2-29-2000

# Emery, Dave oral history interview

Andrea L'Hommedieu

# Interview with Dave Emery by Andrea L'Hommedieu

*Summary Sheet and Transcript*

**Interviewee**
Emery, Dave

**Interviewer**
L'Hommedieu, Andrea

**Date**
February 29, 2000

**Place**
Lewiston, Maine

**ID Number**
MOH 171



## Biographical Note

David Farnham Emery was born on September 1, 1948 in Rockland, Maine. His father was a bookkeeper, accountant, and golfer (he also played baseball for the University of Pennsylvania), and his mother was a nurse. Both parents served in the military during World War II, his father as a staff sergeant and his mother as an officer. He grew up in a Republican family and was an only child. He attended Worcester Polytechnic Institute in Worcester, Massachusetts from 1967-1970. He was elected to the Maine legislature immediately after graduation, during the Vietnam War. In 1974 he was elected a U.S. Congressman when Nixon was in office. He also served as deputy director of the U.S. Arms Control Agency.

## Scope and Content Note

Interview includes discussions of: Rockland, Maine community; first Earth Day (Spring 1970); campaign between Peter Kyros, Sr. and David Emery; Loring Air Force Base; Bath Iron Works; 1972 Republican National Convention; David Emery and George Mitchell in 1982; Margaret Chase Smith; Science and Technology Committee; Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; Armed Services Committee; Marine Conservation Management Act; Threshold Test Ban Treaty/ Limited Test Ban Treaty; Ronald Reagan; Jimmy Carter; George Mitchell; and Emery's view on Muskie's greatest achievements in Maine.

**Indexed Names**

Bass, Charles Foster “Charlie”
Briggs, Jim
Brokaw, Tom
Carter, Jimmy, 1924-
Clauson, Clinton Amos, 1895-1959
Cohen, William S.
Downey, Thomas Joseph “Tom”
Eisenhower, Dwight D. (Dwight David), 1890-1969
Emery, Dave
Erwin, Jim
Gorbachev, Mikhail
Hathaway, Bill
Hildreth, Horace
Hussein, Saddam, 1937-
Johnson, Lyndon B. (Lyndon Baines), 1908-1973
Kohl, Helmut, 1930-
Kyros, Peter N., Sr.
Longley, James, Sr.
McCain, John, 1936-
McCloskey, Jay
McIntire, Clifford
Mitchell, George J. (George John), 1933-
Murray, Frank
Muskie, Edmund S., 1914-1996
Nixon, Richard M. (Richard Milhous), 1913-1994
Payne, Fred
Porteous, Bob
Rabb, John
Reagan, Ronald
Roosevelt, Theodore, 1858-1919
Ross, Rodney
Smith, George
Smith, Margaret Chase, 1897-1995
Snowe, Olympia J. (Olympia Jean), 1947-
Thatcher, Margaret
Trafton, Willis
Tupper, Stanley

**Transcript**

**Andrea L’Hommedieu:** . . . interview conducted by Andrea L’Hommedieu with David Emery

on February 29th, the year 2000 at the Muskie Archives in Lewiston, Maine. Mr. Emery, could you start by giving us your full name and spelling it?

**David Emery:** Name is David, middle name Farnham, last name Emery, E-M-E-R-Y, middle name F-A-R-N-H-A-M.

**AL:** And where and when were you born?

**DE:** On 1 September, 1948, in Rockland.

**AL:** And did you grow up in Rockland also?

**DE:** Yes.

**AL:** What was the Rockland community like growing up?

**DE:** Well, it was very different than it is now, it was a fishing community, a working town. There was an old saying that you knew Rockland, Camden by the sea and Rockland by the smell. And I think that is probably more apt than most Rockland people would have liked to admit because the major industry was fishing and fish processing, and of course that does have a signature odor on a foggy summer morning. Rockland is different now. The fishing is essentially all gone; it's much, it's a much more upscale community than it used to be. And my memories of growing up in Rockland are very fond. There were a lot of kids around, we used to play baseball all summer, it was very safe. One of the great contrasts today is that my wife and I are always very particular about where our son is at all times, but I don't think parents worried about those things to the degree when I was young. It's too bad it's changed.

**AL:** And so it's, is it, something has to drive the community to make it fairly affluent these days. Is it the buying of the real estate from out of state people?

**DE:** No, Rockland was driven by fishing which fed a great many families in those days although it was not an affluent society. Today the community is much more diverse. In addition to some of the more traditional lines of work, there's a very large hospital which employs a great many people. MBNA is located in the area, has substantial employment in Camden and now has moved to Rockland. Fisher Engineering exists now, which didn't even exist when I was a child. And of course with enhanced tourism, computer based home businesses, and various other industries that are not so limited by geographical or physical location, it's easier for someone, as it is in Lewiston or everywhere else, to make a good living by being exposed to the rest of the world. So all of those things have changed, and with that has come investment in infrastructure. I think people are much more cosmopolitan than they used to be now. They've been exposed to art and music and travel and various other broadening experiences that have put us more in the mainstream of American society than maybe we were fifty years ago.

**AL:** And what were your parents' names?

**DE:** My father was Albert Emery, and he was a bookkeeper, an accountant, and also probably

one of the best golfers in Maine. My mother is still alive, her name is Georgia. She had since remarried and her name is now Randall, living in Belfast. She was a nurse, an exceptional nurse, and both of them were in the military during WWII, my father as a staff sergeant who never left the country, and my mother as an officer and traveled extensively through Australia and New Zealand.

**AL:** Did she ever -?

**DE:** Well, let me amend that, not extensively in New Zealand, but extensively in New Guinea.

**AL:** Now, in the years has she talked to you about her experiences in that time?

**DE:** Oh, very much. As a matter of fact, in more recent years, particularly with the fiftieth anniversary of WWII and with the focus on veterans and the greatest generation, reflecting Tom Brokaw's book, there have been a number of interviews that have been done with her, one particularly in one of the Belfast papers, that really very eloquently described the trials of young men and women who found themselves half way around the world in the South Pacific serving their country. It's really very inspiring, you know, it makes me very proud to see the photos and read the stories. And of course I heard a great many of those stories, but I think it has taken veterans many times a long time to let it all out because it was a frightening experience as well as a very personal experience for many of them.

**AL:** Now, growing up, what sort of influence do you feel that your parents had on you?

**DE:** Well, daily and constantly, and I would add my grandmother to that, too, my maternal grandmother, who was a very strong woman. She raised five children on a farm in Sydney, Maine just after the turn of the century in the teens and twenties. My grandfather died of tuberculosis while my mother was, oh, I'm going to say she was no more than seven or eight years old at the time. So the two younger boys essentially ran the farm and everyone else pitched in as they could. It's a typical hardscrabble story that you hear not only from rural Maine, but I'm sure western pioneers and people growing up in the south and everywhere else. And they were dirt poor. But it's very hard to starve a farmer, so there was always plenty to eat, and they, mother has reflected many times saying that they were poor but they didn't know it, which is, I think, a reflection of the family's character. So those are all things which were very important family lore growing up.

My father's family was a little different. They lived in the Rockland area and my grandfather was an accountant and business man, and the family was very much of a middle class family, if not wealthy at least comfortable and stable. And my father took an interest in golf when he was very young. He was a baseball player and golfer, and he always told the story about when he was in college, which was the University of Pennsylvania, on the baseball team. He was facing an opposing batter who was known as one of the best in the league and the coach told him to walk him. Well Dad couldn't do that, he just had to put the ball over the plate, and he paid the ultimate price for it, so after that the coach told him if you can't follow the rules, you're not going to play. So he switched and played golf after that. So those are all, you know, family stories that you hear, all of which are instructive and build character.

One of the things that's really different I remember growing up in Rockland, that you didn't have just one set of parents, you had really everyone in the community was looking at you and watching over you. My friends and I would go downtown, and we knew very well that if we acted up or got into trouble, it would get back home before we did because every shop keeper and the policeman on the corner and various other merchants and people going about their business knew who we were and knew our parents. So it was a deterrent to mischief to some degree, but you also had the very comfortable feeling that you were safe and always around people who cared about your well being. And I'm not sure kids have that today, and it's unfortunate.

**AL:** It's sort of the philosophy of "it takes a village to raise a child."

**DE:** Yeah, I, you know, I think, not that I would necessarily use that description, but there's an element of truth to it in that people who care about their fellow being usually have an influence, and they are directly responsible for inculcating those values in others who grow up with them and around them. It's sort of the fabric that weaves us together.

**AL:** Now the Rockland community when you were growing up was fairly Republican?

**DE:** Oh, very much so, absolutely. And I think it's fair to say that no one in my father's side of the family probably ever cast a Democratic ballot in their lives. My grandmother, my maternal grandmother, was a New Deal Democrat and my mother and I guess all but one of the brothers were all Republican, but there was one who tended to be Democratic. But the family on both sides with those exceptions was almost always Republican, and it was the culture, it was the norm, and it went back to the Civil War and to basic community values. Of course it's different now, Rockland is still basically a Republican community, but Democrats do and have won and, as with Lewiston for that matter, it used to be ninety-five percent Democratic and now Republicans win in Lewiston on occasion. So those traditional lines have broken down, and part of that is the openness, the cultural changes that have taken place, the ability of people from various walks of life and background to mix and talk and exchange ideas which didn't happen to that degree even thirty or forty years ago. So it's evolution, it's cultural, political evolution, and it's taken place not only in Maine but all over the country.

**AL:** Do you think it's a positive thing?

**DE:** Well, it is a positive thing. I'm a Republican, and I vote Republican, and I generally have Republican views on issues, but I don't think government is ever served well when one side or the other side is so entrenched that they're unassailable. No one is right all the time, no one has all the best ideas. And as we've learned over and over and over throughout history, the government is the best and the people serve the best when there's a free flow and exchange of ideas, and when there is a debate and a way to challenge those ideas and develop them in the crucible of public opinion.

**AL:** Did you have brothers and sisters?

**DE:** No, I'm an only child.

**AL:** Were any people in your family prior to you- I know you said they were avid Republicans, but were any of them politically active?

**DE:** No, I was really the first one, I think. My grandfather was briefly a candidate for county treasurer but as I recall he didn't, I don't know if he lost in a primary or a caucus or just didn't follow through with it. That would have been in the earlier part of the century, probably in the twenties or thirties maybe, but that was the only excursion into politics that I'm aware of on either side of the family.

**AL:** I have just been looking through, there's a Website called the political graveyard, and it lists, you can go by Maine, or by family name, and there were lots of Emerys in Maine who were active back in the eighteen hundreds.

**DE:** Right, but not, to the best of my knowledge, not my side. I'll have to look that up because I may surprise myself with what I learn.

