



TRANSCRIPT

SHOW AIRING MAY 8, 2011

Host: Roland Martin

Guests: Denis McDonough, Deputy National Security Advisor

Hilda Solis, Secretary, U.S. Department of Labor

Tom Vilsack, Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture

DeMaurice Smith, Executive Director, National Football League Players Association

Deborah Simmons, Senior Correspondent, "The Washington Times"

April Ryan, White House Correspondent, American Urban Radio Networks

Michael Fletcher, Economic Correspondent, "The Washington Post"

Joe Madison, Talk Show Host, Sirius XM Radio



TV One – Washington Watch
Contact/Producer: Jay Feldman
Story/Angle: “Washington Watch” – May 8, 2011 Show

K. Wills Transcripts

**(HEAD-
LINES)**

MR. ROLAND MARTIN: At the top of our agenda this week: the commander in chief, Pres. Barack Obama, gives the order to capture or kill America’s most wanted terrorist, Osama bin Laden. He is now dead. April employment report shows big growth, but a slight uptick in the unemployment rate. What gives? And there’s a growing online movement to boycott advertisers of Donald Trump’s “Celebrity Apprentice.” Our “Washington Watch” newsmakers: Denis McDonough, Deputy National Security Advisor to Pres. Obama; Labor Secretary Hilda Solis on her plans to create thousands of summer jobs; Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack on what’s going on with rising food prices; plus, DeMaurice Smith of the NFL Players Union on what he’s doing to save the football season. In our “Washington Watch” roundtable, Deborah Simmons, senior correspondent for “The Washington Times”; April Ryan, White House correspondent for American Urban Radio Networks; Michael Fletcher, economic correspondent for “The Washington Post”; and “The Black Eagle,” Joe Madison, host on Sirius XM Radio. All that and more today on “Washington Watch.”

**(SEG-
MENT 1)**

MR. MARTIN: This was one of the biggest news weeks we have seen in quite some time. It was stunning last week to see Pres. Barack Obama stand at the White House to tell America that Osama bin Laden had been killed at the hands of Navy

SEALS. This was the man who was behind the deadly September 11th attacks on the United States. He was killed in a daring, nighttime mission ordered by the President and his national security team. Here's a photo of them in the Situation Room as the raid went down. That man you see is Denis McDonough, Deputy National Security Advisor to Pres. Barack Obama. He joins me right now from the White House North Lawn.

And, Denis, welcome to "Washington Watch."

MR. DENIS McDONOUGH: Thanks a lot for having me, Roland. It's really good to be with you.

MR. MARTIN: I know it's a bit noisy there. They're working on the gardens there, but it's okay. We'll still go ahead and get everything straight.

Let's get right into it. Why did Pres. Barack Obama make the risky decision to send in a team of Navy SEALs and overrule his military advisors, who said they could simply bomb the compound?

MR. McDONOUGH: Well, I think [there were] a couple of things that motivated the President, frankly, throughout the course of his presidency, and then, of course, throughout the course of the planning for this event. In the first instance, he really wanted to bring closure to the families of the victims of 9-11; of the bombing of the U.S.S. Cole in late 2000; and then, of course, the bombing of our embassies in Nairobi and in Tanzania in 1998 – all of these carried out by al-Qaeda and all of them planned by Osama bin Laden. So, 1) the President wanted to bring closure. He wanted to

make certain that the mission was a success; and 2) he wanted to make sure that we could have proof that the mission was a success. And then, too, of course, he wanted to do this in a way that drew on the strength of our assault team, these guys who have a tremendous amount of experience and talent; and then also minimize the risk to them, given the enormous challenges that they faced. So, those were some of the factors that went into his planning and his decision making over the course of the last several months.

I should just make one, last thing clear, Roland, which is in earl- -- in late May 2009, Pres. Obama called in Leon Panetta, Rahm Emanuel and Tom Donnelly and said to Leon Panetta, as the head of the CIA, "You have to make one thing your principal responsibility, and that is tracking down Osama bin Laden." He wrote that down. He sent that order as an order, and that's exactly what Dir. Panetta did.

MR. MARTIN: What do you make of the critics who have suggested that Osama bin Laden was not killed, but assassinated? We were initially told that he resisted. Then later, of course, it was revised that – that he did not actually have a human shield, that he did not use his wife to shield him, that this person was shot coming towards him. And so what do you make up[?] to those critics who are trying to make a distinction between how he was killed, even suggesting that it was in violation of international law?

MR. McDONOUGH: One, it's very difficult from – for any of us from here, Roland, to second-guess those courageous – [the] courageous raid team that undertook this effort when they went after that compound. So, far be it [for] us, sitting

here in Washington, to use an 8,000-mile screwdriver and somehow tell them that they should've done this differently. Easy for anybody to make that determination now, but when you consider the circumstances: the dark of night, very tight quarters; they had come under attack when they arrived on the compound – and, obviously, going in on this effort, they obviously had trained for a range of contingencies. So, we're not going to second-guess them from here, and as far as I'm concerned, they made exactly the right choice in each of these instances.

MR. MARTIN: Speaking of second-guessing, the President decided this week that he was not going to release the photos of bin Laden's corpse. Also, he decided not to release the burial video of bin Laden at sea. Take us through that decision-making process in terms of, was there any doubt from the beginning that was going to take place? Or, over the period of days, did he simply come to the conclusion that it was not the right decision to release those photos?

MR. McDONOUGH: Well, the President went through this, Roland, as he does on all issues, very deliberately. He brought together his team – his lead national security team – to ask them a series of questions. 1) Would releasing this image into the heart of this debate – which internationally is a very volatile debate – would that be in our interest? 2) If releasing this picture, would it bring closure for families and victims of Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda? 3) Would it be misused for propaganda purposes by our enemy? Those are some of the questions he asked.

He – then he went out to our intelligence community and asked them to actually

write up formal assessments of these questions. They did that. The President took time, read those, discussed it with his national security team; and he made the determination that it was *not* in the national security interest for us to release new images into this debate -- into this debate internationally. He knew that it would be -- and our intelligence community assessed it would be -- misused for propaganda purposes by al-Qaeda, and the President determined that it would put not only our troops and our diplomats and our intelligence personnel, but potentially private, American citizens overseas, at risk. So, given all that information, the President made the simple judgment that it was not our interest to release it.

I think you saw early on Friday morning, then, Roland, al-Qaeda made a decision of their own; and that was to release, according to press reports -- their own eulogy for a -- a dead Osama bin Laden. So, now everybody's come clean with the very simple fact that Osama bin Laden is where he should be, and that is to say that he's met justice, and he is now dead.

