

Bates College

SCARAB

Edmund S. Muskie Oral History Collection

Muskie Archives and Special Collections Library

1-19-1989

Muskie, Edmund S. oral history interview

Frank B. Poyas

Follow this and additional works at: https://scarab.bates.edu/muskie_oh

Recommended Citation

Poyas, Frank B., "Muskie, Edmund S. oral history interview" (1989). *Edmund S. Muskie Oral History Collection*. 288.

https://scarab.bates.edu/muskie_oh/288

This Oral History is brought to you for free and open access by the Muskie Archives and Special Collections Library at SCARAB. It has been accepted for inclusion in Edmund S. Muskie Oral History Collection by an authorized administrator of SCARAB. For more information, please contact batesscarab@bates.edu.

Interview with Edmund S. Muskie by Frank B. Poyas

Summary Sheet and Transcript

Interviewee

Muskie, Edmund S., 1914-1996

Interviewer

Poyas, Frank B.

Date

January 19, 1989

Place

Washington, D.C.

ID Number

MOH 016

Use Restrictions

© Bates College. This transcript is provided for individual **Research Purposes Only**; for all other uses, including publication, reproduction and quotation beyond fair use, permission must be obtained in writing from: The Edmund S. Muskie Archives and Special Collections Library, Bates College, 70 Campus Avenue, Lewiston, Maine 04240-6018.

Scope and Content Note

This is the second of a series of interviews with Edmund S. Muskie conducted by Frank Poyas. At the time of the interview, Poyas was historian of the Roosevelt Campobello International Park and Muskie was serving his eighth term as Park Chairman. The interview is dedicated to discussions of many aspects of the Park's history and operation, including personnel and commissioners, United States and Canada involvement, the committee system, budget, and endowment.

Indexed Names

Bailey, Harold

Cohen, William S.

Curtis, Kenneth M., 1931-

Elliot, Jimmy

Hammer, Armand, 1898-1990

Johnston, Murray J.

Larrabee, Don

Newman, Winslow B.

Macnaughton, Alan A.

MacNichol, Alexander

Muskie, Edmund S., 1914-1996
Nicoll, Don
Norris, Brenda
Pike, Radcliffe
Pike, Sumner T.
Robichaud, Hédard
Roosevelt, Franklin D. (Franklin Delano), 1882-1945
Roosevelt, Franklin D. (Franklin Delano), 1914-1988
Rowe, James
Seagraves, Eleanor, 1927-
Stuart, Lawrence
Tully, Grace
Trueman, Stuart D.
Tweedie, Robert
Walker, David H.

Transcript

Frank Poyas: This is Frank Poyas, park historian for the Roosevelt Campobello International Park. This is the second in a series of interviews with Edmund S. Muskie, the current chairman of the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission. This interview is being conducted on the afternoon of 19 January, 1989 at Senator Muskie's office in Washington, D.C.

And, as you remember yesterday, where we had left off, we had just finished going through all of the ex-commissioners and we were just coming up to the current, more recent commissioners, and I think it would be a good idea to continue that way. I'll throw out the name, and then you can just sort of reminisce a bit about the person as we were doing yesterday. The more recent people, I'd especially be interested in what perhaps motivated them to want to be on the commission. What particular aspects of the operation of the park they might be most interested in, whether it be the natural areas and the cottage area and the conference center idea, just to give us a general understanding of the people themselves. The first one I'd like to discuss is Larry Stuart.

Edmund S. Muskie: Well, Larry's background of course is as commissioner, state of parks in Maine. I knew him when I was governor and thought highly of him. He of course was the governor's recommendation, and who was governor when he was appointed? Let me see, when did he come on?

FP: Let me check real quick here. He was nominated by Gov. Curtis in June of 1967.

EM: Well, I don't know whose idea it was to, to my knowledge none of these commissioners, you know, initiated a campaign in their own behalf to become members. I'm not even sure I know what their awareness of the park was. I suspect that may have been Gov. Curtis' own idea. Don Nicoll may have had something to do with it, because I think Don knew Larry. And I

suspect Larry was interested because he's interested in parks, and is very good at it. He's been, of course, an alternate throughout his career on the commission, but his natural interest was park interest, development of the park, its uses, its policies. Sort of a general list for, from the point of view of park manager. And, of course, he and his wife made a very nice addition to the park.

FP: I know Larry has been in rather poor health recently. I was wondering if that might affect his tenure on the commission.

EM: Oh, you do not know that he has resigned.

FP: I do (*unintelligible phrase*).

EM: Well that's, you know, and I think he also shares a point of view, you know, that there ought to be a generation of change in the commission's make up at some point. I think fixed terms have their, or unlimited terms, there's something to be said for them But in this case I think they've tempted people to stay on longer than might be good for the program in the long run.

FP: Now the next one I'd like to talk about is Franklin, Jr., who of course was one of the original commissioners, and died just recently. And I think it might be worthwhile to sort of reminisce a bit about Franklin. We can't go into too much detail, it might take us two weeks, but perhaps just some thoughts that you might have on his involvement with the program.