**AL:** Sure, I'll show you where it is. What was the ethnic and religious makeup of the Rockland community?

**DE:** Well, Rockland was not as monolithic as some of the other coastal Maine communities. I mean, certainly the preponderance were Protestant, Congregational or Methodist Republicans. However, there was always a substantial Catholic community in Rockland. There were a great many Italians in particular who immigrated and worked in the lime quarries and, to a lesser degree, fishermen. So there has always been a very active Catholic community, a very active Catholic church. And as far as I can remember, going back to my youngest days, there was absolutely no social division between the two. That may have been true and probably was true in an earlier time when that was more common, but I remember going to school with Catholics, and actually a few Jewish children as well, and I don't think I was ever aware that there was any substantial difference other than there were different churches in town and some went to some and some went to others.

There's also a small but very visible Jewish community in Rockland, and still is. Very prominent people who held political office and were active in community affairs, and active in business and law. So I grew up not in a sheltered environment where I only saw one background but with a number of different and fairly diverse backgrounds that, you know, I think is healthy in any community.

The one thing we've never had to any degree was any minority population of blacks although as I say that I remember in my neighborhood in the south end growing up there was a gentleman by the name of Mr. Peters who was black and lived in the neighborhood actually. But he was the only one in the immediate neighborhood although there have been a small population of blacks in Knox County since the Civil War, but not a substantial number and not particularly visible in community affairs.

**AL:** What were your experiences in school like in terms of, were there, did you, were you influenced by things that happened at school, such as were there teachers who stood out in your mind?

**DE:** Well, you know, we all have those experiences, and, you know, various people stand out for various reasons. But I was blessed with some excellent teachers, and my second grade teacher, Mrs. McClellan, was exceptional, and she just exuded love of kids. You know, obviously there were discipline issues to deal with from time to time, but I remember her as someone who always got the best out of the youngsters in the class because you knew that she cared about you. My third grade teacher was the same way, different personality but a woman who has always been active in community affairs and was one of my political supporters when I was running for office, which, you know, I think gave her a great deal of satisfaction, that one of her students was a public figure.

And in high school we had some exceptional teachers. My English teacher, Mrs. Viik, was a teacher that made it live. I mean, sometimes English can be very boring if you sit there and read about something that you're not interested in, don't care for, but she made it live. And I found later that when I went on to college, I was as well prepared in English as any student from anywhere. I did very well in English for that reason. And I look back on it, and it was for two reasons: one, she was very particular about what we learned and that we learned what we needed to learn, but she also reinforced a certain love of words and literature which we didn't even realize that we were getting until later on. And then another outstanding individual is Bob Morrill, who was a math teacher, baseball coach, basketball coach, and I think it's fair to say one of the most loved people in the community. He passed away a few years ago and every year now they hold a Bob Morrill golf tournament in Rockland which I always play in, which is designed to raise money for scholarships.

So there's a thread through the educational system, too, of some very special people who were not only good teachers but also very valuable, involved members of the community. It's that thread that goes through any viable community of people and events and institutions that ties us all together.

**AL:** And how did you spell your English teacher's name, Viik?

**DE:** It's Swedish, V-I-I-K.

**AL:** Okay. When do you feel you first became politically aware, or aware that you were interested in politics?

**DE:** Well, that probably happened when I was just about learning how to talk because there was always political discussion in my house. It was always good natured, and it used to drive my mother crazy because she was not greatly involved in politics. But my grandmother very often lived with us off and on through those years, and as I said she was a New Deal Democrat and vocal, and my father was absolutely, solidly Republican, and the two of them used to needle each other in a very good natured way all the time. So this would go back and forth and back and forth over the table, so I was aware of it at a very young age.

But interestingly enough, you always wonder what encourages someone to get involved, and my story is a very basic one, very simple one, but I think telling. In the seventh - the second grade, which would have been Eisenhower's reelection in 1956, both parties opened campaign headquarters downtown in the usual way. And kids would go in and collect the buttons, come to school the next day with everyone's campaign buttons, Eisenhower, Stevenson, whoever else, buttons all over their clothes. So I remember going downtown with my friends and we went into Democratic headquarters, which was the first one on the street, and the response was "don't touch this, don't touch that. These are for the grownups, don't bother us." And we went down the street to the Republican headquarters, and they knew who I was, and "come on in, have a glass of cider, the governor's coming later this afternoon," well, Muskie was governor, but the candidate for governor, whoever it was. And, you know, so it was an entirely different atmosphere, and I'm sure that same story has been repeated throughout the country of, from one side or the other side. And it's instructive that if you want to attract people, setting aside great debates of watershed issues, you have to make people feel that they're welcome and needed. So consequently, as a kid of seven or eight years old, my first inclination was reinforced by being made to feel welcome.

Of course it was always more complicated than that because there were always people in town that you knew were on one side or the other. And Rockland was a very strongly Republican community so it was natural that most of the people that I might know or be influenced by had Republican leanings, and that was particularly true in my family, so there was more to it than that. But I think it's fair to say that if I had not been made to feel part of the political family, I might never have gravitated to becoming active.

**AL:** Do you remember the '56 campaign? Willis Trafton was running against Muskie?

**DE:** I remember it only because I have read about it, but being six or seven years old at the time, there's not much I could add to it other than vague recollection. I remember the '58 campaign, which was when Muskie ran for the Senate. And I remember, I even remember one of the television ads that the Republican candidate for governor, Horace Hildreth, ran because there was a campaign song which was something that would stick in your mind. And one of the ads showed a rocket being launched, which of course was a very modern and exciting thing in those days, but not modern enough or exciting enough because he lost to Clinton Clauson in a fairly close race. And that was the year that Ed Muskie was elected to the senate over Fred Payne as I recall.

**AL:** Now before, okay, let's go, then you went to college. Where did you go to college?

**DE:** I am a graduate of Worcester Polytechnic Institute in Worcester, Massachusetts. My freshman year was fall of '67 and I graduated in the spring of 1970.

**AL:** And so what did you do after college?

**DE:** I was in the state legislature. I was elected to the legislature while I was, well, just a few days after I graduated from college. I won a primary election in June of 1970 and had no general

election opposition, so I was essentially elected that June.

**AL:** Okay, I wasn't sure if there was some time between the state legislature and college, but it sounds like you went straight from one to the other.

**DE:** I went right from one to the other.

**AL:** So you must have been about twenty-two?

**DE:** I was twenty-one when I was nominated in the primary and twenty-two when I was sworn in, that's right.

**AL:** That has to be one of the youngest -

**DE:** Well, interestingly enough, certainly one of the youngest given the average age of the legislature, but I wasn't the youngest at the time. Frank Murray, who is now a priest in Bangor, was I'm going to guess four or five months younger. And I think there are any number of others who have been elected at that age back along over the years. When I went to Congress, I wasn't the youngest either. I was elected at twenty-six, and I was, I think, the youngest Republican. But Tom Downey, who then had a seat from Long Island, was a few months younger as a Democrat. So I've never been the youngest, but I've been the youngest Republican at the time, both times.

**AL:** What was it like being so young going into the state legislature? Did you feel you were at a disadvantageous or did you approach it from the point that I'm here to learn?

**DE:** Well, I don't think I ever allowed myself to think I was at a disadvantage. And in a way it was not a disadvantage because it attracted a fair amount of attention. If I had been elected as a typical middle-aged guy, I would have been about as exciting as the wall paper because no one would have noticed, except for what I might have done to generate some interest. But there was always a newspaper interview or a microphone because I was the youngest. It was a time when there were quite a few young Democrats who were running, several, not as many but other young Republicans. And there may have been twenty or twenty-five of us in the legislature who were, oh, let me say thirty-two or younger. So we were in a sense a block, although we never, ever voted alike on anything. It was mostly, the Democrats were extremely liberal and the Republicans were generally conservative as you'd expect. So there weren't too many things where we voted in a block, but there was always the interest, "well how are they going to vote on voting rights," that was the suggestion of dropping the voting age to eighteen, or "how do you vote on the legal age for alcoholic beverages," or "what about contracts," or you know, there were always these things that constantly were coming up, so there was always a microphone handy. So it was if anything an advantage rather than a disadvantage.

But the question I'm usually asked is how did I have the nerve to run for the legislature when I was still in college. You have to remember it was in the middle of the Vietnam war also and there was a certain predisposition in the public against hippies and various people who were suspected of being anti-war. And of course I was, I had a, I won a draft card, and I was as

eligible as anyone else was at that time. When I was in college, the draft lottery had taken place, the old student deferment system had been replaced, everyone was made 1A and your number was drawn out of a hat and if you had number one, you might as well pack your bags and go to Vietnam, and if you had three hundred and sixty-five. You were all right. Well my number as I recall was something like two hundred and sixty-six. And one of those vivid memories I have, I guess along with everyone who was in college at the time, was sitting in front of the television watching as the numbers were drawn, you know. And you knew that if you had, if you were in the first one third, you were going, you were going to get your draft notice, and you were going and there was nothing you could do about it. And if you were in the middle, then depending on how the war went or what was happening at the Geneva Peace Talks, you may or may not go, and if you were in the bottom third then you were pretty safe.

So I was, my number was in the, as I recall, was in the very earliest of the third tier, so I was pretty confident that I wasn't going to be drawn. And I think it wasn't the fear, although that was, I think anyone who tells you that he wasn't afraid of going into the service when there was a war on is just not telling you the truth because everyone would have some apprehension. But the biggest problem was not the fear of going into the service, the biggest problem was the uncertainty, "What do I do with my life? What do I do with my college education? What do I do with commitments I might have to employers?" And there were people with all shades of that concern who had to deal with it one way or another. Well, Americans have done that throughout the years. Some have volunteered, and, you know, it's just the way it is, you do what you need to do for your country. And there are some that chose to go to Canada, and that was their decision although it was a decision that probably changed their lives and their families' lives forever. But against that background I ran for the legislature, and I'd knock on a door, someone would come to the door and says, "How come you're not in the Army?" And I would pull out my draft card and say, "Here's my 1A and if I'm called, I'll go." But you know, they would look very carefully to see if the corners were singed or whether my hair was too long and all that sort of thing, you know, so it was a reality of political life then.

So as it turned out I was never drafted. I have a very close friend who faced exactly the same situation although as a student he'd spent most of his time partying and raising hell, and his grades were horrible. So he was on academic probation, and his father told him, he said, "Jeff, if I were you, I would go down to the Navy recruiter because you're certainly going to flunk out, and they're going to grab you immediately, and you'll be crawling around in the jungle in Vietnam with a knife between your teeth. So if I were you I'd go down to the Navy recruiter and enlist." So, the lottery was coming up within a month or so, and he had to make the decision as to whether he was going to tough it out and take his chances with the lottery or whether he was going to enlist. Well, he finally decided he'd enlist, so he enlisted, and I think three days after he headed off for the Great Lakes training facility for his basic training, his draft number came up, three hundred and sixty-one, so. But, as much as we've laughed about it over the years, he said that was probably the best decision he ever made because he grew up, learned how to be responsible and met his wife. And you know, life has a way of taking care of itself if you give it a chance, and that's how it went for him. But it's kind of an interesting story.

