreme Court interpreting the part of the constitution you just mentioned on the “quality education.”

SS: Right. You’re right, the ‘70s were particularly fraught with controversy and challenge for Montana, not only because of the Con Con, but as a result of that we moved into the area of natural resources in a big way. And that’s when the Montana coal industry came into the purview of the legislature and a coal tax was enacted that competed with other states that were producing coal. Our coal tax, when it came into being, was 30 percent. That’s the largest sales tax in the history of the country on the sale of coal. Ironically, Montana has most of the coal in America. It was 25 percent of the nation’s coal. But the tax rendered Montana coal production non-competitive, and Wyoming became the state that produced all the coal while Montana did have a large sales tax on coal that was produced, but it was a limited amount because of the onerous tax that the producers saw. That subsequently was reduced over the years and is down to less than half of that today. It’s still not as competitive as Wyoming, but it is more competitive, and considering the quality of Montana coal, the industry continues to flourish.

BB: You were involved in the votes and the legislation and that sort of thing, both in terms of when the 30 percent tax was enacted, and then I think it was cut to 15, and then maybe you even reduced it somewhat lower than that. But you were a member of the legislature during that period of time. In your opinion, was the coal tax legislated in order to stop the coal development? There are some people that believe that the environmental community in Montana simply didn’t want the coal mined and they imposed a 30 percent tax on it. Or at least some of the people who voted for the 30 percent tax voted for it to keep the coal from being mined. There are others who think that because of the energy crisis that was going on during that period of time that Montana had the nation over a barrel and that it would have to pay the 30 percent tax. Do you have any thoughts on any of that? When you were a legislator there, do you remember those things going on?

SS: I think it was a combination of that. There were some people that didn’t want to see coal developed for environmental reasons. There were others that saw an opportunity for the state to profit substantially from the extraction of a mineral that was highly in demand at the time. But what they didn’t take into account, really, is that Montana—as we all know—is competitive with other states, and we have to be able to match them. We could match the eastern coal states from the standpoint of quality. We have low-sulfur coal. But then we can’t match Montana with Wyoming and Utah and other states—Nevada—that were producing coal at less cost and were more attractive to customers.

BB: Had a similar quality coal.

SS: Similar quality, right. Wyoming, in particular, has been very successful with their smaller tax. They still have a substantial tax. It's less than 10 percent or whatever. But they are funding virtually all their educational needs in Wyoming from coal taxes.

BB: Now Stan, also during that period, some people have likened some of the '70s, at least, to Montana's second progressive era. Historians look at the period right at the turn of the last century from the late 1890s until the early 1900s as the progressive era in American politics. Sometimes some historians view the period from maybe 1973 to 1977, or something like that, as the second progressive era in Montana. There was a controversy then about the Equal Rights Amendment, about abortion, about various efforts to protect the environment through legislation. You were, in your early years as a legislator, involved in that sort of thing, or you were there when that was going on. Any thoughts or observations on that kind of turbulent and unsettled time in the political history of our state?

SS: It was, as you describe, a progressive era. The Democratic Party, particularly the liberal wing of the Democratic Party, was riding pretty high in those days. The issues that you mentioned found favor with them. There was opposition and there was controversy and we had...Even though one party was predominant at that time, you could see the swing that's inevitable in politics start to generate because of some of that. The coal tax ignited a lot of people's interest. And as you say, the Equal Rights Amendment. Montana was one of the last states to take that up. At that time, the movement nationally was in need of two or three other states to actually change the U.S. Constitution. Then there was the Panama Canal in '76. That was under President Carter and that was one of the transfers of property that he wanted to see made. That was controversial. All of that moved us close to the end of the decade, and that's when the Republicans took over the Senate and then eventually the House too, but in '79 they took over the Senate.

BB: And Stan, you became President of the Senate, I think, in about 1983?

SS: Right. I was Majority Leader in '79, '81, and then in '83 was President of the Senate.

BB: What are your recollections about your experience in important legislative leadership in the '79, '81, and '83 sessions? Do you have any memories that stand out particularly in your mind?

SS: We did a number of things. Of course, Republicans like to feel that they're better budget balancers than the Democrats. They start out that way, but they very often fall into this same attractive mode of the Democrats, and are inclined maybe not to be as conservative as they originally plan. Basically, the Republicans, I think, did a good job. That's when the presidency of the Senate actually went over. It used to be assigned to the lieutenant governor, but that went over. The first president of the Senate was Gordon McOmber. He was a Democrat and a good

Senate president. Then we had Jean Turnage, who was a former active majority leader in the Republican side. Bill Mathers. Then I followed Bill Mathers. Actually, I followed Jean Turnage. But we did a number of different things during that period of time. My recollection of it was that it wasn't always one way. It wasn't a matter of the party in power got its way all the way. The Democrats didn't do that when they were in power and neither did the Republicans. And of course, that is ideal from the standpoint of the public because they want to see people get along. But we passed some major legislation, particularly in the field of education, I can think of. There were a number of other areas having to do with the budget in general and the—

BB: I believe, wasn't it the Republican leadership in the 1981 session, when you were the Senate Majority Floor Leader, that the largest increase in the public school funding in the history of Montana up until that time—and I think perhaps until this day—was passed during that legislative session?