EM: Well, I'm not inclined to respond with a (*unintelligible phrase*) question, you know. If I had such a thing in mind, I would have written it myself. But Franklin, of course, was chosen for obvious reasons, he was the president's son and namesake, born on the island, had a personal interest in the island. And of course a love for the island quite apart from his, the fact that he was FDR's son, and thoroughly enjoyed being a part of the commission, and having that opportunity to have that excuse to return to Campobello on a regular basis. And it was in that spirit, I think the rest of the commission loved the fact that he was one of us and that he enjoyed the association, and that he made such a solid contribution to the development of the park (*unintelligible phrase*).

FP: Okay, now we can briefly go through the current commissioners. And again, interested in their, maybe the extent of their active involvement in the park, and any specific interests that you might recall that they could have. We could start of with Mrs. Seagraves.

EM: Well, she of course is one of the more recent appointees. She seems to be most interested in environmental issues as they relate to the park. Interested in bird watching, for example. So she has a lot of those interests that one associates with people who are interested in the environment and conservation, wild life and so on. So she brings a very valued perspective to the work of the commission. And she of course also is sensitive to the fact that she's FDR's granddaughter. And of course it has been important to the commission that, in the person of Franklin, Jr. and Grace Tulley, Jim Rowe, and Ellie Seagraves that that connection is kept alive. And what will happen when that disappears, if it does, is hard to say.

FP: Do you see any other Roosevelts down the line that might be interested?

EM: Well, obviously there's a vacancy. Franklin's vacancy we would like to see filled by one of his sons. And I hope that that happens. I don't see why it shouldn't, but there is some jealousy within the Roosevelt clan: the so-called Jimmy Elliott wing and the Franklin, Jr. wing, it that's an accurate definition of the division. Elliott has expressed an interest in going on the commission. I don't know whether they should appear in any written document. I suppose that issue will be behind us by the time you produce anything anyway. No, I think the fact that Jimmy's children of course are young enough to keep that connection alive for a long time. I don't know much about the children of the other Roosevelt boys. I don't know anything at all about them, as far as that's concerned. And they haven't in these twenty-five years of the park's existence really exhibited that much interest in it. Franklin brought them up for one family get together and they turned out pretty well and I think enjoyed it, but it hasn't resulted in anything like periodic visits, or even occasional visits, to the park. So I don't know to what extent they feel a strong tug to the park. My impression is not.

FP: Okay, one of the newer members is Mrs. Armand Hammer.

EM: Well, I wish that, I mean she, I gather is a member because Armand Hammer himself would have liked to have been a member of the commission and campaigned hard for that. I don't know to what extent, I don't want to go into that, but in any case, he was not able to work that out. And subsequently, probably because what was involved was an alternate's position, they apparently advanced Mrs. Hammer as a suitable substitute. And I think she would be, the commission welcomed her warmly. But I don't know, I don't think she's attended more than two, and I think only one meeting of the commission since she became a member. But Dr. Hammer, as you know, is busy traveling all the time, all over the globe, and so we haven't seen much of her. We would like to.

FP: All right, Stuart Trueman.

EM: Well, Stuart, I'm not going to be totally candid obviously, and I forget who Stuart replaced. Was it McClaine?

FP: No, he was one of the original alternates on the Canadian side.

EM: Truman was? Well, that surprises me. But he is not a member who has been very visible in the discussions of the commission. He has been useful and at times valuable, I think, as one of the park's publicists, especially in New Brunswick. He has written a lot of books, mainly related to New Brunswick and its environment. He displays a sense of humor in those books, but not that much in person. And he's not well, and his wife does not appear to be well. But he certainly has been a loyal attender at the commission meetings, no question about it. So he is interested in it, and he likes the park, enjoys being on the commission. But he simply doesn't get involved very much in policy making or planning for the park's future. He has done one thing that I've enjoyed, and that is the last two or three years he's taken it upon himself to interview visitors to

the park. And to make available to us their reactions. I found it very interesting and very useful for him to do.

FP: Mr. (*name*).

EM: He's a very valuable member, an alternate surely, and I think it would be useful if some day he became a full member of the commission. He's, is a former president of the Royal Bank of Canada, he's got the background and experience to be of assistance in managing the resources of the park, and planning its finances and its budgets. But beyond that he has sound instincts and common sense attributable to all of the issues that arise, including relationships with our employees. He's on that committee, I think he's now chairman of that committee. Incidentally, one of Franklin's strong contributions was the working out of our agreements with the employees. (*Name*) is, I mean he and his wife are really two of the people that we enjoy very much when we gather at the park, and we certainly hope he continues.

FP: Senator Cohen.