**AL:** Oh sure, yeah. So you entered the legislature in the state during the Vietnam War.

**DE:** Yes, that's right.

**AL:** Were there issues that you faced in the state legislature that dealt with the Vietnam War directly at all?

**DE:** Well, only once, and it was not supposed to happen, but some of the Democratic legislators, the younger ones, Frank Murray being one of them as I recall, and Jay McCloskey, who has since been in the U.S. Attorney's office in Bangor, and some others introduced an anti-war resolution, which under the rules was controversial because there were those who said it was out of order. It wasn't relevant, it didn't have anything to do with the state, and others felt, well let them blow off steam and then we'll just vote on it. So after some parliamentary wrangling, the debate took place, they introduced the resolution and as I recall the resolution was defeated. But that was really the only time that a war related debate took place. It was in a time (*aside* - you have a friend there coming down to see you, right here - *reference to appearance of a spider*).

**AL:** Oh, oh! Okay.

**DE:** Sorry about that. I lost my train of thought.

**AL:** We were talking about the state legislature.

**DE:** So, at any rate, that was the only time that there was a war related issue that we had debated.

**AL:** And what were the issues that were very prevalent at that time in the legislature?

**DE:** Well, they aren't much different than they are today. I mean, there was the state budget and funding for highways. And the one thing that was blossoming as a national issue then, as it still is, is the environmental movement. We had gone through a long period in Maine, where, as in every other place in the country I guess, waste had been dumped into the rivers. And the Androscoggin River between Lewiston and Auburn, you could just see the foam and the brownness pouring over the waterfall. And you could drive by Brunswick, into Brunswick from West Bath, and you could see tremendous foam in the river there. The fish had almost completely left the Kennebec River; the salmon run in the Penobscot River was pretty well depleted. We were at the tail end of the river driving, the log driving. And I can remember as a youngster going to visit relatives in Bangor and seeing the Penobscot River just clogged with pulp that had been cut and floated down river from way up north.

It was a spectacular thing to see, but, you know, over the years before people had become aware of the consequences of unregulated environmental destruction, tremendous amount of damage had been done. Fifteen to twenty feet worth of waterlogged logs in the bottom of the river choking off natural spawning areas for fish, fresh water fish being decimated by every sort of chemical or human waste pouring out of sewage and sewage systems and factories, air quality where there was no restriction on effluent from stacks. And it was an issue that propelled Ed Muskie. He became aware of this as well he might having grown up in Rumford and having

lived in Waterville and having seen firsthand the impact of emissions and effluent in the natural environment. So those were issues that were coming to the front.

I remember the first Earth Day, I was in college, spring of 1970 as I recall, and then within a year of that I found myself in the state legislature voting on issues that related to environmental protection. And, you know, those issues have always been important to me for that reason, I remember what it used to be like in Maine. And now we see after some years of regulation and some considerable expense that it's making a difference. Parenthetically, in setting the problem of the Atlantic aside, which I think is due to a number of factors, I've been catching brown trout this winter in a place where there weren't any brown trout when I was growing up. The population of water fowl, ducks and geese, we've seen ducks and geese in places and I've hunted them where you never saw them when I was growing up. There's a problem with the decimation of songbirds through pesticides, but the pesticides have been changed, DDT is no longer used. And someone once said that it takes Mother Nature as long to correct a problem as it did to create it in the first place. In some cases it's going to be faster and in some cases it's going to be slower, but I think Ed and others who recognized the importance of that issue and were willing to take the heat deserve a great deal of credit because it's probably one of the most patriotic things, as well as one of the most important things to the average individual, that any elected official could possibly address.

**AL:** And so do you believe that some of the things that, the issues that you dealt with in the state legislature had its origins with Ed Muskie?

**DE:** Well, certainly that issue did.

**AL:** To some extent, yeah, that issue as well as -

**DE:** But you know, no one, someone once said, is ever the first of anything. There was a legislator from Caribou by the name of Jim Briggs, probably passed away by now, but in the '50s and early '60s, he was a champion for environmental cleanup. And they used to ride him unmercifully, "Clean Water Briggs" they called him. But he was a champion in those days for dealing with some of these issues, and he never got anything passed because he was a voice crying in the wilderness, no one else saw the importance of it. But he did, and he came back to the legislature for a term, he was elected in '72, he served with me and sat two seats from me the last term that I was in the legislature before I went to Washington. So he had the satisfaction of going from, not laughing stock but at least someone who was considered to have kind of a quirky notion, to someone who was utterly in the mainstream in the '70s when these issues came front and center.

**AL:** When you were in the state legislature, what was the make up of the legislature, was it pretty even by that time, Democrats and Republicans, or?

**DE:** Well, it was fairly even. There was a Republican majority in both. My first term, and I'm not sure I'm going to get these numbers exactly right, but I think the Republicans had an eighteen/fourteen advantage in the senate or something like that.

**AL:** Close to that.

**DE:** And seventy, no, eighty to seventy-two in the house. My second term, the Republicans gained a two to one advantage in the senate; it was twenty-two to eleven. And the house, I think, was just about the same, might have been one seat different from that eighty to seventy-two or seventy-nine to seventy-three or something like that, but it was a Republican majority in both. Now, the next session, in 1974, which was the Watergate election, the legislature switched, and I believe the house became Democratic - I'm not sure that the senate did, I think the senate stayed Republican but the house went Democratic; there again by a fairly close margin as I recall. Jim Longley was elected governor, I was elected to congress, and Bill Cohen was reelected to the second congressional district seat, so there was quite a shake up. And of course Jim Longley was the headline across the country, being an independent elected to governor, elected governor, defeated both the Republican and Democratic candidates. So it was an exciting time, a very volatile time politically. But people were looking for something different, much as they are now at the presidential level, and they weren't afraid to shake things up. And that's the only reason I won, I never in God's name would ever won a congressional seat defeating a four term incumbent congressman if there hadn't been this tremendous upheaval in the electorate. And I think I owe Jim Longley as much for that election as I do for anything I did simply because he broke the mold, and once people had at the top of the ticket decided that lightening wasn't going to strike them dead on the spot for voting for an independent, then it was only a small leap of faith to go to the next one down on the list and say, "Well, let's make a change here too." And of course they carried that all the way down the ticket and people who had been in office for many years were tossed aside in that Watergate election.

**AL:** When you were in the state legislature, what were some of the committees that you served on?

**DE:** Well, I served on the legal affairs committee, and in those days it was somewhat different than it is now. The legal affairs committee was very, very busy, it was a catch all. Well what used to happen was that the great preponderance of bills, would either be fish and game bills, or they would go to judiciary or legal affairs. And the difference between judiciary and legal affairs is an interesting one. If someone is amending the criminal code or amending some technical detail of the law or legal procedure, that goes to judiciary. If, on the other hand, it's a change in some provision of the law, for example licensing oil burner repair men, which is not a legal question but sort of a technical detail or requirement, it would go to legal affairs. But as it turned out, we ended up getting a number of bills that otherwise would have gone to the judiciary committee simply because the judiciary committee was overloaded.

So legal affairs was both a very important committee in those days, but a very interesting one because you could get all kinds of things. We got the state wide dog control bill, which had to do with requiring dogs to be licensed or requiring them to be on a leash or under the control of their owners at all times. We'd get bills that would be the separation of, one of the proposals was to separate York Harbor from the rest of the town of York so, and we got a number of those, Wells and Ogunquit which the committee did, and that was interesting because it delved into municipal law to a very great degree. If bears wrecked a farmer's beehives, that was a claim against the state because bears were protected, so we would decide whether this was a justifiable

claim, and we'd pay some fellow forty-two dollars and eleven cents for the cost of replacing the beehives. Seems like a very trivial matter that probably wouldn't need to come before the legislature.

One of the bills that I had in my, I guess it was in my second term, was a very emotional one. There was a woman who had worked for the state, who had been injured in a severe automobile accident while she was on state business, and had no insurance, and the issues was, was it the responsibility of the state to cover her medical costs? Well, she had been in and out of hospitals and surgery to repair a hip, and it was just a horrible, horrible situation. And she had gone to attorneys and she'd gone to other legislators and had just gone on for several years trying to get something done. And I got the bill through for her, and it was bittersweet in a way because by the time she knew that necessary surgery was going to be covered, her physicians advised her that she probably wouldn't survive the operation, so she never got it done because she'd aged and physical condition had deteriorated. But nevertheless, in all my political career, that is probably one of the most satisfying things that I ever did because it meant so much to the health and well-being of one person and a family. And it's, I'm sure she's deceased now, that was a long time ago, but you know, it makes you think a little bit. I mean, people in public office like to think of themselves at the vortex of war and peace and . . .

*End of Side A, Tape One*
*Side B, Tape One*

**AL:** We are now on side B of the interview with Mr. David Emery on February 29th, the year 2000.

**DE:** Sometimes the most important things that elected officials can do, as this particular case points out, is to help individual people who have insurmountable problems that otherwise they can't face.

**AL:** And then you went on to become a congressman?

**DE:** Yes.

**AL:** In 1974?

**DE:** Nineteen seventy-four, the Watergate year.

**AL:** The Watergate year, Nixon was in office.

**DE:** Nixon was in office, resigned in August of 1974. And during the entire fall campaign I was running against an entrenched Democratic incumbent, Peter Kyros, in a race that no one anticipated I could possibly win and to such a degree that there was very little press attention that was paid to that campaign simply because it was considered to be an impossible situation. But there were a number of interesting factors that came into play. The only reason that I was the Republican nominee, to be very frank about it, was that it was considered to be a worthless nomination.

I wanted to run. I had a great interest in running for political office, higher office, but the reality of the Maine legislature was then, and still is for that matter, that you can't support yourself on a legislative salary. In those days it was twenty-five hundred dollars for two years plus some paltry expense based on mileage. That was increased to thirty-five hundred dollars for two years during my second term, with some allowance for, I think it was a hundred dollars a week during the special session. So suffice it to say there was no money available for anything other than covering your barest expenses, and anyone who expected to make a living as a legislature would have to live like a hermit somewhere. So for a young guy who was in his early twenties, it was obviously go get a decent job and earn a living and start putting money away, so it was either up or out and I decided, what the heck, I'd run for congress and it would be a great experience that I could tell my children and grandchildren about, and if lightening struck I'd find myself doing what my greatest ambition in life always was. So I had the nomination uncontested, walked through the first congressional district, as did Bill Cohen in the second district two years before. I found that I made contacts and friends very easily, and that having put out that effort over the course of the summer, it reinforced the fact that I was, you know, at least a credible candidate if not a successful candidate. Fundraising was very difficult, most of the money was going into the gubernatorial race. I did not take money from political action committees or the special interest groups, and I dare say that none was offered. So as a candidate I very much ran hand to mouth. I was able to raise through the course of the summer and fall some forty-five thousand dollars, which was a small sum even then, I mean compared to the five hundred, six hundred, seven thousand or even million dollars that a congressional race requires today, even adjusting for inflation, that wasn't too much. But I managed to cobble together enough of a fundraising effort so that I'd have some minimal TV ads, which were basically me talking into a camera. We had printed material in the form of some brochures that we mailed out, and some bumper stickers and lawn signs, the usual sort of thing. But most of the effort was knocking on doors and walking through the district and contacting voters one on one personally.

