

Interview number A-0044 in the Southern Oral History Program Collection (#4007) at The Southern Historical Collection, The Louis Round Wilson Special Collections Library, UNC-Chapel Hill.

This is an interview with Jim ^{bthorp}Apthorp, executive assistant to Governor Reubin Askew of Florida. The interview was conducted in Tallahassee, Florida on May 21, 1974 by Jack Bass and Walter De Vries. It was transcribed by Joe Jaros.

Walter De Vries: What's your background, Jim?

Jim ^{Apthorp}Apthorp: I'm a government major from FSU. And I've been in state government about ten years.

W.D.V.: In the executive branch?

Apthorp: Yeah. Well, I was with the legislature for a couple of years and worked in a campaign in 1960 for the governor's race, in 1964 rather. And then I've been in state government as deputy secretary of state and I was the director of the state land agency and I've been here for about three years. And, you know, I guess that I'm doing what I was trained to do, but it has been . . . there's been . . . this state has gone through a tremendous change, the state government has gone through a tremendous change in that period of time.

W.D.V.: Can you talk a little bit about what has occurred since you've been here?

Apthorp: Since 1964, I think that obviously, the most significant change has been reapportionment. We went through three or four apportionments in the late '60's. And the one that finally stuck was the 1967 plan. There

were new elections in 1968. The legislature that came at that point was a very, very different legislature than the ones that had existed before.

W.D.V.: How was it different?

Apthorp: You know, it was a surprising thing. It was different because those elections tended to attract candidates, not all of them, but a number of members were elected as a result of those elections that were very, very bright and very successful and very committed to the state government. And they came from cities. And I don't think that people had been elected from the big cities, or that people had even run from the big cities in Florida, of that caliber before. Because it was sort of a futile effort to come to Tallahassee to a legislature that was dominated by rural interests and rural legislators. But after the last apportionment, they were elected, they ran and they were elected and they have provided the leadership in the legislature since then. People like Marshall Harris and Dick Pettigrew. Dick was already in the legislature, but he is the same kind of guy. People like Bob Graham, Sandy Dahlenburg, George Firestone, who are all carrying heavy loads in the legislature now and they were elected in that election. That was probably the most significant legislative election that I am aware of ever in Florida. I think that it has served the state very, very well. And they have now been members of the legislature long enough to provide the real basis of legislative leadership. The first couple of sessions weren't particularly significant, but beginning in about 1970, which happened to coincide with the time that the governor was elected, they were in positions of leadership that allowed them to really begin to move things. It was . . . the ten years has been an unbelievable process. I worked in the legislature in 1964, in the

'63 session and on into 1964, there was an impeachment trial and I continued working in that. And the legislature of that day was entirely dependent on people from the executive branch for any information and staffing and even typewriters and desks. I was later, at the next session, the '65 session, I was in the secretary of state's office, and we used to loan typewriters. We'd loan them desks, we'd draft their bills for them, we provided what a good legislative service should provide for the members. And that's not the case at all anymore. There is a significant independence and a feeling of independence that seems to run through the legislature. Of course, the legislature only met every two years, so it was . . . and the major employees of the legislature were all people that worked in the interim for the state agencies as secretaries or analysts or budget people. Even the sergeant at arms of both houses were people that were employed by the executive branch and went over to the legislature during the sessions to take care of their needs.

W.D.V.: Well, the quality of the legislators has changed, you think, to better? How about the product?

Apthorp: Yes. I think that . . . Florida has such a fortunate series of circumstances. There was the reapportionment, there was a constitutional revision that had been set in motion by an earlier legislature and happened to come to the legislature just after all these new people were elected. And that . . . in fact, those new people insisted that the number of departments be limited to twenty-five and that the governmental reorganization follow in 1969 to accomplish that, if the constitutional revision was adopted. It was adopted and it triggered the reorganization of state government which was mandated in the new constitution. So, those three events, the reapportionment,