EM: Well, he, Bill represented attributes that were important to us. It is important, I think, to have a Republican on the commission, a political Republican, and a senator. We do need influence on Capitol Hill, and he balanced me off very well, so we had a senator from both parties. Besides that I like Bill, enjoy his company. Unfortunately, he's, like all senators he's very busy with other things. But when we ask him here in Washington to intervene in issues in the Congress or the White House involving the commission's interest, he turns to very enthusiastically and very well. So he's a valued member of the commission, we hope, continually hope that he'll be able to find more time for commission meetings.

FP: Brenda Norris.

EM: Well, Brenda came home, she'd been out quite a while now. She's a very important, I think voice on the Canadian side. She gets herself fully immersed in the park's interests, and policies, and management, all aspects of it, you know. And of course, she (*unintelligible phrase*), and that's in the pattern of her association with the commission from the very beginning. The fact that she's an attractive woman is not, is hardly a negative. And, well, she's a very positive resource and attribute.

FP: Major Walker.

EM: Well, David is getting old, but I've got to say that from the beginning we've valued the fact that he was interested in the commission, interested in joining, and been actively involved all these years. He was, although not, he replaced Murray Johnston, so he wasn't one of the original members. But he came on soon enough after we began that we think of him as one of the originals, and for all practical purposes he was. He served once as chairman under circumstances which we discussed yesterday. He's getting old and crankier now. He's interested in the natural areas, he's chairman of that committee. He's also interested in the park's role as a conference center. He had much higher expectations of its potential than I think was realistic.

I think, at a time when we really tried to evaluate that potential, he had the exaggerated idea that we might get a former ambassador to serve, and that we might be able to hold truly international conferences at the, you know, at the level of governments. Something way beyond the capabilities that we have in terms of resources and transportation, accessibility and all of that. So I doubt that David has ever been, accommodated himself to our present level of conference work. I think it's about all that we can hope to do, and I think that what we do is in pretty good shape, and we certainly want it to continue. But to envision the kind of conferences, say, like Aspen for example, or some of those places, it's just unreal compared to Campobello. But we had some pretty vigorous arguments about that in the early, late sixties, early seventies, until we finally settled down into our present program.

FP: Robert Tweedie.

EM: Tweedie's one of the original Canadians, and really a very valuable member in ways that it's hard really to speak of, express in specific terms. He's got a lot of community memory of Canadian-American politics and relationships going back to Roosevelt's day and since. He's been involved in that as an official in New Brunswick politics, and he has a kind of congenial, relaxed personality that people enjoy. And he's thoroughly committed to the commission, does everything that we ask him to do whenever the provincial is in a position to be of assistance. His health is not good. So I foresee a number of these resulting in changes in the not too distant future, and that, in every case that will be a sad day. But on the other hand, from the (*unintelligible word*) point of view of the commission and the park, it probably is time.

FP: I have one question about Tweedie that, early on he had been raising the issue of establishing archives at the park, and part of his motivation was that he said that he had many letters and documents in his possession about the creation of the park, and leading up to that. Do you know if these were ever in fact deposited in our archives, or if he still has possession of those?

EM: Oh no, I guess you haven't gone into that. I think the University of New Brunswick is our archival center. You haven't run into that? And I don't know to what extent it has important materials.

FP: Right, I mean specifically Tweedie's papers and documents, you think those -?

EM: I don't know, but I'd enquire about that. Because there was a time when we considered what we should do about the commission's own history, and what Harry should do about the, you know, filing and storing of these day-to-day and week-to-week papers that we generate as a result of our operations. I'm quite sure it was the University of New Brunswick.

FP: Oh yes, I've gone through the archives we got there, I just haven't found these papers.

EM: Tweedie's papers aren't. Well, if they're anywhere, it may be that they haven't been placed anywhere. And if that's the case, then we ought to do something about that.

FP: And the last commissioner to discuss is Gov. Robichaud.

EM: (*Unintelligible phrase*) has been really a hard working and important member of the commission. When he came in there were some changes, about that same time I think there were some staff changes, and, you know, it put us in a little bit of turmoil at the time. I think it was, and you correct my memory on it, that Winslow Newman left as park superintendent. I think Don Nicoll left as park consultant. Of course there's the change in the chairmanship when McNaughton left. And so from an early time in the commission's history, I think we got involved in what was a proper share for each side in the commission and in the management of the commission, and management of the park. It finally all worked out. I can't really remember, you know, the specific tensions that arose, or if (*name*) was part of that, but eventually he settled in. And Gertrude (?), of course, is very important with the ladies.

So I think it's been a very amicable and very productive relationship, with (*name*) as Canadian chairman and vice chairman from time to time. It's worked out very, very well. Not least because he has really thrown himself into the work of the park. And he more than I, when he's chairman, he finds several occasions in the course of the year to visit the park, take a hands on look at what Harry's doing, and how things are working out, what the park needs are. So he's, he comes closer to being a resident chairman than I do.

