

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

February 6, 1976

Office of the Vice President
(Washington, D. C.)

REMARKS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
AT THE
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS
Conference Room, 14th Floor, 2401 E Street, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

(AT 11:20 A.M. EST)

MR. STRAIGHT: Mr. Vice President, this is the Council, as you know, at its 43rd meeting. It is a great delight to the Council members and for the staff and the panel chairmen who are here and who make the basic artistic decisions to welcome you and welcome Governor Shafer.

We greatly appreciate your willingness to come and talk briefly with us about all the problems and challenges we face. As you know, since you have played a leading part in our brief life of 10 years, it has been 10 years of rapid growth, one of the great success stories of the last decade.

At the same time, we all sense that this is now a new time. In a new time the test of leadership and wisdom is to discern what the new time is, what opportunities it offers, and to look to ways of advancing which are consistent with the new time, with the way people feel now, and with the opportunities that are offered to us which are plainly very much harder to discern than they were in the past.

We have, we know here, a continuing appetite, particularly on the part of young Americans, to be enriched through the arts. We have a continuing desire of professional artists and institutions to serve this increasing appetite.

At the same time, as you and the President have pointed out in the past month, we have intense domestic problems of stringency, of over-commitment in the past decades in the Federal Government. Therefore, the government, the Congress, the people, themselves will be looking very closely at every dollar which is spent not only at the Federal level but at the State level.

We have been well aware that the growth in the State Legislatures -- needless to say, New York is leading them, which has matched our own growth -- is now again arrested. In many cases leading spokesmen for the arts have helped to write arts legislation and who have now become governors of key States have come in on the promise of increasing arts expenditures only to find when they take office that they are facing insolvency and must shut down on all but the most needed physical problems of safety and order in terms of expansion.

Therefore, in Massachusetts and California, Connecticut and elsewhere, the rosy promises of a couple of years ago are now replaced by moods of questioning and doubt as to where we go.

MORE

The Council this morning has been attempting to deal with this new time. Mr. McWhorter has spoken of a new concept he has of helping communities themselves look at themselves and what they can do.

The others have spoken here of the tremendous untapped resources in the business community, the fact that only a very minor percentage of corporations today make contributions in the area of the arts or any charitable contributions as Bob Goldwin pointed out. It is still a small minority.

How, then, do we look in the future for funding of the arts and employment of the arts and support of the arts from industry, from corporations, from foundations, from municipalities and States? In turn, how do we match at the Federal level this continued demand for increased services by continuing expansion and service by the Federal Government? These are all the kinds of questions which we have been attempting to grapple with as late as five minutes ago when you were good enough to come and join us.

Our hope is, in the brief time we have, you will speak to us and then go into a perfectly frank discussion with our Council members and others in this room as to where you think the future lies in this tremendous program which you did so much to start.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Michael, members of the Council, members of the panel, staff and friends here, let me thank you for inviting me and say how badly I feel that Nancy isn't here. I just think that this nation and the arts are both very fortunate in her presence, her interest and her extraordinary abilities. I am sorry she is not here.

First, I would like to thank all of you on behalf of the President for your participation, your activities, and say what a strong sense of communication I feel in this group of shared interests and concerns representing as you do the tremendous range and vitality of creativity in this country and appreciation in this country, because that is the happy combination.

It is interesting to think that at this, our 200th Anniversary, we do have now one of the most vital, dynamic, creative, cultural communities which exist anywhere in the world. Whereas from the start, as a nation we thought that all the culture was in the old world, now it is increasingly that the world is looking here.

I would like to express also my appreciation and respect to the panel chairman and to the members of the staff. This organization has had the unique capacity of attracting the best people and those with the greatest sensitivity, ability and talent. This is always a pleasure in any group to find the caliber which exists here and the interest, the dedication in coming together as you have. I have to say that I don't know of any group that has more influence in not only the immediate field which you represent, which is a very broad field, of course, but in the country as a whole.