the constitutional revision and the reorganization that followed, were very, very . . . it represents a radical change from what was going on in state government. And the work product, as a result of all three of those things and the caliber of people that were elected, has been tremendously improved. The legislature has shown a complete willingness to attack issues that would never get to first base in prior years. A corporate profits tax had been kicking around for years. There was a senator from Polk County named Billy Joe Griffin, a citrus man, he has been chairman of the senate finance and tax committee for some time, and he had introduced a corporate profits tax and it never got out of committee. It was never considered seriously. Of course, maybe the governor's direction had something to do with that too. Because he ran on it as an issue. But, ethics and disclosure that swamped this session were matters that would never have been even strongly considered, I think, by prior legislatures. Legislatures before 1968. At every session, I think that we can point at some . . . land planning and land management, water management legislation, which tends to run into private property rights, were matters that would never have been seriously considered by prior legislatures. You can look down the accomplishments of this session when it is finished, and I think that the same will be true. I think that the appropriations process has become a much more sophisticated one and a process based on an assessment of results from prior appropriations. You can't any longer have the executive branch go to the legislature and say, "Well, here's what we had last year, here's what we need."

W.D.V.: Has the increased effectiveness of the legislative branch decreased the power of the governor's office and the cabinet?

Apthorp: Not of the governor's office. It probably has taken away from some of those collective agencies. In effect, the governor and cabinet sat as the highest level of state government for twenty-two months in every two year period, performed as a legislature to some extent. Because they had control of money and people and equipment, all the service functions of the state. And the legislature only met two months every two years. Or only addressed that kind of issue for two months every two years and so they functioned as a quasi-legislative body in between sessions of the legislature. That's no longer true. They are considerably restricted in what they can do and I think that the key to that reorganization in that regard . . . the reason that it did not result in any diminution of the governor's authority was because of the structure that was created in the department of administration. That department, which is headed by a secretary appointed by the governor, has the action in budgeting personnel, planning, retirement . . . and as a result, those functions were pulled out from the governor and cabinet and put in the governor alone. And he must go back to the administrative commission, which is the governor and cabinet commission inside that department, created in that department, for approval of certain actions. But by and large . . . for instance, salaries of department heads and of divisional directors, are set by the secretary of administration without anyone's approval. So, all that has resulted in a more significant governor's office, I think, and some diminution of the collective function of the old budget commission or personnel board, which were governor and cabinet boards.

Jack Bass: And the budget process now originates in the governor's office?

Apthorp: He develops his budget in October. In November, agencies must . . . there is a period of about a month during their schedule and they submit their budgets and he reviews them in November and December and he

J.B.: Is that an oral presentation?

Apthorp: Yes, it's been sort of a perfunctory oral presentation, though. They come in and he spends a day and a half or two days and each agency says, "Here's what we need." And that's been done and then he spends December, January and February putting his budget together. And he has to present a balanced budget, which had never been the case before the new constitution. He has to identify revenue sources as well as appropriations. He can't present one that's in the red

J.B.: Who makes the revenue estimate?

Apthorp: There's a joint group. It's really informal, but everyone sort of by tact, agreed to use the same figures and it's a group of legislative and executive budget and planning people, some economists who sit down and . . . there are people from the comptroller's office, from the department of administration and from each house of the legislature.

J.B.: Staff people?

Apthorp: Yeah, all staff people. I guess that there are about fifteen of them and they estimate during the fall and then they estimate again around the first of the year and then they estimate again at about the time that the legislature convenes. And everyone uses the same figures.

W.D.V.: How did Agnew . . . or Askew (laughter) . . . forgive me, how did Askew put together the staff? I hear that you are chief of staff of the executive office?

Apthorp: Yeah.

W.D.V.: How did he pick you?

Apthorp: I had known him when he was a member of the legislature, I guess that it was sort of a function of that old system where we used to do all the staff work for legislators. We used to work with him and lots of other members on various projects, whatever they were interested in. In fact, in 1967, some of the staff people, myself included, were concerned about our personnel system, the merit system only covered about half of the state's employees. It didn't cover any cabinet officers and it only covered the governor's agencies. So, it was . . . which represented about half of the state's employees. So, we developed some legislation that would broaden it to include everyone and changed the name from a merit system, you just sort of had to get away from the terminology to sort of be successful. We took that bill to Governor Askew, who was a member of the state senate at the time, and he passed it. And I guess that was the one project that I worked most closely with him on. I had also known him from the 1964 campaign that I worked in, which was for Jack Matthews, he ran for governor. He was a member of the senate from Duvall County, from Jacksonville. And Governor Askew was a supporter of his in Pensacola. So, I knew him through that and through just general contact between the executive and legislative branches.