My opponent, however, did absolutely nothing. He made a few obligatory appearances at Democratic functions but ran no TV ads, ran no radio ads, had very little in the way of material and basically had decided early on that this was going to be a huge margin of victory and that if he had, that campaigning was not necessary. But Peter was, Peter was a very bright congressman, a very intelligent, you know, able legislator, but he was considered by most people to be impossibly arrogant, and the stories were legion. Wherever I would go, people would have a Peter Kyros story, something that he did or something that he said someplace that he failed to ingratiate himself.

So everywhere I went, I kept, this was reinforced, and it became apparent to me I guess in late September or October that this was beginning to catch on a little bit. And of course no one believed it, and there was no way that I could raise the money because no one could get over that, you know, that insurmountable view that everyone had. But as Jim Longley began to catch on, I began to see signs on lawns that would say "Longley-Emery, Longley-Emery, Longley-Emery," in places where I wouldn't expect to see it. A fellow who volunteered used to make calls and, as you have in any number of campaigns, and he came to me one day and said, he said, "We just made some calls in Saco and you're almost even with Kyros in Saco." Well, you know, it's one of those things that you want to hear and you want to believe, but you, you don't

quite dare grasp it. So sure enough, during the last couple weeks of that campaign we actually did some serious telephone surveying, telephone polling, which I do now professionally. But we did those in a way that would give us some kind of a measure, and I was only a handful of points behind him. And at that point I was just extraordinarily excited about this. I needed more money for radio and TV; we didn't have it. So I just happened to be talking with Rodney Ross who was a wealthy and prominent Republican legislator from the city of Bath (in those days the campaign rules were different). Rodney says, "You know, I can lend you some money. What do you need?" Well, I needed I think it was thirty-five hundred dollars to get this (*unintelligible word*) of television on during the last weekend of the campaign. So he wrote me the check, I put the ads on, and I remember the night before the election, it was Monday, Monday afternoon, I got a call from some of the volunteers that were saying, "Well, we've just got our last poll back and you're ahead. Forty point one to thirty-nine point six with twenty point three undecided, large undecided but nevertheless ahead." And just to check, I said, "Well how's Jim Irwin doing?" Republican candidate, "Oh, he's going to get killed, Longley's going to win." And, you know, so that was kind of a reality check, because if it had come back with Irwin leading or close to it, I would have blown the whole thing off because I just knew that wasn't the case. I mean, you're out there talking with people every day, you don't need a poll to tell you what's going to happen.

So I found myself in Augusta late that afternoon, my last stop was at the what was then the UPI, United Press International wire service office which was on the fourth floor of the State House in those days. So, it was four or five o'clock in the afternoon, and I went in and just sort of plunked myself down in the chair in there and did a last minute interview and Dick Taffe, T-A-F-F-E, I'll never forget his name, was, I have no idea where he is now, of course that was 1974, was the UPI reporter. And he looked at me, he said, "Well, how are you going to do?" And I said, "I'm going to win." And he kind of rolled his eyes, you know, thinking to himself I was, you know, what else is a politician going to say. He says, "Well no, seriously, how are you going to do." And I said, "I'm going to win, I'm going to win, I've got a poll in my pocket that shows I'm just slightly ahead, I'll tell you this now, and I don't know what's going to happen tomorrow, I honestly don't. But, you know, I'll tell you this now and write what you want tomorrow when the votes come in, but I think I'm going to win this thing." And I said, "It's just, I can't described it, it's been a phenomenal thing, I'm picking it up everywhere I go. I'm picking it up in Biddeford, I'm picking it up in Portland, I'm picking it up in Waterville, places where I have no business winning, but I know I'm going to do very well, I'm going to do very well in the some of the Democratic areas, and I'm going to, I'm going to carry the Republican areas and I'm going to win this by a narrow margin."

So I went about my business, and I can't describe the acid that wells up in a candidate's stomach on Election Day. If you've never been there, it's, and I'm sure there are some people that just blow it off like it was nothing. But you know, the acid in my stomach, it's a wonder, it's a wonder that it didn't eat right through me. It was the most incredible experience in my life, that first time. It was difficult in other years, but this time it was fear of the unknown because I didn't know what was going to happen, how I'd react to it.

Back in the, I guess my high school days and then when I was in the legislature, we'd all gather at the radio station in Rockland, WRKD, where the radio station would have a board on the wall,

fill in all the returns from all the local towns as they do for their reporting on the election. But it was a handy place to go because the manager of the radio station was Paul Hugo, the local state senator, and he had five beautiful daughters who I always liked to associate with when I was in high school, and it was, you know, it was just a very friendly place. It was where the Republicans would go on election night, eat sandwiches, and discuss the returns and all that, so that was home base. I had a telephone put in the basement, I had my calculator, and the UPI wire machine, the old teletype was in the next room. Polls closed at eight, and then it was just this phenomenal wait for results. Some communities had voting machines, Rockland always had voting machines. It would mean about two thirds or maybe half the ballots would be on machine, the other half would be hand counted. So someone would always go over to the polls in Rockland and wait for the voting machine totals, and what would happen, the city clerk would open the machines and read the numbers off, and this would happen at about quarter past, twenty past eight. Of course I had a huge lead in Rockland, which I knew I would win Rockland. But if I hadn't won in Rockland or if it had been close in Rockland, then, you know, I'd just know that I was all done.

So I knew the Rockland returns were okay, and the first thing that came across the wire was some, I still don't know what it was, it was some tiny town or some probably island in Portland or something where there was like ninety votes cast, and I was losing seventy to twenty-eight or some such thing like that, and I saw those at about eight thirty, quarter to nine. I said, "Well, it's been fun, this is the end of the game." And I was a little deflated at that point, but some of the people that were there said, "Well, you know, that's only less than a hundred votes, you know, relax, you know what's going to happen, just relax, you know you've got more than that, it just come in on the Rockland machines." So barely had that come out of my mouth, and the thing started to run again, and there were about, oh I don't, three thousand votes tabulated, and I was ahead. And, you know, I just went crazy because I didn't where those votes were. So I tried to call around, "What's tabulated?" No one knew what was tabulated. Finally I got through to UPI, they didn't know because they were coming from somewhere else.

So then the phone rang and it was *Bangor Daily News* asking me if I was ready to make some kind of a statement because they had seen a trend where I was running some twenty points ahead of the previous Republican candidate, and I said, "I have no idea where these numbers are from." So they started reading me some of the numbers, you know, some of Waterville had come in and I was only trailing in Waterville by a few hundred votes. And at that point in time I can remember just being transfixed. And then we started getting numbers in from rural Waldo county, which was in the district in those days, and I was carrying these towns, you know, three hundred and twelve to a hundred and eighty, two hundred and fifty-six to a hundred and seventy, you know, and it was all coming in. And there'd be a few that I'd lose by a narrow margin, but in aggregate I was running twenty, twenty-five points ahead of where Bob Porteous had run two years ago. And all the calculations that I had done had showed me that I had to carry those twenty, twenty-five points better than other times.

So I said to myself, I said, "Well okay, fine, those come from my own end of the district, but what happens when Portland comes in?" We started getting returns from Kennebec County and York County and Cumberland; it was the same pattern, it was the same pattern. I was running either, you know, ten or fifteen points ahead or twenty five or thirty points ahead depending on

where it was, where the others were. And as the wire service reports would come in, you know, there'd be a batch that would come in, and I'd be leading by three hundred and fifteen votes; and then another batch would come in, and I'd be behind by five hundred, and another bunch would come in and it would be dead even.

So about twelve o'clock, I'm going to guess probably sixty percent of the vote was in, and I was ahead. By twelve thirty, something bad had come in, and I was behind by about a thousand votes, by eleven hundred votes, and I said, "Well, it's been a lot of fun, this is the end of it, you know, obviously the cities are coming in now and, but it's given them a scare." And of course the wire services were going crazy writing all these stories about upset in the making and Longley winning and all this sort of thing.

So about three o'clock in the morning, there were maybe twenty five communities that had not reported, and most of them were small towns. I was behind by, oh I guess seven hundred votes at that point, and we were crazy to find out what was out because if they were all Republican towns, I had a chance to win. If they were places like Saco and Biddeford and Sanford and Winslow, I knew I was going to lose. But no one could find out what had come in. By six o'clock in the morning, there were three communities outstanding and I was behind by about four hundred votes - no, I was behind by a hundred and ninety six votes was what it was, those are numbers I don't forget. The towns that were out were Oakland which I should, I could lose narrowly or split; Newcastle as I recall, in Lincoln county which I should carry heavily; and Winthrop which was my campaign manager's home town, which I knew I would win. So at that point I felt rather confident that I was going to win unless I had a big surprise coming. Well, Newcastle came in and I carried it heavily, Oakland came in and I think I lost it narrowly, and then Winthrop came in and put me over the top.

Then there was confusion in the totals. UPI had me ahead by four hundred, someone else had me ahead by seven hundred, and we knew we were headed for a recount. We had a ballot inspection and a recount, and after the recount was concluded I had won by, unofficially, four hundred and twenty three votes. Officially what they usually do is just take the last standing vote total after the ballots have been officially added, so they don't bother to correct all the errors. But officially I think it had me leading by, or winning by some six or seven hundred votes, but the actual total with all of the recount numbers was four hundred and twenty three. There were two hundred and fifty six precincts, and of those two hundred and fifty-six there were only sixteen that reported the same numbers in the recount that they reported on election night.

**AL:** Where did the discrepancy come from?

**DE:** Well, there were miscounts, addition errors, stacks of ballots that were either counted twice or not counted at all. In some cases there were ballots that were thrown out by the counters because of some stray mark that the court ordered to be counted. But you got to realize that these were all benign errors, I mean no one intended any of these errors, but you know, you have sixty-five year old women counting ballots at two thirty in the morning after being on their feet all day, and you know, you figure it out, how would any of us do under those circumstances, you know? And they have to count every race individually, there's noise and confusion,

telephones ringing, everyone's tired, and it's just human error.

So that was a real wake up call to me that, to any, you know, any voter or any elected official has a vested interest in guaranteeing that that count is fair and accurate and you replace to the greatest degree possible, you replace manual counting by voting machines, you know, and you have some kind of redundant system so that if the voting machines crash you have a paper print out record. And of course that's what is done in almost all communities of any size today, except the very small ones.

So that was wild ride. It wasn't over with then either, because Kyros challenged the election in Washington claiming that federal law would supercede state law and that if the ballots were recounted they'd throw out some of the ones that were counted for me and he'd still win, and claimed that some of the campaign was dirty and he'd been smeared, and it was just a real nasty situation. But I was sworn in on time, and the Washington challenge went by the boards, and on the fourteenth of July, Bastille Day by coincidence, the house threw out the challenge, and that was the end of it. But it was a wild ride for a twenty-six year old from Rockland, I'll tell you that.

