7-16-1999

Jacobs, Charlie oral history interview

Mike Richard

Interview with Charlie Jacobs by Mike Richard

Summary Sheet and Transcript

Interviewee
Jacobs, Charlie

Interviewer
Richard, Mike

Date
July 16, 1999

Place
Lewiston, Maine

ID Number
MOH 117

Biographical Note

Charles "Charlie" Jacobs was born on May 10, 1948 in St. Stephen, New Brunswick. His parents, Isabelle and Stephen Jacobs, were both teachers. He lived mainly in Buxton, Maine until the age of ten, and then his family moved to Bethel, Maine. There, he graduated from Gould Academy. He then went on to the University of Maine at Orono, graduating in 1971. At Orono, Jacobs became politically active, joining the student government, and supporting Eugene McCarthy in 1968. After graduation, he went to work in Augusta in Governor Ken Curtis' office. He then ran for the Governor's Council, and served on that until it was abolished in 1976. He then worked on Ed Muskie's 1976 Senate campaign, and became a Washington staffer shortly after that. He stayed in Washington until 1979, when he moved to the Lewiston, Maine Senate office. When George Mitchell assumed Muskie's seat, Johnson returned to Washington, where he remained until early 1984. He then went to work for the Public Utilities Commission, staying there for eleven years. At the time of the interview, he was deputy commissioner of administrative and financial services in the Angus King administration.

Scope and Content Note

Interview includes discussions of: living in various small Maine towns; McCarthy campaign; political scene at the University of Maine, Orono 1968-1971; organizing for McCarthy in Maine;

Bobby Kennedy; 1968 Maine Democratic Convention; war demonstrations at UMO; career history; leaving law school; Elmer Violette's campaign; working for Ken Curtis; Curtis staff; transition to the Governor's Council; James Longley; Curtis' relationship with the Republican house; driving Muskie in the 1976 campaign; Muskie's temper; contrast between Augusta and Washington; Major Senate debates; Muskie's treatment of the minority party; Muskie's non-partisanship; Madeleine Albright; Gayle Cory; press reports surrounding the possible 1976 Vice Presidential nomination; Muskie's move to Secretary of State; Johnson's family; transition to the Mitchell office; working at the PUC; energy crises in the1980s; change in the Maine legislature from the 1970s; working in the Angus King administration; and his wife's role in politics.

Indexed Names

Albright, Madeleine Korbel
Aube, Mike
Bellmon, Henry
Bradford, Peter
Carter, Jimmy, 1924-
Case, Jim
Cohen, William S.
Cory, Gayle
Curtis, Kenneth M., 1931-
Dyer, Linda Smith
Hart, Philip A. (Philip Aloysius), 1912-1976
Hathaway, Bill
Hughes, Dick
Humphrey, Hubert H. (Hubert Horatio), 1911-1978
Jacobs, Charlie
Jacobs, Isabelle Ansel
Jacobs, Larry
Jacobs, Richard
Jacobs, Stephen
Jalbert, Louis
Johnson, David
Johnson, Lyndon B. (Lyndon Baines), 1908-1973
Jordan- Hillier, Ginger
Kennedy, Edward Moore, 1932-
Kennedy, John F. (John Fitzgerald), 1917-1963
Kennedy, Robert F., 1925-1968
King, Angus
Lipez, Kermit
Longley, James, Sr.
MacDonald, Clyde, Jr.
MacLeod, Ken
Martin, John
McAleney, Mary

McCarthy, Eugene J., 1916-2005
McMahon, Dick
Merrill, Phil
Mitchell, George J. (George John), 1933-
Murray, Frank
Muskie, Edmund S., 1914-1996
Muskie, Jane Gray
Nelson, Gaylord, 1916-2005
Nixon, Richard M. (Richard Milhous), 1913-1994
Pease, Allen
Pease, Violet “Vi”
Reed, Thomas "Boss"
Rolde, Neil
Smith, Margaret Chase, 1897-1995
Violette, Elmer
Wilfong, James

Transcript

Mike Richard: The date is July 16th, 1999, we’re here in the Muskie Archives at Bates College with Charles Jacobs. Interviewing is Mike Richard. And, could you give me your full name and spell it, please?

Charles Jacobs: Charles Jacobs, J-A-C-O-B-S.

MR: And what was your date of birth, Mr. Jacobs?

CJ: May 10th, 1948.

MR: And where were you born?

CJ: St. Stephens, New Brunswick, Canada.

MR: Did you live there for much of your life, or did you . . .?

CJ: No, about a week. My parents lived in Calais, Maine, at the time, and at that time I guess most of the people went to the hospital in St. Stephens to have their children. So it was common practice to go across the border. That’s when, I’m an American citizen; actually I’m technically the son of an American citizen born abroad.

MR: So you lived in Calais for most of your childhood?

CJ: No, we lived there briefly and then moved to Lisbon Falls for about a year, and then we lived in Buxton for eight years, Bethel for eight years. And then my parents moved to Dexter, which is where they live now.

MR: And where did you end up having education?

CJ: I went to grade school in Buxton, and, partially in Buxton. And then when I was ten, we moved to Bethel, and I finished grade school there. I went to Gould Academy in Bethel.

MR: And, actually, tell me a little bit about your family life and background, what your parents' full names were to start with?

CJ: Stephen Jacobs and Isabelle Ansel Jacobs. My father is a native of Hingham, Massachusetts, my mother was a native of Dexter. I have two older brothers. What else can I . . .?

MR: What were your parents' occupations?

CJ: When I was very young my father was a forester. He subsequently got into teaching and so did my mother. So for most of my life until they retired they have been teachers.

MR: Where have they taught, or what level have they taught?

CJ: My mother taught at high school in Bryant Pond and Dexter. My father taught at Gould, well first in Buxton at the high school, and then at Gould Academy and at the high, which is a high school, and then in Dexter at the high school. My father taught physics, and my mother taught English and French.

MR: And you said you were the youngest of three boys?

CJ: Yes.

MR: What was that like growing up?

CJ: Oh, it was sort of typical; we had a sort of a typical rural Maine middle class upbringing. My brothers would go through stages before I did so I would occasionally irritate them because as I suspect most younger brothers do.

MR: Oh, I'm one myself, so I know what it's like.

CJ: So, it was sort of a, I would call it a very typical sort of, you know, rural Maine setting.

MR: So, between the different times that you moved around, well you moved around a lot in your childhood relatively speaking, but were there any real changes or was it pretty much rural Maine? Was rural Maine as far as you can remember?

CJ: The two places that I really spent most of my childhood that I recall is Buxton and Bethel, and I'd only moved. I don't recall the moved from Buxton to Bethel to be particularly traumatic or anything; it was one small town to another small town. In Bethel we lived in a farm three miles out of town. And Buxton we lived in the small village of Groveville which was in those

days very small, it was sort of a sleepy little rural town. So it really, I would say my childhood was really rural Maine.

MR: And you said you went to high school in Bethel?

CJ: Yes, Bethel. Since my father taught at Gould Academy and it was then the, in addition to being a private school, it was the local high school in those days, so we went there.

MR: And what were your experiences there like? What activities were you involved in or what studies interested you?

CJ: I was active in football, basketball, so I was fairly active in athletics in high school. I don't think I was interested by any particular academic area. I was, I think, a fairly good student; I graduated tenth in my class I think. Gould Academy then was a very sort of traditional, conservative, fairly difficult private school, and it was. We did some theater things, we did mu-, I was in the band, in the chorus, and we had a fully equipped theater at the school so we got quite involved in plays and musicals and so on.

MR: What did you play in the band?

CJ: Baritone horn.

MR: Oh really? That's what I play. I'm not very good but that's what I try. And actually skipping back to your parents again, what were their, as far as you could tell, their political attitudes or beliefs?

CJ: Well it changed. They voted for President Nixon in 1960, so I have a vague recollection of that. It seemed as they, from that point forward as they grew older they grew more liberal and more Democratic. I'm not sure why that is, it just seems that way, so that it's sort of ironic now that in some ways I think they're more Democratic and more liberal than I am now. And I, if anything, have become maybe slightly more conservative than I was in my younger years, so it seems like sort of an odd transformation. Maybe it's common, I don't know, but it seems like an odd transformation that they, like I said, they now are probably more active in Democratic politics and more likely to vote Democratic than I am.

MR: Would you have considered yourself more relatively liberal when you were in high school, or kind of average (*unintelligible word*) moderate?

CJ: I think I was totally apolitical in high school. I don't remember any real consciousness of political things or activities. There were no political clubs on campus, there was no discussion about it. So I think until I got well into college I was sort of totally apolitical.

MR: And where did you attend college?

CJ: University of Maine at Orono.

MR: And what were your experiences there and any extracurricular activities?

CJ: I started out in, playing in the University of Maine concert band for two years, and that was, I think, my only extracurricular activity. In my junior and senior years, I was active in student government. And that was the time when, of the anti-war protests. And so I was active in the, through the student government, active in the anti-war movement and other kinds of things on campus.

MR: Were you in college during, no, that must have been after. Were you in college during the '68 Democratic National Convention in Chicago and those issues between Eugene McCarthy and (*unintelligible phrase*)?

CJ: The first political thing I ever did was, began, was to work on Senator McCarthy's presidential campaign. That's really what got me into politics was that campaign, and, so yes, I was aware. That's when I, it's that year and that election that really brought me into the political process.

MR: And what year did you graduate college?

CJ: January of '71.

MR: What was your major?

CJ: History, European history.

MR: And were there any faculty members or other students that influenced you in some way in deciding this, or just in the course of your classes, or?

CJ: I can't think of any professor that was . . . There were certainly professors who were also active politically at that time both in the Democratic Party and in the anti-war movement. So to some degree I'm sure that they influenced my decision, but I think it was really the war that got me involved in politics and steered me toward the Democratic Party.

MR: So like you said, before (*unintelligible word*) the war, you really weren't interested in politics any more than the next person.

CJ: No, no.

MR: Okay. And how did you first come into contact with Eugene McCarthy's campaign?