MORE

You talk about the new times we are living in. I think one of the interesting facets of this new times is that art is no longer anathema to politicians. It used to be when I first got into politics that I was considered, because I was interested in the arts, you know, a little queer and an oddball.

I have at the Mansion in Albany, contemporary paintings. We went through all those things that we used to go through where the legislators would come and a statement is made that "My son could have done this. What does it mean," and so forth.

What really interested me after 15 years of double annual exposure to all the members of the legislature, they not only become understanding and enthusiastic but sympathetic, as was reflected in the support that actually was produced.

Michael touches on the problems of today. They are tough, let's face it -- the over-promising, the young delivering, the increased interdependence in the world, the outside force influence on our economic life which came from two major factors, the Arab-Israeli conflict and the oil boycott, and then the increase in prices, about 600 percent, plus the food problem which grows out of a population growth, higher standards of living, plus crop failures resulted in two years ago the purges, and then the food price increase.

So with price increases, we had inflation and then with inflation we had recession, and with recession we had unemployment. Then we got back to the revenue sources drying up at the local level.

While a great many people down here in Washington, particularly in the Congress, have seemed to have gotten so vicarious satisfaction out of New York's difficulties, I try to keep pointing out to the Congress that they have done everything New York has but they have done it in spades. The only difference is they can print money and New York City can't.

(Laughter)

THE VICE PRESIDENT: So they better think carefully what they are saying about New York. That doesn't help the subjects that we are interested in here -- how do we get the support for this tremendous public demand, this growing public awareness that this whole creative world is a major factor in their lives, in the quality of their lives and in the appreciation of art.

I was fascinated with the figures of the Hirshhorn Museum attendance in the first year: 1,300,000 or something. I tried very hard to get Joe to give that collection to New York State, to the State University there. As a matter of fact, one day at breakfast I had him with pen in hand on a contract. My wife was very intuitive. She said, "You are wasting your time. He loves every minute of this and he will never sign that paper."

(Laughter)

MORE

THE VICE PRESIDENT: She was right. But he is a very good friend of mine, and so is his wife. I am delighted with what he has done. I enjoy it myself.

I have to be frank and say that I am an optimist and that you have two major ingredients that, to me, are in my favor. One is the public, which has got to be the important factor in this country. Two is the consciousness now in the Congress of the United States. I will stop talking as soon as I say this. I have got to remember that when Nancy, as I mentioned the other day, typed out the first bill 23 years ago for a National Arts Council. Lincoln Kirsten and I had been working on this with Nancy and Mrs. Hobby.

The President decided to send it to Congress, and it was given to Senator Smith, from New Jersey, to introduce, which he did. Unfortunately, it ended up in the free piano lesson bill and it never got off the launching pad. We have come a long way, let's face it.

Then in New York State, we just took the same pill and went out and I was elected governor. It was the first year and, with Republican control of both Houses, they figured they had to go along with the one just collected, so we got it through. They began to find this was really something the public was interested in, that they didn't have to be ashamed of, that it didn't bring discredit to them politically to be identified with the arts, but that this was the most exciting thing in America today.

So we have both public recognition and political recognition of the importance of the arts. The job that all of you have done, and particularly Nancy on the Hill here, is really extraordinary. We have lots of good factors.

I am really optimistic about the future. I think our economy is going to come back and if we as a nation have half a brain in our head, we can bring this country and the world back into a period that should be the most exciting period in the history of civilized people. I don't dare say civilized man.

(Laughter)

MR. STRAIGHT: You are very wise.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: So I am very excited. But how do we weather the present? That is the problem. I think with that, I will stop. Thank you for inviting me. I must say it is a very happy atmosphere for me to be in again..

MR. STRAIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Vice President.

Will some member of the Council start off the discussion? Charlie, can you summarize to the Vice President what you were saying before?

MR. McWHORTER: We were in the last hour discussing this whole area of increased private support. I think the

MORE

Council, two meetings ago, considered the overall level of Federal funding and the objectives.