**AL:** I'll bet it was. So starting in the U.S. Congress, what were your initial impressions? Had you been there prior to this?

**DE:** I had been there. I had never set foot in Washington, D.C. until the fall of 1970. I was actually, just, it was after my official election to the legislature, but we went down, you know, everyone takes a trip to the Capitol at least once in his life, and that's when mine was. Now after that, as a legislator, I went several times to various conferences. And then during the campaign in September as I recall, or maybe it was early October, I went down to meet with President Ford and other members of Congress; we had photos taken and films taken with the president for campaign purposes and that sort of thing. But going there under those circumstances and going there as an elected member of Congress is an entirely different situation. When I went back as a member elect, I had access to the house floor, so I could go in on the house floor and sit and watch, and I'll tell you, I'll never forget that. Twenty-six year old, just elected to Congress, walking in on the floor of the House of Representatives and being invited to sit down in the midst of sitting members of Congress. I mean, I could look around and see people I saw in the national news, and I was shortly to be their colleague.

It was an overwhelming experience. You know, it wasn't overwhelming in the sense that I wondered whether I could do the job, you know, at twenty-six you never have those doubts, you're always young and cocky and anxious to get at it. But it was overwhelming in the sense that, gee whiz, I really pulled this off. And it was an astounding thing to suddenly have the responsibility to pull a staff together; people of every description were calling me; people calling me about legislation; other members of Congress were calling me to introduce themselves; I was getting correspondence from national organizations that wanted to know who I was and what I'd done, what my interests were. So I went from campaign busy to being, you know, in need of a full time office just to keep my daily affairs in order. But it all sorted itself out. I went to Washington, went through the process of setting up the congressional office, hiring people and -

**AL:** Were there people from Maine who came with you?

**DE:** There were some, about half of my staff were from Maine, and the other half were people who I picked up in Washington that had some particular experience or expertise. My administrative assistant was Bob Pyle, who had been in and around Washington for a number of years. George Smith, who's now the executive director of the Maine Sportsman's Alliance, came to Washington with me. Hattie Bickmore, who was very active in the Maine Republican party a few years ago, was in charge of my offices in Maine. There was a young woman from Patten up in Aroostook County who had actually been out on the west coast and wanted to come back east, so she came in for a job interview and I hired her immediately to handle fisheries and environmental issues. To this day it's one of the best staffers that I ever had, and more like a sister than an employee.

**AL:** What was her name, what is her name?

**DE:** Carolyn Nightingale. She's married now, and her married name is Khanna, K-H-A-N-N-A, but you know, just absolutely stellar. One of the things that really gives me a lot of satisfaction looking back on it is the people that worked for me on my staff were some of the best people that the Maine delegation had. Charlie Bass, who's now a member of Congress from New Hampshire, he was my administrative assistant later on. Colin Marlow, who was another administrative assistant, is now an executive with Rockwell. John Rabb, who was my military affairs expert, is now with the Department of Energy. So these people have done extremely well and have become influential and important in their own right, and I look back on it with some considerable satisfaction that they were working with me and for me and for the state of Maine and did a superior job.

**AL:** The, when we talk about the Maine delegation, when you first went to Congress, it was yourself and Bill Cohen?

**DE:** That's right.

**AL:** Ed Muskie?

**DE:** And Bill Hathaway.

**AL:** And Bill Hathaway.

**DE:** That's right.

**AL:** When, I have a question because I met, they call it the Maine delegation, in what areas do the four of you as a delegation really come together, or do you?

**DE:** Well, the answer's very simple, and it's anything that affects the state as a whole. And I think the average voter has a feeling that Republicans and Democrats spend the whole day shooting at each other. But the truth of the matter is that there were, I don't recall, I don't recall all the time, well I do recall one instance when, I will say where there were differences between

us on an issue that affected Maine. I was always opposed to the Dickey-Lincoln Hydro project up in northern Maine because I thought it was an environmental disaster and one that would not return the value of electricity that we would need. The other members of the delegation were in favor of it, particularly Ed and Bill Hathaway. So that was probably, that was probably the only issue I can think of where we had some real divisions in the delegation, but it was gentlemanly and friendly and intellectual agreement - disagreement rather than our, you know, a political free for all.

But on anything that had to do with contracts for Bath Iron Works, or Loring Air Force Base, or money for education, or heating oil assistance, or you know, appointments, appointments of Maine people to federal jobs, regardless what the administration was, we were always together, we were always together. When George Mitchell was to become U.S. attorney, we all supported George, not withstanding the fact that a couple years after that George and I would run against each other. But there was no question, if there was a Maine person that was in line for a federal job, it was just automatic that we would all support him. And that's the way it ought to be, you know, unless the individual is someone of really questionable ability or point of view which is clearly out of line, but that's not likely ever to happen.

I think if the public were aware of the degree to which we cooperated on matters like that, they would feel very good about their legislative delegation. And I'm assuming it's the same now, I have no doubt but what it is. And of course Ed was very influential and very powerful in those days as a Democratic committee chairman in the majority party with considerable seniority. He very often would carry our water, particularly in the Carter administration, when, obviously his party at the White House as well. But we all worked, we all did what we had to do to make it happen, and we were very successful at it.

And we had the great Indian land claim debate over the Indians' claim to ownership of land in the state. We had the various attempts to close Loring Air Force Base. Any number of issues relating to ship building contracts or manufacturing contracts at Bath Iron Works or what was then (*name*) Corporation, now Saco Defense or whatever it is now. Various military bases around the state, other than Loring. All of these things to one degree or another demanded our attention.

Then we had some particular problems, I mean the shoe industry and the textile industry were really on their way out. It was at the end of their lively existence in Maine, and they were just being eaten alive by foreign competition, and I think we all knew that their demise was inevitable. But, you know, when people's lives and livelihoods and income are at stake, obviously you pull together and do what you can to help them. If you can't save the industry, you try to save the income, you try to find alternative employment. So we all worked on those things together and we worked very effectively. And, I'll say this too, even in the campaign in which Bill Cohen ran against Bill Hathaway, when it came to legislative or other matters that affected the state, we all worked together. Very few times during my career did, was there ever a breach of that understanding.

**AL:** And what was it like to be a part of the Maine delegation with Ed Muskie? Sort of what, how, give me an example of how the two of you would communicate if an issue did come up.

**DE:** Well, you know, a lot of it, simply because we were all busy running nineteen different directions were staff to staff. But if I ever needed to talk to Ed, I'd just go see him or pick up the phone, and he was, we always got along very well. I liked Ed. We'd disagree on things as Republicans and Democrats tend to do, but I liked him and for all he was known to have an explosive temper and, you know, liked to rail at people and things and objects that he disagreed with from time to time. You know, any time that the two of us ever got into any kind of a spirited discussion, you know, it was always well understood that it was in good fun. And I really did like him and respect him, many particular issues aside, so our relationship was excellent and I never hesitated to call on him or his office if there was a matter that required his attention or could benefit from his input.

**AL:** And did he try to make himself accessible?

**DE:** Oh, absolutely. You know, for all he was an extraordinarily busy man, I mean there was sort of an unwritten understanding that you didn't bug him about trivial things. But if there was something that was necessary or important, than obviously you'd call, that's what he's there for. You know, quite apart from being a fellow member of the delegation he's also my senator, so you know, I've got, and I think any elected official needs to understand that, it's not that someone's bothering you with problems, it's your job, you've got to deal with it. And he understood that and was very good at it, had a very good staff and a very good reputation for solving problems with people and getting them taken care of.

**AL:** When you did discuss issues, was he, I've heard about his experience with debating, and he was quite good at giving speeches. How was he in discussion?

**DE:** Well, he liked to pontificate from time to time, and he'd sit back in his chair in his hideaway, and he'd launch into a dissertation. But it was all for effect. Most of what Ed did was study, it was studied spontaneity I guess is the best way to describe it. I remember one session when we met with Air Force colonels on the Loring Air Force Base thing, why he was swearing at them and pounding his fist on the table and calling them anything but intelligent, and I said, and I thought to myself, I can't believe what I'm hearing, I can't believe what I'm hearing. And you could just watch the officers just sit there and squirm and it was a kind of a hot day in a warm room and everyone was uncomfortable, and as I recall someone was smoking, and you know, it's just an opportunity, they weren't going to go anywhere until he was finished, and he wasn't going to finish until they were damned uncomfortable.

So it was all, it was all for atmosphere and if you understood that, then any time that he'd blow off steam or rail at something you did or said, you'd just sort of roll your eyes and sit there and just sort of let it pass. And, you know, as a strategy, if you wanted, if you wanted to get along with him, if you wanted to deal with him, you didn't react to everything because if you reacted to something, then he would know that you, you know, you were vulnerable to this display. And it was all very clever and very, it was very interesting. It was a study of a statesman at work, and I'm sure that if you looked at Lincoln or you looked at Lyndon Johnson or you looked at any number of hundreds of very successful statesmen in this country, and I'm sure abroad, you would see that there was this same, the same trait, being able to read people and being able to

use body language as well as the English language to convey points and feelings. And he did that very well, he did that as well or better than anyone I have ever known in my political career. And of course not only is that a trait of a successful politician, but it's also a trait of a successful lawyer.

**AL:** I'm going to pause for just a second. (*Pause*). Yeah, I wanted to talk a little bit about the 1972 Republican National Convention, what are your recollections of that?

**DE:** Well, I was a delegate to both the, no, I was a delegate to the '72 convention, and I went to the '68 convention as an aide to the Maine delegation. So I saw the Nixon-Agnew ticket when it was first nominated, and then I saw it when it was renominated in Miami Beach, both conventions. Seventy-two was surreal in a sense, it was the height of the Vietnam, Nixon had initially been elected on a pledge to end the war, had a secret plan to end the war, and as it developed, the extrication from the war took longer and was more difficult than, I think, anyone had envisioned. And I think for a couple of reasons: I think the North Vietnamese were probably a bit more intransigent than Nixon had initially envisioned, plus they could also see that Nixon was in considerable political trouble over the Watergate thing although most of that happened toward the end of that campaign, and actually after the election. But I think they felt that they could win a waiting game, and I don't think Nixon helped his cause sometimes. I think there were turning points and decision points that he might have been able to make, but in retrospect, of course, it's very easy to point out a clearer path. It isn't so obvious when you're living it.

But Miami Beach was confrontational, and it was not confrontational in the convention because it was just simply a renomination of a successful ticket, but Miami Beach was surrounded by this army of protestors, and you could smell the tear gas, and you could see the police in riot gear, and people were carrying signs and chanting and just about every hippie, yippie activist, anti-war activist in the country was in Miami Beach. And then, of course, later in Chicago. So it was a, it was a, it was a very, very difficult circumstance. It was a very difficult campaign because you were not only running, you know, against the Democratic opposition, but there were real divisions in the country. You can only imagine what it must have been like during the Civil War in a border state where you had families divided and communities divided over an emotional issue. Families were certainly divided over this, there was dad who'd been a Korean war or WWII veteran, and son had long hair, ear ring, love beads and was protesting against the war. And that happened any number of times, thousands, hundreds of thousands of times throughout the country. And there were real cultural, social, political differences that the country had really not seen other than very rare times in previous history.