FP: One thing we've mentioned a couple of times is the U.S.-Canadian balance. One of the unique aspects of the park, of course, is that it is totally international, U.S. and Canadian. I was wondering back in the very beginning of the commission, I would imagine there were some times when it was difficult to work out this balance, and to work out the manner in which the commission could work as a whole, rather than as a U.S.- versus- a Canadian. Do you recall any thoughts about ironing this out, because it must be something that was fairly significant at the time?

EM: Oh, I didn't think it was any problem. The toughest problem was working with the two different currencies, really. And then there was the question, after all you were operating on a Canadian island, so there was questions involving customs. Even today I think there's a problem up there that Harry brought to our attention at our last meeting, that American customs were charging a fee to tradesmen, particularly technical people from Lubec, who were asked by the park to do a job on the island. They were being asked to pay a, I forget how much it was, but it's sort of an annoyance. And there have been times when Canadian customs has complicated life at the park. But those have all been worked out, and we've worked together with the Canadians fully on that. I don't recall any problems other than, you know, making sure that the local economies of the island and Lubec, you know, were treated fairly equally in whatever contribution the park makes to the economy. Bank deposits, I think we have a Canadian bank, an American bank, employees, we try to give equal representation. There's the question of, you know, how you compensate Canadian employees and whether our Canadian employees on the provincial part were paid less than American employees. So you have that kind of problem.

But I don't recall, except the importance of having a working relationship, and I think it has been

less sticky almost from the beginning than we anticipated it might be. I really don't remember anything, other than Macnaughton incident, that was on the Canadian side. We didn't get involved in that, we didn't fully understand what was involved. I don't think we were ever told by the Canadian members, you know, why that change took place, what their motivation was. I don't recall, at least I don't recall, being given any information or explanation at all to that. But that was not between the Americans and the Canadians, that was totally on the Canadian side. I think we've become less formal than we thought we had to be in serving as representatives of two different countries. I don't know whether at the beginning, for example, we thought we had to meet separately before we had our joint meeting. That may have originally, but we have no problem with that today. I mean we, when we meet we meet together, and we never, never deal with any issue that I can remember as a Canadian- versus- U.S. issue or the reverse. So we've overcome the currency problems. Canada, as you know, makes an equal contribution in it, equivalent to American dollars even though the Canadian dollar is worth what, twenty-five, thirty percent less than ours. They make their full contribution which I think is, that issue has never arisen, never questioned, never challenged. Of course, I suppose if they'd involved half-a-billion instead of half-a-million, you know, then we might begin to talk about it. But, no, there's never been any reluctance.

There was, someone happened, this is on the part of the Canadians, when within the last few years the American contribution, or the American press for appropriations was cut back on our side by the Congress. And the President, and the Canadians said, how can you do this without consulting us? Of course, the American contribution always comes in before the Canadian. So we're not precisely in, if it were the reverse and they would be in a position of cutting first. But the Canadian government has, the Canadian contribution has never been cut, except in response to an American cut. But now we've worked that out, I think pretty well, so that the, both the administration, or at least this administration and the Congress, are inclined to give us our full request with even, you know, given the budget austerity than now faces us. This year we're going to get our full request. Of course we've tailored our request down, too, you know. So we're running a little short on capital funds as a result, but that'll work out.

But I've, on a personality basis, no, I don't think (*unintelligible phrase*). If you've run into something you might need explained, I'd be happy to do it, but I don't remember it. But both sides were new to what we were about to do, we were about to do something that was unprecedented, manage it properly. I mean, the International Joint Commission existed, but they don't manage anything, they just study problems and they make recommendations. But we had to manage something and we were rather new to it.

FP: Was there anyone that you could look to for precedent or ideas, or was this simply a trial and error, and it was just a group of people who were able to pull this together out of their own (*unintelligible word*).

EM: The latter. Well, it wasn't that big, really. It was kind of fun, we all, we had, well we had enough experience in public service on both sides so that, you know, Eddie Robichaud had extensive experience, Allard McNaughton, Tweedie on the Canadian side, and on our side I did, Sumner Pike. So we had a lot of, and Franklin, Jr. of course, so we worked it out as politicians

do.

FP: The commission meets three, or occasionally four, times a year. As the park has grown, some of the issues have become a bit more complicated and required a little more attention. The commission started a committee system, as we've mentioned several times. I wonder if you could elaborate a bit on how that began, and how it is working out in practice to supplement the occasional meetings of the commission.

EM: Well, I think the committee system was conceived as, number one, as a way to get all members of the commission involved in some specific way. And they ought to keep up their interest as, they do so, you know. And meetings, they tend to be dominated by one or two, three personalities, myself, Robichaud and whatever, Franklin. And there's a tendency for the others to go along, which I didn't think was healthy. I mean, we didn't put it that way to the commission, but we decided we ought to have committees, so that as problems came up that needed a little more attention than we could give at these regular meetings, that we have members of the commission available to go to the park, meet with the appropriate people, conduct discussions with employees.