SS: That's right. That was '81. You're absolutely correct. You've got a good memory for it, Bob. Ironically, the Montana Education Association has never been a real strong supporter of the Republican Party. That rather bold and lavish budget didn't seem to change anything. I remember...Going back just a few years to my first year in the legislature, and you're in there and it's a brand new world, and you're dealing with legislative rules and procedures that are foreign to you at that time. There was an old time lobbyist named Glen Carney, who was representing the Anaconda Company at that time. He came to me one day and asked for my advice on a particular piece of legislation. I told Mr. Carney, "I'm really flattered you'd even ask for my advice because I'm new and I'm feeling my way in this process, and I should be the one to be asking your advice." Subsequent to that little discussion, he said, "Well, if you want some advice from me, Stan, I'll give you some, since you asked. This is a very interesting process, and I've been around it many years, seen a lot of legislators come and go. Some good men and women that work real hard for the state. Here's the advice I'd give you. Never make a snap judgment and never burn a bridge." Now that sounds maybe kind of trite, but when you think about it, don't make snap judgments and don't burn bridges, that's the best advice I had early on, and it's the best advice I can think of today.

BB: Pretty fundamental and it applies in almost every type of situation.

SS: Sure does. Looking back on some of the things that I can recall, we created the vo-tech centers. At that time, vocational technical education was the new thing on the block in education. A lot of us had been kind of startled about what's happening with education, whether it's higher education. What about these people that don't go to the University, what can they do and what's the need for vo-tech? We ended up, as you know, with five different centers in the state and they're still there today, and they're doing a very good job in supplementing what the University system is doing.

BB: And they were created in that period of the early '80s, late '70s?

SS: Right. They were created, actually, in the '70s. It would have been just after the Con Con. They developed in the so-called five major population centers of Montana.

BB: Stan, you mentioned Glen Carney. Are there other legislators or lobbyists that might cross your mind as particularly memorable for whatever reason during that period when you were a legislator?

SS: Well, there are some. I mentioned Jean Turnage a moment ago, who later became the Chief Justice of our Supreme Court, and I have great affection for Jean and he was a great mentor for me. There were others, too. Chet Blaylock, who was the leader on the Democrat side, was a good friend. He is now deceased. I thought he was a man of reason. He had his philosophy that was contrary to mine, but we managed to get along in many ways. I think of Jim Lucas, who was the Speaker of the House, and I think of Dick Dzivi, who was the floor leader for the Democrats at the sales tax time.

BB: A Senator from Great Falls?

SS: A Senator from Great Falls. And one more that stands out too, and he went on to be a Supreme Court Justice, was John "Skeff" Sheehy. I have a particular fondness for John. He is a delightful man and a very happy-go-lucky Irishman, as you might expect from his name. But one thing that John did that remained with me as an indication of his character...I was the one that sponsored the Implied Consent law. The Implied Consent law has to do with alcohol consumption, people driving while under the influence of alcohol. We had to change the tolerance limits in Montana to comply with national standards. So I carried that bill. It was a very interesting bill and quite controversial at times. John Sheehy, who was an attorney, of course, he got up and really opposed that because we were changing the presumptive limit from .15 to .10. We were reducing it to comply with federal standards. He said, "Well, that's bad legislation," and he gave us a typical attorney's presentation about how we were convicting the innocent and whatnot, and interfering with public rights and human rights.

The upshot of it was, his debate skills would have a great positive influence on the Democrat side of the legislature, and I thought, "We can lose this thing because of his debating skill and his pointing out, in his judgment, that this was bad legislation." To his great credit, he went home that night and the next day he got up and said words to this effect: that he wanted to apologize to, at that time, Senator Stan Stephens. He wanted to apologize to him because "I, John Sheehy, was wrong when we talked about the presumptive limit and violating rights. That's a mistake because that doesn't violate rights and it is a matter of statute law now. I was mistaken."

BB: Wow, you don't do hear that very often.

SS: No, you don't. Normally they'd just kind of slough it off. I've always remembered that about him. I thought that was really a mark of integrity and, quite frankly, without that interjection by

him the following day, I don't know if the bill would have passed. So I recall that with fondness and respect.

BB: He didn't change his mind about the bill. He still voted against it.