Well, I remember going to Miami Beach in that background and feeling that it was us against them, but not wanting it to be that way. I mean, I wanted to be a committed, involved, active, proud Republican and a successful legislator and a future candidate, but at the same time, you know, I looked around and saw a lot of people my own age and wondered whether I was going to be forever separated from my peer group by political and social differences over Vietnam. It was a horrible mistake. Whether you supported involvement or didn't support involvement, you look back in retrospect, and I think it's quite clear that we were making 1970s decisions based on 1950s assumptions.

One of the, I think one of the lessons that we've learned from Vietnam, and sometimes we tend to forget it but I think it's still by and large understood, is that you don't commit American troops and American prestige without a clear definition of what the goals are to be. And not only what the goals are to be, but how you extricate yourself, and this is why I've been very hesitant to get into places like Kosovo or the Balkans or any other place where we might be tempted to flex muscles. It's very easy to say, "Well we'll go in and right this wrong," but it's very difficult to say, "Well, what do we do after we're through?" And, you know, further digression, I'm always whimsically amused at these people who say, "Well, we should have gone in and shot Saddam Hussein, we should have gone all the way to Baghdad." Well, it's great fun to talk about what you'll do when you have a half a million men in tanks there, but it's not so much fun when you have to figure out how you're going to actually run the country in the power vacuum that follows. And, you know, that's a great leap of faith. The battle isn't the hard part, it's dealing with the vacuum and the political reality and the hatred and the tension that you leave behind that is a real challenge.

We didn't think any of that through in Vietnam. And it's one thing, it's one thing to talk about saving South Vietnam; it's another thing to ask yourself, "Well, how do we do it? What do we do? How do we run the country? How do we keep it saved once it's saved? And I think the answer is that you can't. And if you don't carefully define what your goals and interests are, and what it means to the country, what it's national interests are and how you extricate yourself, as I've said, then you're just asking for an awful lot of trouble, which I think most Americans finally figured out was not worth the price.

**AL:** And what was it about Nixon that appealed to you, was it because he had what he called a secret plan to end the Vietnam War, or?

**DE:** Well, setting aside the obvious problems later on when the Watergate situation, I found Nixon appealing because he was not, he was not doctrinaire. He had a flexible, he had a flexible view, he wasn't afraid to try things. He went to China, I mean this was a great anti-Communist, but he wasn't afraid to get on a plane and fly to China to try to improve American-Chinese relations. It was a very bold thing, and in any context it was a very good thing; it was something that needed to be done at the time, open lines of communication. When the economy was going sour, he wasn't afraid to try various controls and various manipulations that didn't work. And in retrospect they probably weren't the best judgment, wage and price controls never work, but he wasn't afraid to try ideas, he wasn't afraid to think through problems and was not so bound, hide bound by tradition and by philosophy that he would not tune these things out.

On the other side, he had great negatives as we found out. There was a bit of paranoia there. It was, you know, his enemies list and all the other things that came out of it, which were truly unfortunate. Very much of a Shakespearean character, Macbeth comes to mind, having achieved great heights, fought great battles, but brought low by a fatal flaw. I mean that's Shakespeare, and it's also traditional Greek tragedy, you know, which is not an uncommon failing but in this case a very deep failing. And all you can do when an individual or a country runs across problems like that, whether it's a problem of an individual or a problem of collective judgment, you really can't spend the rest of your existence flogging yourself for having made a mistake. What you really have to do is to learn from it and pick up.

**AL:** I'm going to stop there.

*End of Side B, Tape One*
*Side A, Tape Two*

**AL:** We are now on the second tape, side A of the interview with Mr. David Emery on February 29th, the year 2000. This is Andrea L'Hommedieu. We just talked about your participation at the 1972 Republican National Convention, and sort of giving us a sense of the atmosphere and the time and the issues. I'd like to now jump back probably to when you first met Muskie. Do you have a recollection of that time? How early was it?

**DE:** Well, I'm sure that I met him in Rockland when I was in high school. From time to time, in fact in 1964 when he was running for his first reelection in the Senate, as I recall he came through Rockland on a campaign stop. At that time, as a high school student, I was supporting Cliff McIntire, but it was nevertheless always a privilege to meet, you know, a well known and prominent person. So I remember running into him on the street and just saying hello to him and shaking his hand and, you know, the usual campaign small talk, and I was a high school kid, which he obviously knew, and made a point to say hello. So that was probably the first time that I met him. And then after I was elected to the legislature in 1970, there were, you know, any number of times when he was in and around Augusta, meetings that I would have been at where he spoke or where he made a presentation, or one thing or another. So in that context I saw him. But I really didn't get to know him obviously until I was elected to Congress, and when I was elected to Congress we worked together on any number of projects as I mentioned earlier.

I never really knew him personally, we were never personal friends, I mean never dinner guests at each other's homes or anything of that kind, but in the context of the workaday Washington environment where we would have Maine delegation issues, I would see him several times a week and in some instances every day. So we certainly were on a first name basis, and got to know each other very well and got to like each other. I, you know, I obviously have no way of putting words in his mouth, but I have to say that all the time that we worked together, there was no unnecessary partisanship, there was no bickering, there was no one-upmanship. It was, it was a very close and warm business relationship that served the state well. Now, of course, I think that if I had had designs on his seat or vice versa, that situation might have been quite different. But I wasn't a threat to him, he wasn't a threat to me, he never messed in any of the campaigns that I was running for election or reelection, you know, other than obviously he supported George Mitchell, and he supported other people, but it was never a situation where we were political adversaries in the close up and personal sense at all.

**AL:** So, you just mentioned George Mitchell, when George Mitchell ran against you, did Ed Muskie, was he very vocal about his support for George Mitchell (*unintelligible phrase*)?

**DE:** Oh, you know, absolutely. He's a good Democrat, but I mean he wasn't, Ed wasn't out on the stump telling people they ought to vote for George Mitchell because I was some kind of a jerk. I mean it was all done in very good order and exactly, I mean Bill Cohen supported me the very same way. I mean it was all done in good taste and respectful and that did not in any way

detract from our abilities to work together. I mean even when Senator Mitchell and I were in the same delegation, as we were after he'd been appointed to replace Muskie, the same thing held. If there was an issue that was important to the state of Maine, that came first. And I, you know, I don't recall a single instance where either Senator Mitchell or I did anything that would undermine the interest of the state or the state delegation. That just wasn't done, it isn't done.

**AL:** Did I misspeak? Did George Mitchell ever run against you?

**DE:** No, I ran against him.

**AL:** You ran against, yes.

**DE:** Yeah, in 1982.

**AL:** Oh, okay, yes, all right.

**DE:** I guess, there's another thing I ought to mention just for historical accuracy. During the campaign, I think one of the reasons that Ed was not more visible in Mitchell's behalf was that he was Secretary of State at that point. And as such he wasn't by custom, or by law I guess for that matter, to participate in a partisan overt way in political activities, any more than Bill Cohen does as Secretary of State now. It's just not done generally.

**AL:** No, I didn't even think, just wasn't thinking in terms of that. From the time you met Senator Muskie as part of the Maine delegation where you really got to know him on a professional basis, in those years, what was your initial impression of him and how did it change over time? Or did it?

**DE:** Well, I don't know as the impression changed particularly, but I think it's fair to say that going to Congress as a twenty-six year old and finally ending up in the delegation with two U.S. senators and another congressman, is kind of a rush. And Muskie being the senior senator, the elder statesman, the "eight hundred pound gorilla" as the saying goes; I'm sure to some degree I was in awe of it. And, but that wears off, as I say. I won't say familiarity breeds contempt because there was certainly no contempt, but after you are familiar with the way someone operates and you see him and you get to know him and he says hi to you in the elevator and that sort of thing, the mystery wears off. And I became very comfortable with him, I liked him, we always got along well together as I had said previously.

So I think the initial impression that most people would get is that this is a very powerful individual, as he was, but after you get to know him a little while you realize that, to one degree or another, he puts his pants on the same way you do in the morning and he's subject to the same sorts of likes and dislikes and work pressures. But the most important thing was after you got to know him for a while, you began to read him, as he would get to read us. And you could tell, you could tell what was theatrics and what was real, and you could tell what his hot buttons were and, you know, as humans beings do when they work together you learn the things that really make him tick. And to that degree, getting to know him, I think my attitude toward our relationship and our relative positions in the pecking order would change, and after a while I just

didn't worry about it, I just did what I had to do and we worked together and really quite successfully so.

**AL:** Were there any people from Maine who were politicians before you who served as mentors in any capacity? I'm thinking in terms of Margaret Chase Smith, or . . . .

**DE:** Well, very definitely. Margaret Chase Smith was always a mentor, I always very much admired her, and one of my few political regrets is that I never got to serve with her. I knew her and supported her, and whenever she came to Rockland, particularly when I was in the legislature and when she was campaigning in 1972, which was a race she ultimately lost to Bill Hathaway, you know, I was one of her people. In fact, during one particular swing that fall I drove her all the way from Rockland to Washington County to a function in Machias, so I served actually as a functionary in her campaign. But I admired her very much. I admired her for her independence, and she was very powerful, a very powerful senator who was respected on both sides of the aisle. She would, she would very much be a, she would very much be a mentor, very much.

**AL:** Was there anyone else besides her that?

**DE:** She was the primary, she would be the primary mentor. Now, you take a look in a larger sense and you talk about national figures or historical figures that obviously I never met. You know, I've always been very drawn to Teddy Roosevelt. You know, there again, dynamic, aggressive in terms of getting things done, someone who's not afraid to break the mold, challenge his party, sort of like John McCain these days who's someone I'm supporting. So, you know, it's that, it's that sort of an independent streak that's always attracted me, someone who dared to speak up even when it wasn't popular or easy. And of course Senator Smith was known for her Declaration of Conscience at a time when politics was really pretty rough.

**AL:** And she was a woman.

**DE:** And a woman, that's right.

**AL:** Did you ever know or interact with Stan Tupper?

**DE:** Well, I know Stan very well. As a matter of fact Stan and I have been working on the McCain campaign, and I've talked to Stan about five times a day for the last month or so.

**AL:** So funny I should bring that name up.

**DE:** Yeah, right, and if you haven't interviewed him you ought to.

**AL:** Yes, we have, yeah. So he's still politically active then, still as yourself?

**DE:** Oh yeah, absolutely, yeah, right. Yup.

**AL:** Now what committees did you serve on in the house?

**DE:** I was, my first term I was on the Science and Technology Committee and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. My second term, I dropped Science and Technology and served on Armed Services where I stayed for the rest of my tenure, and I also remained on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Those were good assignments. My first term, science and technology committee was not considered to be, you know, one of the major committees, but it was fascinating to me because I'm an electronic engineer by training. And I'm an amateur astronomer and love to deal with the space program, and to be on the committee that oversees the space program was probably more fun than anything I could ever do, so I thoroughly enjoyed it. And with my interest in matters of science and technology and engineering it was a good fit.