CJ: I think it was when he came to speak on campus at some point in that campaign. It must have been, you know, the winter or early spring of '68. And I think that's when, I think his visit to campus was what, what got me involved.

MR: So you were immediately pretty impressed with him personally?

CJ: Well, actually I, as we got involved in the campaign and the effort to get McCarthy delegates elected to the National Convention. I mean, even in the early days I was never particularly convinced he would have made a good president; he always seemed kind of aloof to me and not, not have the kind of, I can't think of the right word, political skills that it would take to govern the country. So I didn't work for him because I thought he would he would be a particularly great president; I wasn't even sure he'd be a good president. But he was the one who at the time was, that was the way to work against the war in my view. That was the most effective way to oppose the war was to support McCarthy.

MR: And how did you and your supporters in the McCarthy campaign, how did you perceive the Humphrey-Muskie ticket, and Humphrey and Muskie themselves?

CJ: I think, at least my thinking was sort of dominated by the war at that time. And I had, I think I had a fairly negative, I guess I would say real negative, somewhat negative views about Humphrey on the war because at that time. Before he began to distance himself from Johnson, I didn't view him as someone who would end the war. And I, although I didn't have any particular views, negative views about Muskie, I didn't view Muskie as a . . . . And I guess I viewed him in the same light, not really negatively but not as someone who would be likely to end the war.

MR: Did you ever consider any of the Republican candidates as useful candidates against the war?

CJ: No, I don't recall ever even that ever even crossing the radar screen at the time.

MR: And what did you think of Kennedy, this is going back even before Johnson's time, but compared to Johnson and Humphrey (*unintelligible phrase*)?

CJ: Bobby Kennedy?

MR: Actually, yeah, let's talk about Bobby Kennedy.

CJ: I sort of viewed him in a fairly negative way at that time, sort of as the Johnny-come-lately to the anti-war effort. You know that McCarthy was out there first, you know, running, opposing the war. And that Kennedy seemed to me to be sort of just, you know, jumping on the band wagon.

MR: And in this, it was in '68 obviously you were active with Eugene McCarthy's campaign. What type of role did you have in the campaign?

CJ: I guess I, foot soldier. You know, I was, there was, I can't remember the guy's name but he was a French professor at Orono who was leading the state McCarthy effort, and we were sort of doing what we needed to do. I mean, we were very naive at the time. You know we, at least I was, and I'm sure some of the others were, you know, in terms of electing McCarthy delegates to the National Convention we obviously never had a chance. You know, with Muskie on the ticket with Humphrey there was zero chance we'd ever get any McCarthy delegates from Maine.

But I think we were a little naive, we were a little, more than a little naive about that possibility. And I didn't have a clue about how the delegates were elected in those days. So it was, I was very much a sort of naive foot soldier in that campaign.

MR: So it was basically type of put up posters, spread the word about McCarthy type of deal?

CJ: Yeah, and I remember at the state convention I was manning phones, answering phones and things like that. I really wasn't in any of the, you know, the strategy sessions or anything like that.

MR: Do you have any recollections about what the atmosphere at the state convention was like, or were you pretty much absorbed in . . .?

CJ: I think it reflected, I think it was a particularly, how do I put this? It was a, it reflected the divisions in the Democratic Party over the war. And that, and because of a conflict between them, and I don't remember the details, there was some conflict between Hathaway and Muskie as I recall, it was, that sort of came out on the floor, which was sort of unpleasant. So it was a contentious convention by Maine standards. Not by probably any other state's standards, but.

MR: And were you involved in other state and local politics, or was this, at this time when you were in college?

CJ: Not at that time. In fact I remember thinking at that time that local politics was a little boring. And, you know, because I was there for a specific purpose which was to oppose the war, at that point it seemed to me that local politics were sort of not relevant. After that, later on in the early '70s I became fairly active in local Democratic politics, but just not in '68 or '69.

MR: And at the University of Maine, what was the main ideas among the students on campus? Was there a large anti-war movement at that time, was it (*unintelligible phrase*)?

CJ: It '6-, actually I think it began earlier in '66 or so, there was a small group of SDS on campus who opposed the war. And I remember that they were doing things like demonstrating, you know, '66 and '67. But '68, that really, the anti-war movement blossomed and became much more, much larger and much more widespread; meaning that not just a small group of SDS types but more sort of moderate student government types like myself. And that continued through, you know, in '69 and '70. And I think more and more students became anti-war. So that what started out as a small anti-war movement became fairly, quite large, very large by the, by 1970. My guess is by '70 that a majority, a significant majority of the students were opposed to the war.

MR: And were you involved in the college student government at all?

CJ: Yes, I was, let me think. In, it would have been the '69-'70 school year I was assistant to the president of the student government. So I was actively involved in all of the student government activities during that year.

MR: And do you have any recollections about what that experience was like?

CJ: The, it was again sort of in part dominated by the war. And the student government took on the role of sort of the moderate anti-war faction, the SDS being more, by Maine terms, more militant. The student government was sort of the more moderate anti-war element. And, for example, there was an event known as the chicken crisis where the SDS brought three chick-, I think it was three chickens into the student union and had signs around the chickens' necks with Humphrey and Nixon and whatever. And the then dean of students overreacted and called the police and, the campus police, and had them evicted. And this created a huge uproar on campus and the student government sort of moved in and tried to, was sort of the moderating force and tried to put it, get a constructive result out of it; which in their minds was getting rid of the dean of students, which is what ultimately happened.

MR: Did that happen soon after the chicken crisis thing?

CJ: Well, it happened over a period of a year or so after that.

MR: And, actually also moving again to the communities that you lived in when you were a child through your college period, do you have any recollections about what the political attitudes, dominant political attitudes were, even registrations, Republican or Democrat?

CJ: I'm sure the towns I lived in, primarily Buxton and Bethel, were heavily Republican. I mean, they're still, at least Bethel still is, I suspect. But I didn't have any, it didn't even register on, with me at the time. I remember going to a town meeting once when I was in high school. That's about as close as I came to getting involved in anything.

MR: And I don't remember if you mentioned this actually, but what were your parents' registrations?

CJ: At that, in my early years they were registered Republicans. They're now registered Democrats.

MR: And your two older brothers, were they ever politically active, or what did they go on to do?

CJ: My older brother works for an independent state agency in California. And my middle brother is a retired teacher in Dexter. They, I think they're both Democrats. My middle brother might be a Republican, I guess I'm not really sure. But they were never or and aren't now particularly active politically.

MR: And what are their names?

CJ: My older brother is Richard and the middle one is Laurence, Larry.

MR: And also, what were your parents' religious beliefs? Were they, did they have strong beliefs religiously?

CJ: I would, they're sort of Congregationalist Universalist types; they're not heavily religious. They generally go to church on Sundays, but it's, the more, you know, has always been the most liberal denominations, Protestant denominations.

MR: Okay, well I guess moving back to after your college years in 1971, you said you started becoming more involved in state politics at that point?

CJ: Yeah, I graduated in January of '71. I went an extra semester because I was finagling to avoid the draft and get into the National Guards, so that's the reason for the extra semester. Normally I would have graduated in the spring of '70. Let me think now, so I graduated in January '71. I worked on, I had to go to basic training so that took the rest of that spring and summer. And '71-'72 I went and spent a year in law school, decided I didn't like law school so didn't go back. The following year, the fall of '72, I worked on Elmer Violette's campaign, he was the Democrat running against Bill Cohen for Congress, it was Cohen's first run for Congress. And after that I applied for a job in the governor's office and I went to work. Got it and worked for Governor Curtis for two years, '73 and '74 which were the last two years of his administration.

Then I ran for the executive council, which was a, it does not exist now, but it was a body of seven people elected by the legislature, and we confirmed all the governor's appointments and approved financial orders and granted pardon, with the governor, granted pardons and commutations. So it was sort of a relic of the colonial days. And so I served on the executive council for two years, '75 and '76; that was the first two years of Governor Longley's administration. And those, particularly the first six months in there were fairly contentious. Then in '76, while I was a member of the council, I worked on Senator Muskie's '76 election campaign. Then went to work for him in Washington; I'll just keep going if you want.

MR: Oh yeah, that's great, yeah.

CJ: And worked on Senator Muskie's election campaign, then went to work for him in Washington as a legislative assistant in January of '77. Stayed there for two years, came back up here, worked for him up here in one of his offices, in the Lewiston office actually, for '79 and '80. Muskie was appointed Secretary of State, George Mitchell took over. And George asked me to come back to Washington. So I went back to Washington through '83, through the '82 election, and into '83 and early '84. Then decided I wanted to come back to Maine and sort of get out of the active political, you know, working for a politician kind of work. So I went to work for the PUC for eleven years and took the job I now have with Governor King.

MR: And what do you do with Governor King currently?

CJ: I'm the deputy commissioner of administrative and financial services. We have responsibility for all of the central functions of state government: budget, taxation, human resources, all those central functions. So I get exposed to a wide array of operational activities relating to state government. Labor negotiations, negotiations over health contracts for state employees, sale of properties, renovation of state buildings, those kinds of things.

MR: Okay, well I guess we'll backtrack to, you said in '71 you went to law school for just one year?

CJ: Right.

MR: And what did you attend?

CJ: University of Maine Law School.

MR: And was there something specific about it that you didn't like, or you just kind of in general law didn't interest you?

CJ: I have never been a, I never liked school particularly. And so I got into law school and having never liked school, I really didn't like law school and decided I didn't really want to be a lawyer. I think I'd made, I think I applied just because it seemed like a good thing to do at the time, not because of any huge interest in law. So after a year I just said I don't want to do this. And I be - subsequent to that I began working on my masters in public administration and ended up getting my masters quite a few years after that, so.

MR: Was that also at U-Maine that you got your masters?

CJ: Yes, at Orono, yeah.

MR: And what years did you get, or what year did you get your masters?

CJ: Eighty-six, I think I took longer to get my masters than probably anybody in history. When I was in Washington, those years, I didn't work on it. So, when I came back in '83 and '84, I went back to work and got it.

