Collection: Blackwell, Morton: Files
Folder Title: Legal Services Corporation (2 of 2)
Box: 12

File
Legal Services Corp.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

(Palm Springs, California)

For Immediate Release December 31, 1981

The President has granted recess appointments to the following individuals as Members of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation. The President has also designated William J. Olson as Acting Chairman.

HOWARD H. DANA, JR., of Cape Elizabeth, Maine, is a partner in the Portland, Maine, law firm Verrill & Dana. Mr. Dana is 41 years old and is married with three children. He succeeds Robert J. Kutak.

MARC SANDSTROM, of La Jolla, California, is the Executive Vice President of the San Diego Federal Savings and Loan. He is 46 years old and is married with four children. Mr. Sandstrom succeeds Richard Allan Trudell.

WILLIAM F. HARVEY, of Indianapolis, Indiana, is a Carl M. Gray Professor of Law with the Indianapolis University. He is also on the Board of Advisors of the Pacific Legal Foundation's College of Public Interest Law. He is 49 years old. He succeeds Howard R. Sacks.

WILLIAM J. OLSON, of Falls Church, Virginia, is currently a partner with the law firm of Smiley, Murphy, Olson & Gilman located in Washington, D.C. Mr. Olson is 32 years old and is married. He succeeds F. William McCalpin.

GEORGE E. PARAS, of Sacramento, California, is currently in the private practice of law with the firm of Johnson, Greve, Clifford, and Diepenbrock in Sacramento. Prior to that, Justice Paras was appointed to the Superior Court of Sacramento County and later elevated to the California District Court of Appeal for the Third Appellate District. He is 47 years old and is married with two children. He succeeds Michael Kantor.

ROBERT SHERWOOD STUBBS, II, of Waleska, Georgia, is Executive Assistant Attorney General for the State of Georgia. Mr. Stubbs is 59 years old and is married with two children. He succeeds Ramona Toledo Shump.

DAVID E. SATTERFIELD, III, of Richmond, Virginia, is a lawyer with the firm of Cook, Purcell, Hansen and Henderson in Washington, D.C. Mr. Satterfield is 61 years old and is married. He succeeds Revius O. Ortique, Jr.

###

File
LSC

ACCEPTANCE ADDRESS

WILLIAM F. HARVEY
CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD
LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

MARCH 5, 1982

WASHINGTON, D.C.

OPENING PUBLIC STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

MR. INTERIM CHAIRMAN OLSON, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, PRESIDENT BRADLEY, MEMBERS OF THE CORPORATION STAFF, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.

IT IS A VERY GREAT HONOR TO BE WITH YOU THIS MORNING, AND TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION. I HAVE BEEN TWICE HONORED IN THAT MY COLLEAGUES ON THE BOARD HAVE SELECTED ME AS THEIR CHAIRMAN. I HOPE TO REPAY THEIR EXPRESSED TRUST BY PERFORMANCE, AND I DO, OF COURSE, ACCEPT THE POSITION WITH MY THANKS TO EACH BOARD MEMBER. I EXTEND A SPECIAL NOTE OF RECOGNITION AND APPRECIATION TO MS. JOSEPHINE WORTHY. SHE IS PLAINLY THE SENIOR PERSON IN EXPERIENCE AND WISDOM ON THIS BOARD. EACH OF US LOOKS FORWARD TO RECEIVING HER ADVICE AND COUNSEL, AND I FEEL CERTAIN THAT THERE IS MUCH WE SHALL LEARN FROM HER.

APPOINTMENT TO THIS CORPORATION BOARD IS, IN MY JUDGMENT, THE HIGHEST RECOGNITION WHICH CAN BE EXTENDED TO A MEMBER OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION, BECAUSE THE CORPORATION AND ITS CONCEPT REPRESENT THE HIGHEST IDEAL, AND THE FINEST MORAL STANDARD, WHICH THE LEGAL PROFESSION HAS REFINED: THOSE WHO NEED LEGAL ASSISTANCE, AND WHO REQUIRE ACCESS TO THE COURTS FOR THE PROTECTION OF THEIR RIGHTS SHALL RECEIVE IT AND THAT IT SHALL BE PROVIDED TO A PERSON

IF HE IS NOT ABLE TO PROVIDE FOR IT, OR OBTAIN IT FROM HIS OWN AVAILABLE FUNDS. THIS GREAT TRADITION, IN THE UNITED STATES, OF PROVIDING LEGAL ASSISTANCE COMMENCED WITH THE PRIVATE PRACTITIONERS: IT WAS A GREAT AND NOBLE CHARITY, AND IT IS STILL THAT. THIS CORPORATION AND ITS GRANTEE PROGRAMS WERE BUILT ON THAT FOUNDATION AND THAT SPIRIT, AND THEY SHOULD NOT AND CANNOT REPLACE IT.

ACCORDINGLY, WE OBSERVE THE GREAT CONTRIBUTION WHICH THE LEGAL PROFESSION HAS MADE TO THE AMERICAN SOCIAL ORDER, AND IN EACH OF OUR STATES AND COMMUNITIES. IT CONTINUES ON: IT IS THE VERY ESSENCE OF REQUIRED SOCIAL SERVICE AND REQUIRED SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION; IT IS THE ENVY OF ALL OTHER SOCIAL AGENCIES, AND ALL SOCIAL AGENCIES ARE IN FACT SUBORDINATE TO IT.

THE PROVISION OF LEGAL ASSISTANCE HAS AN EXTRAORDINARILY IMPORTANT PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATION. IT IS NOT ONE WHICH STEMS FROM FAULT, OR FROM CONFRONTATION; IT DOES NOT COME FROM FINANCIAL AFFLUENCE, OR FROM UTILITARIAN RESULTS WHICH MIGHT BE ACHIEVED IN A PARTICULAR LEGAL SETTING. IT IS MUCH DIFFERENT THAN ALL OF THOSE. THE BASIS OF OUR MEETING TODAY, AND OF THIS CORPORATION, AND OF THE PROGRAMS OF LEGAL ASSISTANCE, IS IN A FIRST PRINCIPLE. THAT PRINCIPLE IS <u>ACCESS TO THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM</u>. IT IS REFERRED TO AS

PETITIONING ONE'S GOVERNMENT FOR THE REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES. THIS IS THE FIRST PRINCIPLE WHICH IS THE PROTECTION OF ALL OTHER RIGHTS, AND IT IS A PRINCIPLE OF CREATION AND DEFINITION -- AND THUS OF LIMITATION TOO.

IT REQUIRES THAT ACCESS TO THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM SHALL INVOLVE A HIGH PROFESSIONAL QUALITY OF REPRESENTATION, WHICH WILL ASSURE THAT THE ENDS JUSTICE AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF LAW FOR THE PROTECTION OF LEGAL RIGHTS ARE ACHIEVED.

ACCESS TO THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM MUST BE TOTALLY FREE OF ALL POLITICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL BIAS AND PREJUDGMENT, BECAUSE THE ULTIMATE ENFORCEMENT POWER FOR SUBSTANTIVE LEGAL RIGHTS IS, OF COURSE, A STATE MONOPOLY. IT MUST BE AVAILABLE TO ALL PERSONS WHO HAVE REASON TO SEEK ITS USE.

THIS MUCH IS IMPLICIT IN GREAT WORKS OF THE PAST, SUCH AS THE TEACHING OF MR. LINCOLN IN HIS DEBATES WITH SENATOR DOUGLAS.

AND THIS BRINGS ME TO A FEW COMMENTS WHICH ARE ADDRESSED TO ABOUT 10,000 PERSONS WHO WORK, AND PERSONS WHO HAVE WORKED OVER THE YEARS IN THE DELIVERY OF LEGAL SERVICES TO THE POOR, AND TO PERSONS WHO DO NOT HAVE ACCESS TO THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF THEIR RIGHTS.