MR. MARTIN: There was strong evidence found in the compound, after the Navy SEALs took control of computers, hard drives and things of that nature, that al-Qaeda and bin Laden were planning attacks on the United States on the tenth anniversary of 9-11, but the terror threat has not been raised. Give us a sense of where we stand as relates to the attacks on the train system in this country, and what also will our country do security-wise to make sure, with the threat still there, that we -- that we are protecting trains, protecting ports, protecting those, you know, major areas

where we can c- -- frankly, have our way of life altered again?

MR. McDONOUGH: Well, Roland, that's exactly the right question. That's exactly the w- -- the questions that the President pressed us on as we prepared for, and undertook, this operation. And so several of the steps that were taken [were] working very closely with the Department of Homeland Security. Sec. Napolitano is obviously watching this intelligence very closely. There's a team -- interagency team -- assembled to look at all this information and to make sure that it's filtered into one spot where we can make determined threat assessments for the potential threats against us -- against trains, against other matters. So, 1) we're g- -- gathering all this information together, assessing it and putting it in one spot for all of our agencies of the government to look at it; 2) we're also obviously taking precautionary and prudent steps to ensure that we're prepared: one, we're getting that information from the federal government out to state and local, so that they can use it and make some determinations for themselves as well; and then 3) obviously, we're gong to stay on the offense. We're not just sitting here and waiting to find out what we might find out. We think that we have a tremendous opportunity now that we've knocked al-Qaeda back with the President's strong decision.

And what we're going to do now is take advantage of this moment when al-Qaeda's in disarray to try to drive even f[u]rther, to ensure that we strategically defeat the whole movement. As John Brennan said earlier this week, it's our determination to make sure that all of al-Qaeda ends up in the same place that Osama bin Laden ended

up in.

MR. MARTIN: Denis McDonough, we certainly appreciate it. Thank you so very much.

MR. McDONOUGH: Thank you very much, Roland.

MR. MARTIN: Foreign policy is clearly a significant issue for this president, as for any president; but even Pres. Barack Obama has said that he will be judged during his reelection campaign on the state of the economy. And that brings us to the jobs report released Friday that showed 268,000 private-sector jobs were created – more than analysts expected. But the national unemployment rate went back up two tenths of a percent, to 9 percent. Black unemployment rose six tenths of one percent, to 16.1 percent. So, here to discuss what is being done to get even more folks working again is Secretary of Labor Hilda Solis.

Welcome back to “Washington Watch.”

SEC’Y. HILDA SOLIS: Thank you so much. Good to be here.

MR. MARTIN: Everybody, you know, the last couple of weeks focused on the royal wedding; talking about, of course, the killing of Osama bin Laden; but the reality is this economy is still, I believe, going to be the dominant issue when it comes to the election in 2012. And so how do you explain these numbers in terms of the private-sector jobs increasing – but, still, the numbers going up?

SEC’Y. SOLIS: Right. Well, one thing I have to tell you is that over the course of the last 14 months, we’ve actually added over 2 million private-sector jobs – which is

a good thing, because remember just last November – this last November, we were up at 9.8 percent unemployment. Now we're down to 9 percent, and it ticked up a bit because more people are looking for jobs, and people are also finding it harder to get jobs. So, we're still in that little quagmire, so to speak. And what I would tell you is that, overall, in every sector that I've seen we have grown jobs – in the – in the leisure industry, retail industry, manufacturing – across the board. The only area that really suffered was about 24,000 jobs that were lost in local and state government.

MR. MARTIN: Now, one of the things that jumps out when we talk about job creation and job growth is that our economy is really built on consumer confidence –

SEC'Y. SOLIS: Um-hum.

MR. MARTIN: -- and so if people feel confident about the economy, they begin to spend.

SEC'Y. SOLIS: Right.

MR. MARTIN: When they begin to spend, businesses then say, "We now have more demand for product, so therefore we need more people." And so, really, from a government standpoint, what role can you really have to get folks to do that? I mean your j- -- your role is really limited when it comes to actually creating jobs.

SEC'Y. SOLIS: Well, yeah. The government – the federal government – my department doesn't create jobs. What y- -- what we try to do is partner businesses up with, you know, employees and get them trained.

What I *will* tell you is that what's really important here is what the President did in

December – and he really didn't get enough credit for it – was all the tax cuts he gave. Payroll tax – people had an extra thousand dollars to spend. Why do you think leisure, hotel, restaurant industry, drinking establishments are all going up? They're hiring up[?] people, 'cause people are feeling confident. They're using that extra money to buy goods and services.

MR. MARTIN: African-American, in particular, have been devastated by this recession – particularly African-American men. And so we've been asking the question for months: is there a specific plan of action to deal with the groups most hardest hit as a result of the – of – of the unemployment crisis?

SEC'Y. SOLIS: Well, you know, Roland, I would – I would take it a step further and say the group that is most affected right now by this recession is African-American young people, 16 through 19 years of age. Those are the ones that have the highest rate of unemployment. It's about 44 percent, and we ought to be focusing in – if we're going to talk about competition and out-innovation, we ought to be focusing in resources on young people. That's why we have Job Corps. That's why we have Youth Build programs. That's why we have reintegration of ex-offender programs. We have tried to hold on to those programs, unlike some of the people in Congress who would like to decimate and get rid of these job training programs right at the time when unemployment is so high for this particular population.

MR. MARTIN: I want to come back to job training, but there're several job packages floating around Congress right now. Is there any particular one that you say,

“This one is really a stronger, better program for this economy” – for this country?

SEC’Y. SOLIS: Let me tell you. One of the concepts that we have talked about with the White House is on the job training, helping to supplement s- -- or, subsidize part of the salaries. Say you’re a business owner, and maybe you have six people onboard, but business isn’t going so great, but those people have been with you for a long time. Instead of laying them off – two or three – keep them on. We will help to subsidize their training and employment and part of their salary while they get skilled up. Meanwhile, you’re – you know, we’re waiting to – to – to get back those orders and the demand. That will help you in the long run, because if you lose that employee, you’re going to spend more money and more of your effort trying to bring someone back when the recovery really starts to – to pick up more. And we’re seeing that this program has been used in other st- -- in other parts of the country. It’s a successful program, and we want people to take advantage of it. Right now, it’s being used in different states, and we want to keep promoting that.

MR. MARTIN: You talked about summer jobs programs. You’ve seen – we’ve seen Republican want to slash those programs, especially when it comes to the House budget. Overall, tee- -- teen unemployment rate [is] 17.6 percent, but as you said, for African-Americans –

SEC’Y. SOLIS: Forty-four.