And the committees which have been most active, I think in that respect, have been the natural resources, is that what it's called? The natural areas, natural areas I think. I forget the names of these commissions. The employees, personnel committee, those two obviously are the most active. I must say I don't remember the names of some of the other committees, but those have been the two most active ones. And then I've mentioned that Eddie Robichaud liked to go down occasionally, David (*name*) has, he lives nearby, so he's a natural for chairman of the natural areas committee. Let's see, personnel, natural areas, there must be one having to do with buildings and developments that I don't recall, that has been particularly busy. But all of us got involved when we were actually in the process of acquiring another cottage, and went through the interesting and challenging work of rehabilitating it, and furnishing it and all that, that was fun. We get everybody interested in that sort of thing. Like building your own house.

FP: You've mentioned several times during various meetings in the past, in a semi-joking way, I think, that you felt that the chairmanship perhaps could rotate among the American members, rather than always having the same American chairman. What are your thoughts on that?

EM: I think it would be a good thing were it to happen, but there's never any discussion of it that advanced. When it comes, you know, somebody just automatically recommends me, and nominates me, and the same thing happens on the Canadian side. One trouble with rotating it, that maybe there may be occasions when we would not like to take the next rotation. I hadn't thought of that until this moment, but that's conceivable. I'm not going to get into naming names, but a chairmanship isn't that important except that it's a way of maintaining contact. I think it's important in terms of the employees' perception of who the chairman is, and what his authority is, and how credible his authority is.

And I think from that point of view, Robichaud and I would be less challengeable than some of the others. I have an intimidating quality when I want to, and I think Eddie does, too. Not that I

believe in management by intimidation, but you know what I mean. They know who's boss, and we never have to assert ourselves in any way. But somehow they know that we are the chairmen, and that gives a certain steadiness I think to the, and stability to the relationship between the park and the employees that's valuable. And also, you know, from the outside, our contacts with the national government, the state government and so on. Either Eddie or I are the current chairmen, and that makes it less complicated for people to get in touch with us. So I'm thinking out loud about it for the first time rather than the question, do we ever think about it. We don't. We don't talk about it, it's automatic, so I will always be as long as I'm commissioner I guess the longest standing chairman, because Eddie came on after I. And I think I'm in my eighth term now, I think, seventh, something like that? I certainly never expected to be around for eight terms, but.

FP: Another (*unintelligible phrase*).

EM: Well, of course Franklin was chairman for the time when I was in the State Department, and I could not serve. My membership was suspended, and my chairmanship, so he served as chairman, and David Walker perhaps. Other than that, well. . . . that's all.

FP: One of the things about the commissioners we mentioned yesterday, in passing, was that you have this unique arrangement of having full commissioners and alternate commissioners, and yet all full and alternate are very highly respected, competent people. I wonder if you could address a little bit the comparison between full and alternate, if at any time it might present a problem, or, it just seems to me that this is an interesting arrangement and the way the commission has managed to deal with it.

EM: Well, I think I discussed that somewhat yesterday. I don't know that I can add much to that. It is unusual. I don't, as I said yesterday, I don't know of any parallel to it. And I don't really know why, the framers of the structure were basically the park service people, why this idea occurred to them. But from my point of view, it made no sense to treat it as anything, to treat the alternates as anything but the equivalent of full membership, unless we were involved in a crucial vote in which the legitimacy of the vote might be questioned if it were decided by other than the full commission members. So we have an understanding that if we have any such record votes, we haven't had any that I can recall, but we still have the understanding, nobody wants to go on the record as being opposed to a decision. I don't think anybody ever has, even though we've sometimes disagreed very vigorously over a conference program for example, I've mentioned that, and other things.

We always work out a consensus, and the alternates participate in that consensus, because there's no record of people, the position people have taken in reaching a consensus. And that serves the additional purpose, which I also mentioned yesterday, when an alternate has to fill in for a member, then the alternate is as fully acquainted with the issues and the park's policies and history, and that we take as valuable. We assign, if you haven't picked this up, each alternate is assigned an alternate to a specific member. But that doesn't mean that any alternate cannot serve as a substitute for any other member, as was the case I think in this recent meeting in Boston. Let's see, (*name*) attended as an alternate, and Larry Stuart attended as an alternate. I think Larry Stuart is probably alternate to Cohen, so I guess we could say he served as alternate

to Cohen there, but he could have served as alternate for Franklin. Franklin's alternate, let's see, who do we have as alternates now, Larry Stuart, (*unintelligible phrase*).

FP: Mrs. Hammer right now, was Franklin's alternate.

EM: I guess she's Franklin's alternate. We have to have an alternate for her I guess. In any case, it is worked out and the result, you know, we, now we were probably as thin in attendance this time as we have ever been. I suppose if one of four of us couldn't have come, somebody else would have been pretty persuaded to come, but we were, well, we're absent, we're now absent two. (*Unintelligible word*), that cuts us down from six to four, and of those four, Mrs. Hammer, is for all practical purposes, is not available, so we're skating on very thin ice at the moment.