Likewise, I loved Merchant Marine and fisheries committee because, of course, there's nothing more Maine than fisheries. It's a dying industry now but growing up at Rockland and knowing firsthand stories of people who'd gone fishing and a life at sea and all of that sort of coastal lore which is a dying industry now, was very important to me. And of course I was in the house when the two hundred mile limit law and the Marine Conservation Management Act as it was called was drafted. So I participated in that and was actually responsible for the house amendments that created the New England Marine Fisheries Management Council and some of the other conservation measures that were important to the Maine fishery at the time.

When I was elected to Congress, the Republicans had just been wiped out; it was the Watergate election and I think there were a hundred and forty-three of us in the house, we had a two to one minority, and we practically had to ask permission to go to the men's room, I mean it was just a, it was a wipe out, absolute wipe out. So there were a lot of open seats but they all went to Democrats, so when the time came to parcel out the committee assignments, the senior Republicans of course were the ones that would get all the best assignments, it's just the way the system works, and you know, we argued for more seats for the minority on some of these committees but the majority wouldn't do it, so we were left with what was available. So science and technology and Merchant Marine were just fine. I mean, rather than being bogged down with the extraordinary work load that you'd get from some of the major committees, it gave me more time to come back to Maine, consolidate my political seed and do some things that I needed to do anyway.

But after I was reelected, I gave up science and technology and took on services and found myself on the sea power subcommittee, which, of course, is very important to the Bath Iron Works and to Maine workers, and I loved it. It was a committee that was right at the center of important issues. It was not just a mundane matter of deciding what ships were going to be built, but it was military doctrine, military policy, arms control, which I, when I was in the Reagan administration, I was the deputy director of the U.S. Arms Control Agency. So one of the reasons I got that assignment was the background that I'd had in the house armed services committee and my familiarity with weapon systems and their capabilities.

So it was a very, it was a very stimulating time. I stayed on those two committees for the remainder of my service in Congress, and as I've said, there has been no time in my professional career that I have enjoyed more than the time that I served in the House. For all that it can be aggravating and expensive and there's a lot of pressure, you just have the feeling every morning

when you get up and every evening when you go to bed, that you've been involved in important issues and matters that make a difference to real people. It was just marvelously stimulating, and I think most people who have spent time in Congress, either House or Senate, and have been involved at the level that I've been involved, know exactly what I'm saying. And it's very hard to describe unless you've actually been there, but it's an incredibly stimulating time, intellectually and every other way.

**AL:** When you were in the house, would this be, did you have, were you married and had a family at that point, or did that come after?

**DE:** That came during my last term in the house. I was twenty-six and single when I went to Washington, which is a, you know, we won't get into all those stories, but it, you know, it's a wonderful time and a wonderful place to be when you're twenty-six and single. But I met my future wife very shortly after I went to Washington, so most of the time I was there we dated and really did have a lot of fun. But we were married in June of 1980, just prior to my last reelection campaign which was, as I say, 1980, and we've been married ever since with one son. And that's probably the best decision I ever made while I was in Washington.

**AL:** That's great. Now, I'm not sure if there's any connection here or not, but I want to skip to something you just mentioned about being deputy director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. That was after -?

**DE:** That was when I left the Congress, that's right.

**AL:** The Congress. While you were deputy director, did the Iran Contra Affair affect you and what you were doing at all?

**DE:** No, we had absolutely no contact with that at all. That was what we call a political military matter, which was something that was decided, was done between the White House and the Pentagon, and it didn't go through our office at all. Arms sales, although certainly an arms control issue, is more of a state department, defense department, strategic matter, and what we dealt with was negotiating treaties. Negotiating treaties to eliminate chemical weapons, nuclear weapons, biological weapons and that sort of thing, and we weren't involved in the arms sales aspect at all.

**AL:** How does one go about doing that, writing treaties and, what are all the, what are some of the factors that entails?

**DE:** Well, it's extraordinarily complex, but there again one of the most stimulating things that I've ever done in my life. The history of arms control goes back thousands of year, I guess the first time two cavemen decided that the one with the bigger stick had an advantage over the little guy, the little guy tried to find a way to find a way – find a rock that was harder than the stick. So in a very simple-minded way people began to realize that there were things you could do that would reduce the danger by limiting access to weapons and essentially finding ways to talk before you shoot. In more recent times, the most significant proposal was President Eisenhower's open skies policy that was proposed and not accepted by the Russians, or the

Soviet Union, which was essentially means by which each side would be allowed to fly over the other side's airplanes, missiles and so forth to count them. And it was a confidence building measure, it was designed as a way that each side would know beyond a reasonable doubt that the other side wasn't engaged in an offensive buildup that would be threatening.

After that, during the period of time in the '50s and early '60s when there were an extraordinary number of very large nuclear tests, there was some thought that we ought to find a way to limit those tests, and by limiting the tests you limit, theoretically, the ability to manufacture bigger and more dangerous weapons. All that become very theological, but nevertheless that led to treaties such as the Threshold Test Ban Treaty, the Limited Test Ban Treaty, and some others, some of which were ratified, some of which were never ratified and aren't to this day.

During the '70s and '80s when I was in the Arms Control Agency and in Congress, the Limited Test Ban Treaty, or Threshold Test Ban Treaty was not ratified, but both sides agreed to abide by it anyway. What it simply said is that your tests will be underground, and they won't exceed a certain level of explosive capacity. Then the whole argument became, well, how can you tell if the other side is following the rules? How do you measure, how do you measure the size of a blast? And that's usually done by seismology, you measure the earthquake caused by the explosion and depending on the readings you get, given a certain margin of error, it either is or it isn't within the bounds. And this became a matter of great controversy because of the plus or minus fifty percent error factor that you get -

**AL:** Plus or minus fifty percent?

**DE:** Fifty percent, yeah, so you know, it's not as if you're using any great precision, but if something was supposed to be, say, twenty-five kilotons and it turned out to be eighty, you knew it was out of range. If it measured at forty, well you weren't quite so sure because it could be within the range or not within the range. But it was at least a way of reining in some of the potential. But when I was in the Arms Control Agency there were three or four issues that were current. As you recall we had gone through a build up of offensive weapons on both sides in Europe, the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces, cruise missiles and land base missiles on both sides, so (*unintelligible phrase*) we'd counter deploy them, and it was a very tense time. The leftists and the Green Party throughout Europe were arguing for their countries to get out of NATO, didn't want any deployments, wanted a nuclear freeze and immediate disarmament, whereas the western position, particularly that of Reagan and Thatcher, were that you reduce weapons within a framework.

And the four points that were critical to that framework were, first of all, real reductions, nothing that's window dressing or artificial, you make real cuts in weapons so that the result is significant. Second, you ratchet back the rhetoric so that you, when you say things, you don't create an artificial environment in which the tension builds; you don't use the threat of deployment of weapons as an excuse to mess in someone else's politics. Third, you have verification provisions which give each side a reasonable ability to find out whether the other side's following the rules, inspections for example. And then finally, you try to reduce to a level that is not merely a lower numerical level, but you try to reduce to a level of equivalent security, and this was the one that was hard to grasp because superficially you'd say, "Well, you take a

hundred missiles down, and we'll take a hundred missiles down. You take fifty submarines out; we'll take fifty out." But if you don't start off with the same mix, in other words if one side has more submarines in proportion to the other's missiles, or if one side has a three to one advantage, and if you cut down equally, pretty soon you get to a six to one advantage, which, of course, is contrary to the whole argument of stability. So that actually might mean that in order to reach that point of stability, you take two out and I'll take one out, and that's a very, very hard thing to sell to a public that has a superficial understanding. So the Greens and the leftists and others would say well that's unreasonable, America wants to be unreasonable, they're trying to demand the Russians take two missiles out for every one," as an example.

That is the kind of complexity that you get into. And it is to the everlasting credit of President Reagan and Margaret Thatcher and Helmut Kohl, and many other world leaders who were on the hot seat at the time, that they were able to stick that through until the Soviets were able to come to that realization that the rhetoric and the blustering was not going to deter the West from this strategy. And to his everlasting credit, when Mikhail Gorbachev became the leader of the Soviet Union, he was practical, he understood where this was going. And he also understood that the Soviet Union couldn't sustain the guns and butter approach that it had been following because they couldn't keep up with western technology or investment, and their only road to security was to participate.

So the INF Treaty was signed and all the intermediate level forces that had been deployed on both sides were and are now removed. The Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty and its successor, the Start One and Start Two Treaties have gone through various stages, and the number of land based missiles has been dramatically removed. When President Bush took office, he took a very bold step to result in the destruction of chemical weapons so now both Soviet and NATO chemical weapons have been reduced to a very much smaller level than they had ever been, and are practically eliminated. I remember going to a conference out in Tooele, Utah, which is the research and storage facility, or one of them, and just being surrounded by these chemical weapons that were scheduled for destruction. And, you know, when you look at one of those things face to face and realize that it takes three seconds to kill someone with saran gas, and the potential for terrible devastation should they fall into the hands of terrorists, you really see how important it is that we do these things.

So, you know, you talk about things that are satisfying in a person's life, during the time that I was in the Arms Control Agency, all of these things were underway. And you know, I traveled to Geneva any number of times to participate in some of those discussions, and during that four and a half or five years that I was in the Arms Control Agency I'd usually take a tour to the Far East and speak with the Japanese and the Koreans, and down in Australia and New Zealand to coordinate these activities. And then I'd take a European tour and go through Italy and France and Great Britain and Germany and the Scandinavian countries to generate support in Europe. Generally I was the one that had to debate the Green Party and some of the leftists, which was kind of an interesting experience for a country boy, but it was very satisfying and all the more so because substantially those policies have worked, and they have resulted certainly in a much safer world than we might have envisioned fifteen, twenty years ago. And there's still more to do, but you know, a tremendous contribution to world stability in my opinion.

**AL:** And did you work ever with President Reagan (*unintelligible phrase*)?

**DE:** Oh yes, absolutely, oh absolutely.

**AL:** What were your impressions of him?

**DE:** Well, a very, very personable individual. You know, you always used to hear stories about how he was detached and would fall asleep at meetings and all that; that's garbage, absolute garbage. He was, however, one who picked people in whom he had faith. He would give them a philosophical outline of where he wanted to go, and he would expect that his appointees would get the job done. In other words, he didn't meddle in the day to day affairs.

Now, there are two models for a president, one model is the hands on, "I want to play with the mechanism" kind which was Jimmy Carter. Jimmy Carter loved to get into the mechanism and deal with all the intricacies, and of course no one person has enough time in the day to be familiar with all the intimate details of everything you have to deal with in defense, or arms control, or economics, or labor, or education, whatever, you just can't do it. The Reagan model worked pretty well although I think there were times when we felt that the interagency needed a bit more guidance to be frank about it. He knew what was going on and he was in charge, and he knew when something was getting off the philosophical track, but if I had a criticism of the Reagan administration, it might be that there were times when the interagency was allowed to thrash around a little bit more than it needed to. And there were times when I felt that if we had a little bit more direction and guidance, decisions might have been a little crisper. I don't think that affected foreign policy and defense much, but it certainly was an issue in economics and in some other areas. But that's another whole story, and I wasn't involved in those; I was involved in the arms control.