W.D.V.: Are most

Apthorp: I was the director of state land agencies at the time and he asked me to come over and I've been there for two years.

W.D.V.: Are most of the staff people who worked on his campaign in 1970?

Apthorp: I didn't.

W.D.V.: Are the rest of them?

Apthorp: No. Only two people that are on the staff now, three people. Harvey Cotton and Brent Parish and Doug Stewell. There are about fifty-five positions here and there are about ten key staff positions.

W.D.V.: Do all ten of those key positions have direct access to the governor, or do they go through you.

Apthorp: Well, they come through me and we resolve a lot of things without going to him, but they all have regular contact with him. At least once or twice a week, in staff meetings and individual matters that we are working on with him. But of those ten, they all have pretty regular contact with him. We don't have a real formal structure, I could show you an organization chart and I guess that it's as good a way to visually depict it as we could develop, but it still doesn't really reflect the . . . our staff moves to wherever the problems are. We have very consciously tried to be so rigid or strict in making assignments that we lose our ability to respond to problems. For instance, our legislative session presents us with a time when there are probably five or six of us that spend almost all our time working on matters with the legislature. And then we could move to other problems as they occur.

J.B.: How large is the staff?

Apthorp: Fifty-five people. About ten key staff people, the rest are support of various kinds.

J.B.: Does that represent an expansion of the staff from previous

Apthorp: It's only slightly larger than it has been before.

J.B.: How about in terms of the legislature, legislative employees say, back in '64, and what it is now?

Apthorp: Oh, an enormous increase. A thousand percent, probably more. This office staff has an interesting history. It was in 19 . . . when I first

came to work in state government, there was a staff of about fifteen or seventeen people in the governor's office.

W.D.V.: In the senior staff or total staff?

Apthorp: Total staff. Total. And the practice was to get people from agencies to do different kinds of work for you. And then, when Governor Kirk was in office, this got pretty abused, because he was running for vice-president you remember in 1968, I guess it was, and he had staff from the department of commerce and all the public relations speech writers and everybody were all doing things for him in his campaign for vice-president. So, the legislature came back in 1969 and they said, "Now, how much staff do you need to do the job?" And they came up with about fifty. And then they prohibited the borrowing of people from other agencies and for period of more than one week, I think it is, or two weeks. And so, they very consciously staffed the governor's office with enough staff to do the work that goes on in the office.

W.D.V.: So, you've got an independent staffing of the executive office and the legislature occurring about the same time?

Apthorp: Yes, that's right. For entirely different reasons, but

W.D.V.: Right.

Apthorp: But they did both occur about the same time. And that staff is about the right size for us. We perform our work with agencies. Our staff members, our key staff members have what we call liason assignments. And one of those ten people is assigned, for instance, to the department of transportation and he spends, I'm sure, half his time working on department of transportation matters, spends a lot of time in the agency, spends a lot of time with their staff, he goes to their staff meetings and he performs as

the governor's liason man with the department of transportation. And the governor and the secretary maintain a relationship, too. But in terms of having information available in this office, being able to attack a problem of, you know, somebody needs a stoplight or somebody wants an interchange modified, or whatever the problem is in the DOT, our man is there working with them on that problem. And that's the principle executive function that is performed by, the principle assigned function that those key people have.

W.D.V.: Do most of those kind of said people have a program development capability, too?

Apthorp: Not entirely, they do . . . (interruption on tape)
 I think that state news is reported better in the Florida press than it is in the press of most states. If you look at some Florida newspapers, with the exception of the Miami Herald, and this is a major exception, because it's the biggest paper in the state, but with that exception, if you look at the St. Petersburg paper, the Tampa paper, the Florida Times-Union, Orlando Sentinel, the Gainesville Sun, the major daily papers with the exception of the Herald, they do an extensive job of covering state news. It's really remarkable.