MANY OF YOU I HAVE KNOWN VERY WELL OVER THE YEARS, AND ESPECIALLY IN THE 1970s AND EARLIER. I HAVE VIEWED YOUR EFFORTS WITH GREAT PRIDE AND A MUTUAL SATISFACTION, AND AT TIMES WITH CONCERN OR SADNESS. PRIDE BECAUSE YOUR ACHIEVEMENTS ARE MANY. CONCERN OR SADNESS BECAUSE IT SEEMED TO ME THAT YOU SOUGHT TO ACCOMPLISH A GREAT TASK BUT FROM A PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATION WHICH WAS FRACTURED.

I REMEMBER READING, YEARS AGO, THAT GREAT BOOK, THE GOD THAT FAILED. IN IT, ONE OF THE AUTHORS, PERHAPS IT WAS RICHARD WRIGHT, SAID THAT THE CRITICAL QUESTION WAS AND IS: HOW TO LIVE A HUMAN LIFE?

I SUGGEST THAT PERHAPS THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS FOUND IN THE PROPOSITION THAT PROGRESS AND HUMAN WORTH IS NOT MEASURED IN DIRECTION: IT IS NOT UP OR DOWN, THIS WAY OR THAT. IT IS NOT MEASURED BY ECONOMIC CRITERIA, AND CERTAINLY NOT BY A SYSTEM OF WEALTH DISTRIBUTION. IT IS NOT DETERMINED BY VICTORY OR DEFEAT IN A COURT; ALL OF THOSE CRITERIA ARE TEMPORARY.

I RECOMMEND THAT YOU CONTEMPLATE THE IDEA THAT THERE IS NO FINALITY, AND NO PREDETERMINED ARRANGEMENT, AND THAT THE ONLY LASTING AND CREATIVE

SOCIAL ORDER IS THE SPONTANEOUS SOCIAL ORDER, WHICH IS AFFECTED BY THE HIGHEST PRINCIPLES OF HUMAN CONDUCT. FURTHER, EACH GENERATION MUST REDISCOVER THOSE PRINCIPLES, AND IT IS IN THAT CONSTANT REDISCOVERY OF TRANSCENDENTAL PRINCIPLES THAT ONE LEARNS HOW TO LIVE A HUMAN LIFE, OR AT LEAST ONE CAN APPROACH RICHARD WRIGHT'S QUESTION.

TODAY YOU SHOULD ATTEMPT TO EXAMINE THE WORKS OF T.S. ELIOT, AND THOMAS SOWELL AND ASK WHY EACH INFORMS US THAT THERE ARE NO SOLUTIONS, AND ONLY ISSUES WHICH ARE FOUGHT OUT AGAIN AND AGAIN. PLEASE PERMIT YOURSELVES TO CONSIDER THE IDEAS OF EDMUND BURKE OR RUSSELL KIRK OR FRIEDRICH A. HAYEK'S GREAT TRILOGY ON LAW AND JUSTICE. TRY TO UNDERSTAND WHAT HAYEK MEANT WHEN HE SAID, "THE IDEAL OF EQUALITY OF THE LAW IS AIMED AT EQUALLY IMPROVING THE CHANCES OF YET UNKNOWN PEOPLE BUT INCOMPATIBLE WITH BENEFITING OR HARMING KNOWN PERSONS IN A PREDICTABLE MANNER." THERE AND WITH THOSE PERSONS YOU MAY FIND BETTER IDEAS FOR THE NOBLE CAUSE YOU HAVE SERVED THAN THE EXPLANATIONS YOU HAVE CONTEMPLATED IN THE PAST; AND WITH THEM YOU MAY BECOME EVEN MORE EFFECTIVE IN THE FUTURE.

THE EXPRESS PURPOSE OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION IS TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR COMPETENT LEGAL ASSISTANCE IN NONCRIMINAL MATTERS

AND PROCEEDINGS, FOR PERSONS WHO ARE FINANCIALLY UNABLE TO AFFORD IT. THE PRIMARY DUTIES OF THE MEMBERS OF THIS BOARD IS TO SEE THAT THAT PURPOSE IS EXECUTED; THAT IS OUR DUTY, AND WE SHALL PERFORM IT, IN FULL ACCORD WITH ALL APPLICABLE LAWS, THE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY, THE CANONS OF ETHICS AND THE HIGHEST STANDARDS OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION. AND THOSE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS GUIDE ALL LAW SCHOOLS AND CENTERS FOR LEGAL EDUCATION, AS WELL AS POST-GRADUATE AND CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS.

THIS MEANS THAT IT IS THE PROVINCE OF THE CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT TO ESTABLISH THE PROGRAM IN WHICH FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR LEGAL SERVICES IS TO BE PROVIDED. OUR BOARD SHALL ADMINISTER THE PROGRAM IN STRICT COMPLIANCE WITH THE STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS WHICH GOVERN IT; AND WE SHALL, OF COURSE, SEEK THOSE FUNDS WHICH WILL ASSURE THE DELIVERY OF LEGAL ASSISTANCE WHICH IN TURN ASSURES ACCESS TO THE ENFORCEMENT OF LEGAL RIGHTS AND CLAIMS OF LEGAL RIGHT.

WE DO THIS AS MEMBERS OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION AND AS CLIENT REPRESENTATIVES. WE DO THIS REFLECTING PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL OBLIGATIONS AND DUTIES TO RECOGNIZE THE NEED TO PROVIDE LEGAL ASSISTANCE TO INDIVIDUALS OF INADEQUATE ECONOMIC MEANS.

WE OF THE CORPORATION HAVE AN OBLIGATION AND A DUTY TO PROVIDE LEADERSHIP AND DIRECTION--AND TO ENCOURAGE AND DEVELOP NEW INCENTIVES FOR THE PROVISION OF SUCH LEGAL ASSISTANCE. WE WELCOME THE VIEWS AND JUDGMENTS OF ALL PERSONS, AND IN PARTICULAR THE FORMER MEMBERS OF THIS BOARD.

CANON 2, ETHICAL CONSIDERATION 2-25, STATES THAT THE BASIC RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROVIDING LEGAL SERVICES FOR THOSE UNABLE TO PAY, RESTS, ULTIMATELY, UPON THE INDIVIDUAL ATTORNEY. IT ALSO IDENTIFIES ADDITIONAL PROGRAM, OTHER THAN INDIVIDUALS, TO ASSIST IN THE EFFORT OF PROVIDING LEGAL SERVICES.

THIS CORPORATION AND ITS INDEPENDENT GRANTEES ARE EXAMPLES OF THOSE PROGRAMS. THEY ARE NOT, OF COURSE, THE ONLY PROGRAMS WHICH ARE OR MIGHT BECOME AVAILABLE.

THIS PROGRAM IS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S PROVISION FOR LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOR POOR PERSONS. IT DOES NOT, HOWEVER, REMOVE OR ALTER A DUTY WHICH RESTS ON EACH OF THE APPROXIMATELY 550,000 ATTORNEYS IN THE UNITED STATES.

IT IS A GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM TO ASSIST THOSE MANY ATTORNEYS WHO CARRY THE DUTY TO GUARANTEE ACCESS TO COURTS FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF LEGAL RIGHTS. BUT, FUNDAMENTALLY, IT IS A GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM WHICH MUST CAREFULLY PROTECT, AS THE STATUTE TELLS US, RECOGNITION OF PERSONS AS PERSONS, INDIVIDUALS AS

INDIVIDUALS. RECOGNITION OF HUMAN BEINGS AS THE SUPREME VALUE IN OUR SOCIETY--INDEPENDENTLY VALUABLE APART FROM THE WEALTH THEY POSSESS OR THE POWER THEY MIGHT ASSERT OR ACQUIRE--IS THE SOURCE OF AMERICAN FREEDOMS.

