

REMARKS OF SENATOR BOB DOLE

ANNUAL MEETING
LABOR POLICY ASSOCIATION
CONFERENCE CENTER
WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA
SATURDAY, MARCH 6, 1976

I NOTE FROM YOUR PROGRAM THAT MY TOPIC IS SUPPOSED TO BE "1976 -- A POLITICAL FORECAST." IT GOES WITHOUT SAYING THESE DAYS, THAT POLITICAL FORECASTING IS A RISKY BUSINESS. JUST LOOK AT THE TREMENDOUS CHANGES THAT HAVE OCCURRED ON THE POLITICAL LANDSCAPE IN THE PAST THREE YEARS OR SO.

FOLLOWING THE 1972 ELECTION, NO POLITICAL PROGNOSTICATORS COULD HAVE PREDICTED JERRY FORD WOULD NOW BE PRESIDENT. THE PLAYERS HAVE CHANGED IN WAYS NO ONE WOULD HAVE DREAMED. IF HE HAD HAD THE DISTORTED IMAGINATION IT WOULD HAVE TAKEN TO PREDICT RECENT POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS, AND WRITTEN A BOOK ABOUT IT, ALLEN DRURY NEVER WOULD HAVE FOUND A PUBLISHER TO PRINT IT FOR HIM.

-2-

PROBABLY ALL A PRUDENT MAN WOULD SAY ABOUT THE POLITICS OF 1976 IS THAT ONE -- IT'S REALLY TOO SOON TO TELL; AND TWO -- ANYTHING CAN HAPPEN.

A LOOK AT THE PLAYERS

THE PRIMARY ELECTION PROCESS, HOWEVER, DOES LEND ITSELF TO SOME ANALYSIS AND WITH MUCH DARING AND CONSIDERABLE PERSONAL RISK, I WILL VENTURE A FEW OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE POLITICAL BALL GAME AND SOME OF THE PLAYERS.

ON THE DEMOCRATIC SIDE, THERE ARE ACTUALLY THREE DIFFERENT PRIMARY RACES BEING CONDUCTED TO DETERMINE THE FRONT-RUNNER IN THE LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, AND MIDDLE-OF-THE-ROAD FACTIONS OF THE PARTY. GEORGE WALLACE IS THE UNCONTESTED LEADER IN THE CONSERVATIVE FACTION. MO UDALL APPEARS TO BE A MARGINAL FRONT RUNNER IN THE LIBERAL FACTION ALTHOUGH HE IS BEING CLOSELY PURSUED BY FRED HARRIS AND SARGENT SHRIVER. SCOOP JACKSON AND JIMMY CARTER ARE THE CURRENT FRONT RUNNERS OF THE MIDDLE-OF-THE-ROAD FACTION.

-3-

THIS IS THE FACTION WHOSE CANDIDATE MUST BE SUFFICIENTLY EXCITING TO KEEP HIS FOLLOWERS INTERESTED WHILE ALSO NOT BEING SUFFICIENTLY SPECIFIC ON ANY ISSUE TO ALIENATE EITHER THE CONSERVATIVE OR LIBERAL FACTIONS OF THE PARTY. THE ABILITY TO SPEAK WITHOUT SAYING ANYTHING AND TO APPEAR TO BE ALL THINGS TO ALL PEOPLE ARE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FRONT RUNNERS IN THE MIDDLE-OF-THE-ROAD FACTION.

IN ADDITION TO THE FACTIONAL LEADERS, WE ALSO HAVE THE OUTSIDE CANDIDATE, SENATOR CHURCH, AND THE NON-CANDIDATES, SENATORS KENNEDY AND HUMPHREY, AND SURELY OTHERS. A NON-CANDIDATE IS A CANDIDATE WHO IS WAITING FOR THE FACTIONS TO DEADLOCK. SOME OF THE NON-CANDIDATES ARE RUNNING HARDER THAN ANNOUNCED CONTENDERS.

ON THE REPUBLICAN SIDE THINGS ARE SIMPLER. WE HAVE TWO CANDIDATES WITH CONSERVATIVE PHILOSOPHIES, COMPETING FOR THE SUPPORT OF THAT MINORITY GROUP CALLED REPUBLICANS.