W.D.V.: Why? Why do they do it?

Apthorp: I don't know. I don't know why that's happened in this state, but it has. And I look at papers from other states and I don't see that kind of coverage. They do it in great detail and it's very extensive coverage of what goes on in state government. They have strong bureaus here, they have some of the best reporters assigned to state government and they are willing to spend the money to provide that space. Obviously, that makes a larger impact, because if there are more inches and there is more detail, then people know that what they are doing will be reported. And it makes them

W.D.V.: Does that have an impact on the way that policy is made in government?

Apthorp: Yes.

W.D.V.: How?

Apthorp: Well, aside from whatever they report, they also engage in pretty heavy editorial exploration of various issues. And I think that as you move to a more urban legislature and to, you know, more urban voters living in the state, those major daily newspapers have a wider and wider influence over the decision-making process. Because that's the only source of information that a large segment of the voters have, is through these newspapers. Television stations, well, television stations have done a fair job in Florida, not as good, I think, as they might have. The daily newspapers, however, have a significant impact. You can just about, in some areas of the state, predict how whole delegations will react to the result of what the newspapers say. The St. Petersburg Times does as good a job as any newspaper that I have ever seen anywhere, to cover state news. It's extraordinary. During sessions of the legislature . . . you ought to pick up the Times while you are here

J.B.: We have.

Apthorp: Daily, they have, you know, a two or three page section devoted to legislative news, pictures and quotes and it's a nicely put together piece of journalism and you can believe that those legislators read it. They also have done a good circulation job, deliberately here. You know, they see that it's here early in the morning and all members of the legislature are delivered a copy of the St. Pete Times every morning.

J.B.: Is that right?

Apthorp: Whether you subscribe to it or not.

J.B.: To their office here?

Apthorp: Their circulation office here, yeah. They deliver it to every legislative office in the capitol every morning. They want to have it, in fact, that's the major reason.

(tape turned off)

J.B.: That's a typical Knight newspaper?

Apthorp: Yeah.

W.D.V.: Why does Askew want to run again? What is there to accomplish that he hasn't accomplished?

Apthorp: I think that he has some other significant tax proposals to make. Well, I shouldn't say entirely tax, they are sort of tax and finance related areas. We have seen, in three and a half years, probably that the most significant strides of this administration has been in those areas. And there are literally dozens of areas that we have talked about, some of which we have proposed to the legislature unsuccessfully, and some that we have not and we will pursue in that area. I think that I would have to put first. Then, beyond that, there are significant other areas. One is environmental. We have made some good headway there, particularly in the land management and water management bills. Both those programs, thought, have been underfunded and are not yet operational to the extent they should be. We are going to see the first significant funding of them at this session of the legislature. And there is an awful lot more to be done there. Things like funding that capacity land project. That ought to be available to every local planner in Florida. The local planning commission that has a shopping center proposal before it ought to have that data before acting. They ought to know what the capacity of that land is, in every respect. They ought to know what the water problems are, they ought to know what the drainage problems are, they ought to know how many people should live there and not to

abuse that land. They should know what its best use is. And they don't, they don't have that information. And so, seeing that, which is probably a two, three, four year project, to implement those acts that have been adopted in the course of this term, are quite significant. I think that I would tie those concerns, environmental, land and water management concerns, to a whole series of other issues that relate to the quality of life. They are, housing, transportation, and they are growth related issues. If there is a state in the union that ought to be concerned about its growth and the quality of its life and people, of people who are already living here and how growth impacts on that quality of life, it should be Florida. Surprisingly, these are concerns that have ~~xxxx~~ evolved in him as a public official, since he became governor. They were not concerns that he ran on or ~~was~~ elected on. But sitting as governor for three and a half years has made him much more sensitive and aware of them than he ever has been before. And they have become deep concerns and we don't know . . . you know, if we don't know enough about the land and the water resources of the state to make rational planning decisions and rational zoning decisions, then we also don't know enough about our in-migration and why people move there and what motivates new residents to a particular region of the state, to be able to plan and control and regulate that. We have a lot of ideas about things that could be done, but it hasn't fallen into a pattern of legislative concern, except in the planning areas. We haven't figured out how to implement a lot of these things, yet. We keep turning back to local government and the traditional methods of controlling and development and they are pretty inaccurate in many respects. It is of such significant concern to everyone in this state, that we have to address it as a state problem and not continually put that burden