I EXPRESS MY PROFOUND THANKS TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR MY APPOINTMENT TO THIS BOARD, AND I JOIN WITH MY COLLEAGUES ON THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS IN DECLARING OUR COMMITMENT TO MEET THE STATUTORY, MORAL AND ETHICAL DUTIES WHICH OUR APPOINTMENTS DEMAND.

LSC

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION / NEIGHBORHOOD LEGAL SERVICES (among others)
INFORMATIONAL DATA SHEET

Legal Services Corp. distributes grants to some 323 Legal Services programs in approximately 1450 neighborhood offices in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands and Micronesia. In their February, 1981 news release, they listed approximately 6200 lawyers and 2830 paralegals on their payroll.
The Pennsylvania Legal Services Corp. operates 20 different legal services centers - Neighborhood Legal Services Assn. (NLSA) is but one. NLSA covers a 4 County area - Allegheny, Beaver, Butler and Lawrence Counties - and has 72 paid attorneys on its staff. In a recent news interview, the director of NLSA stated that locally they have represented 19,000 clients in 1981! With 72 attorneys, that represents 263.888 clients each!. Estimating a 5 day work-week, 52 weeks @ year, no time-off for holidays, vacation, illness or personal reasons, there are 260 work-days in a year. That means that each of the 72 attorneys had to have handled more than 1 case each day without a break of any kind - unless they were estimating "classes" in their client totals.

There is sufficient reason to question the existence of Legal Services Corp. both nationally and on a local/State level. Following are some of the reasons for curtailment or abolishment of this private corporation funded by Federal and State tax dollars: LSC lawyers have sue to:

1. remove South Boston High School from jurisdiction of elected school committee and placed in receivorship.

2. force Ann Arbor (Michigan) School District to recognize "Black English" as a foreign language.

3. Prevent the Florida Dept. of Education from requiring a passing grade on a "functional literacy" test as a pre-condition to receiving a high school diploma.

4. uphold quotas through filing of an amicus brief on behalf of the board of Regents of Univ. of California in the Baake case.

5. stop the same Board of Regents from pursuing research and invention of more productive farm machinery.

6. Require expulsions from a Newburg,NY Jr. Hi School on a quota basis (i.e., proportional to the numbers of white and black students in the school population) without regard to the facts in each expulsion case.

7. force an out of court settlement, requiring Alaska to spend $40.6 million to provide a high school in every Alaskan village requesting one.

8. overturn a school board election in Hereford, Texas.

9. forced two-way busing of kindergarten children in the Albert Gallatin School District in Uniontown,PA in apparent violation of the supposed prohibition against LSC lawyers being involved in desegregatory suits.

10. overturn the Santa Ana, CA unified school district Board's decision to terminate a school breakfast program.

11. represented Iranian students at Texas Tech to overturn a local denial of permit to march past the home of Reza Pahlevi, sone of the late Shah of Iran.

12. sue to force the U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare to pay for the sterilization of a teenage girl in Utah.

13. sued to force the Social Security Administration to pay disability benefits to a man while going thru a sex change operation.

14. sued to have the Iowa Dept. of Social Services pay for a patient's sex-change operation.

15. sued to stop Massachusettes Governor Edward King's efforts to reduce welfare fraud.

16. representing ACORN, sued to halt fare increases proposed by SEPTA (Southeastern PA Transportation Authority) in Philadelphia.

17. representing ACORN, sued to roll-back and restructure fares, riding zones and to eliminate all passes and student fares in the Port Authority of Allegheny County, regardless of increased cost and inflation.

18. represented five Western PA students seeking to avoid prosecution for defaulting on student loans received from PHEAA.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

NOV 6 1981

GOVERNOR'S PRESS OFFICE
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
CONTACT: Paul Critchlow
Press Secretary
(717) 783-1116

HARRISBURG (Nov. 2) — Gov. Dick Thornburgh today expressed his gratitude at the safe release of the remaining hostages at Graterford State Prison.

"I am sure that all Pennsylvanians joined me in our prayers on behalf of these hostages and their families," the governor said.

"While we have achieved the most important result of obtaining the safe release of the hostages, there are lessons for the future to be learned from this situation which should not be ignored," he added. The governor said he believed there were at least four such immediate lessons.

"The ringleader in the attempted escape and hostage-taking is a three-time convicted murderer," he said. "He murdered a police officer and, while in prison, murdered a warden and deputy warden. Nevertheless, Community Legal Services of Philadelphia insisted upon pushing for a court order in 1975 requiring that this convict be returned to the general prison population at Graterford. More disturbing, the Shapp administration agreed to have this order entered over the strong objections of its own professional correction officials.

"Thus, one lesson that must certainly be taken from this situation is that never again should government permit 'cause' groups, or even the courts, to place the purported rights of vicious criminals above the safety of law enforcement and correction officers without the strongest possible opposition.

DID HIS PERSONAL CRISIS ABOUT HIS PERVERTED SEXUALITY HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH THE LSC PROMULGATION OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS REQUIRING AFFIRMATIVE ACTION FOR HOMOSEXUALS EXACTLY A YEAR AGO? (SEE ATTACHED CONGRESSIONAL RECORD INSERT AND PROPOSED REGULATIONS)

THE NEW YORK TIMES, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1982

file Legal Services

Homosexual Takes Leave of a Job and of an Agony

By PHIL GAILEY

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, March 30 — In more than 15 years on state and Federal payrolls, Dan J. Bradley, the departing president of the Legal Services Corporation, always worried first about keeping his secret. It survived routine background checks by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the relentless grind of the rumor mills in this city of whispers. And, despite some close calls, the chance discovery that might have sidetracked his public service career never happened.

Now, as Mr. Bradley prepares to leave Washington to begin a new life and career in Miami or San Francisco, he has stunned friends and associates with this disclosure: he is a homosexual.

Last Friday, Mr. Bradley wrote letters to close friends around the country to tell them his "deep dark secret." The first letter was to a former dean of students at Mercer University, the Baptist college in Macon, Ga., where Mr. Bradley studied for the ministry before the church's stand on segregation alienated him.

"He was a great influence on my life and I didn't want him to read about it in the newspapers," he said. "This was the first time I wrote the words, 'I am gay,' and it was unbelievably traumatic. Halfway through the letter, I realized I was being defensive and apologetic, which I didn't want to be. Once I had finished that letter, I can't describe the overwhelming relief I felt."

The New York Times/George Tames

Dan J. Bradley in his Washington office.

Common Inner Torture

Mr. Bradley's story provides a rare view inside the anxious and complicated world of closet homosexuals in the Federal work force, men and women living on a ledge of fear. Mr. Bradley, a 42-year-old lawyer who grew up in an Atlanta orphanage, has homosexual friends among members of Congress, White House staff members, Capitol Hill aides, lawyers and bureaucrats throughout the Federal establishment.

What many of them have in common, besides their sexual preference, is the inner torture of laughing at anti-homosexual jokes at office parties, of being seen in the wrong bar, or with the wrong person and, above all, of always calculating the price to their careers and personal lives of being found out.

So, he said, they live a double life, button-down straight at the office and something very different in their private world, every day of it a "terrible agony." With some exceptions in the military and intelligence areas, a change in the law in 1975 dramatically increased job protections for homosexuals in the Federal sector. But many homosexuals, including Congressional aides and appointed officials in the executive branch, still consider themselves vulnerable to the pressures that can be applied by their employers, according to Mr. Bradley.

"Until I finally came to grips with my sexuality about a year ago, and made up my mind to come out of the closet when I left this job, I lived almost every day in sheer, unmitigated fear," he said. "The fear that you're going to be discovered is always there, gnawing inside you, every time you enter a gay bar, or slip off to another city for a gay party."