-4-

POLITICAL FORCES AT WORK

HAVING LOOKED AT THE PLAYERS, I FEEL IT TIMELY TO FOCUS ON OTHER FORCES AT WORK WITHIN THE POLITICAL ARENA WHICH WILL SURELY HAVE AN IMPACT ON THE OUTCOME OF THE 1976 ELECTION.

THE WATERGATE HANGOVER

THE SERIES OF EVENTS EUPHEMISTICALLY REFERRED TO AS "WATERGATE" WILL DEFINITELY HAVE AN IMPACT ON THE 1976 ELECTION. WATERGATE HAS BEEN A FACTOR IN THE SHAPING OF THE PUBLIC IMAGE OF POLITICIANS AND POLITICAL ISSUES. LET'S FACE IT, ANY REPUBLICAN RUNNING AS A CONSERVATIVE, WHO IS "AIDED" BY "BIG" BUSINESS HAS TWO STRIKES AGAINST HIM.

-5-

DOUBLE STANDARD

IT IS NOT MY PURPOSE TO CONDONE WHAT WAS DONE IN WATERGATE, BUT RATHER TO POINT OUT THAT NOT ALL OF THE ILLEGAL POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF THE PAST DECADE WERE UNDERTAKEN BY REPUBLICAN^S CONSERVATIVES, OR BUSINESSMEN AND WOMEN. THE PUBLIC PERCEIVES IT THAT WAY, HOWEVER, AND THE HEADLINES OFFER LITTLE EVIDENCE TO THE CONTRARY.

BUT THE FACTS REVEAL A DIFFERENT STORY. I HOPE EVERY AMERICAN WHO BELIEVES WIRETAPPING, ILLEGAL ENTRY, AND POLITICAL ESPIONAGE ARE A RECENT REPUBLICAN PHENOMENA, READS^CCAREFULLY THE CIA REPORTS TO BE RELEASED LATER THIS MONTH. I HOPE EVERY VOTER ALSO TAKES A LOOK AT THE POLITICAL ESPIONAGE PRACTICED IN THE 1960 AND '64 ELECTIONS TO BE REVEALED IN THESE REPORTS. TWO WRONGS DO NOT MAKE A RIGHT, BUT PRIOR WRONGDOING BY DEMOCRATS SHOULD BE REVEALED TO AT LEAST REMOVE THE MISCONCEPTION THAT CORRUPTION AND POLITICAL MANIPULATION ARE A REPUBLICAN PHENOMENA THAT CONTINUES EVEN TODAY.

-6-

IT ALSO SEEMS THAT WE DAILY READ OF CONTRIBUTIONS BY BUSINESS AND THE EFFORTS OF CORPORATIONS TO INFLUENCE VOTES. YET THE INFLUENCE OF BUSINESS IN CONGRESS IS MINIMAL WHEN COMPARED TO THE INFLUENCE OF LABOR. WHEN LABOR LEADERS CALL IN THE VOTES, YOU CAN BE ASSURED CONGRESS WILL RESPOND, WHY DOESN'T THE PUBLIC PERCEIVE THIS AS "SPECIAL INTEREST" CONTROL?

THE SACRED LABOR BOSS

THE TERM "LABOR CONGRESS" MAY SOUND HARSH, BUT IT'S NOT VERY WIDE OF THE MARK. TOTAL UP THE VOTES IN CONGRESS ON ANY GIVEN BILL ON WHICH ORGANIZED LABOR HAS A KNOWN POSITION, AND COMPARE IT TO A LIST OF RECIPIENTS OF LABOR CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS SOME TIME,

-7-

IT'S FRUSTRATING THAT NOT VERY MUCH OF THIS KIND OF COMPARISON GETS DONE, ESPECIALLY IN THIS AGE OF CAMPAIGN REFORM.

COMMON SITUS PICKETING

LET'S TAKE A SPECIFIC BILL, THE SO-CALLED COMMON SITUS PICKETING BILL. ORGANIZED LABOR HAD A POSITION ON THE BILL THAT WAS NEVER IN DOUBT, IT PASSED THE SENATE BY A VOTE OF 52 TO 45.