We reached a conclusion that 10 years from now we ought to have at least a \$500 million or an average of that much, or a percentage of annual increase. This is in recognition of the fact that what we are talking about must be a partnership where, if the Federal Government were to put that much money in right now in fiscal 1977, it would overwhelm everything, and you would have a Federal agency dominating arts all over the country. Nobody wants that. And certainly the Council members don't want that.

What we are talking about is a system that would permit a steady growth, where the Federal role was important in leadership, as well as in actual dollars, encouraging States and local communities to contribute, and also taking greater advantage of the private resources, both corporate and individual foundations, that are available.

You have been saying this is the most exciting thing happening in America today. It captured the spirit of what I think many people sense that probably there is more truth in a performance by an orchestra or a theater than there may be in some politician's statement in the analysis of the economy -- with a capital E. So when people increasingly are turning to the arts for their own private nourishment of their quality of life or whatever you want to call it, there has to be growth.

The number of young people who plan careers in the arts is increasing. Not that everybody who wants to be an artist has a title to a full career but, nevertheless, they are increasing the numbers of young people who want to get into this. How do we match that up so that they can have a real career, as the people who plan the other non-arts fields. They have a responsibility there.

What we really would appreciate from you, if you could help us a little bit, is your thinking on how do we move in this partnership approach so that the Congress and the government and the OMB recognize that what we are doing here is a pioneering thing. Unlike other agencies, what we talk about are not full funding Federal dollars but where the government, by giving maybe three to eight percent of the total budget of the institutions, gives it the survivability faculty.

We also have here a marketplace test. Unlike most government programs, where you pick up 100 percent of the cost of lifeguards and park attendants and all these other people -- they are just out there -- we are talking about giving this essential difference, which means that musicians and artists and other dancers can have an opportunity to perform.

But the public reaction to that is the real test of the validity of the artistic enterprise and the leadership of that group.

How do we get more people to be aware of this process and the fact that it must continue to grow? If you are just

MORE

talking about it on a purely economic basis, what we do with a Federal dollar which stimulates six, seven, eight, 10 private dollars, then activity generates in the multiplying of that probably does more to produce jobs than what the President is talking about. All these Public Works things of the President --

THE VICE PRESIDENT: That is the Congress.

(Laughter)

THE VICE PRESIDENT: He is vetoing it.

MR. MCWHORTER: What things can we do that we can articulate these kinds of views. I am sure you share them.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Let's take a few of the pegs on the walls. One, we all agree -- and I think that the patterns have been set -- that government's relation is essential but government domination would be disastrous. Your point about a major Federal increase is a sensitive one.

We were fortunate in New York State to get a group of individuals on the Council there who both had, if you will forgive the word, prestige in the community as well as this total awareness of the need for restraint in relation to use of government money and to insulate it from the projects. The temptation is to use this money because it is so popular politically. In this I think we are beginning to see a few little signs of the power of the money in the field of the arts if used politically.

For instance, the legislature voted up there -- and I use this simply because this is the only area I know about -- last year on a so much per county. This is interesting, but let's say New York County probably has a lot more cultural activity per individual than Tioga County or something of that kind. So you start to see political factors coming in. You can't expect not to.

That brings you down to another question that, to me, is interesting. The last thing I did in legislative action on this was to specify that half the money would go to the operation and maintenance, rather than new projects, in order to help preserve existing institutions which really are the fountainhead of the loan exhibitions or the dance companies or the ballet companies or opera or theater, whatever it is, which go out to the communities and which is the cultural life of the communities.

It is always more exciting to give something new than to support what exists. If we don't support what exists, then we are not going to have the basic roots. So first the maintenance and operation of the program and then the new projects which so many new communities want to have. These are factors which to me are very interesting. Whether they should be included in the legislation or not, I don't know.

MORE

I think about these and I worry about these, to get a balance there so that we think of the cultural vitality and institutions of our country, both in terms of their basic strength and then in terms of encouraging the new, the creative, and so forth, and how to get the balance. We can't just establish institutions that stifle the creativity, the imagination and initiative of new elements, new groups that are springing up.