Always, the Coverup

Always, he said, there was the coverup: Arranging for women with whom he was friendly and had shared his secret to brag about his virility to F.B.I. agents making a routine background check; keeping up a macho front with male colleagues; making sure he had a female escort for parties, and worrying about how to deal with homosexual issues in the legal services program.

One of his worst moments came in June, 1981, when Congress was debating an amendment by Representative Larry P. McDonald, Democrat of Georgia, to bar legal services lawyers from representing homosexuals.

"Here I was, sitting in the House gallery for three days during this debate," Mr. Bradley said, recalling the experience. "I was lobbying Congress on all kinds of amendments and was doing it with great conviction and energy. Then the McDonald amendment came up and I fell apart. I wanted to strangle that demagogue, bu[illegible]ad a terrible time lobbying Con[illegible] [illegible]en when they were debating civil rights."

[illegible]dley said that several homo[illegible] [illegible]use members he knew voted [illegible]mendment, something he said he could understand because he, too, had been "a master at deception."

"The web of deceit I had so consciously and meticulously woven over the years made it possible for me to rationalize whatever I had to do to protect myself," he said. "You can rationalize the lies, the deceptions or whatever. There is no end to it."

In the mid-1970's, when Reubin Askew was Governor of Florida, he selected Mr. Bradley to be State Racing Commissioner. Once again, he said, he made it through a background investigation with the aid of friends who lied for him. Mr. Bradley recalled the state investigator who checked him out saying at the time, "Mr. Bradley, you are either above reproach or you are the biggest fraud in the world."

Eventually, however, he said, he ran into Mr. Askew's "moralistic" side. "I remember being at a news conference with the Governor," Mr. Bradley said. Mr. Askew was asked his position on Anita Bryant's anti-homosexual campaign in Miami, and he said he supported it, Mr. Bradley recalled, adding, "Then he was asked if he would ever hire a homosexual, and he said he would not. I had to loosen my collar to breathe."

In recent weeks, Mr. Bradley said he had been asked by some of Mr. Askew's political associates to consider a role in the former Governor's campaign for the 1984 Democratic nomination for President. "I'm sure they'll change their minds now," he said.

Mr. Bradley, who began his Government career as a lawyer in the legal services program when it was part of the old Office of Economic Opportunity, took a leave of absence in 1976 from his r[illegible]onal director's job in Califor[illegible]nia t[illegible]rk in Jimmy Carter's Presiden[illegible] [illegible]mpaign.

Later, when he was asked to think about what role he would play in the Carter Administration, Mr. Bradley said he concluded that he should not consider any position that would raise his public profile. In June, 1979, President Carter named him to the top job at the Legal Services Corporation, an independent, federally financed agency whose 5,000 lawyers help poor people with their legal problems. The corporation has long been high on the list of some conservative organizations that view it as a nest of left-wing activists.

"I was ready to come out a year ago, but I knew that it probably would be used by the enemies of legal services in their effort to abolish the corporation," he said. "Even now, I worry about whether someone might try to use my coming out to discredit legal services."

In a recent interview, Mr. Bradley choked up and wiped tears from his eyes with a napkin as he talked about his devotion to legal services. "What sustained me all those years as I struggled with myself was legal services," he said. "In a way, it was my ministry. What legal services represented to me was the embodiment of everything I believed in politically, morally, professionally and otherwise. All those years when I was struggling with who I was, when I had no social life or meaningful personal relationships, when I was literally hibernating, Legal Services was my life."

'Suicidal Depressions' Cited

During his last days in office, Mr. Bradley quietly accepted a position on the board of directors of the Gay Rights National Lobby, which agreed not to announce the news officially until after he left the Legal Services Corporation on March 31. He also granted an interview to The Advocate, a California-based magazine for homosexuals, that is to run next month.

Mr. Bradley said he had had his first homosexual experience at age 28, and immediately went into the first of several "suicidal depressions." It was the beginning of almost a decade of regular sessions with psychiatrists and long periods of isolation "when I was neither straight nor gay." He said the fear that haunted him daily began to subside about a year ago when he began confiding to a few friends and became more relaxed about being seen at homosexual bars and gatherings.

Now that the news is out, Mr. Bradley said he expects many of the lucrative job offers he has had from law firms to be withdrawn. "That doesn't bother me in the least," he said. "It's a small price to pay for the burden I have shed. From now on the job will have to fit my life, and not vice versa."

Mr. Bradley said he intends to either join a Miami law firm, which has told him his homosexuality does not matter, or to settle in San Francisco, which has one of the largest homosexual communities in the country, and become active in local politics.

As he leaves Washington, Mr. Bradley is taking with him a thick sheaf of letters from Senators and Congressmen that poured in last week praising his stewardship at the Legal Services Corporation, and especially the political skills he demonstrated on Capitol Hill in his lobbying campaign to save legal services.

"I think I helped save legal services," he said. "Now, I have to try to save myself."

WAS BRADLEY'S ARRANGING FOR WOMEN TO SUPPORT HIS BRAGGING ABOUT HIS VIRILITY TO FBI AGENTS A CRIME? SPECIFICALLY A VIOLATION OF TITLE 18 UNITED STATES CODE 371 OR TITLE 18 UNITED STATES CODE 1001 (ATTACHED).

UNITED STATES CODE ANNOTATED

Title 18
Crimes and Criminal Procedure

§ 371. Conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States

If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States, or to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

If, however, the offense, the commission of which is the object of the conspiracy, is a misdemeanor only, the punishment for such conspiracy shall not exceed the maximum punishment provided for such misdemeanor.

§ 1001. Statements or entries generally

Whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact, or makes any false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or representations, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

excellent illustration of the philosophy that will restore the taxpayer's faith in the American system of government.

DEAR GOVERNOR MOORE: I am sorry that I am unable to be present Wednesday for the report of your Commission of Transportation Needs and Financing. I have, however, read the report carefully. I compliment you and the members of your Commission on all the hard work you have done and on your personal commitment to the welfare of this state. I have no doubt that much work needs to be done on the highway system as your Commission has so ably pointed out.

As important as all this is, I would like to suggest, however, that the real priority issue confronting North Carolinians is not transportation but the level of taxation. The tax burden of North Carolina citizens cannot be isolated to state taxes only. These same people also carry the burden of city, county and federal taxes. This total tax burden now consumes approximately forty-four percent of the average person's income. Just how much are the citizens willing to pay for the cost of government? I shall have to let other citizens speak for themselves, but as for me I am unalterably opposed to any further increase in the tax burden of our citizens. I refer to the percent of our income represented by the total tax burden.

In the medieval days, the feudal lords required that the serfs work forty percent of their time for the state. Obviously, we are already working forty-four percent of our time for government. So great is this problem that I have come to the position that no matter how worthwhile any new program is, if it increases the tax burden as a percentage of income, it must be either denied or other expenses in government must be curtailed to make room for it. In fact, I think it is essential that the tax burden be decreased through the years to come rather than increased further.

Now, accepting as fact that our highways do need the attention which your Commission proposes, the question is, "How do we get it done without further increasing our taxes?" May I suggest two alternatives:

1. Raise taxes on gasoline and perhaps other items as suggested in your report and lower taxes elsewhere by a compensating amount.

2. Continue the gasoline and related taxes as are, combine the highway fund with the general fund, set priorities of expenses as needed and cut the budget elsewhere to accommodate these priorities.

One can take the position that the net result of either of these two alternatives is to shift the burden of the cost of the highway program back to the people through the general fund and thereby ignoring the "user pays" principle, a principle long utilized in connection with the highway fund.