FP: And I guess it would, to take action -

EM: And they serve on committees, too, the alternates.

FP: To take action, of course, it would require the (*unintelligible word*) vote of two Americans and two Canadians. As you mentioned, it's conceivable you might be down to yourself, Mrs. Seagraves, who is your alternate, and then Sen. Cohen.

EM: And not get two votes.

FP: It could be very interesting getting a quorum there. Okay, I'd like to move on from the commission, a little bit, to the administration of the park. Just briefly, because we don't want to get too bogged down in this. But there has been always the question of the role of an executive secretary, and now a superintendent, or a superintendent who is an acting executive secretary. I wonder if you could recount some of the commissions' thinking over the times of what is an executive secretary and what is his role, as opposed to a park manager or superintendent?

EM: Well, since it's been a long time since we had an executive secretary, I suspect those details are lost in the mists of history. Who was our first executive secretary? Alec McNicoll was our first superintendent, I don't think he was executive secretary. Who was? Do you know?

FP: As I recall, I don't think there was one until Rad Pike (*unintelligible phrase*). I think actually McNicoll was like an executive secretary.

EM: But we never viewed it at that time as being one and the same person. Well, I'll scratch my memory on that one. (*Unintelligible phrase*) became combined in Harry, oh, at about the time, who the hell was it? I think we viewed the executive secretary initially as someone who was sort of a keeper of the minutes and the policy making side of the commission. The repository, if you will, of the records and the official contact with government agencies in Washington and on the Canadian side.

End of Side A

Side B

EM: . . . Alec McNicoll died. Winslow Newman became the superintendent. He was working for Alec at the time. Now, was Don Nicoll the executive secretary?

FP: Franklin Pike was for a while, until Harry came on in '75.

EM: Well, Red wasn't the first one, I don't believe. He was at one time and he (*break in taping*). And there was a question of how we were going to give the Canadians representation at this level of park staffing. If the superintendent was to be an American, as was the case with both Harry and Alex, then it was fully right that the Canadians should have the executive secretary, it was thought. It wouldn't be fair for the Americans to have both. So at that time, I don't know whether Don Nicoll was park consultant, but we made Don Larabee park consultant, in effect what we had thought of putting in the hands of the executive secretary. But it was left in that ambivalent state ever since, we're not that, you know, hierarchically oriented to the management. But in any case, most of the employees are Canadian. And I've forgotten what Hal Bailey is, is he American or Canadian?

FP: He's from the U.S.

EM: He's American?

FP: I think he's from Lubec, isn't he?

EM: Yeah, he's from Lubec. Doesn't necessarily mean he's not Canadian. But, so I guess at the management level, well let's see, there's (*name*) who is Harry's secretary. She'd like to have the title of assistant superintendent, but I don't think the commission was ready for it. If anything happens to Harry, I suspect we will probably turn to Ned. I think Hal Bailey would be (*unintelligible word*). This is all speculation. So I don't know how it divided. But there was a time when we definitely, I think, and you might want to check this, that the words, the title executive secretary may appear somewhere in our statute or in our by-laws, so that we thought it was important to assign it to somebody. But I'm not specific about that, you might want to look at that. Otherwise, we might not have one.

FP: For the last fifteen years now it's been combined in one, a single administrator of the park.

EM: And he seems to like to use both of them. I would think he'd rather be referred to as the superintendent of the park than executive secretary. But it doesn't bother me, so if he likes to have both titles, it's fine. Nobody sees any need to change it. I'm sure it would make no difference to Don Larabee whether he was called park consultant or executive secretary, he would do the same things. So, see, we're not oriented to that kind of issue. I think if I had the benefit of chronology, I could straighten it out for you, so you'd know what happened. But beyond that, I don't think it's of much importance. Not now, but it was at the time, between the two sides at that time. It was.

FP: Let's speak just briefly about the finances, which in some respects may be one of the

miracles of the commission, that they have done so much with such modest financing. We had mentioned briefly, when we were talking about Sen. Cohen, the role of an active member of Congress. You do feel that this is something that really is valuable to maintain, an active member of Congress on the commission, primarily for easing the budget through, or?

EM: Well, it has that value which is an important part of it. But we want the Congress to know what the commission, what the park is. I don't expect it's role will grow, but it may well have to be enlarged, at least the facilities, they're certainly going to be under pressure. So it's important that there be a member here in Congress in one of the appropriate committees and what the park is. And I think in this few years that we've had budgetary problems with the Congress, we should have done this before, but under the pressure of that issue and that urgency, I think we've managed to become better known to the Congress lately. And I think we've got some friends now, especially at the staff level, who have visited the park, who know what it is, who knows of the relationship with Canada, and who have come to appreciate what the park is and what we've done now. So that, you know, when they receive, after all, our budget when it comes up to the Hill in the context of a trillion-dollar budget isn't, you know, it's totally invisible. It's only when they have to make across-the-board cuts in the interests of general budget austerity, that then we begin to get hurt, and we have to start yelling, and we want to be visible. Up until that point, we didn't particularly want to be visible, at least at the budget level. We didn't want to have congressional committees looking over our budgets. Especially since Cohen and I knew something about congressional committees work.