MR. MARTIN: -- 44 percent. And so what specifically are you doing – [unintelligible] – to confront this whole notion of summer jobs in terms of partnering

private, public? What's going on?

SEC'Y. SOLIS: Well, you know, Roland, as you know, the ERA money that was set aside is – is exhausted. There *is* no more money for summer jobs, and that was a good chunk of money that helped put m- -- well over 300,000 young –

MR. MARTIN: How much money –

SEC'Y. SOLIS: -- people –

MR. MARTIN: -- are we talking about?

SEC'Y. SOLIS: -- we're t- -- well, we're talking about, right now – what I would tell you is that there *is* no more money. So, what we're doing –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

SEC'Y. SOLIS: -- in lieu of that, is creating an initiative and saying, "You know what? Companies, corporations that have fared well – this is your time to" – "to stand up and be patriotic. Set aside some slots to hire young people this summer." And we've already started this two, three weeks ago. We have about 45,000 jobs already that we're listing, but we want more companies. We got Jamba Juice. We also got UPS. We got Wells Fargo, but we need many, many more people to come in. We will shine a light on them. We will say, "We" – "You were a part of our initiative, with this administration, to put young people first – and especially underrepresented African-American, Latino and Asian young people."

MR. MARTIN: Ho- -- how much money was allocated that was actually cut? So

--

SEC'Y. SOLIS: We –

MR. MARTIN: -- ho- -- how much –

SEC'Y. SOLIS: -- well, it's – it's –

MR. MARTIN: -- [crosstalk]- --

SEC'Y. SOLIS: -- not that it was cut. It was –

MR. MARTIN: What did the –

SEC'Y. SOLIS: -- a first-time –

MR. MARTIN: -- program cost?

SEC'Y. SOLIS: -- well, we're talking – we're talking anywhere, perhaps, a – a –
a billion dollars –

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

SEC'Y. SOLIS: -- or so.

MR. MARTIN: So, the summer jobs program was about a billion dollars.

SEC'Y. SOLIS: It's – and it's a l- -- and it's money that helped big inner cities, as well as rural America; put people back to work in record number[s]. But now, mayors have come to me, and they said, "Secretary, how can we continue this initiative? We *have* to put people to work – young people. We can't let them sit by idly and get in trouble, and we need to give them that opportunity to start looking and planning ahead for education." This looks good on their resumé. Many times, those employers end up hiring them for the remainder of the year.

MR. MARTIN: So, you have about 45,000 folks in ter- -- 45,000 –

SEC'Y. SOLIS: *Jobs.*

MR. MARTIN: -- jobs –

SEC'Y. SOLIS: Slots.

MR. MARTIN: -- slots that folks have actually opened up.

SEC'Y. SOLIS: Right.

MR. MARTIN: What's your target number? And also, how can a company out there who says, "Okay, fine. I want to be a part of the initiative" – who do they reach? Who do they call to say –

SEC'Y. SOLIS: Right.

MR. MARTIN: -- you know, "Count us among this" –

SEC'Y. SOLIS: Well –

MR. MARTIN: -- "number"?

SEC'Y. SOLIS: -- we're – we're being very cautious about what we're setting as a goal, but I would say we're starting out at – our goal is 100,000. I'd like to get there way before we get into the summer – right – so –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

SEC'Y. SOLIS: -- we have these available. And also, we want people to go online: dol.gov/summerjobs – [on screen, "dol.gov/dol/summerjobs"] – and put their listing up there. We will connect them with our one-stops. We already have my assistant secretary for employment training talking to UPS, because they've given us about, m-m-m-m, maybe twenty- -- 1200 slots around the country. So, we're trying to

identify those – those particular one-stops, so we can connect. When people go online, they could find out where the job is.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. Well, Sec. Solis, we certain appreciate it. Again, we –

SEC'Y. SOLIS: And I have –

MR. MARTIN: -- certainly hope those young folks will have the opportunity to get those jobs.

SEC'Y. SOLIS: -- I want you to help promote that. [Hands Martin a button.]

MR. MARTIN: All right. So, we[‘ve] got “U.S. Department of Labor Summer Jobs USA, Make the Commitment.” [Displays it for a camera close-up.] All right.

There – there it is right there. All right. We appreciate it. Thanks a bunch.

SEC'Y. SOLIS: Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: All right, folks. Coming up next: the price of food and gas keeps rising. The American people want the President to fix it, but is there anything this administration can do? We’ll get into that with Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack, up next.

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 2)**

MR. MARTIN: Crude oil prices on the world market plunged this week to under \$100 a barrel – cold comfort for folks spending \$60 to fill up their cars and trucks. And if that wasn’t enough, a walk down the grocery store aisle is causing shoppers to gasp at the high cost of staples like milk, butter and bread. Why are we getting hit with such

high prices? And is there something that can be done to make gas and food more affordable? Our next guest will provide some answers. Welcome back to “Washington Watch” Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack.

Glad you’re here.

SEC’Y. TOM VILSACK: Good to be here.

MR. MARTIN: Food prices have increased 36 percent. Everybody keeps talking about gas –

SEC’Y. VILSACK: Right.

MR. MARTIN: -- but that’s really something that folks absolutely need. They – the – you know, they – th- -- they – they can do public transportation, get a ride with a friend. Food’s a different story. What’s going on here?

SEC’Y. VILSACK: Well, first of all, folks have to understand that farmers only get 16 cents of every food dollar, so I think the key question is, “Who gets the other 84 cents, and what’s going on in their world?” These are people who refrigerate, store, transport, truck, shelve, package, process food; and all of it has to do with energy costs. So, when you look at high oil costs, it often translates also into high food costs, because a lot of the 84 cents is dependent upon oil.

MR. MARTIN: And also, most of our goods in this country are transported by trucks.

SEC’Y. VILSACK: Trucks and – and sh- -- and barges – things that basically use a lot of diesel, a lot of – a lot of oil-based products. So, the result is, when you

have high oil prices, you're going to see high food prices. We saw this back in 2008 as well. So, the key here is to s- -- is to focus on alternatives to oil, so that we can bring those oil prices down permanently.

MR. MARTIN: Well – and – and here's the question with that. Because that argument is rarely made. Whenever we talk about alternative sources of fuel, we always talk about, "Well, that way, when it comes to driving" – but you – you don't really hear folks, you know, linking the argument of alternative sources of fuel with food.