I think, therefore, the time has come when we should re-examine the "user pays" principle. While it is basically a fine concept, I have come to the conclusion that the term is one used mostly for convenience when talking about highway expenditures. Consider the following:

1. The people of North Carolina probably participate more completely in the use of the state highways and roads than any other item of state expense. Even those who don't own cars pay through the fares of public transportation. The "user pays" principle is reasonably approached by the very nature of this situation; i.e., general use by everybody of the state road system.

2. We seem to apply the "user pays" principle when it suits our convenience, as in the highway fund, but don't apply it where it doesn't suit this convenience, as in the higher education fund. Whereas most of our citizens use our highways in one form or another, less that twenty-five percent go to our state universities and colleges. Yet all citizens are taxed for the benefit of the relative few who do go to these state supported institutions. It is also important to note that the cost of this higher education is greater than the highway fund. If the "user pays" principle were used in this very significant budget item of higher education, the university system as we know it would probably be destroyed. We simply could not afford the massive higher education system we now have. How is it we can justify forcing people who never would or can go to college to pay the cost of others who do go? Yet we do it. I believe it is clear that a general tax for everybody to support the highway system, which is used by nearly everyone, is much fairer than a general tax to support our system of higher education which is used by only one fourth of our citizens.

3. The same argument can also be applied to our system of community colleges and technical schools.

4. The same argument, although in a lesser degree, can also be applied to our general education program. There are many people in this state who do not have a high school education, but who are paying taxes to keep up the system for those who do use it. Even here, the "user pays" principle does not work completely either.

To get back to my earlier point, the overriding consideration in the whole picture is the excessive level of tax burden our people now carry. This must be reduced rather than increased. I support good maintenance and proper expansion of our highway system and urge that we put these items into a priority structure with other items of importance and work it all out within our present total tax structure. Otherwise, I cannot in good conscience, accept it, and I don't believe the people of North Carolina will accept it either.

In my opinion, there is a way to do it without increasing our taxes if we only have the will to do it. Surely we shall have to cut back on other things, but if the priorities tell us that this is the thing to do, then so be it.

Thank you again, Governor, for your commitment and hard work in this matter. Please know that I love North Carolina, too, and will do everything in my power to support those programs and causes which I believe are to the ultimate best interest of our citizens.

Sincerely,

W. D. STEDMAN.●

HONORARY CITIZENSHIP FOR RAOUL WALLENBERG

SPEECH OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1981

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am honored in taking this opportunity in joining my respected friend from California (Mr. LANTOS), and the rest of my distinguished colleagues, in supporting the House resolution bestowing honorary citizenship on Raoul Wallenberg, certainly one of the greatest humanitarians of our time, and a man who will forever remain an inspiration to us all.

When one reads about the heroic feats Raoul Wallenberg performed during the Nazi occupation of Budapest, Hungary, an initial reaction may be to think that Roaul Wallenberg is a character found in a World War II novel. It seems impossible that one man could literally singlehandedly be responsible for saving up to 100,000 men and women, young and old, from an almost certain death at the hands of the Nazis. But it is true. In 1944, at the request of the U.S. War Refugee Board and the World Jewish Congress, he went to Budapest, Hungary with the goal of saving as many Jewish citizens as possible, claiming they were Swedish. In the face of Nazi intent to exterminate the Jewish race, he risked his life day after day and night after night for almost a year to save innocent men and women. No writer could have ever made up the courage, dedication, and sacrifice Roaul Wallenberg displayed at that time. No writer could have ever dreamed up a character who did so much for so many.

There is the distinct possibility, that somewhere in the Soviet Union Raoul Wallenberg is alive in a Soviet prison. If he is indeed alive, as reports have suggested, then we as a nation, must do all within our power to exert pressure on the Soviet Government to release this innocent man. I pray that he is alive and that he be granted the freedom he so justly deserves.●

LEGAL SERVICES: REGULATIONS FOR WHAT?

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in all the discussion about the President's decision to cut funds for Legal Services, there has not been much said about the view of society that those who run this agency bring to their task. Walter Pincus of the Washington Post recently disclosed the fact that Legal Services is proposing regulations [redacted]

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD, "Legal Service Corp. Suits Itself, Waves Red Flag at Reagan" by Walter Pincus, the [redacted]

LEGAL SERVICES CORP. SUITS ITSELF, WAVES RED FLAG AT REAGAN

(By Walter Pincus)

"They have put a gun to their head and pulled the trigger."

That was the way one conservative caller last week described the comprehensive civil rights regulations proposed earlier this month by the Legal Services Corp. and published in the March 23 Federal Register (page 18055).

They include all the rules that drive Reagan conservatives crazy [redacted] requirements for bilingual employes, affirmative action plans to guarantee employment of women and minorities at levels that reflect "appropriate labor force characteristics," and inclusion of drug addiction and alcoholism as diseases that would qualify someone as being a "handicapped person" and, thus protected from discrimination.

LSC, you must remember, is the nonprofit corporation that supports legal services for the poor by distributing $300 million in federal grants and contracts to local organizations, which use the money to pay for lawyers and other legal specialists in almost every county across the nation.

President Reagan has long had a distaste for the federally supported legal services program, and his administration, as part of the budget-cutting effort, has marked LSC for elimination next year.

An LSC official conceded that the agency's board was aware that the proposed regulations, developed before the White House termination plan was announced, would be a red flag for the Reaganites. But LSC decided to put the rules out for comment anyway because "this was our position."

The purpose of the proposed rules, according to the notice, "is to prevent discrimination by legal services programs supported in whole or in part by Legal Services Corp. funds in the delivery of services or in employment. . . ."

The proposed rules, which for the most part codify procedures in effect since LSC's establishment in 1974, add a prohibition against discrimination by reason of "sexual orientation." That phrase, an LSC official said, refers to homosexuals.

The agency, she added, decided to prohibit discrimination against homosexuals because similar policies have been adopted by the District of Columbia and other state and local entities.

The rules, however, also bar recipients of LSC funds from having "any contractual or other relationship" with other agencies or organizations including "labor unions, (or) organizations providing or administering fringe benefits to employees of the recipient . . ." if the agencies discriminate against specified groups, including homosexuals.

That provision, according to my outraged caller, "would eliminate the Catholic Church groups." Not so, according to the LSC official, and if it did, the rule would be altered. "That is why we have put it out for comment."

Another provision that's bound to draw criticism is one that says a recipient of LSC funds cannot "make a preemployment inquiry as to whether an applicant is a handicapped person or as to the nature of or severity of a handicap except where the examination or inquiry is related to an essential job function."

What about drug addiction and alcoholism, which LSC includes as characteristics of a certain kind of "handicapped person"? On first blush, the LSC official said a lawyer certainly could be questioned, but there was doubt about other job applicants.

Fund recipients under the rules would be required to provide bilingual employes, "not limited to clerical positions" in "any area where 5 percent of the eligible population are members of a minority language group." They also must provide informational literature in the appropriate languages and post signs in those languages. The percentage requirement was taken from the federal voting rights law, which requires ballots to be bilingual in areas where 5 percent of the population speaks a language other than English.

Grant recipient that have 50 or more employes must have an affirmative action plan approved by LSC's director of office of equal opportunity. Before producing such a plan, the recipient must, "determine if underutilization on the basis of race, national origin or sex occurs in any job category or unit of its workforce" using a formula supplied by LSC.

Its plan must include "goals and timetables to correct underutilization of women and minorities." In those instances where a recipient is found to have an employe "workforce or segment of the workforce not on parity with the relevant labor market," approval of higher authorities would be needed before any vacancies were filled.

In the Carter years, LSC's rules would have raised a few eyebrows; today they may hasten the lowering of the boom.●

RED SMITH ON HANDGUNS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Red Smith, who is probably the dean of American sportswriters and certainly one of the most highly respected, sees "no valid reason why possession of handguns should not be prohibited by law."