I have to agree with you that, if it were possible to organize corporate giving on a national basis, where the corporations or groups of them were willing to say that they would join together and take a percentage sort of on an organized conceptual basis, that this would probably be one of the most fruitful and important areas that exist, because they do still have tax exemption. They don't all use it. They do it, each one, on their own, really.

If they were organized by regions or as a nation as a whole, that is probably today the most single, most important new source that could be tapped, I would think.

There are new individuals coming along in terms of giving. I have to say there is a worrisome trend in Congress against the whole concept of tax exemption for giving and a philosophy that the giving should be done by government and if anyone has extra money, the government ought to take it and they can more wisely distribute it. This, to me, runs sort of counter to the whole concept of individual freedom and human dignity. This is a real thing to watch in this country. This has some very interesting political ideological overtones too.

Basically, if we are looking straight at where the source of money that could be tapped now that hasn't been tapped, at State and local governments, I think one can't expect very much -- they are in real trouble -- for any major increase. The Federal Government is in trouble, as you know. They have this huge deficit. The Congress still seems to be plowing right ahead. I don't think they got the message yet that the local governors and mayors, and so forth, have. You will find that they will increase the amount that is in the President's budget, which is good.

For right now, I would think that an organized effort with corporations is the best major potential.

MR. STRAIGHT: Billy.

MR. TAYLOR: One thing that has always bothered me is the manner in which small communities and individual artists -- these are two different things -- could communicate with the larger organizations. In your work with the Council and the Cultural Resource Commission in New York State, you made some provisions for that. How can we do that on a Federal level so that (a) through this kind of organization we can mobilize the resources which are available to us governmentally, and spread them around, so to speak, and still not lose sight of the fact that there are many artists who are not joiners, who do not

MORE

participate in specific organizations and therefore miss out on some of the things that would be available to them if they were a part of an organization? Is there any way?

It is a tough one for Federal dollars because there are many safeguards in terms of tax dollars. But surely there must be some solution. Perhaps you have some suggestions.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: The only way I think that kind of question you are raising can be dealt with is, either through legislation or through administrative decisions, to allocate percentages for certain objectives. If there is, as you point out, important talent to be encouraged, which isn't interested in joining a project, maybe there ought to be a percentage of funds allocated for that purpose that seeks out that kind of talent, and then a system devised to find them.

The competition and the pressures are great for a limited amount of funds. I found the only way to keep one group from not pushing the others out was to get some allocation: percentagewise. But they have got to change it every so often.

MR. TAYLOR: You made a part of the legislation the kind of protection for the existing organizations, which is very important so that we can have continuity. Many composers, sculptors, and specific kinds of artists who work alone who are not attached to a dance company, not attached to a particular museum, or whatever, are the people that I am concerned with. I think that we lose a lot if we lose specific artists of great magnitude, great talent.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: As an illustration, when I was in the Museum of Modern Art, in order to try to reach this group we used to have a new talent show of people who weren't shown in any galleries in New York and who have never been shown in a museum. It was sponsored by a group of trustees who put up so much money for prizes. This was the kind of thing you are talking about. It can be done, but it needs to be organized.

MR. TAYLOR: Could the Department of Interior or somebody do it?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: This is a very interesting way of doing these things. Excuse me for going back, but one has to draw on experience.

As Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, I was very interested in getting contracts. I worked in Latin America and the idea was this was sort of a dollar-hungry-oriented country and they had no culture. So instead of trying to do like the British Council of the Government, actually getting into the deal, we contracted with private institutions. We contracted with the American Ballet and Lincoln Kirsten. George Balanchine went on a trip to Latin America, which has got to be a saga if you read his letters.

We contracted with the Museum of Modern Art to organize traveling exhibitions. I am not sure the government couldn't, in an effort to reach what you are saying, contract

MORE

in communities with existing institutions for specific projects which insulates the influence of government itself in government selection of government stamped art, which is what I worry about. That always gets to the lowest common denominator.

MR. STRAIGHT: Ken?