SEC'Y. VILSACK: Well, he- -- he- -- here's the deal. There're three strategies here for – for breaking our – our addiction to foreign oil, which is, in part, the reason why we have o- -- o- -- oil cost- -- high oil costs today. One is of greater efficiency, and the Obama Administration has historic efficiency standards on cars and trucks. Secondly, it's about producing more of our own domestic supply; and, third, it's about biofuels – renewable fuels. We have a study this week that came out of Iowa State University that says that fuel costs would be – energy costs would be 89 cents a gallon *higher* if it hadn't 've been for ethanol. Right now. Consumers have saved \$3½ billion over the last decade because we had a biofuel alternative. In my home state, gas is a dollar a gallon cheaper because of ethanol. So, the key here is to get more supply of those k- -- of those biofuels, less reliance on foreign oil – particularly from the Middle East.

MR. MARTIN: People out there – I mean I see critics, and they say, "Pres. Obama, what are you going to do about gas prices?" Realistically, what can *any*

administration – Democrat, Republican – Congress do when it comes to rising gas prices, if we're not the ones in control of the supply?

SEC'Y. VILSACK: Well, what – what the President *is* doing – which is, first of all, saying we need to have more efficient cars – that should've happened a long time ago. This administration, through the EPA [and] Department of Transportation, historic mileage efficiency standards on cars. And I think you're going to see additional information on trucks in the near future. Secondly, this administration is, in fact, providing more opportunities for harnessing our own energy sources, whether it's natural gas, or – or oil. And, finally, no administration's had any more of – of a commitment to biofuels than the Obama Administration.

So, we *are* taking steps. The Justice Department is taking a look at what kind of speculation may be inherent in these prices. I mean the reality is that, because people sensed some instability in the Middle East, they decided to take advantage of increasing their margins a bit. These oil companies obviously are making substantial sums of money. The to- -- three of the top four companies of the For- -- Fortune 500 are oil companies. There's reason for that.

MR. MARTIN: One of the things that also amazes me whenever we have this conversation is that I believe – and we said this last week on this show – that America is o- -- is, frankly, a reactionary country; that in order for us to truly confront the need for alternative sources of energy, it is, frankly, going to have to take prices being at a sustained level – high level – for people to go, “Okay. Finally, we get it,” because the

last time we had this problem, when the gas prices dropped, folks went, “Okay. That was done. Let’s go back to the way we were doing business beforehand.”

SEC’Y. VILSACK: Well, here’s why it’s a little bit different. We have a different president with a different vision. The President understands in order for this country to rebuild the middle class and have a stronger, more stable economy, we need to make, create and innovate again. And one of the areas where we have the greatest opportunity to do that is in the clean energy area. So, whether it’s renewable energy, or biofuels, this is a tremendous job-creating opportunity for us, in addition to stabilizing our economy. We saw – we’ve seen private-sector job growth in part because of the strength of agriculture. The President wants to build on that.

MR. MARTIN: You mentioned the th- -- three oil companies being the top Fortune 500 companies. A[n] issue that we’ve seen this week, the issue of oil subsidies –

SEC’Y. VILSACK: Um-hum.

MR. MARTIN: -- but also farm subsidies. Can this government, can our economy continue to sustain, frankly, subsidizing farmers, subsidizing oil companies when, on the other hand, Republicans are saying, “Let’s cut, cut, cut,” and get the deficit under control?

SEC’Y. VILSACK: You know, it depends, Roland, on what we mean by “farm subsidies.” If you’re talking about conservation p- -- payments to farmers, I would say that that’s something we need to continue to do.

MR. MARTIN: F- -- first of all, what is -- for the person at home saying, "I don't even know what that is," what is --

SEC'Y. VILSACK: Right.

MR. MARTIN: -- that?

SEC'Y. VILSACK: Conservation payments are payments that the government helps farmers to do conservation on their -- on their land: to create buffer strips to avoid chemicals and pesticides getting into rivers and streams makes it harder for us to have clean water. I think most people want conservation. They want to maintain soil. They want to clean the water.

If we're talking about crop insurance, that's a program that basically says to those farmers in the Mississippi River area that 're now seeing their lands being flooded because of natural causes, and their crop totally wiped out -- there's going to be some help for you during this tough period. I- -- I- -- most folks will say insurance is a good idea.

I think what most people are concerned about are the direct payments -- the payments, checks that go to farmers who are doing quite well in this economy. The President and I proposed reductions in those payments --

MR. MARTIN: How much money are we talkin' about?

SEC'Y. VILSACK: Well, that's the -- [chuckles] -- other thing. Everyone thinks this is a huge amount of money. Direct payments are somewhere in the neighborhood of 5 to \$6 billion.

MR. MARTIN: Now, the reason I asked that question [is] because earlier we had Secretary of Labor Hilda Solis, and she was talking about the summer jobs program. The funding for that was almost a billion dollars. And so – so, here we are making direct payments to farmers, and – frankly, for t- -- to what? *Not* grow? Is – is that what these subsidies are for?

SEC'Y. VILSACK: No, no. The – the – it's essentially a safety net for farmers who grow certain commodities. So, they get it regardless of whether they're growing or not growing. This isn't about idling land. This is –

MR. MARTIN: [Crosstalk] –

SEC'Y. VILSACK: -- [crosstalk]- --

MR. MARTIN: -- so, getting checks whether they grow or not.

SEC'Y. VILSACK: -- right. And here's why: 80,000 farmers are primarily responsible for producing 90 percent of what we eat. Of those 800,000 farmers, 600,000 honestly don't make any money from their farming operation. They – they average \$10,000 in income from their farming operation.

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

SEC'Y. VILSACK: So, if you want to keep those folks on the farm, you want to keep them helping to populate rural communities and supporting rural parts of this country, they need some degree of s- -- of safety net. They need some degree of help and assistance. The real issue here are the folks who are making very good money in this –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

SEC'Y. VILSACK: -- economy. Maybe it's time for us to take a look at whether or not those folks actually need a direct payment from the government, whether they need the ki- -- that kind of financial assistance. That's why the President has proposed reducing subsidies to those individuals.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. This is very interesting. I think in some areas, they call them "subsidies." Other areas they call them "welfare." Sounds to me like it's the same.

SEC'Y. VILSACK: [Chuckles.]

MR. MARTIN: Sec. Vilsack, we appreciate it. Thanks a bunch.

SEC'Y. VILSACK: Good to see you.

MR. MARTIN: Coming up next, was the President right to withhold the photos of a deceased Osama bin Laden? And an African-American presidential hopeful has a good showing at the GOP debate. My journalists' roundtable will look at all of that, up next.

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 3)**

MR. MARTIN: The successful mission to kill Osama bin Laden has definitely changed people's attitudes about Pres. Barack Obama's national security skills, but it is still the economy that will ultimately decide whether he stays in the White House after 2012. Here to dig into what this all means for the President and you at home: Deborah

Simmons, senior correspondent for “The Washington Times”; April Ryan, White House correspondent for American Urban Radio Networks; Michael Fletcher, economic correspondent for “The Washington Post”; and “The Black Eagle,” Joe Madison, host of Sirius XM Radio.