AND THE 52 SENATORS WHO VOTED FOR IT RECEIVED FROM ORGANIZED LABOR IN THEIR LAST ELECTION CAMPAIGNS, AN AGGREGATE OF \$3,222,155. THAT IS A STAGGERING FIGURE, ESPECIALLY WHEN YOU CONSIDER THAT THESE CONTRIBUTIONS ARE ONLY A PART -- AND BY SOME ESTIMATES, ONLY THE SMALLER PART -- OF LABORS' TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF MONEY, PLUS "IN-KIND" CONTRIBUTIONS LIKE MAILINGS, PHONE BANKS, AND "VOLUNTEER" SERVICES. IT IS EVEN MORE STARTLING WHEN

-8-

YOU CONSIDER THAT ON THE MORE SIGNIFICANT MOTION TO END DEBATE AND BRING THE BILL TO A VOTE, LABOR WAS ABLE TO GAIN THE SUPPORT OF AN ADDITIONAL 16 SENATORS WHOSE CONTRIBUTIONS ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THESE FIGURES. THE 229 MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WHO VOTED FOR THE BILL RECEIVED CONTRIBUTIONS FROM ORGANIZED LABOR TOTALLING \$2, 449,170.

CORPORATE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEES

I BRING THIS UP, NOT TO RESURRECT OLD ARGUMENTS ABOUT THE BILL, NOR EVEN ABOUT THE LEGITIMACY OF LABOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS.

I BRING IT UP, BASICALLY, FOR TWO REASONS,
FIRST, BECAUSE IT ILLUSTRATES THE DEGREE OF INFLUENCE LABOR HAS IN THE CONGRESS; AND,

-9-

SECONDLY, BECAUSE LEGISLATION WILL SOON BE CONSIDERED -- PROBABLY NEXT WEEK -- TO RESTRUCTURE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION, AND EFFORTS ARE ALMOST SURELY GOING TO BE MADE TO REVOKE BY LEGISLATION THE THREE MONTH OLD RULING BY THE FEC, WHICH HAS PROMISED RELATIVELY FAIR TREATMENT TO BUSINESS POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEES -- TREATMENT UNDER THE LAW WHICH WAS AT LONG LAST, COMPARABLE TO THAT AFFORDED THE LABOR UNIONS,

IN POINT OF FACT, BUSINESS PACs STAND TO LOSE A LOT IF THESE EFFORTS ARE SUCCESSFUL AND I URGE YOU TO DO WHATEVER YOU CAN TO BUILD OPPOSITION IN THE CONGRESS TO SUCH DISCRIMINATORY AMENDMENTS. AT THE SAME TIME, I WOULD IMPLORE YOU TO ACT NOW TO ORGANIZE YOUR CORPORATE PACs IN KEEPING WITH THE SUPREME COURT AND THE FEC SUNPAC DECISIONS,

-10-

THE REASON TIME IS SO MUCH OF THE ESSENCE IS THAT ONE OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFICATION AS A MULTI-CANDIDATE COMMITTEE IS THAT IT BE ORGANIZED FOR A PERIOD OF NOT LESS THAN 6 MONTHS. OBVIOUSLY, IF YOU WERE TO FORM ONE TODAY, IT WOULD BE SEPTEMBER 6 -- ALREADY BEYOND THE PRIMARIES AND LESS THAN 60 DAYS PRIOR TO THE GENERAL ELECTION -- BEFORE YOUR PAC WOULD BECOME ELIGIBLE FOR THE \$5000 PER CANDIDATE PER ELECTION (AS OPPOSED TO \$1,000) LIMITATION.

OF COURSE, THE PENDING LEGISLATION -- IF IT EVER GOT BY THE WHITE HOUSE -- WOULD SEEK TO FURTHER RESTRICT THIS OPPORTUNITY WITH RESPECT TO THE NUMBER OF PAC'S AND EMPLOYEE SOLICITATIONS. BUT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THE LAW AS IT NOW EXISTS, AND NO MATTER HOW THE UPCOMING LEGISLATION MAY TURN OUT, YOU MUST DO MORE IN FUTURE POLITICAL ACTION EFFORTS THAN YOU HAVE DONE IN THE PAST.