In yesterday's New York Times, Mr. Smith concluded a column on the attempted assassination of President Reagan with the following pithy paragraphs:

Inevitably the attempted assassination revived talk about strengthening gun-control laws, a campaign that has not had ardent support from the President up to now. Wouldn't this experience alter his views?

Maybe, maybe not. The fact is, there is no valid reason why possession of a handgun should not be prohibited by law, though that would not keep the weapons out of the hands of assassins and other criminals.

Handguns are not sporting goods like rifles and shotguns. They are not used for any normal kind of hunting, not even trap shooting. Target-practice competition could be held with toy guns and rubber-tipped darts. The only practical civilian use for pistols and revolvers is shooting people.

This being the case, the law ought to ban these weapons. Such a law may make it more difficult for a wife, in a moment of pique, to plug her ever-loving helpmeet. It would be observed by the law-abiding and ignored by the lawless. President Reagan, who has waved plenty of six-shooters around playing cowboy in the movies, is perfectly aware of that.

Mr. Smith, the bill that does what you advocate is numbered H.R. 40.●

COGENERATION LEGISLATION

HON. CECIL (CEC) HEFTEL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. HEFTEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce legislation which I feel will have a significant impact on our Nation's energy conservation effort. The bill, the Cogeneration and Small Power Production Deregulation Act of 1981 is intended to streamline those aspects of the 1978 National Energy Act which have constrained the full use of cogeneration by America's industries and utilities.

The United States is faced with an energy problem of unprecendented dimensions. As the present war between Iraq and Iran clearly demonstrates, our Nation is perilously dependent on highly unstable and uncertain foreign supplies of oil. Energy now has a direct and significant impact on our foreign policy and our domestic economy. It is essential then that strategies be devised and implemented to deal with the energy problem in the short term. We feel that a cornerstone of any energy strategy must involve increased conservation. Since America's industries and utilities consume well over half of all energy utilized in the country, we believe that an aggressive energy conservation effort in the industrial and utility sectors is essential to our Nation's energy future.

Cogeneration is perhaps the most important and readily accessible source of industrial conservation in the near term. The highly acclaimed work, "Energy Future," by Harvard Profs. Daniel Yergin and Robert Stobough, describes cogeneration as "industry's North Scope." Very simply, cogeneration is the production of two forms of useful energy from one fuel source, leading to a more efficient use of the primary energy. A number of studies estimate that perhaps over 20 percent of total industrial energy presently used in the United States could be saved through cogeneration. Our European allies are already effectively using this conservation technology. For example, cogeneration acounts for approximately 27 percent of all electric power used in West Germany, as compared with less than 5 percent in the United States. Interestingly, the United States once relied on cogeneration for a significant measure of its electricity needs. In 1922, for example, 22 percent of all our electricity came from industrial cogeneration. However, declining electricity prices and inexpensive oil led to a marked decline in the role cogeneration played.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am introducing today is aimed at encouraging utility cogeneration by removing those barriers in the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 which discourage utilities from owning and operating cogeneration plants. By removing these barriers, utilities will have been given a significant incentive to cogenerate, which will in turn maximize the energy efficiency of their power generation. A second major aspect of this legislation is intended to increase the efficiency of oil and gas use by America's industries. By modifying those aspects of the 1978 Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act, which to now have prohibited, the use of oil and gas in industrial cogeneration facilities, I hope to encourage the more efficient use of these precious resources. Eventually, cogeneration using coal, biomass, synthetic fuels, and other energy sources will be used with great efficiency by industry and

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM J. OLSON
MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS
LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION
December 16, 1982

In recent days the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation has come under criticism for its hard work in attempting to manage this Corporation. Congressman Kastenmeier's claim that we have spent too much time in exercising our statutory responsibilities to govern the Corporation is part of his effort to coverup the abuses and rampant illegality in this program which he is supposed to monitor as Chairman of the House Subcommittee.

This is a vicious, McCarthyite attack by Congressman Kastenmeier and certain members of his Subcommittee who have participated through lack of diligence in enforcing the Act in the coverup of the illegalities at the Corporation and the waste of the taxpayers' money through the funding of the Left. If his Subcommittee had ever done its job to provide proper oversight to Legal Services the work that this Board has been forced to do to bring this program in line with the law would have been unnecessary.

It would be interesting to have the public review all of the Subcommittee's pay, travel and expenses for the past years to find out what they have been doing while the Corporation has been allowed to break the law and divert money away from the poor it was designed to serve.

Let me respond to the charges in one sentence: This Board has spent more money than prior Boards to manage this Corporation because it has worked harder than prior Boards to stop the illegalities in the program and insure that the money be spent on the poor.

Congressman Sawyer, who has served on the Subcommittee for some time, did not even know that since 1975 Board members had been compensated. To express outrage at this Board's following the law and the practice of prior Boards shows an unbelievable lack of familiarity with the program that he is responsible for monitoring.

The Board doesn't set the fees it is paid — the Congress does. There's something morally wrong about these Congressmen attacking us for following the laws that they write.

Every honest observer of the Corporation knows that we have devoted more time to this job than prior Boards because we want to end the cover-up of LSC abuses. Congressman Kastenmeier knows that we have worked harder than prior Boards to make sure taxpayer funding goes to help the poor people it is designed to help.

Congressman Kastenmeier has been happy to sit back over the years while prior Boards line the pockets of his leftist constituency such as the National Legal Aid and Defender Association. Congressman Kastenmeier and certain Subcommittee members apparently do not object to the fact that this Board is spending money as much as that we are saving money.

Congressman Kastenmeier has opposed legislation to allow public access to information through the Freedom of Information Act in order to allow the public to monitor the inner workings of the Corporation.

Congressman Kastenmeier has sat back while $41 million in bank balances of local programs were squirrelled away without even batting an eyelash. In this Board's work in forcing that these $41 million dollars be spent to help poor persons it did more good for the poor than any prior act of any Board.

The last Board of Directors adopted the 1982 Corporation budget even though the then Chairman of the Board admitted that most of the Board had spent less than one hour reviewing it. The last Board had only a total of nine meetings of the Board and all its Committees during 1981. Our Board has had a total of twenty-eight as of today.

The record of the prior Board is not a record that this Board wanted to emulate. Apparently certain Congressmen feel that having a pro forma Board which simply conducts business as usual at the Legal Services Corporation is fine. I do not.

I hope that now that this attack is out of the way that we can return to solving the substantive problems of the Corporation. There are many and they deserve a Board committed to spending sufficient time to correct them.

A quick note from

PATRICK PIZZELLA

Morton,
This is the
tip of the
iceberg –
"defunding" the
left will happen as
we cut govt.
What do you think
they were advocating?

PP

file Legal Services

Legal Disservices

WSJ about 12/21/82

WALL ST JOURNAL 12/22/82

Legal Services Corporation, the government program set up in the mid-1970s to give the poor legal advice on civil matters. An oversight committee of the House of Representatives has exposed what members call the scandalous consulting fees and expenses charged by President Reagan's appointees to the corporation's board. The new LSC president has been accused of getting himself a cushy sweetheart contract. The Reagan crew looks like parasites fattening off the suffering of the poor.

This is what they should have expected when they took on the poverty establishment.

What is really at issue here is the following: The Legal Services Corporation has not only been giving the poor routine civil advice on divorces and the like, but has been bringing class action suits against organizations—like state governments or jails or housing authorities—that poverty lawyers thought were wronging their clients as a whole.

This practice made the corporation absolute anathema to the right, and a prominent symbol in Ronald Reagan's presidential campaign against poverty bureaucrats and their ilk. When Mr. Reagan came to office, he tried to abolish the corporation altogether. At first he decided not to try to appoint his own corporation board, because this would look like resigning himself to the organization's continued existence. When it became clear that Congress wasn't going to let the corporation go away, Mr. Reagan moved to take control of it by making some recess appointments of his own.