SS: No, I think he voted eventually for the bill.

BB: I see.

SS: But he was man enough and, as you point out, not many people would do that. They would find some way to get around it and say, "Well, I think he's misunderstood," or something. Kind of slough it off. But he wouldn't do that. He took the blame on the chin and I thought that was a mark of good character.

BB: Stan, I'm just going to mention two or three names here. If you have any thoughts that occur to you, or any memories, you can go ahead and just say so—Jack Galt?

SS: Jack Galt, good friend, and he also later became President of the Senate. Very prominent Republican in national and state affairs, and did a great job in the legislature. A man of few words, but always words of wisdom. A great friend.

BB: Bill Mathers.

SS: Bill Mathers? Same way. He came from Miles City and performed well. He was in the legislature a good number of years. Later became a member of the Board of Regents.

BB: William Norman.

SS: Bill Norman was a physician from Missoula and was what I would consider a conservative Democrat. Very intelligent man. Great background in neurology in his profession. A very responsible individual, very fair-minded. I think made a mark on both sides of the aisle for his integrity.

BB: Jerome Anderson, a lobbyist.

SS: Jerry Anderson, yes, a very astute lobbyist. Represented a major company. He himself had been a legislator at one time in the Montana House. A good friend. Very knowledgeable man. I want to say former Marine, because there are no former Marines. He's still a Marine. He's really part and a good example of the integrity of the men and women that take up the business of lobbying in the legislature. They get maligned a lot by people that don't understand what they do, but they are a respected body.

BB: Jim Murry.

SS: Jim Murry represented the AFL-CIO, and did it very well, and later so well that he was conscripted by the AFL-CIO to go national, and served in a national capacity. He was true to his members, certainly. Intelligent guy. Knew the issues and stood up when he had to.

BB: Tom Towe.

SS: Tom Towe, an attorney from Billings, a Democrat. He is the father of the sales tax on coal that we talked about that caused so much controversy and still does today. Very dedicated legislator. Worked very hard and was very articulate and had a good following in the legislature. He was not admired for his skills by the Republicans because they recognized he was a very strong adversary for issues they opposed.

BB: Stan, you, as I remember, I think you didn't seek re-election in what would have been 1986?

SS: 1986, right.

BB: And the Republicans, I think, might have been in the minority in '85, and so Bill Norman was probably President of the Senate then.

SS: Correct.

BB: And so you didn't run for re-election in 1986, but then you did run for governor in 1988.

SS: Right, and after I stepped out in '86 I felt I'd been in there 16 years, and I felt it's time to leave. You don't stay forever, really. That, in my judgment, was a good time to step out.

BB: When you didn't run for re-election in 1986, did you have the thought at least in the back of your mind that you might want to have some discretionary time to maybe lay the groundwork for possible candidacy for governor? What was it that induced you to run for governor?

SS: Well, you're right, I stepped out in '86 and actually by that time I had disposed of my interest in both broadcasting and in cable television. So I was, in effect, retired at a fairly early age, in my late 50s. I just spent, actually, the year of '86 mulling over what I might do. I felt I was too young to step out, and I didn't want to step out, and I was still very much interested in the political scene. It was that time that I made the decision—and I talked to a few people but nothing real publicly—to run for governor. I made up my mind I would file the first day of 1987—New Year's Day—and be among the first, and was the first out of what eventually became ten candidates to run for governor.

BB: Were there that many?

SS: Yes, the total was ten candidates.

BB: On both sides—Democrats and Republicans?

SS: Right.

BB: This, I think, mystified some people at the time because usually when you put together a ticket, Democrat and Republican, you try to put some geographic balance into it and that sort of thing. Yet you and Allen Kolstad ran, and Allen's district and your State Senate district—you're both State Senators—I think maybe even adjoined each other.

SS: Yes, that's right. You're right, normally the so-called political thing to do is to get somebody from the east and somebody from the west in Montana, and therefore you address both areas of the state.

BB: So coming from Havre, you might have thought that you might have tried to find someone from Missoula or Billings or Bozeman or someplace.

SS: Right, right. Allen and I were very close and he was in the legislature at the time. We were good friends over the years and he indicated that he would be interested if I was interested in joining on the ticket as lieutenant governor, and that's what happened. Now, that caused some raised eyebrows because of what we talked earlier about the geographical importance. We were right next door. We might just as well have been across the street from each other. But it turned out that we were successful in the effort. But it did cause, from our standpoint, some questions to be answered as to how come you did it this way. I started in '87, Bob, for the '88 election, realizing—as most candidates today probably come to the realization too—when you're in the legislature you're not well-known. You may get some publicity in the local press and on the radio and TV, but outside of your home district you're not very well-known at all. You have to get well-known and name ID in this vast state. I knew that, and we traveled—not together, but separately—but I traveled 150,000 miles in two years. That's six times around the circumference of the earth—all in Montana. Some by air and some by windshield time in a car.