MR. DAYTON: Mr. Vice President, you pointed out this tremendous untapped pool of business giving. It probably represents the biggest hopes of the arts at this stage in the game. The Administration has done all that it can in increasing our budget. I think that any help which the Administration can give in support of business use of that available deduction is the best way that it can now effectively help the arts' jawboning for its leadership role in getting business to recognize this opportunity. It could have tremendous leverage on the giving.

We were talking just before you came in about some of the factors which cause the amount of hesitancy that still exists in the business community to take advantage of this opportunity. Any help that the Administration could give in this regard I think would pay off very heavily.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: That is interesting. Just following your idea, let's say the President was to invite 200 or 300 corporate executives down for this purpose. There ought to be some preconceived plan. I am a great believer, if you have a meeting where you want to come out before you start the meeting -- excuse me, that doesn't sound very democratic.

(Laughter)

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I think there ought to be some sort of objective as to what the plan is. Maybe this group can think of it. Corporations give, both out of the generosity of their hearts and also in support of their products. So that there has to be some thought there. You see these programs on educational TV or on TV generally supported by or sponsored by companies. And this they can justify.

Now you get into the nonprofit area, the tax deductible area, and I think there needs to be -- and I hadn't really focused on this -- some plan as to how this could be worked out so that when they came and discussed it that there would be at least some suggestions as to what the form might be, what the amount might be, and the manner of handling it, and so forth, and so forth.

MR. DAYTON: Corporations respond to goals. The government has simply said you can deduct five percent but there has never been a goal set. I would hope that a real national goal, of what corporations could do in the arts, could be set. It was done in education once and served a very useful purpose. If it could be legitimatized, then I think we could attract very great corporate support for the arts.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: That is right.

MORE

MR. DAYTON: And the Administration could play a very significant role in launching such a project.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: If the Council wants to come up with an authority on this, amounts, forms, or organization, and so forth, I would be glad to take it up with the President.

MR. STRAIGHT: Mr. Cauthens.

MR. CAUTHENS: Mr. Vice President, dealing as I am in education and television, last Wednesday evening live from Lincoln Center was the Symphony, which is one of the major advances both for television and the arts. Bringing awareness of really fine arts to the general public is one way of making it more attractive for industry and business to contribute to the arts.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: This is very good.

MR. CAUTHENS: If we can bring these two together in some way and perhaps whatever might come out of a meeting like Ken Dayton was mentioning, and it could receive publicity by public television and other sources, we can get a little bit of a magnification of our efforts.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: In the performing arts, the concept is easier to visualize. I know that the former head of NBC, Pat Weaver -- you may know him, who was a classmate of mine -- was a major promoter of the cable TV until a proposition in California knocked his company out, sponsored by you can guess who.

He felt that cable TV would be the major source of making available the performing arts to the public. You could have a library of cassettes or you could tape in and pick up any opera or philharmonic or ballet you want, and so forth. That to me, is a very exciting thing. Therefore, an individual citizen pays so much for the service and he can then tape into all of these things.

I think your point is very well taken. I don't know what your experience has been in the use of television in relation to painting, sculpture and the visual arts.

MR. CAUTHENS: Very definitely, it is kind of obscure and mostly in sports for a long time. Overnight they have become nationally popular. I think the same thing can happen to fine arts, if it is made available to the public in a form they can understand and then generate support from the business and the public.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I watched the skiing last night. A lot of people are seeing things they have never seen before. I think this is a very important aspect of it.

MR. STRAIGHT: Mr. Seybolt.

MR. SEYBOLT: Mr. Vice President, there is plenty of

MORE

precedent for the thing you suggested between the White House Council on nutrition and studies by Bill Paley, and so on, of the future of education and the future of the economy, and so on. I think if you could prevail on the President to participate and participate yourself in such a focus, it would help enormously to accomplish this business of getting the corporations in the United States more supportive.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I hate to get in an important meeting and end up with a study or a committee. What we are interested in is money, if I understand this correctly.