MR: And, so there was no one, there was no one who was really encouraging you externally to go into law at the time that you went into law school, just kind of a personal . . . ?

CJ: It just seemed like a good idea at the time.

MR: And how did you get involved with Elmer Violette and his campaign?

CJ: I'm not sure I remember. It must have been partly because I needed to work, which was, you know, since I wasn't going back to school I needed to find a job and that opportunity came along and so I took it. I don't think I knew Elmer before except I'm sure I knew him to say hello to or something, but I didn't really know Elmer. It wasn't out of, you know, a personal commitment to Elmer that preceded the campaign. It was sort of an opportunity that was there. And during the campaign I became very fond of Elmer and have known him as a good friend ever since, but that wasn't the reason for taking the job.

MR: So the job was just advertised, or someone (*unintelligible phrase*)?

CJ: No, for those kinds of political jobs you don't usually advertise. I, you know, heard about it, heard that they were looking for someone through the usual political word of mouth. And worked with, Frank Murray was the campaign director who was then a state legislator. So I worked with Frank, you know, during that campaign.

MR: And what were, at this time, just after graduating college, what were some of the political connections that you had, through which you could hear about these positions?

CJ: I mean, Maine is a very small state so it doesn't take very long to get to know people. And particularly then, I think it's still probably true today, it doesn't take very long to get to know people once you get active and start doing things and volunteering to work. In Curtis' 1970 election I was, myself and a lot of other kids, students up in Orono, got involved in the campaign. We leafleted the City of Bangor, and so, you know, probably starting with that I began to become, you know, began to know people that were involved in politics, Democratic politics.

MR: And what exactly was your role in this campaign, in the Violette campaign?

CJ: I guess I did a little bit of everything. I drove the, I drove Elmer around, you know, in his campaign schedule some. I did everything from putting up, you know, posters and leafleteering to working with volunteers. All of the sort of, you know, trench work in a congressional campaign.

MR: And who else did you work with on the campaign, other than Violette of course?

CJ: Well, Frank Murray was the direc - campaign director. John Martin was the finance director. I guess those were two of the primary people.

MR: Was it a pretty friendly, efficient group as far as you remember?

CJ: Oh yes, I think we had a, you know, out of that Frank and I became sort of life long friends. But yeah, it was a very congenial group to work with.

MR: And what was Elmer like to work with and as a candidate?

CJ: He was sort of like, I mean I, since then of course after that I worked with a lot of political figures, so that I guess he was similar in a lot of ways. He, Elmer was and is a person of very, I don't know, what's the word I want, he has a very, I can't think of the right word. I guess he's a, it's almost idealistic liberal Democrat, in other words, he views government as a way to do good things. And that, he had served in the State Senate, and saw the Congress I think as . . . And he had run against Margaret Chase Smith in '66. So he, I think, he saw the Congress as a natural step for him to move up and do more. I mean he was a, he was and is a very committed, liberal Democrat, traditional liberal Democrat committed to public service kind of person; very high integrity, very intelligent. And he went on to become a member of the Supreme Court, the State Supreme Court.

MR: And would you say that your political attitudes were pretty similar to his at the time that you were helping in the campaign?

CJ: Yes.

MR: So there were no big issues that you had, personally or anything like that?

CJ: No.

MR: Okay, and after the Violette campaign, you said you started work with Ken Curtis, is that the next thing?

CJ: Yes.

MR: And how did you, was it kind of the same way that you heard about this position as before, or was it a special connection that you heard about?

CJ: I can't remember how I heard about it, but I just, someone left his office, I think it was Kermit Lipez who left his staff; it was either Kermit Lipez or Neil Rolde. I think it must have been Kermit who left his staff. Kermit later went on to, is now a federal judge on the court of appeals in Boston. And I heard about it, I obviously heard about it, I don't remember how; I'm sure it was word of mouth. And sent in a resume. It wasn't the kind of, those kind of jobs are never advertised, it's, you just hear about them, and interviewed for the job and ended up getting it.

MR: And what was Ken Curtis like to work with as a governor?

CJ: In some ways he was, he's probably the most likeable person, political figure I've ever worked with in terms of his just general personality. He's just one of, plain, the nicest people I've ever encountered, and it's so rare to see that in politics. You know, his, like everyone has an ego but not the kind of ego that you often see in elected figures. He was exceedingly pleasant to work with.

MR: And did you become very close with him personally, or was it kind of a professional relationship all the way through?

CJ: While I was there I would say it was professional. I mean it was certainly friendly, but you know, we never socialized. And he was at that, he was quite a lot older than I was of course, and I certainly wouldn't consider myself then or now as a close personal friend. But it was a friendly relationship and in subsequent years I would, on occasion, call him up just to shoot the breeze and, or seek his opinion or whatever.

MR: And the staff, how large was the staff that he was working with?

CJ: It was smaller than most governors have now. There were, must have been ten or twelve of

us all together, including secretarial help and so on.

MR: And were you more of a junior member of the staff (*unintelligible phrase*)?

CJ: I was definitely at that stage the junior member of the staff.

MR: Were the other staff members pretty helpful in getting you involved in the new process and kind of getting you acclimated to state politics?

CJ: Yeah, they, when Eric Stauffer was the governor's counsel, Willis Johnson was the press secretary, and Allen Pease was the administrative assistant who had been with Curtis since he was first elected. Yeah, they were exceedingly pleasant people to work with.

MR: And, what was I going to say? Oh yes, how did working in state government, how was that a new experience for you? I mean, were there things that were really, that you didn't expect to find at this level, from before your experiences with, you know, working with Violette's campaign and being politically active in college?

CJ: I really didn't have a clue what I was getting involved in. It seemed like I never planned any of this in advance, I just sort of, things came along, and I took, you know, took the opportunities. So I didn't really have a clue of what I was getting involved in until I did it. It turned out to be a, I would say one of the two best jobs, two or three best jobs I've ever had. Being in the executive branch is just inherently more interesting I think than the legislative branch because you can initiate things. In the legislative branch you're almost always reacting to events and initiatives as opposed to initiating them. It's more action oriented, and I think I saw that very early when I worked for Governor Curtis. You're sort of in the middle of things, you're kind of initiating things, you're in the middle of what's going on. So I thought it was a very exciting job to be in, even in my junior role.

MR: And what was your role in the office?

CJ: We were, each of us were assigned certain departments to work with to deal with problems and so on, and I think I had DHS, that being the Department of Human Services. I can't, honestly don't remember what the other ones were. But we were assigned different agencies to handle issues as they came up, respond to, for the gov-, write letters for the governor in those areas if somebody was complaining about. In my case about, some doctor was complaining because they hadn't received their Medicaid reimbursement, then I would respond to the letter, and if there was a problem to be looked in I would work with the commissioner of that department to try and resolve it. So it was fairly standard staff work.

MR: And did you come into contact or witness any correspondence between Governor Curtis and some of the politicians at the state level, or any . . .?

CJ: No, I think, I don't remember any. As the junior staff person I wouldn't have been in on the more high level political discussions at that stage.

MR: And what was the transition to Governor Longley's executive council like? How did that first come about, first of all?

CJ: Well, it, I was sitting in Allen Pease's kitchen when, at that time he lived in a staff house behind the Blaine House, and I was over with Allen and his wife one day after work towards the end of the administration. And Allen's wife Vi said she was going to run for the executive council, and I just, without giving it any thought whatsoever, said, "I think I will too." And because I had worked for the legislature as part of my duties for Governor Curtis, I knew most of the Democratic, I knew all of the Democratic legislators and figured I might have a shot at getting their support because the council was elected by the majority party. So the, so I was elected by the Democratic, actually technically I was elected by thirteen legisla-, Democratic legislators in Penobscot and Piscataquis counties because the council had seven districts and I represented, I ran for the, because I lived in Dexter I ran for the council seat in Penobscot and Piscataquis County. And I was, so I was nominated by the Democratic representatives and senators from that area, those two counties, which I think were thirteen at the time, and I won, There were several other candidates, and I won on the fourth ballot, I think. Actually I beat Clyde MacDonald, who also ended up working for Senator Muskie.

The first few months, particularly the first six months of that two year term were very contentious because Governor Longley was coming in who was, what's the word, anxious to make his mark on the world as every new governor is. And we were there in his view being partisan and, and obstructionist. We voted down several of his appointees for commissioner and other positions. And we, for the first time we held public hearings on nominees. That had never happened before, everything had been done behind closed doors, and we decided to have public hearings on gubernatorial nominees, and he resented that greatly. So it was six months of very visible political skirmishing between not just the council and the governor, but the legislature and the governor. I think the governor vetoed that first session thirty bills or something, (*unintelligible phrase*). And it was a, there was a very tumultuous political time, actually kind of exciting.

MR: Did you personally have any confrontations with Governor Longley, or was it kind of him versus the executive council in general?

CJ: No, I actually had a, I think you could say personal, I mean I never sort of viewed it as a personal thing, but he did. And I think he viewed me as sort of a key person on the council who was opposing. At one point he wrote a letter to the chairman asking that I, saying that I should resign because I was so prejudiced against the governor. So I, it was, I think there was, if you viewed it just from reading the papers you'd say that he and I were at odds. Directly I mean, not just as a member of the council.

MR: And was he pretty much at odds with every member of the council, all seven members?

CJ: Not in the same degree. I mean, I've always, obviously if we turned down a nominee that was, the majority on the council would have to vote to, vote down the nominees. So I think he, to some degree or other, he viewed all of us as political enemies. I think he viewed some of the members of the council as less enemies than myself.

MR: And what reasons did you have for voting down his nominations?

CJ: The, at the time, and I still think that's the case, I think we, we didn't do it for political reasons just to obstruct the governor. I think he made some poor appointments, and we were there to, you know, to say no.

MR: So, personally obviously your relationship with Governor Longley was much more strained than it was with Curtis, I mean very different relationships.