But it took that much, because I recall my first foray into western Montana and Missoula: I was told by a well-meaning friend over there that you don't have a chance. Nobody knows you from Adam out here. I said that's precisely why I'm here. He said, "But they don't know who you are. Half of them don't know the road to Havre." And words to that effect. And of course, that caused me to continue to return to different areas and to develop some rapport and understanding and friends and committees and whatnot. The actual job of putting the campaign together over that period of two years was harder than the office itself when I eventually became elected.

BB: What a huge job, to run statewide in a big state like this.

SS: It is. It's amazing, Bob, and you've experienced that too. I often talk to people about the size of Montana versus, say, Alaska. Alaska being so huge you would think, my goodness, that would

really be tough. It isn't. You go to about six communities in Alaska and you've covered the area, so to speak. You can't do that in Montana. They want to see you in the four corners and Westby and in Alzada and Monida and the Yaak. They want to see you everywhere, and they expect that. If you show up, they'll welcome you, but if you fail to, they'll also punish you.

BB: Yes, they'll vote for the guy that did show up.

SS: Well of course. So that requires an enormous stamina and expense in carrying out a campaign in 56 counties.

BB: Did you have a statewide campaign chairman, a campaign manager? Did you have someone who kind of helped you with the statewide organization?

SS: Right, I did. I hired a committee. My actual Executive Director was the Executive Director of the Republican Party at that time. We hired him away from the party, so to speak.

BB: Steve Yeakel.

SS: Steve Yeakel. And then we had John Brandon.

BB: Who later was the Republican National Committee man for Montana and also a State Senator.

SS: Yes. And a group of people. And then what we tried to do is develop a small cadre of people in every county. We organized it that way so we had a chair and a treasurer and somebody that could raise some funds for us in each county.

BB: I'm sure because of the friendships you'd made in the legislature gave you a network statewide that—

SS: That was very helpful, right. That's a good cadre of people, and they're all respected in their communities. Many of them were inclined to help out and I really appreciated that. One of the things we did that was a little different—and they still kid me about it today—I spoke earlier in this interview about my start in life as a trumpeter. What we did during the campaign, we hauled out my trumpet, which I hadn't been blowing for years, and we made that part of our campaign. We had a bugle call that you hear at sporting events: "Dah dah dah dah daaah!" You know. The response to that is "Charge!" And that became kind of our signature logo as we traveled around the state.

BB: You would blow that at rallies and (unintelligible) and that sort of thing, which is an inspirational kind of exciting sort of (unintelligible).

SS: You know, you hear that one when there's two outs in the bottom of the ninth and on the five yard line, so we adapted that and blended that into our campaign.

BB: Now, you had a hotly contested primary. You'd mentioned before there were ten people running and I think former Governor Tom Judge ultimately became the Democratic nominee. As I remember, Mike Greeley, who was the attorney general at the time, and a Democrat, was one of the Democratic candidates for governor. And then—

SS: Frank Morrison.

BB: I had forgotten that, but Frank Morrison, who ultimately became a State Supreme Court Justice—whose son John Morrison is currently the State Auditor and ran for U.S. Senator—he was in that contest. And then on the Republican side, the two I remember were the Secretary of State, Jim Waltermire, and a young state representative from down in the Billings area by the name of Cal Winslow.

SS: Correct.

BB: Now, something rather dramatic and tragic and startling happened during that campaign involving Waltermire. Maybe you can tell us about what you remember about that.

SS: We tried. Those three—Waltermire, Winslow, and myself—were traveling around during the primary making presentations and competing with each other.

BB: Lincoln Day dinners.

SS: Lincoln Day dinners and that type of thing. On April 8th—I remember that day—we were in Glasgow. This would be the eighth of April in 1988, and we were in Glasgow, and we made our presentation that evening.

BB: What was it, a Lincoln Day dinner?

SS: A Lincoln Day dinner. And we were through and I planned to stay overnight and leave the next morning, as did Cal Winslow. Jim Waltermire—who was then, as you point out, the Secretary of State—he had a commitment to get back to Helena, and he flew out of there that night. I awakened the next morning to the very tragic and sad news that Jim Waltermire had been killed in a plane crash. As they were coming into Helena, for whatever reason, a malfunction of the plane or whatever, the aircraft went down and he lost his life. So obviously everybody was terribly shook up. His wife, Nancy, was distraught, as you well imagine. Following that in a short period thereafter, both the Winslow campaign and the Stephens campaign were invited to come and talk to the Waltermire people about what we were going to do, because it was a very difficult thing to do. Both Cal and myself approached it with a certain degree of trepidation and wanted to reach out to their supporters.