So that, but now we do have, and we're going to have to do some educating, because we're going to have capital needs. The visitor's center ought to be enlarged. I think the concept of park utilization needs to be changed in line with some of the things we heard in Boston.

(unintelligible phrase) ought to be made, because as park visitation grows you've got find ways to give them something to do that doesn't generate unacceptable pressure on the cottage itself. You've got to give them a place to go, something to do.

FP: Within the financing aspect, as you mentioned, there may be some exceptional expenses. The park, I believe, has never gone in for any supplemental appropriations, although it had been suggested from various sources. Is this something that you see as being conceivable *(unintelligible phrase)*?

EM: Well, it's something we're going to have to think about, yes. As a matter of fact, we did have in the beginning, when we had that, whatever that amount was, a capital grant. That was the way we treated it, and I think that's the way it was envisioned. I'm not sure they gave us an operating budget at that point. I think we did everything that, what was suggested, did everything with that one grant. It set the level of our annual appropriations, or our annual budget needs and funded the original, the first, out of that grant. And then we went in for annual appropriations. Of course, we, I think, started with something like twenty-five thousand from each government, I think that's pretty close. And we were able to do that, of course, because the prevailing wage in Campobello is far below what it is in Ottawa or Washington, and you could give people good jobs, really the best jobs on the island, at wages that they regarded as generous by comparison with what else was available there, but far below what you'd have to give for similar skills down

here in Washington. So our budgets are goddamn reasonable, especially after Congress began to know what we did with it, or what we achieved with it. And our policy, of course, of acquiring land as fast as we could pick it up, you know, gave us a real (*interruption to get a lozenge to clear Muskie's dry throat*).

FP: I know, one time when the across-board cuts came through under the Department of the Interior, we lost our ten percent, or whatever it was. After the few tense years there, it was felt this had been ironed out, it would not happen again. Do you feel that we are immune from future across the board cuts?

DM: There's no such word as never. Well, for a while, of course, we avoided the problem by digging into our reserve funds. See, somewhere along the line, one of the problems affecting our finances was the difference in fiscal years. The Canadian fiscal year begins in April, and American was originally July and now October, and of course then there's the calendar year. We had to accommodate these three. And our season, of course, was in the summer, that our greatest expenditures were in the summer. And for a while there we were getting our appropriations piecemeal, and we were able to bridge the gap initially because we had that capital fund. But then, as that began to run out, we had problems. So we did manage to get the U.S., because it's the first on the appropriations schedule. Well, first of all, we made the calendar year our fiscal year, which was a compromise between the two. So we are operating with three fiscal years, ours, the U.S., and Canadian. And we were able to persuade the American side to give us our appropriations in a lump sum in October. This was about the time, I think, that we initiated the congressional budget process. I was chairman of the budget committee, and we were able to get the entire government funding, you know, rationalized and compressed into a (*unintelligible phrase*). So getting the American contribution in October, we were able to draw interest on it. Congress had never questioned that, never asked us about it. We just deposited it when we did it, so did the Canadians although it was later, so we'd draw interest. I think the interest capital now is about thirty-five-thousand dollars a year. At one point it was larger than that, and we used a significant part of that to enlarge our working capital, and draw interest on it. But when the thing reversed and we began to find that, you know, our budget's been cut and so on, well, we drew on our working capital for a while, until we realized, "God, if we did it that way we were going to reduce another source of income." You can't, you know, you can't use your working capital to fund your deficits, and at the same time draw interest from it. So that's the squeeze we ultimately came down to, and I guess three or four years ago I took the flat position we weren't going to use working capital for anything. We weren't going to lump deficits that system. We'd cut down on our operations if we had to in order to at least preserve that source of income. And that was unstable enough that we were subject to interest rates on (*unintelligible word*).

So we're sure of that revenue, and we get some revenue of course from the sale of memorabilia of one kind or another, that isn't important revenue. What else do we get? Not much else. So the working capital fund was a very important innovation, when we finally settled down into that. It gave us a source for a long time, funds for capital projects until it shrank to the point where we didn't feel we could do that any more. It gave us additional income, and then it gave us, you know, the assurance that between seasons we'd have money to pay all our year round help and take care of ourselves. And it worked out finally in a pragmatic way. We didn't start with these

concepts, they just sort of emerged and evolved as we ran up against experience and problems.

FP: Seems like excellent fiscal management. I wonder if there's any possible conflict though with the legislation that any sort of income profits should be returned to the governments in equal shares.