CJ: Oh, night and day, yeah. I mean, it was a different position too. I mean I, in, with Longley I had a constitutional role to play, to give, you know, approval or disapproval to his nominations. And with Curtis, I worked for Curtis, and it was a very different relationship, and they were very different people. In other words, Curtis in my opinion, and I think most people would agree, was probably one of the two or three most effective governors in modern times, and nobody would say that of, no objective person would say that of Governor Longley.

MR: And you mentioned that even during your time with Curtis you had a lot of correspondence with the legislature, with the state legislature.

CJ: Yeah I did, I was, as did all of his staff. We did legislative work, I mean, we worked with the legislature to oppose or support bills and so on.

MR: And what was the atmosphere in the legislation like and, the legislature I should say? Did you get to know any particular legislators well or, what was the partisan situation like?

CJ: It was, both house were rep-, when I worked for Curtis both houses were Republican. Curtis was in his second term and he had had a, particularly early in his first term the Republicans had really taken off after Curtis. There was a lot of direct political assaults on the governor in his first term, as is often the case.

The second term was much calmer politically and particularly the last two years. So the Republicans in those last two years, the rep-, particularly the Republican leadership was really, had a very, pretty, what I would call a pretty good warm relationship with the governor, so it wasn't like there were, you know, political wars during those two years. You know, it was a, well I would call it pretty productive, you know, working relationship with the Republican legislature.

MR: And do you remember any certain legislators that you particularly worked closely with, or that really stood out at some point?

CJ: Of course John Martin was then the house minority leader, so I worked closely with John. On the Republican side, the president of the senate, Ken McCleod. And, at least in my case to a lesser degree, Dick Hughes who was the Republican speaker of the house. Those are the ones that stand, that come to mind right off.

MR: Do you remember anything about, I'm thinking about Louis Jalbert at that time, he was still active in the house I believe?

CJ: Yeah, he was on the appropriations committee. I didn't, in my role then I didn't have anything to do with the budget side of things. So I didn't really get, I didn't deal with the appropriations committee in my role and therefore didn't really, at that time in my career, didn't deal with Louis particularly. I remember there was one, I mean I knew who he was and had, you know, some contact with him but not a lot.

MR: Okay, and how did your relationship with the legislature change when you moved into the Longley position, the executive council position?

CJ: The council traditionally was sort of in session whenever the legislature was in session, meaning that we'd literally sit in the council chambers and not do much of anything when the legislature was in session. So during the, that would have been in the regular session of '75, I was there at the legislature virtually every day. And John Martin had become speaker, so I worked very closely with him on various issues. Particularly, we were supporting a bill to abolish the council because the Democrats had always advocated abolishing the council. And we decided that once we controlled the council we shouldn't change our tune, so we actively supported abolishing it, which we did. So I was around, you know, working with John and other Democratic legislators on various issues throughout that period.

MR: Actually, I'm going to stop and flip the tape right here.

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

MR: This is the second side of the first tape of the interview with Charles Jacobs on July 16th, 1999. And we were just talking about, on the other side, your time in the executive council in the late '70s with Governor Longley. And you mentioned that you voted to abolish the council, or you were a supporter of abolishing the council.

CJ: Yeah, obviously I couldn't vote because I wasn't in the legislature. But we, the council, passed sort of a resolution early on supporting its own abolition. And then I worked during, throughout that first session, to get legislation passed to abolish the council. Actually helping to draft the legislation and convince the legislature to pass it, which was fairly difficult. Even though the Democrats were sort of committed to it, there were some who began to get cold feet at the, towards the end and decided they might want to keep it. In the end, we managed to get two-thirds in both houses to abolish it.

The real issue was the role of confirmation of gubernatorial appointments. The issue was the Senate, both the House and the Senate wanted a role in that; and it was very complicated to try and figure out a way to give both the House and the Senate a role. In Washington only the Senate has advice and consent on presidential appointees, and figuring out a way to do that, to get them both involved in it, was difficult. I think there were five committees of conference on that bill. And in the end the system they set up was to, it would take, in order to approve a

gubernatorial appointment, it would take an affirmative vote of the committee.

Here in Maine we have joint House-Senate committees. There is ten house members and three senators on each committee. So it would take a majority vote of the committee to approve a nominee. And since the committees were obviously, you know, controlled by the House, the way they gave the Senate a role was to say that two-thirds of the Senate could overturn a vote of the committee. So if a committee voted to approve a nominee, the Senate, it then goes to the Senate and the Senate by a two-thirds vote can overrule the action of the committee. So that was the compromise that still exists today.

MR: And you mentioned that the first five or six months of your time in the council were the most tumultuous and controversial. How did, what were some of the reasons that it settled down maybe a little bit after that, was it just kind of the breaking in period of a new governor that caused that?

CJ: I think with any new governor there's a period- governors come to office, whoever they are, I think, and are not used to, don't really expect that somebody can say no to them. And it gets, I think with anybody it's frustrating to deal with. I think Longley partly because of his private sector background and probably because of his personal nature, I think with him it was more of an intense adjustment than with most people. So I think what happened is that after the first session, I think he began to acknowledge that the legislature and the council could say no to him and he seemed to become less, less argumentative or less anxious about that.

MR: And so after your time in the council, that ended in '76, you left the council?

CJ: Actually it was January of '77.

MR: Actually, was that the time the council was abolished or was? It was.

CJ: Yeah, I was a member of the last council.

MR: And, so you moved immediately, or almost immediately to the Muskie staff then?

CJ: Yeah, I literally, the council was abolished one day, and I was on my way to Washington the next.

MR: And what made you decide to join up with the Muskie staff?

CJ: It was sort of like my same decision to join Curtis' staff, the opportunity came along and I took it. I never really sorted out or planned it; it just sort of came along and I did it.

MR: And you mentioned from before you preferred McCarthy at least, Eugene McCarthy over Muskie in the '68 election, or nomination. Was that, did you have any qualms about working with Muskie due to his Vietnam views in the past, or was it just kind of another job?

CJ: No, it was, since I worked with, on the '76 reelection campaign I worked with Muskie, for

him I should say. And the, I think the sort of the '68 anti-war thing had sort of long gone. I don't know as I, I don't ever recall him, I don't recall ever even thinking about that when I went to work for Muskie on the campaign. You know that, should I work for someone who wasn't where I was on the war in '68; I don't think that ever crossed my mind. I was, at the time I went to work for him on the campaign and later on his staff, you know, on his Senate staff, I don't think I ever had any feeling other than that I was completely compatible with him politically.

MR: And what were some of the ways in which you were compatible? Was the environmental issues any big issue, or was it something else?

CJ: Well, I certainly had generally similar views with all of the people I worked for. I mean it just sort of seems to work out that way in politics, you know, you don't, you don't just end up gravitating towards people who don't share your views generally. But I think that, I think with Muskie it was something, and with Curtis, actually with all of them I should say. I guess there was, it was his, and I don't know if this was conscious with me at the time, but I mean there was something about Muskie that was attractive; and I, even to this day I'm not entirely sure what it was. But there's something about him that, and it wasn't personal because I mean in some ways he was just personally less likable than Curtis for example, but there was something about Muskie that just always attracted me to him as a political figure: stature, integrity, or something, I don't know.

MR: That Lincolnesque quality that people talk about?

CJ: Yeah, I don't know.

MR: So was this the first time that you had a really close working and personal relationship with Ed Muskie?

CJ: Yes. Well, actually it was during the campaign, the '76 campaign, I was responsible for northern Maine and drove him around a lot during that campaign. So it was actually during the campaign I'd probably had more personal contact with him than I did when I went to work on his staff, because I'd drive him around all over the place and have hours, spent hours in the car with him.

MR: What was that like? I'm sure you've got some stories about that. A lot of people . . . .

CJ: I did, later when I came back to Maine, I worked in his field office. Whenever he was in my area I would drive him around. So in those, both in the campaign and in, I worked in the Lewiston field office. For that reason I actually got, had more direct contact with him than I did in Washington. And it was sort of interesting, I mean, I, at times he would be very talkative and other times he just wouldn't want to, he wouldn't want to talk. So I, when he got in the car and we headed someplace I'd always sort of throw out this conversational softball and see if he was, which mood he was in, you know, whether he wanted to talk or whether he wanted to just not talk. So if he was in the mood he'd just take off and start talking and be very talkative, and other times he would just sort of grunt and not say anything, and I could go either way.

MR: I remember hearing some stories from some of the other transcripts I've been listening to. Such as Dick McMahon often was a subject of his, well I don't want to say temper, but sometimes he would be a subject of Muskie's, I guess if Muskie got irked at something he might kind of go off on Dick McMahon about something when he got in the car. Now were you ever the subject of anything like that?

CJ: Well, I certainly was the recipient of an occasional outburst. I don't remember ever that happening in the car. I mean, Muskie had a temper, absolute, no doubt about that. He'd always say that he used his temper, not, you know, for tactical purposes, which was certainly true on occasion, but at other times he would just, he just had a temper. I always thought he got frustrated because of, you know, after years of being pulled in ten different directions by schedules and staff, I think he got, it just was continually something that grated on him. You know, being on tight schedules and being pulled in ten different directions, and it was just the way he was. I don't remember that ever happening in the car.

MR: Did he usually seem pretty stressed out or pressured?

CJ: No, no, no, not on a normal day, no. On a typical day, either on the campaign trail or in Washington would be, he didn't, no, I wouldn't say that at all. I think he was always pretty comfortable. It always seemed to me that he was a little more comfortable in Maine than he was in Washington. I mean, I think, he said it often, and I think it was true just from observation, that when he came back to Maine he felt at home. I mean that sort of sounds like a trite political thing to say, but I think it was true. You know, I think he enjoyed being here in Maine and got reinvigorated by meeting Maine people.

MR: Now I think in '76, around then, there was kind of a movement to get Muskie back in touch with Maine after his time in Washington for so long?

CJ: That's right.

MR: Do you remember anything about that, did you ever talk with him about that, or any staff talking with him about that?