BB: Now I hadn't heard about this before, Stan, but the Waltermire people had a committee, I assume.

SS: Right.

BB: And so they convened their committee where? In Helena?

SS: Yes, they convened in Helena and they, in effect, interviewed both candidates.

BB: Was it a large number of people?

SS: I think there was about a dozen who were instrumental in his—

BB: Do you remember any of the people who might have been there?

SS: Yes, I do, very well. Chuck Brooke was his right-hand man, and Chuck later worked on our campaign, and later was a member of the cabinet for us. A remarkable guy. He's now retired, living in Arizona. John Olson, who was a very prominent Republican over in Sidney. He's a very successful Pepsi-Cola dealer, businessman. Larry Akey. Larry was working for Jim Waltermire in his office as his right-hand man. So people like that. There were others whose names I can't quickly pull up.

BB: Larry Akey's wife, Sue Akey, became the Republican State Party Chairman.

SS: That's right, she did, she did. So then it became a two-person race. Actually four, I guess, when you consider lieutenant governors too. Chase Hibbard was the lieutenant governor for Cal, and then Allen Kolstad for myself. Then the primary came along shortly thereafter in June.

BB: Did the Waltermire committee select one of you over the other?

SS: No, they didn't. A number of them selected to help our campaign and, I presume, some went the other way too. But there was such a letdown and such a tragedy for those people to lose their candidates that... Well, I'm sure they voted at the polls, but they really weren't active in the campaigns either way. They didn't suddenly sign on and go to work. But later, after the election dust settled and the decision had been made, we reached out to a couple of them. I mentioned Chuck Brooke, in particular. They came to work in our administration.

BB: Now Stan, my memory's kind of slipping here, I think, too. Cal Winslow's running mate... Was it Hibbard?

SS: Yes.

BB: Who was Waltermire's running mate? Was it a woman?

SS: I think so. Again, it's been so many years ago I should remember that. Actually his campaign hadn't really started before it was snuffed out, because he was attending to his duties in the state. We had taken some polls and our polls looked pretty good considering all three of us. But still, you can't make any conclusions on that.

BB: You felt good about it with a three-way split, but of course the dynamics of the whole thing changes drastically when you remove one of the...

SS: Oh, yes.

BB: So, you didn't know what to think after that, I'm sure, and you didn't know how to approach it. It must have been a...

SS: Well, it was difficult, yes, approaching members that had been loyal to Mr. Waltermire, but you just do the best you can and it's just one of those things in life. And of course, it evoked memories of the fact that Governor Don Nutter had been killed in a plane crash during his office. The possibility of plane crashes and the danger of flying around all the time in light planes was really revved up. We did a lot of flying.

BB: And in the general election, to cover the space as you have to in Montana, you've got to do some flying.

SS: There's no question.

BB: You've got that anxiety. I know it myself.

SS: You do. Sure, you've experienced that. And you have some pretty rough rides on airplanes. You're not flying around in jets. You're flying around in the storm front in front of you and, as you say and know Bob, people want you and they expect you to show up for a function and sometimes the weatherman says no. So it can be dicey.

BB: You won the primary against Winslow and I don't remember either, was it close?

SS: Not too close. I don't think that we swept all the bases. But we had a solid win. There was no problem.

BB: And of course, he was from Billings, Montana's most populous city. His running mate, Chase Hibbard, from Helena. So you'd think by the conventional wisdom they were positioned better than you and Kolstad were. But you and Kolstad probably had the advantage of a vast network of friends, and you had the advantage of being involved in politics longer and —

SS: I think we did, and I like to think that perhaps the organization and the people that helped us, and the tremendous amount of work they put in—going way back to the beginning of 1987—really paid off. In the succeeding years, I've talked to candidates that want to run statewide and I remind them that you've got to get out early and get known. You've got to get the name identification first, and then start laying the groundwork with the philosophy you want to bring to the office.

BB: I think a nagging thing for anybody that's ever run for statewide office is the fundraising aspect. It's just hanging over your head all the time.

SS: It's difficult. You went through it. It's awkward. I found it awkward to ask for money. I think you probably did too. It's just not our nature. And yet you have to get money to fund the campaign. Once in office, I found that...everybody that runs for governor has never been a governor, unless he's running again for re-election. You come across the realization that this is all over with, Stan. This legislative business is fine, but you're no longer a legislator. You're a governor. You have support and you have detractors in the legislature. You have them in the bureaucracy, you have them in the media—for and against—you have them in the general public, different special interest groups who are going to categorize you up or down. It's an entirely different situation that you are facing and you have to try to understand that, and we did.