But specifically to answer your question, yes, when I was there there were times when I saw him a couple times a week for several years, particularly toward the end of the time that I was in the Arms Control Agency. Very often I would go to the situation room meetings on the director's behalf, and whenever he was out of the country I would go to the State Department morning briefings and be there with the secretary of state. And I would also go to the White House at sub-Cabinet level meetings and on a couple of occasions Cabinet level meetings with the president and the vice president and the senior appointees.

**AL:** That must have been a lot different experience, even from being in the House of Representatives.

**DE:** Yeah, entirely different, entirely different, and you know, it's obviously something that, as I say, not bad for a country boy, someone growing up in Rockland in modest circumstances and then finding himself a few years later, you know, involved with some of the most critical decisions that the free world makes. I mean, it was a, not a bad thing. From a personal satisfaction standpoint, though, I have to tell you in all candor that to do it over again and to choose it again I would go back to Congress every time, House or Senate, the difference being that in the administration you're a cog in the gear, you're part of the system, there's a food chain, there's a chain of command and that's well and good, it's necessary. But you don't have quite

the hands on satisfaction that you do as a member of Congress when you can point your finger to something and say, "I did that." It's much more difficult in the administration position to say, "Yes, this is my project, I did that, I'm responsible."

And of course that's life, that's real life, you, everything works best when it works together. And there's nothing wrong with that, it's just that for my own preferences I, nothing really is equal to the legislative experience, which I loved. I've always considered myself to be someone of a legislative temperament as opposed to an executive temperament. And, you know, there have been a number of times over my career where people wanted me to run for governor, "Why don't you run for governor?" Well, I don't want to be governor, never been an area of interest for me. I would be frustrated at it, and one of the reasons I've never considered it when I was a political candidate.

**AL:** Would you ever consider running for Congress again?

**DE:** I doubt it, I mean, been there, done that. My life's different now. I have a thirteen year old son, home in Tenant's Harbor. I have a consulting business, and I can go hunting or fishing or playing golf or whatever I want to do when I want to do it. And quite frankly, at fifty-one years old I think it would be a little difficult for me to shift those gears again and get back into the campaign mode and do all the very public things that I did when I was doing it.

The, you know, the other thing which is another whole subject, is that the nature of the process has changed. When I was running for office it was much more collegial. You'd find partisan Republicans and partisan Democrats, and it's not that they couldn't get into a tangle once in a while, but it was good natured. You go into a place, maybe union guys sitting around at a bar having a beer after work, you could go in and joke with them and needle each other and this sort of thing; it would all be very good natured. Now you go off on a main street someplace, and you go into a shop and you run into someone and, you know, if you're anti-abortion and he's pro-abortion, or vice versa, you're a bum. Or if he happens to be a Christian Coalition conservative and you've strayed from the line, then you're going to hell in a hand basket and get out of my shop. Or if you voted for a tax bill and someone thinks you should have voted against the tax bill, you're wrong and he's right. It's much more confrontational, and it's not a healthy thing.

Stan Tupper and I were talking about that the other day, that we've lost the ability to disagree on issues in a collegial fashion, and we're polarized. And it's not just liberal and moderate Republicans, it's Democrats and the right and left. Listen to the Democratic debates, as well as the Republican debates, or listen to people disagreeing over an issue of policy. And it's very destructive because no one's right all the time, and we work best when we work together. We've lost the ability to do that in any kind of a collegial sense, and I hope the pendulum will swing back. This is very bad for the country I think.

**AL:** I've seen that already in this, the campaign for president. In the debates you've seen them.

**DE:** I've watched every single one of them on both sides, and, I mean, I am not a fan of the Christian right, which is not to say that people don't have the right to take their own religious and moral views, and I respect that completely and share many of those views. But the idea that

it becomes injected into a campaign and two people who have identical voting records can be divided into good and bad, right or wrong, to me is a very chilling thought. You know, the whole Bob Jones University thing appalls me because we are pluralistic; there has to be room for a variety of views. We work best when we work together, and if we can't tolerate even minor differences in theology or personal outlook, how in hell are we going to be able to deal with major differences that we have to deal with from time to time? Now, that's another whole subject but one I feel very strongly about.

**AL:** In talking about George Mitchell a little bit, how would you illustrate your relationship with him?

**DE:** Well, it's complicated because, of course, we were adversaries in the Senate race. George is certainly one of the brightest and most able people who has been elected to office from Maine, very bright and very able. The thing that has always frustrated me about George is that he gets high marks for being bipartisan when in fact he's the most partisan Democrat that I've ever run across, and I guess the big frustration is that the press and the public have never caught on to that. Now, there's nothing wrong with that, there's nothing disrespectful or evil, but it's just frustrating for someone who's had to deal with it.

**AL:** How do you think he's managed that?

**DE:** Well that's a good question, I don't know, but I wish he could put it in a bottle and sell it to me, I could have used it. But, you know, you have to give George a lot of credit. He learned how to be a successful candidate - unfortunately he learned it at my expense - but when he ran for governor in 1974 he was very stiff and not very fluid and he really didn't make that good of an impression, which is the reason Longley was able to beat him, no one ever questioned his ability. But when he was appointed to the Senate, he knew that he was going to have to run a difficult race for reelection; it was either going to be against Olympia Snowe or against me. So he did something about it, he surrounded himself with some of the most capable advisors; and he polished his delivery; and he improved his presence; he learned how to tell jokes and engage in self deprecating humor; he put together a plan that was very carefully crafted to appeal to the electorate; and you know, like any good strategist will do in a military campaign or a baseball game, he went out and did it. So, you know, professionally I admire him, I mean he did, he did what he needed to do and ran a better campaign than I did. He also had a number of factors going in his favor, not the least of which was he ran, we ran that race after the first two years of the Reagan administration where all of the doubts were still in place and none of the good things had been accomplished. So, and it, it was there for everyone to see, I mean if I had thought about it- and I'll have to say Lord in heaven himself couldn't have deterred me from running that race- but if I had thought about it, and if I had taken the advice of some sage observers, I would have realized that that was going to be a very difficult time to run simply because of the great changes that were happening and the unrest over changes in tax policy, spending and disarmament, and all those things which really hadn't gelled yet. Having said that, it's something I really wanted to do, I wanted to run and I did run, and I can't conceive of any circumstance in which I would have done that differently.

And as I look back on it, they always, the question everyone always asks is, "Well, what could

you have done? Could you have won the race? Is there anything you could have done?" And I think honestly looking back on it I might have been able to change the numbers, but I don't think I could have changed the results. I think it was just something that was going to happen. Olympia and I had done some jockeying. I was senior in the delegation, senior Republican and congressman. She had been elected in '78, and I had served for eight, and she had four at the end of that term, so I think a lot of people had sort of decided that I should run and she should wait, which did not go down easily, but nevertheless that's the way it had come out. Now, had I decided to step aside and had she been the Republican candidate, I think in retrospect she might have been the stronger candidate, being a woman and being, you know, coming from the second district, that might have been more of an opportunity for her. Certainly I didn't think that at the time, and there again it may just have been a different set of numbers but the same result.

Could she have beaten him? I don't know, probably it would have been closer. I lost sixty-forty, she probably would have made it a closer race for those reasons, all of which were totally unacceptable to me at the time. But sometimes in the light of dispassionate review some years after the fact you look back and say well, it might have been better if you'd done this or that, which is great fun except that isn't the way it happened. So we just, well I've never regretted it, you don't like to lose, but never regret the experience. I still have friends that I run into all over the state, friends I made in that campaign, and George is a very able individual whether you agree with him or not, and there's no shame in losing a race to someone of that stature.

**AL:** On a state level, what do you think that Muskie's greatest contribution was to the state of Maine?

**DE:** Well, I think there are two things. As a Republican this one may go down hard, but he clearly deserves credit for opening up the political process. There were people who voted for him when he ran for governor and then for Senator who never voted for another Democrat in their entire lives. And he made it respectable to vote Democratic. As I say it goes down hard for a Republican, but no one has the right answers all the time. And certainly if it is true in southern states that a robust Republican party in a two-party system is good for Alabama, then you'd have to say that a robust two-party system is good for Maine. And I think generally speaking a balance, where there is real debate and where people have to think about issues and have to be responsible for what they say and do because there are political consequences if they don't, is a much healthier situation. And Ed will certainly be remembered for opening up that two party process and leading the way for others, and making the state a state in which real debate takes place. And certainly, if you spend any time in the legislature today, even though the Democrats have small majorities, it's a very lively place and there's room for great diversity of arguments and views, all of which serve the state well, although any of us can rail and rant over an particular decision that they may choose to make on a given day.

*End of Side A, Tape Two*
*Side B, Tape Two*

**AL:** Now on side B of tape two of interview with David Emery.

**DE:** The other issue, you asked what is his lasting contribution to the state, it's really a

national contribution, and I touched on it earlier, which is environmentalism. Of all the things that Ed is remembered for nationally, that is going to be it because he really led the way. People had been interested in environmental issues, but no one had really taken the bit in the teeth and had decided that it was important enough so that something was to be done. So he did, and it's a very detailed, complex, esoteric world when you get into talking about parts per million of sulphur dioxide, or the difference between something you can smell which may be harmless versus something you can either smell or taste which is potentially deadly. And he mastered a very complex subject. It was a complex subject where there was disagreement in the scientific community and a great deal of opposition in industry.

And he was successful for a number of reasons. One was his mastery of the subject and his parliamentary skill and being able to outmaneuver legislators who had contrary point of view; but he was also able to marshal support as a moral cause when you face rivers like the Cuyahoge River in Cleveland, it was actually a fire hazard, or the loss of wildlife habitat, or destruction of trout streams. I mean right here we have a picture of Ed bird hunting. And you know, he lived it, it was important to him because it was part of his life, hunting and fishing. And when he could see in his own beautiful state of Maine that there weren't as many fish or as many birds or as much habitat as there were when he was youngster, I think he was moved to ask what could be done about it. So that was not only a contribution to Maine, but a contribution nationally, and to his credit the issue now is not whether or not we ought to do something about clean air and water, but now the issue is over the degree of regulation. So you might argue about the degree, but no one argues about the fact any more, so he moved the playing field which is even more important than moving the ball.

**AL:** Are their any individuals or issues that I haven't thought to ask about that you feel are important to talk about in terms of your career or Maine history or Senator Muskie?

**DE:** Well I'm sure some things will come to mind, but right now I think we've covered a lot of territory and if there are, you know if something else comes to mind that you would like to ask or something that I might think up, I certainly don't mind doing this again at some point.

**AL:** Okay, great, and thank you so much.

**DE:** It's been fun.

*End of Interview*