Bin Laden dominated the news cycle for the entire week. One of the most controversial decisions, though, was Pres. Barack Obama choosing not to release the photos. Good decision? Bad decision? I thought he should’ve released them. Joe?

MR. JOE MADISON: I don’t know. I think, initially –

MR. MARTIN: Joe’s in the *middle*?

MR. MADISON: -- I – I really did.

MR. MARTIN: [Unintelligible] – maybe?

MR. MADISON: I really did –

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

MR. MADISON: -- but then you know what convinced me was I remember how I felt – and I’m old enough to remember – I think all of us in this room –

MR. MARTIN: Emmett Till?

MR. MADISON: -- Emmett Till. And I knew the visceral reaction. You know, if – I told my children, “If I’m 95 years old and have sight, and I saw that Emmett Till photograph, I could tell you ex-“ – “I could tell you the impact it would have.”

Now, it had an impact on *all* of us, and it was transformational, because that’s why Rosa Parks, for example – this lie that was told that her –

MR. MARTIN: Gotcha.

MR. MADISON: -- feet hurt – she thought of Emmett Till.

It could be transformational for the Arab world to have this icon seen for maybe – what – a hundred years from now. We don't know.

MR. MARTIN: [Crosstalk] –

MR. MADISON: So –

MR. MARTIN: -- [crosstalk]- --

MR. MADISON: -- I think – I think, bottom line, he probably made the right decision.

MR. MARTIN: Fletcher.

MR. MICHAEL FLETCHER: Yeah, I agree. He made the right decision, and I think it could've been inflammatory, too, to have – you know, God knows what this photo looks like – you know, this guy with his head shot off. I think that may 've sent the wrong message. I think it's a little bit like the President said. I have to agree with him here that we don't want to trot out trophies. You know, the – the idea – people know he's dead. Al-Qaeda has acknowledged that bin Laden's dead. No need to sort of go f[u]rther.

MR. MARTIN: April.

MS. APRIL RYAN: The- -- there're several factors involved in this. I mean we are, one, a very visual society, an immediate society. We have Twitter. We have Facebook. We have anything to put the visuals out right away. But at the same time,

you have to remember the Muslim world does not want to see this. Again, going back to what Mike said, it would inflame already tense issues out there and – and tensions with the Muslim world. And you have to also remember, too, the White House was seriously thinking about doing this; because Sunday night, I got word before there was another lead, that he could possibly put – the pictures could possibly be released. And then you heard, “Well, maybe tomorrow.” But there was a serious debate as to whether to do it or not, and the issue really was the fact of not inflaming the Muslim world, because they are already planning attacks on this country –

MR. MARTIN: But –

MS. RYAN: -- again.

MR. MARTIN: -- but also let’s understand, Deborah –

MS. RYAN: Well, Jihaddist – [crosstalk] –

MR. MARTIN: -- according to –

MS. RYAN: -- [crosstalk] –

MR. MARTIN: -- the information that we discovered after he was killed, they were planning an attack on 9-11 any- -- s- -- on the anniversary anyway. So, it’s – it’s – it’s sort of like somebody – they hate you, but now they *really* hate you.

[CHUCKLING.]

MS. DEBORAH SIMMONS: [Chuckles.] Right. They still hate you. And the thing is, with terrorists, you – there’s no way to inflame them. They’re self-inflaming.

[Chuckles.] Fl- -- fl- -- self-flammable.

MR. MARTIN: They already hate us.

MS. SIMMONS: They already hate us.

[CHUCKLING.]

MS. SIMMONS: We don't – we can't give them –

MS. RYAN: [Chuckles.] “Self-flammable.”

MS. SIMMONS: -- any other rea- -- yeah, self-flammable.

MS. RYAN: [Chuckles.]

MS. SIMMONS: We – we can't give them any reason to hate us any more. The thing with the photo is – is that we've done pu- -- the FBI does “Public Enemy Number One.” We – we use – and as April said, this is a visual soci- -- an *instantaneous* society. Can you imagine – and we all can, because we're all – we've all used Blackberrys and – and iPods and such as our fifth appendages – what would've happened immediately when tho- -- when those photos would've been – whe- -- when those photos would have been released. The – the reaction would have been uncontainable. There was absolutely *no way* to put –

MR. MARTIN: Gotcha.

MS. SIMMONS: -- in check how people, and groups of communities, would have reacted.

MR. JOE MADISON: [Crosstalk] –

MS. SIMMONS: -- and –

MR. MADISON: -- [crosstalk].

MS. SIMMONS: -- and the Muslim world isn't mad at us. It's --

MS. RYAN: The Jihaddist --

MS. SIMMONS: -- the Jihaddist --

MS. RYAN: -- Movement.

MS. SIMMONS: -- Mo- --

MR. MADISON: Right.

MS. SIMMONS: -- yeah.

MR. MADISON: Look -- look --

MS. RYAN: The Jihaddist Movement.

MR. MADISON: -- what --

MS. RYAN: That's -- [crosstalk] --

MR. MADISON: -- happened --

MS. RYAN: -- best.

MR. MADISON: -- look what happened when that crazy minister in Florida --

MS. RYAN: Oh, gosh.

MR. MADISON: -- burned the Qur'an.

OFF CAMERA: The Qur'an.

MR. MADISON: I mean, you know, embassies were attacked. People were killed.

And here's the other thing. I bet you anything the military probably said to Pres. Obama, "Don't release the photographs, because our men will have to stand down

tighter than they're *already*" –

MS. RYAN: [Crosstalk] –

MR. MADISON: -- “having to stand” –

MS. RYAN: -- [crosstalk].

MR. MADISON: -- “down.”

MR. MARTIN: [Crosstalk.]

MS. RYAN: But the President has been talking with groups of people – various groups. But you have to also remember for that – that group that is the “grassy knoll” theorist group, there – there was – you know, we – we do have that segment of society.

MR. MARTIN: No- -- now called “deathers.”

MS. RYAN: Okay.

MR. MARTIN: First there were birthers. Now there're deathers.

[CROSSTALK.]

MS. RYAN: Birthers – yeah.

[CHUCKLING, CROSSTALK.]

MS. RYAN: Bu- -- but – but you have to remember – and – and this – that – this feeds what they're saying – the fact that when they went into this raid, only 80 perce- -- they were only 80 percent – 60 to 80 percent sure that it was Osama bin Laden.