In the meantime, some progress was being made in scaling legal services down. The board was getting ready to revise the regulations and make it harder to launch the class actions that were driving everybody crazy. Congress seemed ready to make it easier to suspend grants to local legal services organizations that were behaving obnoxiously.

But the legal services establishment, permitted a continuing lease on life by the delay in the Reagan appointments, had been organizing. It managed to turn around the rules on defunding local organizations and made it harder, not easier, to cut them off. And it went public with its charges against the Reagan board.

What do these charges amount to? Well, you never know with these things; an OMB investigation has now been started to determine who has been putting up his pet duck at the local Holiday Inn. The Reagan crew is said to have charged the government much more for their part-time consultants' services than previous boards did. This looks true. It also looks true that this board, as opposed to previous ones, was a new board that had confirmation hearings to prepare for and go to. It further seems true that the present board held a lot more meetings than its predecessors did, in part because it had to control a hostile staff. It is even true that its pay scale was effectively raised 15% by Congress this past year, which may have had at least a little something to do with the big numbers. Nor does the board president's contract look a great deal different from his predecessor's.

Don't get us wrong; for all we know investigations may turn up some padding, as they would in most government agencies, Congress not excluded. But anyone who thinks that what's going on here is a hunt for expense-account abuses must have been born yesterday. These charges come up only as a weapon which opponents of the current Reagan policies are trying to use to deprive the board of the legitimacy it needs to make the changes it wants in legal services operations.

Let no one confuse these accusations with the substance of the legal services struggle. The fight is over whose notion of poverty law is going to prevail in this country, and the expense issue is nothing but a low tactic.

Consumers Union To Close 3 Offices, Trim Its Magazine

* * *

Consumer Reports' Publisher Cites Pending Rate Rise for Nonprofit Groups

By a WALL STREET JOURNAL *Staff Reporter*

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y. — Consumers Union, blaming a postal rate increase for nonprofit organizations, will cut back its Consumer Reports magazine and close its three advocacy offices.

The moves were announced after the Postal Service's board of governors last week approved higher rates, effective Jan. 10, for certain mail sent by nonprofit groups. Consumers Union said the increase will boost its annual postal costs about $2 million. Circulation is about 2.9 million.

Rhoda Karpatkin, executive director of Consumers Union, said Consumer Reports will switch to a cheaper grade of paper, effective next spring. The magazine, which evaluates consumer products and services, will be reduced to 52 pages from its current average of 60 pages. The cutback will eliminate some features but won't affect the magazine's product evaluations, Miss Karpatkin said.

Consumers Union also plans to close its advocacy offices in Washington, San Francisco and Austin, effective in late January, unless a new source of funds can be found. The offices, which provide legal and other services related to consumer issues, employ 11.

Consumers Union, before the announcement of the higher postal rates, had made plans to furlough about 25 employes at its Mount Vernon headquarters, of a total work force of 243. David Berliner, assistant director, attributed the cutbacks to "disappointing returns" from recent subscription solicitations for Consumer Reports. "It now appears we will have substantially less revenue than we had anticipated," he said.

Chem-Tronics Report For Fiscal '81 Qualified

file Legal Services

Official Mail Seeks to Curb Legal Services

United Press International

A board member of the Legal Services Corp. is using official funds and stationery to enlist support for proposed rules that would curb government-financed lawyers for the poor.

In letters to conservative groups such as the American Conservative Union, William J. Olson said Congress "has given us a great opportunity to reform" the legal services program.

He urged the groups and law professors to "give us your help in the proper implementation of these provisions of the law."

The letter, dated Nov. 23, was made available yesterday by liberal supporters of the program.

Opponents of the proposed regulations said they do not think Olson's use of legal services funds and stationery is illegal. But one lawyer said, "If a legal services' lawyer did that, he or she would be fired on the spot."

The proposed regulations could greatly restrict the ability of legal services lawyers to bring class-action suits against the government and make it much easier for the board to refuse to refinance programs it does not like.

Legal services' successful class-action suits have dealt with such issues such as prison conditions and crowding in mental institutions.

The controversial proposed regulations were published for public comment last month in two forms—one a moderate version penned by corporation staff members, and a more restrictive version by Olson and Legal Services Corporation Board Chairman William F. Harvey.

Hou

CONSE
by industry si
by DOE.
Despite m
mand, it was
with rising en
The averag
ture for ener
$917 during
an increase o
spite declinin
energy expen
from $55 bill
lion in 1980.
However,
dence yester
mand for pe
ing prices do
announced t
price of a b
or approxim
Ashland O
by $1 a barr
pay for crud
in value of p
crude.

SMILEY, OLSON & GILMAN
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
1815 H STREET, NORTHWEST
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
(202) 466-5100

MS - FYI + then file Legal Services

12/28

Morton —

FYI

Bill

WILLIAM J. OLSON

The Legal Services Corporation Storm

Media Sling Mud at Conservative Board Members

Congressional staff aides and a Washington *Post* reporter collaborated last week in the use of half truths and selective statistics to smear the Reagan-appointed board of the Legal Services Corporation and to undermine the Administration's efforts to reform the federally-funded program of legal aid for the poor.

The $241-million Corporation, a quasi-autonomous unit established by Congress in 1975 to provide legal aid to poor persons in civil matters, has been a target of numerous attacks by conservatives over the years for using tax funds for lobbying and political advocacy.

At a hearing on December 14 before a Congressional oversight committee headed by Rep. Robert Kastenmeier, documents produced by the current Corporation staff who had been appointed in the Carter years led to charges by Washington *Post* reporter Mary Thornton that consultation fees paid to Reagan's appointees were "at least twice as large as those paid to any previous board in the program's history."

The figures prompted retiring Republican committee member Caldwell Butler to exclaim that "it sounds like the first thing [Reagan's appointees] did was to put all four feet and a snout in the trough."

A second charge based on the statistics furnished the committee was that Board Chairman William Harvey had bypassed a board committee and unilaterally negotiated a flagrantly excessive contract with the new Corporation president Donald Bogard. The New York *Times* took up the hue and cry with an editorial entitled "Chiseling on the Poor," while Republican Rep. Harold Sawyer of Michigan wrote a letter to the White House charging Reagan's board with "making a profit on the backs of the poor by applying a suck-up as opposed to a trickle-down theory."

Sawyer's letter, which called for the removal of the new Corporation president, was signed by six other House members, including a conservative, Henry Hyde of Illinois. James J. Kilpatrick of the influential TV show "Agronsky and Company" agreed with liberal commentator Carl Rowan that the performance of the Reagan board was "disgraceful." The White House, caught unawares, promised to have OMB look into the matter to determine whether the fees and contract provisions were excessive.

Information developed by HUMAN EVENTS indicates that the *Post* charges are without foundation. Payment of consultant fees and other expenses for board members had been the Corporation's practice since the Corporation's inception in 1975 and Congress *never* questioned this practice in the past.

In January 1982 the newly-appointed Reagan board was advised by Dan Bradley, the out-going President who ran the Corporation under Carter, that consulting fees could cover travel time and preparation for meetings and that the rate had been raised from $192 a day to $221 pursuant to action by Congress on the Corporation's budget. Using the rates and practices established by previous boards, in 1982 the Reagan board billed the Corporation for $180,994. $156,000 of this was for consulting fees and $24,000 for travel and lodging expenses reimbursed by the Corporation. Since the Reagan board met 28 times during the year, the average cost per board meeting was $6,464. The Carter-appointed board on the other hand, during the last year of its existence in 1981, spent a total of $100,100, which included $72,000

WILLIAM OLSON

in consultant fees and $28,116 for travel and lodging expenses. The Carter board met just 12 times and the average cost for each meeting was... $8,341 or nearly $2,000 *more* per meeting than costs incurred by the Reagan board.