-11-

GET INVOLVED

BY YOU, OF COURSE, I MEAN AMERICAN BUSINESS
GENERALLY, AND I MEAN MY URGINGS IN ALL SERIOUSNESS,
FOR UNLESS SOMETHING IS DONE TO COUNTERBALANCE THE
INFLUENCE OF BIG LABOR IN AMERICAN POLITICS, WE WILL GO
ON BEING SERVED -- AND ILL SERVED -- BY AN UNBALANCED
CONGRESS, HEAVILY BEHOLDEN TO THE EFFORTS LABOR MADE
TO ELECT IT, AND PRACTICALLY COMMITTED TO THE SPECIAL
LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS LABOR EXPRESSES,

THIS CONGRESS WILL REMAIN ESSENTIALLY UNCHANGED
UNLESS YOU DETERMINE TO SEE TO IT THAT YOUR LEGITIMATE
POINTS OF VIEW ARE EXPRESSED AND HEARD WITH FORCEFULNESS
IN THE PUBLIC POLICY FORUM, YOU MUST USE EVERY LEGITIMATE
MEANS AT YOUR DISPOSAL TO DO THIS TO INSURE THAT BUSINESS'
OPINIONS ARE GIVEN WEIGHT THAT IS IN PROPORTION TO THE
IMPORTANCE OF BUSINESS TO THE WELL-BEING OF THIS SOCIETY
AND ITS ECONOMY.

-12-

THE VALEO DECISION AND INDEPENDENT INVOLVEMENT

LET ME STRESS HERE THAT IN ITS RECENT RULING, THE SUPREME COURT MADE ONE VERY IMPORTANT DISTINCTION, THAT IS IT'S DISTINCTION BETWEEN POLITICAL EXPENDITURES MADE IN BEHALF OF A CANDIDATE AND "CONTROLLED BY OR COORDINATED WITH" HIS CAMPAIGN, AND THOSE POLITICAL EXPENDITURES MADE IN BEHALF OF A CANDIDATE BUT MADE INDEPENDENTLY FROM THE CANDIDATE IN HIS CAMPAIGN.

IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, SUCH EXPENDITURES ARE EFFECTIVELY LIMITED BECAUSE THE AMOUNTS OF CONTRIBUTION TO PAY FOR THEM ARE SUBJECT TO LIMITATION UNDER THE LAW.

BUT THE SECOND CATEGORY OF EXPENDITURES ARE THOSE WHICH AN INDIVIDUAL OR AN ORGANIZATION, SAY A POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE, MIGHT MAKE IN SUPPORT OF A CANDIDATE BUT WITHOUT HIS KNOWLEDGE, PERHAPS, AND CERTAINLY WITHOUT HIS CONTROL.

-13-

THESE EXPENDITURES, UNDER THE COURT'S RULING
ARE EFFECTIVELY UNLIMITED,

AND YOU CAN BET THAT GEORGE MEANY AND HIS NUMEROUS
MINIONS WILL EXPLOIT THOSE PROVISIONS OF THE LAW TO THE
MAXIMUM TO FURTHER THEIR POLITICAL GOALS,

IF BUSINESS DOESN'T DO THE SAME, IT WILL BE YOUR
FAULT AND OURS. FOR THE FLEXIBILITY IN THE LAW PERMITS
YOU TO MAKE IMPACT -- INDEPENDENTLY -- ON THE SHAPE OF
THE 95TH CONGRESS, AS WELL AS THE WHITE HOUSE,

OUR CONGRESS -- EXAMPLE OF A BANKRUPT APPROACH

I FEEL THE 94TH CONGRESS IS A LIVING EXAMPLE OF WHY
CHANGE IS NEEDED AND YOUR INPUT INTO THE POLITICAL PROCESS
IS IMPERATIVE AT THIS TIME,

-14-

OVER THE PAST 20 YEARS, CONGRESS -- A LIBERAL CONGRESS -- HAS PROJECTED ITSELF AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AS THE SOLUTION TO EVERY AMERICAN'S PROBLEM. OVER THE PAST 15 YEARS, FEDERALLY-FUNDED PROGRAMS HAVE INCREASED IN NUMBER FROM SLIGHTLY OVER 200 TO NEARLY 1,000. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REGULATION HAS PERMEATED EVERY ASPECT OF BUSINESS AND PRIVATE LIFE. WHAT ARE THE RESULTS OF THIS EXPANSIVE FEDERAL MONOLITH? THE ONLY RESULTS I SEE ARE AN ENORMOUS FEDERAL DEFICIT, GROWING BIGGER EVERY DAY AND A GROWING TREND AWAY FROM PRIVATE RESPONSIBILITY AND A GREAT DEPENDENCY ON UNCLE SAM -- A DEPENDENCY WHICH ASSUMES HE CAN GIVE US SOMETHING FOR NOTHING.