MR. MADISON: Right.

MS. RYAN: So, they are still – there're still people on the fence up – with it. But when you have al-Qaeda saying, “Yes, our leader is gone” –

MR. MARTIN: Here's what[?] also jumps out. The Senate passed a resolution honoring the military mission to kill bin Laden. House Republicans say, "We're not going to vote on this." Now – now, well, what do you actually make of that?

MS. SIMMONS: That's a political thing. That's –

MS. RYAN: Yeah.

MS. SIMMONS: -- just the majority of Republicans saying, "Ah, we ain't doin' what they're doin' over there. Leave it" –

MR. MADISON: Oh. You call –

MS. SIMMONS: -- "alone."

MR. MADISON: -- it "political"?

MS. SIMMONS: A- -- oh, absolutely!

MR. MADISON: Oh, I call it –

MS. SIMMONS: A- --

MR. MADISON: -- *stupid!*

MS. SIMMONS: -- absolu- -- absolutely.

MR. MARTIN: [Chuckles.]

MR. FLETCHER: [Chuckles.]

MS. SIMMONS: Well, the thing is – is that once you start doing that, you have to keep doing it for every major military action that is taken.

MR. MADISON: But *nothing* is as *major* –

MS. SIMMONS: But the –

MR. MADISON: -- as --

MS. SIMMONS: -- ques- --

MR. MADISON: -- as cla- -- as catching --

MS. SIMMONS: -- and it's a -- it *is* --

MR. MADISON: -- bin Laden.

MS. SIMMONS: -- a political stu- -- it is a stupid --

MR. MADISON: Stu- -- okay.

MS. SIMMONS: -- political move, because ver- -- voters are going to *remember*

that --

MR. MADISON: Sure.

MS. SIMMONS: -- next year this time.

MR. MADISON: And if I were --

MR. FLETCHER: We all know what --

MR. MADISON: -- military --

MS. SIMMONS: Without -- without --

MR. FLETCHER: -- we all know what --

MS. SIMMONS: -- a doubt.

MR. FLETCHER: -- would happen if Bush were still president and this happened --

MS. RYAN: Oh, my heavens.

MR. FLETCHER: -- and a resolution was up for a vote.

MS. SIMMONS: The resolution would've –

MR. FLETCHER: You t- -- you think –

MS. SIMMONS: -- gone –

MR. FLETCHER: -- they would stand –

MS. SIMMONS: -- through.

MR. FLETCHER: -- on the same principle? Right.

MS. SIMMONS: It would've gone through.

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. FLETCHER: Exactly.

MS. RYAN: But I – I agree with both Joe and with – with – with Deborah here.

The issue is it is political, but the thing I think that – the reason why it's political [is] they don't want to give Pres. Obama, ultimately the man who did this –

MR. MARTIN: Don't want to give *him* –

MS. RYAN: -- the credit.

MR. MARTIN: -- a trophy.

MS. RYAN: *That's the point.* And *that's* why it's political. That's why I believe it's political.

MR. MADISON: It is so – it has got to be the *dumbest* –

OFF CAMERA: Um-hum.

MR. MADISON: -- *lamest* thing I've – I've – I mean, and I – you know, Republicans have got some *lame* folk out there. I mean I'm – I'm talking about their

presidential candidate[s]. But you know what's really great about this week, why I'm really celebrating? Not only that. It's Mother's Day, and happy Mother's Day –

MS. RYAN: Thank you.

MS. SIMMONS: [Crosstalk.]

MR. MADISON: -- [crosstalk].

[Pats Fletcher on the back consolingly.] You count, too.

MR. FLETCHER: [Laughs.]

[LAUGHTER.]

MR. MADISON: But – but no Donald Trump, man.

MS. RYAN: Ooh!

MS. SIMMONS: Oh.

MR. MADISON: All week long.

MS. RYAN: I saw him.

MR. MADISON: I read your –

MS. RYAN: I saw him Saturday.

MR. MADISON: -- piece on Donald Trump when – and you were right on. You were right on in – in blaming the media for – for, one –

MR. MARTIN: For creating the beast.

MR. MADISON: -- and – and not questioning him and allowing him to say, "Move on. Next question." Who – who – I mean what great – a Roland Martin wouldn't do that.

MR. MARTIN: Uh, *hell*, no.

MR. MADISON: [Laughs.]

[CHUCKLING.]

MR. MARTIN: That – that – that wouldn't – that – that – that would not happen. And so that's why I also say for – you know, we – we certainly have a – a show on this network. I guess the other folks – other networks [are] scared to give a brutha a show, because, yeah, that's *exactly* what the question would've been to Donald Trump.

Now, let me also make that point there's been a clear boycott of "Celebrity Apprentice." I've been tweeting it, pushing it. I've made it clear to people, "Don't even tweet me what's happening on 'Celebrity Apprentice.' I don't care." Groupon pulled out. We also hear McDonald's no- -- [is] not going to air their ads on the show. I mean Pepsi is a holdout, and I've made it clear: do not drink Pepsi. And so people have made it clear: "If you want to sit here and lie and act a fool, there will be repercussions"

–

MR. MADISON: Bu- -- but –

MR. MARTIN: -- "Donald Trump."

MR. MADISON: -- wasn't – wasn't it great – and I don't – and I'm not getting into conspiracy theory – but the *timing* for the Obama Administra- --

MS. RYAN: Uh-oh.

MR. MADISON: -- -tion –

MS. RYAN: Uh-oh.

MR. MADISON: to –

MS. RYAN: On Sunday –

MR. MADISON: -- a- -- --

MS. RYAN: -- night.

MR. MADISON: -- on Sunday night –

MS. RYAN: [Giggles.]

MR. MADISON: -- at that key point on – on “Celebrity Apprentice” –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. MADISON: -- when everybody was waiting to see if Star –

MS. RYAN: Who was going to –

MR. MADISON: -- Jones –

MS. RYAN: -- to be fired.

MR. MADISON: -- would be fired –

MS. RYAN: “You’re fired.”

MS. SIMMONS: [Chuckles.]

MR. MADISON: -- [crosstalk] –

MR. MARTIN: I – I – I – [crosstalk] –

MR. MADISON: -- we watched the President – [chuckles] – walking –

MR. MARTIN: -- [crosstalk] – a- -- as they –

MR. MADISON: -- down to the pod- --

MR. MARTIN: -- say –

MR. MADISON: -- [laughs] –

MR. MARTIN: -- at church, “God is good” –

[LAUGHTER.]

MS. RYAN: “on time” –

MS. SIMMONS: “On[?] time.”

MR. MARTIN: -- “on time, all the time.”