back to local officials, who haven't demonstrated great ability to deal with it in the past. We can help them with better data, we can help with giving them some planning money and grants from the state and that sort of thing, but we also have to face it as it exists, and it exists as a problem of a scope that is much bigger than can local governments can deal with. Just because of the limitations of boundaries as much as anything else. I think that those concerns are the principle ones. I think that first, in the tax and finance area, he has demonstrated a very sound approach to those problems and he ought to continue them, which have served the state well so far. And then, to keep that in order and continue to make improvements in the fairness of the tax structure and in the inequity of the structure and then address these problems related to growth and environment, to land and water management as they effect the quality of life of the people who live here. Those are the kinds of concerns that he would have in the second term, the kinds of things that he would work on. Now, I could name a hundred other things, but I think that those are central to anything else that he would do.

W.D.V.: You would dismiss the charge that the second term is essentially a holding pattern waiting for 1976, and that everything he promised in '70 has been fulfilled?

Apthorp: Most everything that he promised has been fulfilled, but as I said, these are issues that he didn't even run on in 1970. They were not great issues in that campaign. They were not issues at all in that campaign.

W.D.V.: Where's the vice-presidential organization?

Apthorp: It's not. He is genuinely not interested. Nobody ever believes it. (inaudible)

W.D.V.: I don't enjoy putting these questions to you, because when I was sitting in your spot in '66, you know, they always wanted to know, "Where's the presidential organization?" Maybe I should say, "Where's the presidential organization?"

Apthorp: It's not, it doesn't exist and it only exists in some encouragement that he has had from some people who, you know, say, "You have some qualities that might be attractive to the voters of the country and you ought to pursue them." And beyond that, it really doesn't exist. And he, two years ago, as an indication of the way that he will handle that, is grounded in what happened in the six months prior to the Democratic National Convention in 1972. He kept saying that he wasn't interested and people didn't believe it. They just said, "Oh, if they called and asked, you'll go. And you'll do it." And he didn't. And he still feels the same way.

J.B.: Was he called?

Apthorp: Yeah. He was. He was not directly, you know, "Get on this ticket with me," until after Tom Eagleton was dropped. But, you know, there were clear indications, "You're on the list, you're one of the four or five people. Are you interested?" And he kept saying, "No, I'm not." He never was asked before that, but he was asked afterwards. And I think that if he had been indicating interest beforehand, I think . . . I went over the day before McGovern made his choice, to see Gary Hart and I said, "Gary, he does not want to be considered. Please don't leave him on the list. He does not want to embarrass Senator McGovern. He doesn't want to do anything to damage the Democratic chances in the election this year, but please don't ask." Because he had really made the decision a month before

that he was not interested.

W.D.V.: Well, but certainly, Jim, his position in the Democratic national party, as a result of a re-election victory, which will probably come fairly easily, is going to change his stature and his role in that thing.

Apthorp: It may change his role, but I don't think that it will change his candidacy, you know. He may wind up in the position of being able to . . . he's going to be chairman of the Southern Governors Conference next year, he will be

J.B.: Where is that meeting? When is that?

Apthorp: The Southern Governors Conference is in San Antonio in September . . . the 8th or 9th.

W.D.V.: We'd better put that down.

J.B.: Yeah.

W.D.V.: Can I ask you something here, you are a student of government, and as you look at the other southern states, let's forget about the rest of the country, what distinctive differences do you see with Florida as compared to the rest , both politically and governmentally? ~~xxxxxx~~ Or are there any significant differences?

Apthorp: Yeah, I think that there are large differences. This state tends to be much more diverse in terms of its population and its geography and its economy than other southern states. And I think that it tends to be more partisan, in terms of party system.