EM: No, the only provision in the legislation that deals with that is, it has to do with entrance fees, admission fees, if we were to institute those I think the legislation requires that we account for that between the national governments. We've never been able to do that anyway. Canadians don't charge admission to their national parks, and we decided we wouldn't. We considered whether or not we should, but the additional revenue you'd get wouldn't amount to much. I mean, what would you charge? If you charged a dollar, you know, say you'd get a hundred thousand plus. And we didn't think that was in the spirit of the damn thing. And Congress never suggested that we use entrance fees.

As a matter of fact, with respect to national parks, they've been controversial, and Congress hasn't been enthusiastic about entrance fees. But I guess they use them in places, don't they? But this is an international shrine and on a Canadian island. We just didn't see any justification to it. We were afraid that it might impact on visitation. That may not be realistic, but once you have them in place, then the temptation to increase them begins to come into play. And so they're a dollar, you know, you get in a budget squeeze and, well, another dollar, that isn't that much. Before you know it, you know, you're asking five dollars. Hell, we want people to come to the park, we don't want to, it's not a profit center, not supposed to be. And if the national governments can't afford to fund it, well, let them find some other use for the land.

FP: Now, from time to time, usually when discussing budgets, but also discussing possible expansion of the park, especially in light of conference centers, there have been various proposals put forward to some sort of a foundation system to provide additional sources of revenue. Is this a matter that is still actively under consideration, or something that might be revived in the future?

EM: Now you're talking about an endowment, what is the, Eleanor and Franklin Roosevelt institute had it, they'd fund raise. They did at the beginning a fund-raising drive to put together five million dollars for that institute. And Armand Hammer, and (*unintelligible phrase*) a hundred thousand dollars on a moment, he was a great man for a headline. I wouldn't mind getting him to do the same thing. I'm more interested really in the possibility of raising maybe five million dollars, so I suppose you'd get interest of ten percent. That's five hundred thousand dollars. That amount could be useful. But then what the Congress would tend to do is to cut its contribution to the park, so then you'd be in the fund raising business constantly. And I just don't see that a park up on the Canadian- American border and you're building a constituency, that would generate that kind of voluntary contribution. You'd have to put money into raising it. What would we use for that purpose? You'd have to want to have to beg somebody to give us a, you know, a grant or a contribution to do that.

Maybe I'm too negative about these things, but I think this is an appropriate function of the two

national governments. It's, hell, it was a deliberate act on their part to symbolize the health of the relationship between Canada and the United States which stands there as that, on a Canadian island with a commission that's unique in the world. And I think that we try to do that kind of thing, it's not that, it's not an extravagance, as you can see for yourself. It's very modest really in terms of money that's been put into it, and in terms of the size of the park. I think our management has been prudent and conservative. It hasn't been pie-in-the-sky. Now I think we may have reached the point where we ought to try to raise some money. I don't necessarily want to compete with the Franklin Eleanor Roosevelt Institute, that's something different. But if we could get some money contributed by Armand Hammer, for example, to help us enlarge the visitor's center or to do some of the other things that, some of the other ideas that we picked up at Harvard last, this month, that I think might be worth trying to do. Especially if you've got a potential like Armand Hammer to be the first angel. Or, as far as I'm concerned, he could be the only angel. Whether or not he has saintly qualities or angelic qualities, to me that would qualify him for a place on a very high cloud. And I have no objection to that. But I'm not sure about the endowment idea, the foundation idea, because I just don't see a constituency that would keep it alive.

I'm more strongly of the opinion, you know, as time passes, that the Roosevelt generation is long gone, the Roosevelt constituency. Now, he's of interest to people who are interested in the history of our country. Heaven pray, you don't have a foundation for George Washington. His home was left virtually abandoned for years until the women of colonial Virginia decided to raise the money privately and acquire it. And now it's on, I don't think there's any government funds, and I rather doubt that it indulges in fund raising now. I think it's a commercially viable proposition now, that's my impression (*unintelligible phrase*). That's true of Monticello, the Roosevelt place, so I think there are a limited number of things you can do in the name of a president. I want to see an FDR memorial in Washington, and I, I have no desire to make this the memorial. I'm glad it's there in the absence of anything else, but I sure as hell wouldn't want people to think that we're promoting it as a Roosevelt, an FDR memorial (*unintelligible phrase*). I don't know that I want that in the public domain, but I think Campobello is what it ought to be, and there are things that, additional things that ought to be done. But I don't think we ought to raise our expectations too high. We need to protect what's there, and that's going to be a problem, but the thing that I'm most worried about is that this Campobello estates thing will not take off, that those lots would sell for a song, will attract a low, a cheap, low cost kind of development, rather than the kind of quality development the originators of that project had in mind. If that happens, you know, you might have a southeast Washington in the northern half of Campobello Island. I sure don't want that, I don't want a rural slum up there.

FP: Okay, I think that we're at the point now where our next topic's going to be getting into the operations. We've talked a bit about the planning and the development and expansion and projects. It seems like it might be an appropriate place to put a stop to the taping for today. I don't want to try to do too much in one day.

End of Interview
moh016.int