MS. RYAN: All is good.

[CHUCKLING.]

MR. MARTIN: There you go!

MS. RYAN: [Laughs.]

MR. MADISON: [Chuckles.]

MR. MARTIN: Now, let me ask you this question. We saw our first debate this week – Republican –

MS. RYAN: *Did we?* [Laughs.]

MR. MARTIN: -- well – well, I – I don’t – you know, five showed up. And when you look at the focus groups afterwards that took place on Fox – I didn’t watch it; [I] don’t watch Fox – Herman Cain won the focus –

MS. SIMMONS: Yes, he –

MR. MARTIN: -- group.

MS. SIMMONS: -- did.

MR. MARTIN: This sort of reminds me of – I had to remind people Alan Keyes

always won the focus groups, too, and we saw what happened to him. What do you make of – of Cain, Republicans saying, “Oh, my God. He’s so great. He’s wonderful. He’s going to be a” – “just a great candidate” –

MS. SIMMONS: [Crosstalk] –

MS. RYAN: Whoo!

MR. MARTIN: -- “in this race”?

MS. SIMMONS: -- [crosstalk]. Look, none of those cats that were up there at the debate the other night is going –

MS. RYAN: “Cats.”

MS. SIMMONS: -- to win the nomination.

MR. FLETCHER: [Crosstalk.]

MS. SIMMONS: Okay? *None* of them.

MR. MARTIN: So, Pawlenty was there, but –

MS. SIMMONS: Pa- --

MR. MARTIN: -- but you –

MS. SIMMONS: -- Pawle- --

MR. MARTIN: -- but you don’t think he –

MS. SIMMONS: -- Pa- -- Pawle- -- well, i- -- the – there was a tri- -- look.

Obama won this debate. Why? Because –

MR. MARTIN: [Laughs.]

MS. SIMMONS: -- be- -- [chuckles] – because –

[CHUCKLING.]

MR. MARTIN: [Laughs.] He wasn't even –

MS. SIMMONS: -- [crosstalk] –

MR. MARTIN: -- *in* it, but he won it.

MS. SIMMONS: -- exactly.

MR. FLETCHER: [Crosstalk.]

MS. SIMMONS: He won because there's a – there's too much of the public who doesn't *want* to know who Pawlenty is. Not that they don't know.

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MS. SIMMONS: It's that they don't want to know. There's huge curiosity now about Herman Cain, and that's very, very good, because it really is nice to be able to see a brutha up – you know what I mean -- o- --

MS. RYAN: That's –

MS. SIMMONS: -- and front –

MS. RYAN: -- the reason – that's –

MS. SIMMONS: -- the brutha front –

MS. RYAN: -- the only reason –

MS. SIMMONS: -- and center.

MS. RYAN: -- he is in the Tea Party. He is in the Tea Party. He's walking into the Tea Party. He is now the prince. They lost Michael Steele. They don't have Alan Keyes like they used to.

MS. SIMMONS: But –

MS. RYAN: He is now their prince. I –

MS. SIMMONS: -- it's those –

MS. RYAN: -- hate to say it.

MS. SIMMONS: -- other folks who didn't show up, the personalities – the –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MS. SIMMONS: -- Donald Trumps, the Sarah Palins –

MR. MARTIN: But also –

MS. SIMMONS: -- the Newts –

MR. MARTIN: -- but – but also, the real candidate –

MS. SIMMONS: -- the Mitt –

MR. MARTIN: -- Romney.

MR. FLETCHER: Romney.

MS. SIMMONS: -- Romneys –

MR. FLETCHER: Mitt Romney, yeah.

MS. SIMMONS: -- yeah, the Mitt Ro- -- a- --

MR. FLETCHER: Right.

MS. SIMMONS: -- absolutely.

MR. FLETCHER: Mitt Romney and maybe Huntsman. I mea- -- the- -- those
are going to be –

[CROSSTALK.]

MS. SIMMONS: Because they act like – [crosstalk].

MR. MARTIN: [Crosstalk] – to wrap this up –

[CROSSTALK.]

MR. MARTIN: -- I think it says a lot when, even at this early stage – ‘cause remember back in 2007, you had De- -- Democrats, even in the early stage, having various debates in June, July, having the conversations. I think the credible Republican candidates are saying, “You know what? We don’t need this nonsense. We’ll see you guys after Labor Day” –

MR. MADISON: Exactly.

MR. MARTIN: -- the traditional kickoff to a campaign.

MR. FLETCHER: Exactly.

MR. MADISON: And – and the reality is that after what happened Sunday, they now have to talk seriously.

MR. MARTIN: Gotcha.

MR. MADISON: They can’t talk just to get everybody’s –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. MADISON: -- attention. They’ve got to talk seriously.

MR. MARTIN: And even Nikki [Haley], the governor of South Carolina, said, “We don’t want to hear that nonsense. We don’t want to hear what he hasn’t done. We want to hear what *you* want to do.”

MR. MADISON: Right.

OFF CAMERA: Um-hum.

MR. MARTIN: Folks, that's it for us. Deborah, April, Michael, Joe, we certainly appreciate it. Thanks a bunch.

MR. FLETCHER: Thank you.

MS. RYAN: Thank you.

MR. MADISON: Thank you.

MS. SIMMONS: Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: Folks, still to come, we go inside the huddle to get an update on the NFL lockout.

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 4)**

MR. MARTIN: Earlier, we talked with Labor Secretary Hilda Solis as relates to the unemployment numbers in this country. Well, right now another labor issue is taking place, in the NFL, between the owners and the players. It all revolves around \$9 billion. That's how much the NFL earns every, single year. Well, joining us right now to confront this issue, to talk about what's going on is the executive director of the NFL Players Association, DeMaurice Smith.

Welcome to "Washington Watch."

MR. DEMAURICE SMITH: Roland, thank you very much.

MR. MARTIN: You know what? Lots of fans out here – huge fans. I'm a season ticket holder to the Houston –

MR. SMITH: Me, too.

MR. MARTIN: -- Texans, and so I love my football. But at the end of the day, isn't it important for fans to understand that this is a business?

MR. SMITH: I- -- it's incredibly important for fans to understand that, because it's important for our players to. Right now, we're in a lockout situation because the owners have shut down that game and taken away from our fans and from our players.

MR. MARTIN: What i- -- what is really holding the two of you back?

MR. SMITH: Right now? To be honest and truthful, the players are working out on their own. Whether it's Texas, New Orleans, Washington, or Green Bay, the players are working out on their own because they love to play football.

MR. MARTIN: What are the sticking points in terms of right now?