CJ: Well during the '76 election there was, I mean part of that. He had run for president in '72, and that obviously had necessitated that he be out of state a lot during that period, and I think there was some concern that that might hurt him in the '76 election. So there was a real effort during the campaign to have him back here a lot. I don't remember the number of days he was in Maine in 1976 but it was very large, and '75 too. I mean I think he, I recall in '75 he was back in Maine a lot.

And we did radio ads and personal testimonials from people who had been helped by Muskie in various ways. You know, people who had problems with the federal government and Muskie had been able to help them out; and they had this series of radio ads where these folks would describe how he had helped them, you know. It was part of our effort to show that Muskie had continued to be close to Maine and helping Maine people even while he was involved in national campaigns.

MR: And were you following Muskie's career before you joined up with his campaign staff in '76, or was it kind of you heard about him once in a while?

CJ: Well, it was certainly more than heard about him. I mean when he was running in '72 I remember going over to New Hampshire and leafleting: There was a whole bus load of Democrats went over in the New Hampshire primary, and leafleting New Hampshire. I remember going over and doing that. So it was certainly more than, he knew who I was and we'd had some contact, but certainly not close. You know, it wasn't any kind of close personal or professional relationship until I went to work for him.

MR: And were you present for the '72 incident in Manchester in front of William Loeb's office?

CJ: No, no. I remember going, I remember when I had, went over on this bus to leaflet New Hampshire. I remember having a very bad feeling about that election; you know, I just didn't have a good vibrations about what was going on over there. And at the time, now I don't know if I could really explain why I had those, why I had those feelings, but I just remember very distinctly feeling that that election wasn't going well. And of course, even though he won, I mean technically won, he lost politically because he didn't win by enough.

MR: And who were you working with on the staff in the '76 campaign?

CJ: Phil Merill was the campaign director. Ginger Jordan Hillier was sort of the office person working with him. Mary McAleney was, well there were three regional people, staffers; Mary McAleney had Southern Maine, Jim Wilfong had Central Maine, and I had northern Maine. Those were the principal ones.

MR: And what were they like to work with, I guess how did they interact with Muskie also?

CJ: They were great people to work with; they've been close friends ever since. And I think their, and I think all of our relationships with Muskie were, I guess, I think, I never thought about it, but I think they were all about the same and I think we all had a good relationship with Muskie.

MR: And you said after the '76 campaign you went down to Washington with the Muskie staff. How was that, I mean, obviously that's a big change, but in what ways exactly was that different politically?

CJ: Actually I didn't find it a lot different politically because I'd worked with, in the legislature which was considerably different, but not totally different than working with Congress. Though the living down there was a big change for a, you know, a rural Maine boy. Went to the big city, and I didn't like living there at all; that's one of the reasons, the main reason I came back.

But I enjoyed the work and, you know, I got to moni-, one of my jobs was to monitor activity on the Senate floor and advise the Senator about votes as they came up. In those days they didn't

have speakers like they, it's hard to imagine but they, the only way you knew what was going on on the Senate floor was to go over there and listen. So staff members would be assigned to track what was happening and when there was a vote tell the senator what the vote was, the motion was, as he came on to the Senate floor. So it was a, it was very, it was a lot of fun.

MR: So you must have come into contact with a lot of senators and congressmen through that?

CJ: Yeah, not congressmen, there's a real, when you work on one side of the Capitol you don't have a lot of contact with the other side. At least at my level, I mean, maybe the senior staff do because, when they have conference committees. But there was a, I virtually never came in contact with congressmen or congressmen staff.

MR: What was your time like in the Senate, on the Senate floor with the senators and during the Carter administration? Like, I don't know how much contact you have with any of Carter's staff?

CJ: Some. It was mostly, I mean it was, in one sense it was boring. I mean you'd just sit there and listen to senators drone on. Most of the speeches on the Senate floor aren't particularly exciting occasions of great debate. But just being there and sort of being in the, you know, in what is arguably one of the great chambers, deliberative chambers in the world, is, was pretty exciting for someone who was twenty-six or whatever. And keeping track of the issues as votes came up, we would do memos to the senator, you know, that this issue is coming up on the floor tomorrow, and here's the, you know, they'd essentially be one page memos outlining what was happening. So it was, it was interesting work.

MR: And were there some major debates that you remember? Some really interesting issues that popped up while you were there?

CJ: I remember one. Carter was trying to pass his health cost containment act which was essent-, as I recall, essentially price controls on the health services and doctors and hospitals; hospitals particularly I think. And Maine at that time had had some early activity in that area. And I remember standing on the Senate floor with Muskie and Senator [Gaylord] Nelson from Wisconsin and one of, another staff person and myself. And there was a White House staffer who in that event was on the floor lobbying the bill. And Muskie wanted to exempt Maine from the provisions of the bill. And so Muskie said to Nelson, "Senator Nelson," he said, "I want Maine out." And Nelson said, "Fine." And the deal was done in seconds. And the, Carter's staff member was sitting there sort of objecting but not purely daring to say much of anything to the senators.

So this other staff member and I went out on the steps of the Capitol and drafted this amendment that exempted Maine from the bill. And Muskie went in, held it out, and it passed in a few seconds. And it always struck me how different it is there in the, just in a technical sense from here in Maine. I mean, you can draft an amendment on the steps of the Capitol, run in, and have it passed by the Senate in a few minutes, whereas in Maine we go through all kinds of, you know, the legislature is very careful never to make a mistake. You know, to make sure everything gets done carefully and written and drafted and proofed and all this stuff. And

Congress just doesn't do that, they fix it up later if there's any technical problems with it, you know, they do it later. So that's one issue that I remember distinctly.

MR: Well you had a great opportunity to witness Muskie, well, I guess Muskie in action in the Senate. What was he like? What was his debating style like, and how significant a player was he?

CJ: He was then chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, and, I mean he was a senior, respected senator. I mean he was viewed by everyone that I knew of or heard of down there as a very powerful senator. And I think he, I think he was, I'm sure he was viewed that way by the other senators. Not because he was a, you know, Johnson style sock-em-on-the-back politician; he wasn't that, that wasn't his style of doing things. I mean, I think he was respected for the merits of his arguments, you know, and his ability to articulate those. I mean, he was very eloquent, he was probably one of the, at the time he was certainly one of the most eloquent debaters on the Senate floor, if not the most eloquent. And I think if people would look back today and, you know, gave you a list of the ten most eloquent senators over the past twenty-five years, he would certainly be one of them. So I always had the feeling that I was, I sort of was proud that I was working for someone of that caliber, you know, that intellectual caliber.

MR: And who were some of the senators that he was working closely with?

CJ: Well this, well one of his, I mean just on a personal note one of his closest friends was Senator [Phil] Hart, who later died and was not there when I was. But he worked with the Republican, ranking Republican on the budget committee was from Oklahoma I think. I can't think of his name right off, but that would certainly be one of them. He was also on the public works committee, and I can't remember the chair of the public works committee, but whoever it was would certainly be, you know, from a sort of a procedural sense the people he was working with every day. Bellmon, Henry Bellmon was the ranking Republican on the budget committee; I think he and Senator Muskie had a particularly effective relationship.

He was a, Muskie had always treated the minority on his committee as if he might some day be in the minority. You know, he always divided the staff up in a fair way and treated the minority fairly. You know, he was not a partisan, in the day-to-day business of the Senate and the committee work. He was not a partisan type that, in the same sense as say, well, Boss Reed, speaker Reed from Maine, you know if, you may have heard of, who started his staff meetings every morning saying what outrage can we perpetrate on the minority today. I mean, Muskie wasn't into that at all, you know, he wanted to have an effective working relationship with the minority.

MR: Do you think that was pretty unusual in the Senate at the time, his relatively non partisan way of dealing with things?

CJ: I think he did more, he went, did more in that regard than most senators. I mean, I wouldn't call it highly unusual but it was, because there's always been sort of a clubby kind of atmosphere in the Senate. But it was, at the time I would say he went further in that regard than most chairmen would have, and certainly far different from the way it is today. It's the difference

between what Muskie was doing in the '70s and what happens there today just from reading the papers. I'd say it was like night and day.

MR: And do you remember any confrontations that Muskie had with, in the Senate with other senators or maybe some staff members?

CJ: On issues certainly, but I don't remember any kind of personal kinds of things. But the one I remember was actually over a limitation on honoraria. Muskie had always supplemented his income by making speeches around the country and getting paid for it. And there was a bill sponsored, and I think it was by Senator Nelson, I'm pretty sure it was, from Wisconsin if I'm remembering correctly. And it was one of those floor debates that people stop and watch. I mean it was this, not, not in the least bit personal, but very eloquent intense floor debates over the issue of limiting honoraria. And I can remember to this day Muskie standing up on the floor debating that issue. And I wish I could remember the details of that speech. But he, in the course of his speech he referred to some event, I don't remember what it was, that reflected now Senator Nelson's position on honoraria which were then different than they were at the time he was debating. In other words, he was pointing out an inconsistency in Nelson's position, Nelson's position on honoraria, and it was extremely eloquent and effective. I mean, in the end Muskie lost the vote but it was just a, I thought it was a particularly dramatic moment on the Senate floor. It had sort of two titans, you know, debating. It's what people think the Senate should be.

MR: Sounds like an exciting time to be there.

CJ: It was, yeah.

MR: And what was it like working on the staff in the office itself down in Washington, as compared to the Maine staff in '76?

CJ: Well of course up here we were doing, I mean as I said before, I saw the Senator, you know, much closer personally up here because I'd drive around with all over the state. Down there, particularly because I wasn't, was not a senior staff person down there, I had, my day to day contact with him was less when I was there, it was certainly less than it was up here. And more, my days were more devoted to, you know, the every day staff work. You know, working with Maine problems, working on legislation, tracking what's going on on the Senate floor, also answering letters to the Senator, those kinds of things.

MR: And the staff was obviously larger down in Washington than it was in Maine, or was it pretty much . . .?