We found support, and we also found detractors, as you might expect. The political parties are inclined to want to block a lot of the things you want to do because their philosophy is different. You run into the press that has its own agenda very often. The result of that is, I've found, that you're not going to change the system—it's always going to be there to one degree or another—but the ability to recruit and encourage good men and women to join you in some capacity in government work is tough because of that. We see things in the national scene, particularly with the furor over the U.S. Supreme Court appointees now and some of the other positions in Washington, D.C., and the scrutiny and the harassment and sometimes the unfair judgments that are made. That all adversely affects the political process because a lot of good men and women said, "Look, I'd like to help but I'm not going to go through that." You've experienced that.

BB: It doesn't pay real well. In many cases, important administrative jobs in state government don't pay real well. People have to move from Billings or Great Falls or wherever to Helena. Maybe they've got a family. It's not really that prestigious of a career move, at least in many cases it isn't. So it's difficult to attract the quality people that you know are out there. That's probably true.

SS: You're right. So you struggle to do that. One of the other things, Bob, in looking back—having been in office—when you get out of office, as Mark Twain said, it isn't the things you do you think about, it's the things that you didn't do, you think about those. I thought, in answering questions of people, that one of the things that troubled me so much when I was in

office, you don't have time to think. You are so busy, you're caught up in the maelstrom of day-to-day activity. There's so many big things and little things all entwined, and you don't have the time that you want to really thoughtfully think out some of the things you're doing, some of the positions you should take, and sampling the wisdom and the intelligence of other people around you, because you're just like a driver on the Indianapolis Speedway.

BB: You have to confront situations, you have to make decisions, and sometimes you'd like to have the opportunity to reflect on them overnight or maybe talk to other people about them and don't always have the opportunity. You learned during the political campaign, too.

SS: Yes, you do that during the campaign, and you do it predominately when you're in office. There were so many things. The average person goes into the governor's office—I think, if I can say the average person is something I understand—with some fixed ideas on what he'd like to do, he or she: "These are things I would like to see get done." Invariably, you pick too many things. You can't do that. Major events that change in government change over a period of time. The idea has to germinate in the minds of the voters, in the minds of the lawmakers, in the minds of the general public.

Taxation, for example—a future taxation—big changes in education, big changes in natural resource development, they don't happen over a busy weekend. So you reflect on the idea that you want to pick on two or three major things—you're going to handle the other stuff—to get anything really done. Again, the thought process—time to think. You don't have to go into a monastery and be a monk, but you just need time and you just don't seem to have it. There's always someone or some problem tugging at you.

BB: Now, during the campaign you were opposed by a former governor, Tom Judge, who obviously—having been governor for eight years—had a pretty clear concept of what the office was all about. Are there any particular issues or any particular recollections that you have in that campaign? Maybe things that you tried to accomplish, or strategies that you had or that Judge had that you think might have been important in terms of the outcome?

SS: No, not really. Tom and I had a good campaign. I thought it was above board and there weren't any personal attacks on each other. As you say, he had one advantage and that is that he'd been there before. But in some cases that had been somewhat of a disadvantage too because, you know, it cuts both ways.

BB: He'd been governor once and the people had voted him out of office in the Democratic primary, and he was trying to make a comeback. So that might have been almost as though the people had formulated a judgment about him once and he had to come back from that.

SS: Yes. So it was a challenge to him. I was thinking, too. You and I were talking about decisions and whatnot. I think what it really tests, and it does in the legislature too, but this to a greater degree because in the legislature you've got a group of people, 150, also in the same boat. I think the matter of judgment...Now, you can acquire a lot of knowledge and you can acquire

experience, but I'm not so sure that you can acquire judgment without looking at the whole spectrum of your life. It involves morality, experience; judgment is what you're looking for. Not so much just carrying out a political philosophy that some political party says, "Here are your marching orders," but to take those key individual situations and really give it a thorough—and what you hope is an intelligent—reasoning to arrive at judgment. Again, that goes back to having time to do that. Because as you know, and you are an experienced legislator and a candidate for statewide office, there are often many facets to what appears to be an obvious conclusion.

Another thing, and I'll just touch on it as we move along here, is I've also had a great concern about the way both the federal and the state government handle the Indian problem in Montana, if you can call it a problem. You've got seven reservations. There's some great difficulties on those reservations, and some very sad occurrences as far as illiteracy and education and social problems. And you've got the federal government, in effect, telling seven different Indian reservations that they really are sovereign nations. So now you have seven sovereign nations within one state. While that may appear to be just on the part of many people, including some of the Indian people, it presents a horrible list of problems for a state in trying to handle those problems. I think a lot of it traces back to the national government, to the origin of the whole treaty situation that went back to the origin of the country. I think some bad mistakes were made and I don't know how you rectify it. You can't confiscate land. But I thought in the '70s, when we were passing resolutions denouncing apartheid in South Africa, which was proper to do, that was wrong and apartheid eventually died. But we create apartheid in Montana.