MR. SMITH: Well, right now, we're outta work! [Chuckles.] The sticking point is there's a lockout by the owners that is only there because they don't want to bargain on a level playing field. The issues that divided us in the past, before we decertified -- the critical one was that, for the last 20 years, we've split the revenue approximately 50-50 between players and owners. Before we --

MR. MARTIN: Yeah.

MR. SMITH: -- decertified, the owners wanted a fundamental shift in that 50-50 split, and they were unwilling to demonstrate, by showing us audited financial statements, or any other audited proof, that they were suffering.

MR. MARTIN: What jumps out at me -- and I've always had this contention -- [is]

that here you have all of these owners, all of these sports owners with these taxpayer-funded stadiums. And when I start hearing people say, “Oh, we’re losing millions and millions of dollars,” the first thing that s- -- that that says to me is that, well, when you’re losing millions of dollars in the business, what you typically do is you will cut expenses to try to sit here and balance it out. Or, if need be, you sell your business. Do you buy the poor-mouthing from the –

MR. SMITH: [Chuckles.]

MR. MARTIN: -- owners that, “Oh, we’re in a tough” –

MR. SMITH: You know the answer’s –

MR. MARTIN: -- “financial strait[?].”

MR. SMITH: -- “coming.” You know what the answer’s coming. No. A- -- a- -- and to actually add a finer point to that, none of the owners – just to make it worse, because your point is – is *directly* relevant. To make it worse, not one owner has said that “we’re losing money.” The National Football League has never come to the players and said teams are on – are in financial extremis. The National Football League never came and said, “Wait a minute. We need to change something, because football is going to end because we’re economically unable to sustain our business model.” *Not one person* from the National Football League has ever said that.

MR. MARTIN: I have to ask you this question as relates to the health issue in the NFL. We’ve seen numerous stories – “Real Sports with Bryant Gumbel,” we’ve seen ESPN “Outside the Lines,” we’ve seen newspapers, magazines, online talk about

the health crisis – that is players dying at an earlier age.

MR. SMITH: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: We see the whole issue of brain injuries. We look at Dave Dorsett, who committed suicide. They've studied his brain. It showed the kinds –

MR. SMITH: [Crosstalk.]

MR. MARTIN: -- of trauma. And so from a player's standpoint, when you hear, "We want two more games," is that simply flat-out a nonstart[er], not gonna happen? When you look at the health crisis affecting these players – because the average fan is going, "Hey, I want to see ball," but they don't see guys not being able to walk and play with their children when they're 40 years old.

MR. SMITH: Well – a- -- and, again, you've hit the nail on the head. I – I go to probably about 30 to 40 alumni events – former player events a year. I – I see their wives, who say that their – their husbands are slower, that they have migraines, that they fear the early onset of dementia. I –

MR. MARTIN: These are –

MR. SMITH: -- talk to[?] –

MR. MARTIN: -- guys in their late thirties, early forties.

MR. SMITH: -- late thirties, early forties. So, when it comes to the issue of the players' health and safety, about two years ago I said something that a number of owners for some reason thought was controversial. I said that the health and safety of our players is nonnegotiable. It's nonnegotiable. Our players play for approximately

three years. We're still in a system where there is no guaranteed healthcare for our players for the injuries that they suffer playing football. That's the truth. If something happens to a player, and he's injured, he has to file for worker's comp – the same worker's comp system that is in place when accidents occur in the normal –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. SMITH: -- workplace.

You have to play for three years before you get any post-career healthcare.

MR. MARTIN: And the average c- -- career –

MR. SMITH: Is about 3.2 –

MR. MARTIN: -- is about three – [crosstalk] –

MR. SMITH: -- years.

MR. MARTIN: -- two years.

MR. SMITH: So, the issue of concussions – you know, we've been very aggressive about, taking our facts up on Capitol Hill. I think that was a game changer in the way in which the country perceived CTE and traumatic brain injury. When I took this job, the head of the NFL Concussion Committee was a rheumatologist.

So, look. We've done a lot together, I think, to make the game safer. Are we there yet? No. When we – negotiations broke down, the players had the position that we should be moving forward in the issues of healthcare and moving forward in the issues of pension, moving forward in making a safer game – for one, critical reason. We do not, I do not believe that there is – that you have to make a choice between a

game that's fun and a game that's safe. That's a false choice. You *can* have a game that's fun and a game that is safe. You can have a game that takes care of the men who play this game. You can have a game that ensures that, if they suffer injuries, they'll be taken care of down the road.

But if we continue to believe that – in that false choice –

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. SMITH: -- it's a disservice to the players who played, it's a disservice to the men who play, and it doesn't serve the men who are going to play this game.

MR. MARTIN: Well, DeMaurice Smith, certainly good luck in the negotiations –

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: -- and like any football fan, I'm – I'm certainly hopeful we will see football this fall so I can cheer for my Texans – and against the Dallas Cowboys.

MR. SMITH: [Laughs.]

MR. MARTIN: All right, DeMaurice. Thanks a bunch.

MR. SMITH: Thank you very much –

MR. MARTIN: Thanks a –

MR. SMITH: Roland.

MR. MARTIN: -- bunch.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: Folks, "My Perspective" is up next. You don't want to miss it.

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 5)**

MR. MARTIN: It's time now for "My Perspective."

This week, the Justice Department sent a letter to the NCAA asking some serious questions as to why there is not a football playoff when it comes to college football. The NCAA has said, "Look, it's all up to the colleges. We are a nonprofit. We're a volunteer organization. The BCS – it's all up to them."

It is right for the Justice Department to be asking these questions based upon antitrust laws. Now, some people out there say the government has no business being involved in sports, but the reality is they are being protected by antitrust laws. The same thing when it comes to baseball. I do not believe that the government should not be involved in this. I believe they *do* have a role. One of the arguments being made by the attorney general of Utah, and that is state schools are being cheated out of millions of dollars as a result of what he calls an "unfair" system. Now, remember state schools are government schools. That is, if you're a state institution, that means the state is actually funding your school. So, yes, the government has a role in all of this.

I believe it is time for the feds to demand real answers from what I call the "NCAA cartel." And that's exactly what they are. And so I say to feds, "Keep it up. They deserve to give some answers."

That's my perspective. What's yours?

We'll be right back.

[END OF SEGMENT.]

**(SEG-
MENT 6)**

MR. MARTIN: That's it for this edition of TV One's "Washington Watch."

Don't forget. We do not watch "Celebrity Apprentice," so don't tweet it. Don't Facebook it. Also, I want to give a shout to my mother, Emelda Martin, and to all the mothers. Have a great Mother's Day.

Folks, goodbye, and have a blessed week.

[END.]