CJ: Well the campaign staff was pretty small. Down there there must have been, in his sort of central office; he had committee staff that worked for him on the Budget Committee, on the Public Works Committee. The staff in the central office down there must have been fifteen or twenty people I guess all together. And then he had staff here in Maine, Senate staff here in Maine who dealt with, you know, constituent problems. All together it must have been thirty if you count those in I guess.

MR: Did your office have close contacts with the Maine office while you were in Washington?

CJ: Yeah, I think almost on a daily basis. You know, we would deal with, you know, the Maine offices would deal with us on various issues, you know. Obviously things that were particularly, were Maine issues, like you know, potatoes, foreign workers, Canadian workers coming in to work in the woods. Those kinds of Maine, unique Maine problems were often, you know, the Maine staff would be sort of the front line people on those. And we would deal with the Washington aspect of that, you know, meeting, they might be meeting with a group up here who are concerned about an issue, and we would follow up in Washington.

MR: Did you yourself have much correspondence with the Maine office, or was it kind of left up to other people's duties to do that type of correspondence?

CJ: Oh we would, I mean it was mostly done by phone I think; I think most of our contact was over the phone.

MR: And what was it like to work with the Maine, I'm sorry, the Washington staff? Did you get to know many of the people there pretty closely?

CJ: Yeah, yeah I think so. Madeleine Albright was then the, Muskie's legislative director, so I got to know Madeleine well. Jim Case was his legislative counsel who is now a lawyer here in Maine. So, (*brief interruption in taping.*) I wasn't close to all of them but I guess the people I was closest to were Madeline and Jim and Gayle Cory and Mike Aube. I guess there was a group of us that just ended up being closer.

MR: What was Madeleine Albright like back then?

CJ: Pleasant to deal with, very bright. I guess I, I didn't, she didn't strike me, at that time, as being terrifically ambitious, but now that I look back on it it's clear that she was. But I guess what, in addition to being pleasant and bright, she, what struck me about Madeleine right off the bat even before I went to Washington when, just before the election in '76. I was in the Bang-, working out of the Bangor office, and we had gotten word that some of the Washington folks were coming up to help for the last few days of the campaign. And for people in Maine that's always sort of a, you know, great, we're going to have people around here who really don't want to do the work. You know, we're going to have people come up who don't want to leaflet or that kind of stuff. We're going to have people who sit around and go out to dinner. So my expectations when Madeleine, when I heard Madeleine was coming to Bangor, were fairly low in terms of actually getting any help.

But when Madeleine came to Bangor, she picked up a, literally picked up a stack of brochures and said, "Where do I leaflet?" And she'd do anything, I mean she would go out and do whatever we asked of her. And, you know, she was a well to do, you know, Washington society type person and I thought it was rather extraordinary that, you know, rather extraordinary that she would be willing to do virtually anything, you know, trench work in the campaign. But, and she was great, I mean I liked here, even before I went to Washington I liked Madeleine very

much.

MR: Now I've heard Gayle Cory was kind of an all around secretary person for Muskie. What was she like to work with, what was her . . .?

CJ: Gayle was far more than that. I mean she went to Washington with Muskie in '59, when he first was elected, and stayed there right to the end. In fact stayed after that with Mitchell. But she was, I don't know how to describe her role. She was confidante, friend, political advisor; she knew every player in Washington and in Maine politically. I mean she could pick up the phone and talk to virtually anybody in Washington or in Maine. And I mean she was just one of those people that's invaluable to an elected official. But is, you know, was very much behind the scenes. I mean you wouldn't know, to people on the outside, they wouldn't know, probably know who she was or what she did. But within the circles, you know, of, political circles and so on, she was someone who always knew what was going on, who was always there to deal with particular problems as they came up, and besides that she was just a great person. She was an extraordinary person. She was very close with Jane, too, I mean she was very close friends, personal friends with Jane.

MR: And did you become close with Jane at all or did you have much contact with Muskie's family?

CJ: During the election and when I was working here in Maine I probably had more, much more than I did in Washington because I would pick up Muskie at their house in Kennebunkport or drop him off or that kind of thing. So I got to know her more here than down in Washington. So I would say we had a, always had a pleasant relationship. I'd occasionally drive her places. Not a close personal relationship, but certainly a pleasant one. I always thought it was extraordinary that Jane was, went to Washington in '59 and never lost her Maineness. You know what I mean? She never, she was always sort of real Maine. I don't know, you know, it was just in the way she spoke and acted and, she never lost her Maineness, I guess that's how you would say it.

MR: Now you mentioned a while ago that you weren't, you didn't have any real confrontations, or Muskie didn't really blow up at you I guess during . . .?

CJ: Oh, he did, just not in the car.

MR: Yeah, right, yes, what were some of the times that he did?

CJ: The first time was when, let me think now, was after Car-, it was during the '76, it was during the '76 campaign. I got a call, I think I was in Bangor or someplace, and I got a call that I should go to Muskie's house in Kennebunk or, go to Kennebunk, because there was talk then about Carter picking Muskie as vice president, and the press was beginning to gather down in Kennebunkport because of that. There was the *Time* magazine, and other people like that were gathering there because they thought word was going to come that Muskie was going to be selected as vice president. So they said you got to go down there and, they meaning the Washington folks, the Washington staff.

So I went down and went out to the house and said, just told Jane that I was there, and I'd be at the hotel. And she said, "Well don't tell, Muskie's out fishing, but he's coming back this afternoon, but don't tell anybody." So, "Because he doesn't want to, you know, deal with the press." So I went back to the hotel and these *Time* guys are around and they're all, you know, obviously nosing around trying to figure out when Muskie was coming back.

So then I got a call from somebody in Washington, one of the staff members in Washington and they said, "You know, it really would, if the press went out there they could get some great shots, you know, of Muskie in his home and so on and so on, and that would be a great idea."

So even then I was, knew enough about these things to know that you didn't just walk in on Muskie with a bunch of press people at his home. So I said, "I'll do that. I'll take them out there, but you've got to call out there and make sure it's okay." So I went out naively thinking that this was was all going to be arranged and that everything would work just fine.

So I got out there and the guys from *Time* magazine knew more than I did; they wouldn't go to the door with me, they stayed behind at the car. I should have, I should have sensed (*unintelligible phrase*) at that time. But so anyway, I went to the door and Jane answered the door and then Muskie heard, when I explained what we were doing, Muskie heard. That was the first he'd heard, nobody had called in advance, and he was really pissed. I mean this is an example of I think the frustration he felt, you know, in his schedule, and private time was being invaded upon, you know. And he was more than a little pissed. And so I said, "Okay, you know, I'll take them back." And so I went out to the car, and I was about to say to these guys, you know, "Sorry, we aren't going to do it." And then I heard footsteps behind me and Muskie was right behind me coming out just as nice as could be to these guys, saying, "Hi, how are you?" You know, "Come on in, let me show you around." And so he gave this tour of the house, you know, and they took all kinds of pictures and that was the end of that.

But that was sort of my first exposure to his temper. And I remember being sort of slightly shaken by it at the time. But it's like, you know, it's like chicken pox, you know, you get it once and then it doesn't bother you after a while. I mean that was, it's just the way he is, and it's not a personal thing so, you know, after that I didn't, and I can actually only think of one or two other occasions when he lost his temper. And I'm not, I guess temper isn't, not so much as he lost his temper, he was real pissed was a better way of describing it. But it seemed to be on, most, at least on two occasions, when he was sort of unexpectedly, his private time was being invaded.

And I remember another time when I was up in, during, this was during the campaign also, and I had gotten some word about some potato farmers up in Aroostook with a problem; I don't remember anything about the details. So I called Ed Muskie and suggested that he should meet with these people. And he was, he didn't want to, he was pissed off and so on and so on, but he did. And then he went down to Washington, and he got off the plane and walked into the office and immediately started giving orders about dealing with this problem. So I always felt like I did the good, you know, the right thing by sort of pushing him to meet with these folks, but at the time he was pissed off. You know, he didn't want to take time out of his private time to do that. So, that was sort of typical. It didn't happen very often.

There were, other times I think he just got frustrated. I remember trying to explain to him once that there was this vote on abortion, and it was a really complicated procedural vote, and I was trying to run him through the procedural stuff, you know. You had about thirty seconds to explain it out to him, because that's about all he had time or patience for when he was walking onto the Senate floor. So you'd get it down pretty well so you could say this is about to table a motion by Senator blah, and do this and this. This was pretty complicated and I couldn't figure out how to say it in a short period of time so I, I got sort of twisted up about it, and he was getting frustrated. And finally I just said, "Vote with Kennedy." And he said, "All right," and walked into the Senate and did just that. And that's how I would, or those are the times I can think about, and I just think that's the way he was, you know, just his nature.

MR: Now did you ever talk about these incidents afterwards, or was it just kind of, they happened and then life went on?

CJ: Oh, the staff talked about it, sure. But, . . .

MR: But you and Muskie never really discussed it?

CJ: Oh no, I mean I never, I don't, I doubt if he'd even remember. You know what I mean? I think it's, you know, I think it's just, I never, even the first time I never took it as anything personal, you know, as anything directed at me. It was just his frustration, you know, with the way, with events and pressures on his time and so on. So it was, in my mind it was not a significant, you know, occurrence or event. It's just the way he was, you know.

MR: Do you remember any times when you or other staff members kind of had to, you know, guide Muskie along or keep him in line if he was kind of, his temper, well not necessarily his temper, but he was getting out of control on a certain issue? I remember Gayle Cory at least kind of had a, I wouldn't say motherly relationship with him I've heard, but kind of people that, you know, advised him on an issue or . . .?

CJ: Muskie had something of a, what's the word, something of a love-hate relationship with his staff, you know. He didn't, like a lot of elected officials he didn't like to admit that he relied on staff a lot, and compared to some he didn't. But I think he would, with Muskie it was never a case of, in my view, at least, of scripting him. You know, of saying, like if he was going into a meeting with some potato farmers or something, it was never a case of saying senator, "Here's what you need to say to these people." It was a case of saying, "Senator, here's the situation, you know, they're upset about x, y, z. And, you know, this issue has come up before and this is your." You know, reminding him what his background is on that particular issue if he does have, did have a history on it. You know, "This is what you did two years ago on this," or something like that. I never felt that Muskie, in fact I haven't with any of the people I've worked for, that they were the types that needed to be scripted, you know, you have to sort of tell them what to say.