(Laughter)

MR. SEYBOLT: Both. As you wisely say, you know when you want to end. I suggest that there are all sorts of resources available now which, if brought together into focus, say in July or some time like that, we could have a whale of a conference.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: It could be ready so the spadework could be done in advance.

MR. SEYBOLT: A lot of it has been done.

MR. DAYTON: I would like to suggest that where we end up getting businesses or corporations to donate money for the fine arts, that one percent of that donation be considered as deductible taxable income.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: That is a lot of money.

MR. STRAIGHT: Mr. Robertson.

MR. ROBERTSON: Mr. Vice President, after you finish speaking to the President, I wish you would also speak to your Secretary of the Treasury who came out the other day -- I have been out of the country and I am repeating myself this morning, but he came out with, I think I saw it in The Paris Herald Tribune about simplification of income tax forms and the possibility of eliminating the deduction for charity.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Bill did.

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, exactly. I am a partner of Goldwin and Sacks. I keep hearing remarks from your competition down the street. There are only a couple of partnerships left in the country of this kind.

I think the remarks I got are most unfortunate because if you take someone of his caliber and what he says gets quoted around all over the country, in addition to Congress, I think you have a very dangerous situation.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Was this for corporations or individuals?

MR. ROBERTSON: Individuals. That would make it much worse.

MORE

THE VICE PRESIDENT: This is the thing I was just mentioning before. But I never heard of it from what I considered an intelligent individual. I would check on that. I will talk to him personally. I would almost have to believe that somebody wrote the speech for him.

MR. SHAFER: It is unbelievable.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I am hopeful that he didn't have time to read it before it was made.

(Laughter)

THE VICE PRESIDENT: That is a tragedy. That is really a tragedy. Where did he make this speech?

MR. ROBERTSON: I don't know. I have been out of the country. I think I saw it in The Paris Tribune. It is very unfortunate.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I have another five minutes.

MR. STRAIGHT: Wonderful. We have a new Council member, Mrs. Delores Wharton from Michigan.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Very nice to see you.

MR. STRAIGHT: Billy.

MR. TAYLOR: One of the things that we have been concerned about is that sometimes by legislation, you pointed out a moment ago, there are political overtones to some of the things the Congress is doing.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: And local government too.

MR. TAYLOR: Absolutely. We have, as Council members, and the staff and all the panels try to keep the quality of the grants that we make on a very high level without reference to political overtones or geographical restrictions, except as they apply to the art form itself.

Yet we seem to be getting more pressures that don't have anything to do with quality of the arts, and so forth. I was wondering if you could give us some advice on how we could perhaps get that to be a little less, or what we could do about it.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Again, I have to go back to New York, only because I am more familiar with it. There was a tendency of the staff -- and I had it while I was there under a certain period -- to want to create an institution of their own and then they give the money to individuals, and so forth, and they become sort of the arbiters, and so forth. I was very opposed to it. I feel it is very dangerous for government to build up a group which slowly becomes the judge.

I think the great strength is diversity in this country and freedom which exists. Therefore, I would go back, in answer to your question, and say if there are things to be

done that involve selectivity, and so forth, to help creative individuals, I personally like the idea of the contract with local institutions to do it, where they are not controlled by the government. They may do a good job or bad job, but if you use enough of them, you preserve the diversity.

MR. TAYLOR: What I was really concerned about is that I think this is a good system. It is bad enough in the New York State Council, which has the panel system and which has people who are involved in every aspect of the arts, the production of it, the business end of it, and everything.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: On the Council.

MR. TAYLOR: On the Council. So all of the people who try to make decisions along these lines are doing it hopefully from a basis of an overall interest, rather than a special interest. I have been very impressed, at least with the things I have been a part of, with the kind of fairness I felt on the panel level and on the Council level. That doesn't seem to come across to Congress. They seem to think that we are being very arbitrary in some of the things we do and should be restricted, as you say, because we are maybe not giving the kinds of grants that are best suited for their political purposes.