-15-

IT IS TIME TO REVERSE THIS TREND AND RETURN TO INDIVIDUAL AND PRIVATE RESPONSIBILITY. AND I THINK CONGRESS MUST ASSUME THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR REVERSING THE TREND. I HAVE INTRODUCED A BILL, S. 2516, WHICH REQUIRES EACH CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE TO REVIEW EVERY PROGRAM IT HAS ON THE BOOKS EVERY TWO YEARS IN ORDER TO IDENTIFY WASTE, DUPLICATION, AND INEFFICIENCY IN THE EXPENDITURE OF TAX DOLLARS. THE PHILOSOPHY BEHIND THIS BILL IS THAT WE ALREADY HAVE TOO MANY PROGRAMS AND SPEND TOO MUCH MONEY. IT EXPRESSES THE BELIEF THAT CONGRESS SHOULD SPEND ITS TIME PUTTING EXISTING LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMS IN ORDER RATHER THAN SEEKING NEW AREAS OF FEDERAL INTERVENTION AND BIGGER WAYS OF SPENDING YOUR TAX DOLLARS.

-16-

BOGUS EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

I AM AMUSED BY SOME OF THE PROPOSALS COMING OUT OF CONGRESS DIRECTED AT REDUCING UNEMPLOYMENT, WHICH VISUALIZE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AS THE ULTIMATE PROVIDER.

ADVOCATES OF THESE LARGE FEDERAL MAKE-SHIFT JOB PROGRAMS CLAIM THAT SUCH PROGRAMS PAY FOR THEMSELVES THROUGH INCREASED TAX REVENUES REALIZED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FROM THE SALARIES OF THE WORK FORCE THEY CREATE. ALTHOUGH SOME ADDITIONAL REVENUES ARE REALIZED, THE ARGUMENT CANNOT BE TRUE OR IT WOULD BE IN THE GOVERNMENT'S BEST INTEREST TO NOT ONLY PUT EVERY WORKER ON THE PAYROLL, BUT ALSO TO PAY EVERY WORKER ANY SALARY HE WANTS. WHY NOT? AS THE ARGUMENT GOES, "SUCH EXPENDITURES WOULD BE RECAPTURED BY THE GOVERNMENT THROUGH INCREASED REVENUES." UNFORTUNATELY, IT DOESN'T WORK THIS WAY.

-17-

AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO THIS "GIVE AWAY" APPROACH, WE ARE INVESTIGATING A LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL WHICH WOULD PROVIDE A TAX CREDIT TO BUSINESS FOR WAGES PAID TO NEW EMPLOYEES DURING PERIODS OF HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT. THIS PROPOSAL HAS THE ADVANTAGE OF PUTTING WORKERS BACK TO WORK AT ONE-TENTH THE COST TO THE TAXPAYER PER JOB.

BY INCORPORATING WORKERS INTO THE PRIVATE SECTOR, IT ALSO ASSURES THAT THEY OBTAIN PRODUCTIVE, LONG-TERM JOBS. UNFORTUNATELY, CONGRESS SEEMS BLIND TO THE FACT THAT THE GOOD MANAGEMENT EFFORTS OF AMERICAN BUSINESS, OVER THE LAST TWELVE MONTHS OR SO, DESERVE THE LION'S SHARE OF THE CREDIT FOR THE RECOVERY OUR ECONOMY HAS MADE. THEREFORE, I AM UNCERTAIN OF THE FATE OF SUCH A PROPOSAL. YET IT CERTAINLY BEARS EVALUATION AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE PUBLIC SECTOR JOB PROPOSALS WHICH PROBABLY WILL COME TO A VOTE EVERY MONTH, AS THE ELECTION APPROACHES.