MR: And then when Muskie moved on to the Secretary of State position did you, you came up to Maine immediately after that, or pretty soon after that?

CJ: No, I was in Maine when he was appointed, working in the Maine office, and stayed here working for Mitchell in the Maine office for him, one of the, the Lewiston office. Until Mitchell asked me to come back to Washington in January, I think it was January of '81.

MR: And so you've worked with, the first time in '76 in the campaign you were in the Waterville office, and then in the Bangor office in '79?

CJ: No, I was, in the campaign I worked out of the Bangor office.

MR: Oh, okay. And what were some of the differences between working in that campaign and then working in Maine again in '79 in the Waterville office?

CJ: In, now in '79-'80 I was in the Lewiston office. Sorry, I may have misspoken. But it was, I mean it was obviously not a, a campaign is much more, you know, intense in every way. I mean being on the staff here in Lewiston, working with constituent problems was just sort of, you know, every day work. I mean it was less exciting than Washington. You know, I came back because I just wanted to get back to Maine, but the work wasn't as exciting. I mean it was, it was fun, it was okay, but you know. By the time George asked me to go back to Washington I was ready to do something else anyway. I was getting tired of, you know, doing constituent work. I think it's easy to get burned out doing that after a while. You know, after you've heard several thousand constituent complaints, you know, you want to move on and do something else.

MR: And so you started, you were living in Dexter before and then you started living around the Lewiston area at this point?

CJ: I lived, when I was working for Curtis and then on the executive council I was really living in Augusta more than any place else. Well I, you know, I still had my home base in Dexter but, and when I lived, worked here in Lewiston in '79 and '80 and '81, or '80, I still, I lived in Augusta and commuted down into Lewiston.

MR: And actually, something I didn't ask you yet, are you married?

CJ: Yes, I'm married and have a daughter, thirteen year old daughter.

MR: And when and how did you meet your wife?

CJ: I actually met her when I, way back when I worked for Governor Curtis. I went to some event in Winthrop and met her there casually and nothing else. And then when I was leaving George Mitchell's staff, I made a very conscious effort, I wanted to come back to Maine, I wanted to get married. And so I, I mean this sounds stupid really, but I made a list of women I wanted to check out, you know, and she was first on the list and we ended up getting married, so. I called her up and asked her if she wanted to go to lunch, and she said she couldn't, but she was definitely interested. And she called me back and asked me to go to the movie theater, the theater down in Brunswick, which we did, and we ended up getting married, so.

MR: And what's your wife's name?

CJ: Linda Smith Dyer.

MR: And has she been politically involved with you at all or on her own, or what has she been doing?

CJ: She's been, she's actually a registered Republican although she votes both ways and is certainly a social liberal. We never have worked [together politically]. When I came back to Maine and started going out with Linda, I was also making a deliberate decision to get out of active political work because I didn't want to, I couldn't envision myself at age fifty still working for a political figure. So I made a deliberate decision to come back to Maine, get married, and to get out of politics at least in an active sense. I took a non-political job at the public utilities commission. And so since I, from the time I started going out with Linda I was sort of phasing out of political activity. So we never did anything together politically, really, except she went to some political dinners with me and things like that.

She's been active in her own right in her own issues. She's a member of the Winthrop town council now, and she's been president of the Maine Bar Association and president of the Maine Women's Lobby. So her activities have generally been non-partisan but, you know, issues directed specifically, women's issues or things of that kind.

MR: And what has some of her non political work been?

CJ: She's an attorney and has, up until recently, has been a lobbyist; most of her work being lobbying work in the State House. She just took a job as deputy commissioner of agriculture, so, you know, we are now both deputy commissioners in the King administration.

MR: Okay, actually I'm going to change the tapes right now.

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

MR: This is the first side of the second tape, the interview with Charles Jacobs on July 16th, 1999. And we were about to start talking about your time with George Mitchell and on his staff. What was that like?

CJ: I was, as I mentioned earlier, I was working for Muskie here in the Lewiston office when he was appointed Secretary of State. So I stayed on with Mitchell here in Lewiston for a while. And then sometime in the fall of '80 he asked me to come down to Washington as his executive assistant, which would be the second ranking staff person. And so I, I sort of knew that request was coming, and so I said, "Sure." I think I said, "Let me think about it." But I got back to him the next day and said, "Sure."

So I went down, I think it was right after the New Years in '81 and stayed there through the fall of '83. And then stayed on his staff, transitioned up here for a while, and then left his staff in the

spring of ‘84. While I was there my job was, his chief of staff or administrative assistant was David, can’t think of his last name. I’ll think of it in a minute. David, anyway. And I was, he was a Washington person who had worked on Muskie’s committee staff in Washington. And George wanted a Maine person to be his sort of, a Maine political type to be the second staff person there to oversee the Maine offices and be sort of the, you know, the leading, head Maine person on his staff. So I went down and did that through the campaign and (*unintelligible word*), a year or so after the campaign transitioned out of the political life.

MR: Did you know George Mitchell before you started to get involved in this work, or was it kind of . . .?

CJ: Not closely. I’d known him way back when I worked for Governor Curtis in the early ‘70s. And George ran for governor against Longley, so, you know, I’d seen him around. I didn’t work actively on his campaign, but I saw him around in the ‘74 time frame, so I certainly knew him to speak to and so on, but I didn’t know him well personally and didn’t until, you know, I got to know him in the senate.

MR: And what was he like to work with compared with Muskie or some of the other people you worked with?

CJ: George wouldn’t show his, you know, his, he was much more controlled, you know, in some ways than Muskie. He, when he’d get really ticked off the worst thing he’d ever say was, “This really distresses me.” You know, he wouldn’t lose his temper or get visibly upset or anything. So, I mean he was, he was, in some ways it’s hard to distinguish between Muskie and Mitchell in terms of working for them.

Mitchell was very good, very pleasant to work with. I mean, again I had the feeling like I was working for someone who was rather extraordinary, you know, in terms of his intelligence and discipline. But to make the comparison in a very personal way, I never felt quite the sort of personal affection for Mitchell that I did for Muskie. And I like George, and I respect him enormously and loved working for him and all of those things. But with, when Muskie left the senate I always had a feeling of personal loss, you know, that, there was something about Muskie that made the connection between me and him more emotional than it was with anybody else I’d worked for. And I couldn’t tell you why that it? I mean, it wasn’t because of his warm and fuzzy personality, it was something else. I don’t know what it is.

MR: And did a lot of the Muskie staff stay over with you to the George Mitchell staff, (*unintelligible phrase*)?

CJ: Yeah, most of them did.

MR: So it was mostly the same crew, the same conditions as Muskie’s?

CJ: Yeah, it changed obviously over time. When George came in he said that he would keep the staff on, but would reserve the right to make changes. He didn’t, he never really made huge changes, but just things worked out so that various people left and new people came in. But

initially everybody stayed on I think.

MR: Did you get to know some of the new people well?

CJ: I think the, sort of the core, I'm trying to think now, that's a good question. I think the people I was closest to are probably the people that had worked for Muskie. I can't think of anyone now that was, that was new that, you know, that I became particularly close to.

MR: Did their, did they, did you see them interact with George Mitchell much, like the new junior members of the staff, or was it pretty much . . .?

CJ: He was pretty open to his staff. So it's, so, I mean, it was a, he had a more open door than Muskie had so that staff had more freedom to go in and talk to him than they did with Muskie. So I guess I'm trying to think now, I guess the answer is yes. I mean I would have observed that more than I did with Muskie.

MR: Now it was '83 or early '84 that you went to the public utilities. . .?

CJ: David Johnson.

MR: Oh, David Johnson, great. It was in '83 or '84 you went to the PUC, you said?

CJ: Spring '84.

MR: Spring '84. And what was your, you spent thirteen years there, right?

CJ: Eleven years.

MR: Eleven. What was your time there like, I mean I'm sure you witnessed a lot of changes around the commission while in there for eleven years, but . . .?

CJ: It was, I was the administrative director for the commission, and so it was, I didn't have a policy role although I was involved informally in knowing what was going on in policy issues, but it was basically an administrative role. But it was during, when I first went Peter Bradford was the chair, and I think there were, I think I had three, there were three different chairs while I was there, I think. When I first went in, the big issue was with the Seabrook, not Seabrook, yes, the Seabrook Nuclear Power Plant, and the problems related to that construction and all, you know, the, it was then under con-. If I remember correctly, it was just about coming on line at that time and there were huge issues about whether that was, what impact that was going to have on the rates because it was so expensive, it was way over budget. And public service in New Hampshire was getting ready to go bankrupt. And so this was sort of the, I guess the, my early years there were sort of dominated in some way by the end of the nuclear era you might say, or the beginning of the end of the nuclear plant era.

MR: And what were some of the groups, or who were some of the individuals, in state and local government that you dealt with closely during that time?

CJ: Well, we certainly dealt with the legislature and worked with the legislative public utilities, well the utilities committee of the legislature closely. I set up this group of my counterparts in New England which would get together periodically just to talk about mutual concerns and issues. The PUC doesn't, I mean we didn't deal with, we dealt with like local utility districts and the large utilities. So most of the contact on a day-to-day basis we had were with utilities, as you might expect. Also with groups that were representing various interest groups before the commission. There were, you know, were attorneys representing the, for example, the large electrical users, the paper companies, and there were consumer groups, you know, who appeared before the commission. So it was pretty much people who had something to do with the commission, as opposed to other state agencies.

MR: And you've had at least sporadic contact with the state legislature since 1973 to the present I guess.

CJ: That's right.

MR: What have your, how has it changed as you've perceived it, or how has the partisan politics changed or the goals and (*unintelligible phrase*)?