Just recently I've noticed that a decision has been made by the elders of the Chippewa-Cree tribe at Rocky Boy, the reservation just outside of Havre that I'm familiar with that has to do with gambling and the consumption of alcohol. The elders, in their judgment, and I think in their wisdom, have decreed to the Tribal Council that it's not a good idea to promote alcohol consumption and promote gambling, casino gambling, on our reservation. Their feeling is, and I agree with them, that it would ultimately be bad for their own people. That took some courage and some thought. I don't know what will happen. The city or the Tribal Council will ultimately make the decision. They're talking about building that casino. But I was really impressed with the thinking that went into that by the Indian people at Rocky Boy.

BB: That's the exception to the rule, because as we conduct this interview the beguiling nature of money to all Indian tribes has caused them—or, not all of them, obviously, you just mentioned one—has caused them to be intensely interested in developing gambling on the reservations. The federal laws are such that they're a little more permissive in terms of the regulations on Indian reservations. So many of the tribes have in mind expanding gambling on the reservations to generate more money for the tribe and perhaps also generate more jobs. But as you say, the result could be serious social problems and other difficulties as well. You know, I remember when you were governor there was a special session that was called to balance the budget. The Montana State Constitution requires a balanced budget, so when the

budget drifts out of balance we pay careful attention to that in Montana and we don't wait until the next legislative session. We have a special session to balance the budget. So I remember a group of us got called over to Helena at that time, and you were there in the room, and you had a package of about a half a dozen bills that we needed to have introduced to address this budgetary problem.

The one that you assigned to me was to privatize the liquor monopoly, and that was something that Republicans had wanted to do for a long time. The state then owned all the liquor stores in the state of Montana and they sold wholesale to the bars and they sold retail to the general public. I think that you and your budget director had calculated that if we sold the liquor inventory that we'd raise something like three or four million dollars and that was what it took, I think, to make the University system whole, or something like that. So anyway, I remember that was the bill that I took before the Taxation Committee. Of course, the employees at the liquor stores were unionized. They all paid union dues. So the AFL-CIO in the state didn't want the bill to pass because they would have lost all those dues-paying members. So the chairman of the Taxation Committee at the time the Democrats had the majority was a good friend of mine, Mike Halligan, from Missoula. He came to me on the Monday morning that the session had begun and I had my bill before the Taxation Committee. He said, "Well, Bob, I'm sorry but we caucused on that last night and we're not going to pass the bill because the unions don't want it passed." I said, "Well Mike, you come from the University area. This is the way that's going to make you whole, and the people of Montana will still be able to buy their whiskey." He said, "I can't help it. We've got interest groups that are important to us and you do too and we can't let this bill pass." And it didn't. Ultimately it did, but it didn't during that legislative session. But there were tough times and tough decisions that had to be made. That would be an example because people are accustomed to having government tell them "yes." They like it when their taxes are cut, they like it when benefits are increased and services are increased and expanded. When government's got to take things away they don't like that very well.

SS: That's true. And you're right. You did a good job on that bill. We just got out-gunned by a caucus position by the Democrats. But it did come to pass and everything's fine. They're in a private position now to deal with it, and they're doing very well, and so is Montana. Those things enter into it, the legislative process. I've always felt that you'd like to have the majority of your own party in both the House and the Senate, and of course there have been times when you've had that during the '90s, but it can never really function if it gets to be too much of a majority, because then you get factions breaking out within a political party and it becomes even more difficult. And that's just the history of these political parties.

BB: It's like hauling frogs in a wheelbarrow. They're jumping out all the time [laughs].

SS: That's right, they do.

BB: Stan, we're nearing the end of the amount of time we've got for our interview, but I wanted to ask you too, because as governor of our state you got to see into a level of politics that very

few people ever get a chance to see into. You were a member of the National Governor's Association and so you attended their meetings and conferences in the major cities around the country, and you, no doubt, became personally acquainted with some of the other governors. I'm just curious to know if there are any other governors that stand out in your memory.

SS: Oh yes, there are. In fact, I wrote one the other day a letter in response to a column that's been published nationwide—Tommy Thompson. Tommy Thompson was the governor of Wisconsin. Later became, in the Bush II cabinet, Secretary of Health and Human Services. He had great success with the reformation of welfare in his state and really the success of the Wisconsin project ultimately under President Clinton, and the Republican House became the foundation for welfare reform in the country. So he's one that stood out. Big Jim Thompson of Illinois was another one that stood out. Mario Cuomo, not in a positive sense, necessarily, but he's very flamboyant and has an opinion on just about everything.