-18-

THE ECONOMY IS MOVING IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION WITH NO THANKS DUE, PARTICULARLY TO THIS CONGRESS. THE CREDIT FOR THE RECOVERY SHOULD BE DIVIDED BETWEEN YOU IN BUSINESS AND THE FORD ADMINISTRATION, WHICH HAD THE GOOD SENSE TO SHOW RESTRAINT AND WHICH CONTINUES TO HAVE THE PERSERVERANCE TO MAINTAIN POLICIES OF RESTRAINT.

POLITICAL FORECASTS

MY FORECASTS ABOUT THE POLITICS OF 1976 -- REMEMBER I PROMISED I WOULD GET BACK TO THEM IN SPITE OF THE RISKS -- ARE PREMISED ON THIS IDEA THAT THE PEOPLE OF AMERICA ARE READY FOR A LITTLE RESTRAINT BY THEIR GOVERNMENT.

IF THE PREMISE IS RIGHT, THEN THE CHANCES FOR SOME SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN THE CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS ARE GOOD. THE TIMES SEEM RIGHT FOR THEM. I AM NOT PREDICTING THE KIND OF CATAclysmic CHANGES THAT WOULD GIVE REPUBLICANS

-19-

CONTROL -- THOUGH REMEMBER THAT IN 1976 THE PRUDENT MAN WOULD POINT OUT ONLY THAT "ANYTHING CAN HAPPEN" -- BUT I DO FORESEE MAJOR CHANGES IN THE MAKE-UP OF THE CONGRESS WITH THE REAL POSSIBILITY THAT THE 94TH CONGRESS MAY GO DOWN IN HISTORY AS THE LAST OF THE BIG SPENDERS.

FORD'S CHANCES GOOD

AND IF I AM RIGHT ABOUT THE POLITICAL MOOD IN THIS ELECTION YEAR, 1976, THEN I WOULD ALSO HAVE TO SAY PUTTING THE PRESIDENTIAL FORECAST IN BLUNT TERMS, THAT JERRY FORD'S CHANCES LOOK DARN GOOD AND ARE GETTING BETTER ALL THE TIME.

AND FOR THOSE OF US WHO ARE CONCERNED ABOUT MAKING SOME REAL CHANGES FOR THE BETTER IN GOVERNMENT, THAT'S AS IT SHOULD BE, FOR AGAIN, TO PUT IT BLUNTLY, AMONG ALL THE CANDIDATES RUNNING, JERRY FORD IS THE BEST MAN FOR THE JOB.

-20-

IT MAY BE TRUE THAT THE CONGRESS IS MAKING HIM LOOK GOOD -- IT HAS GIVEN HIM A CHANCE TO VETO SOME OF THE WORST LEGISLATION IN MEMORY, BUT APART FROM THAT, I THINK HE STANDS ON HIS OWN.

LET'S BE FRANK. HE WENT THROUGH A PERIOD WHEN MOST AMERICANS -- INCLUDING MYSELF -- FELT HE HAD A LOT TO PROVE ABOUT HIMSELF BEFORE WE COULD GIVE HIM OUR SUPPORT.

BUT THAT PERIOD IS OVER. HE HAS HIS OWN PROGRAM AND IS BUILDING HIS OWN RECORD -- AND BOTH ARE OUTSTANDING. ONCE AGAIN, ANYTHING COULD HAPPEN, BUT AS OF NOW, I WOULD HAVE TO SAY THAT JERRY FORD'S THE FRONT RUNNER FOR THE NOMINATION AND FOR ELECTION. AND BECAUSE HE SURMOUNTED SOME OBSTACLES THAT WERE TREMENDOUS -- REALLY FRIGHTENING, IF YOU THINK BACK TO WHAT IT WAS LIKE IN AUGUST, 1974 -- I WOULD HAVE TO SAY THAT HE GOT TO BE THE FRONT RUNNER BY A LOT OF HARD WORK. THE FACT THAT HARD WORK IS STILL GOING ON

-21-

MAKES IT INCREASINGLY LIKELY, IN MY VIEW, THAT ANYTHING
THAT COULD HAPPEN TO DISLODGE HIM AS FRONT RUNNER,
ACTUALLY WON'T HAPPEN AND THAT HE'LL GO ON TO WIN,

Now, WITH THE FORECASTS OUT OF THE WAY, I'D BE
HAPPY TO HEAR SOME QUESTIONS.

#####