I don't know how it gets turned around that way, but in some of my conversations that is what I get back.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: There is no question that a Congressman or a legislator who has a constituent who wanted to get some support and didn't get it is going to say what you are saying. Therefore, one needs very strong support from the executive, the President and the governor, to keep it out of politics.

That, hopefully, will continue but there are bound to be periods when it doesn't.

The only way I see, if that trend should grow, would be to try and get part of the money spent for these purposes in local community groups rather than having it done all by a central group in relation to individuals to give it the insulation.

MR. STRAIGHT: We will have one more from Henry.

MR. CAUTHENS: May I ask for one more piece of support from the Administration? A third of this Council rotates off every two years. This is an election year. The quality of the arts in this country, long-term, is very dependent on the quality of this Council. I hope the Administration will do everything that it can in the election year to resist the temptation to make political appointees to this Council but get the very best people.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: What is the procedure for it? Do you make recommendations from the Council to the President for a position?

MORE

MR. STRAIGHT: From the Chairman to the President, yes.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: If that is your procedure, I would think that he would follow it. I haven't seen any signs that he won't. Of course my feeling is good government is the best politics anyhow. A good group in the field of the arts has got to be doubly good politics, and the wrong group would just open them up, or open anybody up, to attack.

One of the things that you all have got to do is to see to it that if any State or if any Federal Administration moves from that, that you really organize public indignation against it.

MR. McWHORTER: There was a procedure to get the Congress to get in this and name one-third and a third being named by the Speaker and a third by the President. In my opinion, that would be disastrous, in terms of balance and everything else. Yet it is understandable and I think the people who have suggested it are really concerned about the overall relationship between the Congress and the Administration in terms of power, and so forth. It is not directed against the arts in particular. It just would be another implementation of an effort to get some more balance between the power. I don't know whether that decision of the court last week in terms of the Federal Election Commission might reflect on it.

The important thing is to refer to these particular appointments for this year as something that is given a very high priority in the Administration from the standpoint of quality and balance. We can eliminate these sorts of political pressures, either from the Congress or all sorts of sources, so we don't get this thing corrupted.

MR. GOLDWIN: Do you have any indication there is going to be any trouble over it?

MR. CAUTHENS: No, none at all. There is always that potential danger, and the danger is greater in an election year.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I would think the sooner that the list was transmitted from the Commission or the Director to the President, the better.

On this thing you are talking about, I know the trend. I happened to have been in a meeting last night with the bipartisan leadership on the Supreme Court decision, with the President and the Congress discussing this, shall we say, there is no unanimity on anything relating to this whole question. But the idea of the Congress appointing people on these Commissions, to my way of thinking, goes totally against the whole concept of the Federal system. How can you hold the executive responsible and the legislative function in its capacity unless the legislative is involved in the executive side of the action. Then nobody is responsible. This is what is happening in this country in the Federal system.

With these categorical grants -- Ray and I feel very strongly about this -- Congress likes to give out these goodies on a spoon-fed basis and get the credit. But the trouble is that nobody is any longer responsible under all of these programs because the Congress started up legislation and money, and then the States get in and match along with the local communities. So you got three levels of government in everything.

The Administrator of those programs cannot be responsible to the people who elect them or who was appointed by, let's say, a governor or a mayor because he says, "The legislation ties me up. I can't make a decision." The money comes from three levels, and we are getting a government where no group is really responsible to the people.

I think it is a very dangerous system. This just compounds that. I am totally with you on it. I know the President is. I will take up these two things with the President. If you have your names or if you haven't got them, as soon as you get them over there, I think the better.

MR. STRAIGHT: I will have to say this discussion has been so focused and so significant and relevant that we have to tell the Vice President that it was not rehearsed. These questions are extemporaneous.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: And this meeting wasn't planned.

(Laughter)

MR. STRAIGHT: Thank you so very much.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I can say there has been no happier meeting for me in the little over a year I have spent here this last time. This is the sixth President I have worked for and this is the happiest meeting I have had. I want to thank you very much.

END (AT 12:10 P.M. EST)