W.D.V.: You mean bi-partisan?

Apthorp: Yeah, bi-partisan. It tends to be . . . it is more urban than most of the rest of the South. Not only because of one big city, but

because of several urban areas. There is a major urban area at Jacksonville, the Tampa-St. Petersburg area, Orlando-Disneyworld, Miami-Ft. Lauderdale- West Palm Beach, much more urban in its character. And those are all reflected in its politics and its government, I think. I believe the makeup, the background of its public officials and it's executive and legislative tend to be more urban. And their view of . . . you know, if they prioritized problems, I think that those priorities would come out quite different from the priorities of the same officials in other states in the South. They would tend to be more related, more growth related, for instance. They would tend to be more urban related than the priorities from other southern states. In my own experience, my experience is limited to contacts with the governors' offices in other states, largely to that. And I see some pretty significant differences. I can talk to them about what they are working on and what they are concerned about and they just tend to be different problems than we are involved in.

J.B.: Does tourism slant development in major industry, major economic development in Florida?

Apthorp: Yeah. Well . . . yes, it is a major one. It may be overstated sometimes, but it is a major one.

J.B.: What comes after that?

Apthorp: Agriculture, I guess.

J.B.: You mean citrus, primarily, and then what?

Apthorp: As the leading agricultural enterprise.

J.B.: Is manufacturing fairly low down?

Apthorp: Well, it's followed maybe by manufacturing, but it's . . . also, economic indicators sometimes lose their meaning when applied to Florida.

Agriculture does not, but there is not a national economic indicator of tourism. They use recreation-leisure time indices, which tend to be manufacturing related. When they work up those indices of leisure time, they will talk about manufacturing of travel homes and private airplanes and all kinds of things. And they don't capture our figures. They don't capture the significance of tourism in this state, I don't think.

J.B.: Is there anybody that has done a really good, short report on Florida's economy?

Apthorp: Yeah, there's a current one that I can give you, that was just done for the first time this year, the Governor's Economic Report.

W.D.V.: Yeah, I read about that.

J.B.: I'd like to get a copy of that.

Apthorp: Yeah, sure. We'll get one for you. It's a good piece of work, I think that it will give you the kind of information that you are looking for.

W.D.V.: Jim, are there any other documents that

Apthorp: It's not very historic, but it's a good current information piece.

J.B.: That's what I'm wanting, where things are now.

W.D.V.: If you come across any other documents like that, that will help us try to explain what happened in the last twenty-five years and what may happen in the future, we would appreciate it.

Apthorp: As to the economy, I'm not sure that a lot of things have happened to it. I think that what you find in this book is probably fairly reflective of what has been the case since that period of time. Tourism was probably less important twenty-five years ago, but fifteen years ago, it probably had about the same importance that it does today.

J.B.: Well

Apthorp: What I was going to say about the Florida economy . . . I saw some figures not too long ago that indicate that two billion dollars of the income in Florida comes in the form of social security and retirement benefits, so that becomes a pretty significant part of our economy that again is not reflected in most indicators of economic conditions. And that is a constant, stable, predictable economic base that is very important in economic

W.D.V.: (inaudible) . . . the production of goods and services.

Apthorp: Not at all, you know, there are good years and bad.

J.B.: It's really tourism/retirement.

Apthorp: It may well be.

J.B.: And development is an adjunct of retirement

Apthorp: And of tourism, in a way. Because much of the development that goes on is tourist oriented, you know. The development at Disneyworld is all related to one major tourist attraction. All of it is related to that. It's kind of on the rocks now. Another interesting thing about tourism

J.B.: You mean that Disneyworld is on the rocks, or the development is on the rocks?

Apthorp: Well, the whole . . . everything that has built up around Disneyworld is kind of one the rocks.

J.B.: The gas business?

Apthorp: That and . . . that largely, and overdevelopment. But when Disneyworld opened, the average weekly wage of the employees was lower than the average weekly wage of the state. Tourist industries don't pay their

employees anything. They are very low paid people. So, in terms of what it adds to the residents of Florida, it adds some tax dollars to the state government and it adds some incentive for other kinds of development. Hotels, motels and restaurants. But it doesn't add anything to the working people.