BB: Did you get a chance to become acquainted with him?

SS: Oh sure, yes. You get to meet them all. And Bill Clinton, as far as that's concerned.

BB: Oh, really?

SS: Bill was governor of Arkansas, and so I got to meet with Bill.

BB: What do you remember about Bill Clinton? Is there any kind of a lasting memory?

SS: He's a consummate politician. He was the type that walks into a room and spends the time making sure that he would visit with everybody in the room, shake their hand, and have a little word or two. He was extremely capable in working the crowd, as they say.

BB: So most everybody liked him? He had good interpersonal skills?

SS: I think so. He was just there for a short period when I was there, and I was only there for a short period too, four years. But he had his following, and of course he'd been quite active in the Democrat Leadership Council and you could see that he was a potential, certainly, to go on within the Democratic Party, which of course he did when he became elected President of the United States.

BB: Was there any talk about him running for resident? Do you remember people saying, "Boy, Bill Clinton is somebody that's likely to run for resident?" Did that ever (unintelligible)?

SS: They may have talked among themselves. You kind of look around to see whether the governors—

BB: (unintelligible) someone that they might have been more (unintelligible) about it.

SS: Right. And [Mike] Dukakis, of course, was there with Massachusetts. And there were a number of them. But quite frankly, the National Governors, the NGA, I don't think if you interviewed anybody in the street and asked what NGA stands for, not many people would know. It's more of a social gathering of the nation's governors. One of the things that I brought up to them at the time was what we need to do is address the relationship between the federal government and the state government. What's happening is the federal government is overwhelming state governments. As you know, the U.S. Constitution is not laid out that way. They assign specific duties to the federal government and the rest belongs to the states. But when you get into highways and education and environment and natural resources, federal government has a big hand. So we were trying to encourage them maybe to convene a session in Washington, D.C. and, in effect, tell the federal government to knock it off. That's easy to say and hard to do. But you see that tension and that conflict even today with federal...you had to vote on federal mandates in the legislature, and it's difficult to handle.

BB: You want the money but you don't want the strings.

SS: That's correct, that's correct.

BB: Did you ever have a chance to meet President Bush?

SS: I met the father, yes, but I—

BB: He was president while you were governor.

SS: That's right. I met him on two or three occasions. I met, of course, the previous governor, Ronald Reagan. This governor I had not met. I know Dick Cheney and some of the others around him, but I haven't had the pleasure of...Ironically, my daughter, who is an attorney in Billings, she's met him.

BB: She's met the current President Bush?

SS: Yes, when he was governor she spent some time in Texas with a good friend of hers that was, at that time, the legal counsel for the governor. So she got a good chance to meet him when he was governor.

BB: Any impressions of Ronald Reagan or Bush Senior?

SS: Oh, well, of course I'm a very strong Ronald Reagan admirer. I think he was one of the major factors in the future of this country in the latter part of the last century. He's just a remarkable individual. Great as governor of California and a credible president. President Bush, the senior, I found...I mean, the assignments that he had in his political career, his resume, if you will, is just incredible. He's had so many important assignments and handled them so well. The one

mistake, in retrospect—and we all look back and I can look back on the mistakes I made in retrospect—was the “Read my lips” statement that he modified, if you will.

BB: He said, “Read my lips,” which was at that time kind of a slang expression for “I want you to know that this is—I want to make this very clear: no new taxes.” Then he later felt he needed to raise taxes and he couldn’t keep that promise.

SS: He got romanced by George Mitchell and others.

BB: Who was the Democratic leader in the U.S. Senate at that time?

SS: Right. And they, in effect, said, “Look, you get us this tax increase which we need and we’ll cut back on x number of programs in the state which you want to see reduced.” It didn’t turn out that way, and the residue, the lingering detriment, was to George Bush senior. And then, in addition to that, he had the unfortunate occurrence of having Ross Perot run. So you had Clinton, who did not get a majority of the vote, and Ross Perot, who got enough votes, had they been distributed probably mainly to President Bush, he would have been re-elected. So those are the foibles of political life, and it turned out to be a difficult thing for George H. Bush.

BB: Stan, as you look back over your life in politics and as a public figure, are there any just overall thoughts or impressions or anything that come into your mind as you look back now over many years of public service?

SS: If I could capsule that, it would just simply be how fortunate I have been to have had the opportunities that Montana has given me, not only in my years in broadcasting and the work I met with people in the state and out of the state there, but in the legislature and then later as governor. I’ve just been really honored and really supported in a way that I’ll never forget, and I’m indebted deeply to the people of Montana.

BB: Well, we’re indebted to you, and it’s been my great pleasure to have served with you and to have known you, and to consider you my friend.

SS: Great, well, thanks very much Bob.

[End of Interview]