CJ: I think it's, I think the legislature, the Democratic. Let me back up a little bit, the Democratic Party in the, from the mid-fifties when Muskie was elected governor, through the seventies, was, had a pretty clear program of ideas that it was pushing in the legislature. You know, it was a fairly coherent legislative program. And it would be hard for me now to go back and tell you exactly what it was. But in the, but it was, it was a, ideas, what sort of held the, was a group of people with common ideas pushing those ideas in the legislature, I guess, is the way to phrase it.

And they were certainly partisan, but I think the parties, the two parties got along, had a better working relationship than they do now. I don't think the partisanship in the end got in the way of getting things done. The Republicans in the legislature in the late '60s and early '70s were sort of, you know, moderate Republicans who you could work with; you know, who you could, in the end, reach an agreement with and get something done. I think as the '80s, say the early to mid '80s on things seemed, the legislature seemed to get more partisan. The, both parties, I think, had less coherent political agendas. And I think frankly the Democrats; the Democratic Party I think has been adrift, you know, through the late '80s and early '90s. I think they're, I don't think they have the coherent agenda or program that they had in earlier years. It's been a less pleasant place to be, less pleasant place to be generally.

MR: Do you think these changes in the state legislature kind of parallel the changes and developments in the national Congress?

CJ: Yeah, I think what's going on here is not really different than any place else. Maybe le-, I mean, and in fact it may be less dramatic here. But, you know, increased willingness to use attack ads in campaigns, more partisan, which I think results in, you know, more partisan activity and less civility in the legislature. I think it makes it harder to cut deals because everybody sees

sort of the next attack, how this vote might be used in the next attack ad. So I think we generally mirror what's happening around in Washington and the rest of the country probably.

MR: Now it was '95 you started work with Governor King?

CJ: Yes.

MR: And you started in right then as deputy commissioner of finance and administrative services. What exactly do you do in that position?

CJ: I have, I'm responsible for our legislative program; I'm the lead person for the department with the legislature. I deal with, because we deal with all of the central services of state government from taxation and budget to buildings and grounds and human resources and health insurance and all of this, labor and employer relations. So I get involved in all of those things in one way or another.

I was, for a while I was chairman of the health commission, which negotiates the contract with our health insurance provider; which is a large, hundred million dollar contract annually. I got involved in the strategy for labor negotiations with the unions. I was responsible for the current renovation project we have for the state office building in terms of, you know, emptying the building and helping the commissioner get the project, the renovation project under way. I'm responsible for trying to sell the Pineland campus, which is a now abandoned mental health facility in New Gloucester; that's where I was this morning before I came here.

So I get to know a lot of very different things. Every day is, involves something else. For example, when recently there's been concerns about power shortages in New England in these hot days, I'm involved with working out the program in state government to reduce our electrical usage on these days. To do so, we're doing our part to reduce consumption. So it's been a great job, you know, it's, in terms of sort of day to day excitement and interest, this is similar to working for Governor Curtis back in the early '70s.

I like being in the executive branch. Muskie used to say that the best job he, I don't know if he used these words, but he sort of said the best job he ever had was governor. Every governor I've known has said the same thing in one form or another, that it's the best job they've ever had because you get to be, you get to act. You know, you can, there's a lot of things you can do and initiate, as opposed to the legislative branch, which is much more difficult. It just isn't designed, you know, as an initiator. So this is, you know, I like being in the executive branch, I think. You know, you mentioned that I dealt with the legislature forever, and I like dealing with them as a member of the executive branch I think.

MR: And you mentioned, I think, off the record that your wife is also a deputy commissioner in Governor King's administration?

CJ: Yes.

MR: Do you have much contact with her through that?

CJ: Well, she only took the job two weeks ago, so I don't know.

MR: We'll see I guess.

CJ: So we'll find out, yeah.

MR: And, so you've worked with Governor Curtis, Governor Longley, and now Governor King all in different capacities. What have they been like, I don't know if it's easy for you to compare them or not, but what are they, over all what are their different styles and personalities?

CJ: Of course I wasn't around when Muskie was governor, so that was. But I think . . . maybe, I'm just thinking of my, I've never really thought about this, but there maybe a theme that connects Muskie, Curtis, not Longley, but Muskie, Curtis and Governor King. And that is that Muskie was forced to work with the Republicans because they controlled the legislature by huge margins, and he did that very effectively.

Curtis was in the same position, he worked effectively with Republicans, got some amazing things accomplished in terms of restructuring the executive branch. And as you probably know, enacting an income tax and so on. And I think King, because he's an independent, has also been very effective in dealing with both in this case, both parties of the legislature.

So I guess there's a certain similarity in styles, I think, that is sort of an ability to work, you know, beyond politics, meaning with either the other party or both parties. And the fact that all three of them had a very clear program, when Muskie ran for governor he had a very clear program; when Curtis ran for governor he had a very clear program, and when Angus ran for governor he had a very clear program. I think they're the only three governors in recent memory, or at least in my memory at least, that have had that kind of clear agenda.

MR: And how would you compare your own views to those of Governor King?

CJ: Well, when I read his book, and I didn't decide to vote for him because I've always voted for Democratic governors. I didn't decide to vote for him until I was actually on my way to the voting booth. But in August of that year, which would have been '94, I read his book, and I liked what I read in – I liked what I read. And so I began to think seriously about it, about voting for him at that time. And ever since then I guess my, everything that's happened since I went to work for him has reinforced my, sort of, my earlier feelings that I was on the same wavelength as he was, that he was someone who had very similar ideas to me.

MR: What are some of the specific issues that this comes up in?

CJ: I think a good example is his belief that you, how do I want to say this? I've never really articulated this before, that everything, the economy is the key to everything. That you can't accomplish anything you want to in terms of whatever it might be, social programs or tax cuts or anything, unless the economy is in sound condition. So the first policy consideration when you're considering, you know, what to do, is what do we do to make the economy stronger.

And if you succeed in that, which of course, not, the governor certainly can't take sole credit for that, but he certainly can take a substantial piece of the credit for what's going on in our economy now. And that's in my view bearing out that you can begin to do some of the things you want to do if the economy is sound and people have jobs and they're paying taxes and the revenue is coming in.

And, let me give you a more specific example. The Democratic Party is, created the worker's comp. of program that we now have. And what they created in the '70s and early '80s was an enormous burden on business. And Governor Brennan and subsequently Governor King have both tried to rein that in so that worker's comp costs could be reduced, and to the great gnashing of teeth in, at least in some Democratic circles. But it's had a lot to do with business being able to grow and prosper in Maine. I mean, the actions of Governor Brennan and now, and Governor King in restraining worker's comp costs have had a lot to do with our current business climate. And so I guess that's sort of the practical sound judgment kind of thing that I like about King. He just, he seems to have a very, very good judgment; judgment that I agree with I guess. My definition is good, about what we need to do to, from a policy point of view.

MR: And over all, what would you say that Senator Muskie's effects on politics, Maine and national in general, and on the state of Maine have been?

CJ: Well, sort of, I mean, there's all the traditional things that people say which are all true, is that Muskie was sort of the father of the modern Democratic Party. And, you know, he made it acceptable to be a Democrat. You know, he was the spokesperson for the Democratic program in the '50s. So it's not stretching anything at all to say he was, you know, the father of the Democratic Party in Maine. But I think it's, I think his sort of effect on Maine goes beyond, you know, specific accomplishments. I mean, you can list them all, our clean rivers and various things that he did, but it took me a long time to figure this out, but I don't think that's his legacy.

One time I was driving into Rumford or somewhere up near Rumford and we crossed the Androscoggin River. And I made some comment like, you know, "It must make you feel proud to see that river being cleaned up and knowing you had something to do with it." And he sort of dismissed it with a grunt, and obviously that didn't strike a chord with him; it wasn't something that was important to him. And I didn't really figure out what that was all about until a long time later when he was being interviewed on television and I happened to see the interview. And somebody asked him what meant the most to him in his Senate career and he said, "I think it's credibility." Meaning that, being able to speak and having people trust in you and believe what you're saying. And I think that, that then made sense, that response that I heard on television then allowed me to understand what he'd said in the car years earlier, indicating that, you know, specific things like clean rivers and whatever else, new bridges, whatever, weren't what was important to him.

What was important to him was his relationship with the Maine people and being listened to and believed by Maine people. And so I think perhaps his legacy, or his most important contribution throughout his career was not any specific thing, but the fact that Maine people, I think, trusted him and believed in him more than any other, probably any other political figure we've had at least in this century. So I guess that's what I would think of as his, his real legacy, as one of

trusting and believing in your political leaders.

MR: And did you maintain any contacts with him in the ‘80s and early ‘90s after he was Secretary of State?

CJ: Not a lot. I’d see him at various, you know, events. They had an event here, for example, when they opened this, the Muskie Archives. And oh, they did, there were several other events. They dedicated the federal building in Augusta, named it the Muskie Federal Building, and so I would see him at occasions like that. But I didn’t have any close contact with him after I left his staff.

MR: Okay, well is there anything else that you want to talk about that we might have missed, or about your involvement with Muskie or anything at all?

CJ: I don’t think so. But I, one thing just sort of struck me when Muskie died was that, the comment that, that I found was sort of most appropriate among all of the hundreds that were made was that when the press asked Governor King about Muskie’s death. He said, “It’s just like looking over towards the western mountains and seeing one of them gone.” He was just sort of a presence. Muskie had such a presence that you can’t imagine it not being there. And I think that relates sort of to what I said, you know, about credibility and maybe also about my sort of attachment, personal attachment to Muskie was that he had a presence that no other political leader in my memory certainly has had. And even though we’ve had some extraordinary leaders, you know, Curtis and Mitchell and Cohen and Angus and others, nobody in my mind has had really the presence that Muskie has had. And I don’t know how you define presence, but it’s, it’s something like, you know, like you can’t imagine a mountain being gone; well you can’t imagine, and to this day I sort of can’t get used to the idea that he’s not here.

MR: Okay, great, thanks a lot for your time.

CJ: Okay.

End of Interviews