J.B.: So that the people who work at the hotels, motels and restaurants are also low paid, aren't they?

W.D.V.: All the service workers.

Apthorp: Sure. So, I think that what we are beginning to see is some pretty significant reappraisal of our reliance on tourism as an economic base. It's not a very beneficial economic base in terms of what it does for the working people of the state. And it is still so important to us that we have to be concerned about what happens to it, but over time, we need a more diverse and stable kind of a base.

J.B.: It's extremely important to a tax base, right?

W.D.V.: You're talking about ad valorem taxes more than anything else, right?

Apthorp: No.

J.B.: No, sales.

W.D.V.: Sales and ad valorem.

Apthorp: That's right.

J.B.: Liquor taxes, racing taxes

Apthorp: That's right, it is very significant. In terms of sales tax alone, it produces 20% of our sales tax rate, it's paid by non residents.

J.B.: Gasoline taxes, all of that

Apthorp: See, sales taxes account for about a billion dollars of our

W.D.V.: Well, it may not be important for the working people of the state, but for state government revenue, it's critical.

Apthorp: No question about it.

W.D.V.: Let me ask you about

J.B.: Let me ask him about . . . well, I want to ask him a question, but I'm going to go about it indirectly . . . in the presidential primary in Florida, what determines who goes on the ballot?

Apthorp: Anybody that wants to.

J.B.: Do you have to declare?

W.D.V.: Are you saying that you put them on unilaterally?

Apthorp: Yeah.

W.D.V.: You can, o.k. And you can asked to be withdrawn if you certify that you are not a candidate or something?

Apthorp: But they'll keep you on if you don't do that. It's sort of like that Oregon

W.D.V.: Yeah.

J.B.: And you don't know who the secretary of state is going to be, right?

Apthorp: No. It'll probably be an appointed one for this fall, but it'll be a newly elected one in the '76 election.

W.D.V.: But the governor gets to appoint one?

Apthorp: For six months, yeah.

W.D.V.: Tell us about it.

Apthorp: Who will be appointed?

W.D.V.: No. (laughter) Did you say "anoointed?" (laughter)

Apthorp: (laughter) Appointed. It's an important appointment, because

he's going to serve during the elections this year. We've got a United States Senator's race and the governor's race and all six cabinet officers and three-quarters of the legislature.

J.B.: I presume that any cabinet appointment the governor would make would be someone that he felt was so qualified that they would be able to continue to serve the people in that capacity.

Apthorp: Not in this one, I don't think. This is a surprising one, because it's the chief elections officer. And he has an opportunity this time to appoint someone, an excellent person to manage this election and I think that he would prefer to appoint a person who is not a candidate.

W.D.V.: But that appointment, and if he served well, that would guarantee him to be re-elected, wouldn't it?

Apthorp: Well, no

W.D.V.: Not necessarily?

Apthorp: He probably wouldn't run. He would appoint somebody that would not plan to run.

W.D.V.: Oh, I see. I misunderstood.

Apthorp: Because he is the chief elections officers and you know, it's just a happenstance, but he has an opportunity this time to appoint someone who would not be a candidate in the election that he is supposed to be managing as chief elections officer.

W.D.V.: So, you've been around politicians a long time, tell us about Governor Askew.

Apthorp: I have a good story about that. Governor Kirk, well, anything else that he was, he was a very likeable guy. He was the kind of person that you would like to go to a cocktail party with and that you would like to, you know, just shoot the breeze with. He was very humorous and funny and very

open and never guarded. After he was defeated in the elections in November, I saw him one day and he said, "What's this guy Askew like?" He had just lost to him. And I said, "Well, he's about what you've read, I think. He doesn't drink and he doesn't smoke and he likes to spend a lot of time with his family and he's clean and nice." And he said, "Really? I didn't think that anybody was really that way." And he couldn't ever figure it out, because he was the exact opposite of Claude Kirk in many respects. And he tends to be more guarded and more deliberate and

(end of interview)