The frequency of the Reagan board meetings is understandable in view of the fact that the board was facing confirmation (three meetings were for confirmation hearings), had to conduct the search for a new president and assume a number of administrative duties pending selection of a permanent president, was required to restructure the program in line with Congress' budget cut of 25% and call for new regulations and undertook a thorough and long-overdue review of grantee operations. One of the results was the discovery of $41 million which legal aid lawyers had been hoarding without the knowledge of Congressional appropriations committees.

The Carter board, on the other hand, had little to do in its last year except rubber stamp requests for refunding. The fact that the Reagan board met 28 times as opposed to 12 meetings of the Carter board was ignored by both the oversight committee and the Washington *Post.*

Another instance of selective reporting was the indignant citation by the *Post* and the New York *Times* of the consulting fees and expenses collected by Reagan appointees William Harvey and William Olson. The record shows that the client representative appointed by *Carter,* Josephine Worthy, received approximately the same amount as William Harvey, while Howard Dana, a Reagan appointee favored by the liberals, drew $5,000 *more* from the Corporation than William Olson, who has been savaged repeatedly in the liberal press. *None of this information about Worthy and Dana was even hinted at in the press coverage.* The list of the highest paid board members and what they received during 1982 is as follows:

Harvey	$33,810
Worthy	33,794
Stubbs	30,576
Dana	30,198
Olson	25,212
McKee	23,205
Paras	23,672

All of the above were reimbursed at the rate of $221 a day or $29 an hour, a rate not viewed as exorbitant in legal circles. A judicare lawyer (a private lawyer who serves the poor and is reimbursed by the government) charges from $25 to $30 an hour, while a lawyer who serves paying clients charges from $70 to $100 an hour. Members of the Reagan-appointed board were frequently required to work 10 to 15 hours during meetings but received no reimbursement for time worked above eight hours.

The charge that the contract of the Corporation's new president Donald Bogard was illegally negotiated and provides for excessive benefits is equally baseless. Board minutes indicate that after Bogard was chosen as president by a vote of 8 to 3, the board requested a committee composed of Clint Lyons, the acting president, Howard Dana, a board member, and William Harvey, the board chairman, to negotiate a contract with Bogard. Clint Lyons subsequently withdrew from the committee, pleading a conflict of interest. Howard Dana, who had voted against Bogard and had written a public letter to Bogard requesting that he withdraw on the grounds he was unqualified, refused to participate in the negotiations. Consequently it was left to Harvey alone to execute the wishes of the board. The contract was ratified by a majority of the board on December 16.

The terms of the contract Harvey negotiated with Bogard were essentially the same as those in the contracts of *all* of Bogard's predecessors. These included a club membership, reimbursement for travel expenses pending resettlement in Washington and six months severance pay. The contract of the first president, Thomas Ehrlich, for example, provided for regular trips each month from California to Washington during the first six months of his tenure. Since the board could not assure Bogard that their selection of him as president would not be reversed by a new board or by a court decision resulting from one of the lawsuits against the Corporation, Bogard was offered an additional six months severance should he be forced to leave in the first year, to offset the relinquishment of his previous employment. Some scandal!

The Great Legal Services Flap

'The [Post's] Job Both Shined and Stunk'

By James J. Kilpatrick

Washington.

THIS MONTH'S flap over the Legal Services Corporation may have had no more than a lady-cracker's impact across most of the nation, but here in Washington the story went off with the bang of a cherry bomb. Let me pick up a few missing pieces.

For the record: Congress created the Legal Services Corporation in 1975 to provide legal aid to the poor in civil matters. The agency has been a battleground ever since. On one side are the liberal activists, who want the LSC's lawyers to bring class action suits, to lobby in state capitals for social legislation and to seek sweeping changes in the law. On the other side are the conservative standpatters, who want the LSC's lawyers to stick to aiding poor persons in such areas as small judgments, evictions, divorce and government services.

In point of fact, the great bulk of the LSC's work has been in the conservatives' areas, but the activists have controlled policies and staff from the beginning. President Reagan, a longtime critic of the corporation, proposed to reverse the situation last year. He nominated nine persons to a new board of directors, headed by William F. Harvey, but the Senate refused to confirm his choices. A couple of weeks ago the president withdrew all his nominations. Meanwhile the board had elected a new corporation president, Donald Bogard. He took office on December 13.

The big bang came two days later. The *Washington Post* broke the story under a Page One headline: "Legal Service Appointees Get Fat Fees." The gist of it was that the Reagan nominees have been collecting "large consulting fees," at a rate "at least twice as large as those paid to any previous board." In the first 11 months of 1982, board members had been paid $156,200, compared with $72,000 for the former Carter board in all of 1981. Chairman Harvey, it was reported, had billed the corporation at $221 a day for four days of driving to and from his home in Indianapolis in order to attend board sessions here.

The story grew. The *Post* seized gleefully upon the contract given President Bogard. It contains a clause by which the corporation will pay his dues in a private social club of his own choosing. For several days the *Post* regaled its readers with juicy tidbits intended to show that the Reagan crowd, as a congressman viewed it, had all four feet and a snout in the trough. "It is disgusting," said a *Post* editorial. The New York *Times* weighed in with its own me-too editorial, "Chiseling on the Poor." The *Times* was outraged that one Reagan nominee, Washington attorney William Olson, had "bagged" $19,000 for part-time work.

As a smear job—and that is precisely what it was—the *Post's* reporting had all the beauty of John Randolph's mackerel in the moonlight. The job both shined and stunk.

Why were the 1982 per diems (meetings) double those of 1981? The Reagan board put in 28 days on corporation business in 1982, the Carter board only 12 in 1981. The per diem rate had been raised by Congress from $192 in 1981 to $221 in 1982. The Reagan members followed the identical practices of the Carter members in terms of fees and travel expenses.

The $19,000 that Olson "bagged" represented $29 an hour—about one-fourth of the going rate for a Washington lawyer. The *Times* did not mention that board member Josephine Worthy, who serves as the officially designated poor person to represent client interests, bagged $20,000 plus $17,500 in travel expenses.

As for the Bogard contract, the private club provision parallels the same provision in the contracts of his predecessors—a fact the *Post* grudgingly acknowledged three days after the story broke. Mr. Bogard's contract assures him a year's severance pay, double the severance period provided for last year's president, Dan Bradley, but the circumstances are different. To accept the post as head of the LSC, Mr. Bogard resigned from Stokely-Van Camp, where he was chief of litigation, and agreed to move his family from Indiana to Washington. With dissolution of the Reagan board, Mr. Bogard now has been left high and dry. Mr. Bradley had no such obligations or uncertainties.

Viewed objectively, with the facts in perspective, the story never was much of a story. Most of us in my business, which is the news business, were taught as cubs to keep our reporting fair, balanced and neutral. Reading the *Post*, you kind of wonder whatever became of those elementary rules.

Legal Disservices

The roof has fallen in again on the Legal Services Corporation, the government program set up in the mid-1970s to give the poor legal advice on civil matters. An oversight committee of the House of Representatives has exposed what members call the scandalous consulting fees and expenses charged by President Reagan's appointees to the corporation's board. The new LSC president has been accused of getting himself a cushy sweetheart contract. The Reagan crew looks like parasites fattening off the suffering of the poor.

This is what they should have expected when they took on the poverty establishment.

What is really at issue here is the following: The Legal Services Corporation has not only been giving the poor routine civil advice on divorces and the like, but has been bringing class action suits against organizations—like state governments or jails or housing authorities—that poverty lawyers thought were wronging their clients as a whole.

This practice made the corporation absolute anathema to the right, and a prominent symbol in Ronald Reagan's presidential campaign against poverty bureaucrats and their ilk. When Mr. Reagan came to office, he tried to abolish the corporation altogether. At first he decided not to try to appoint his own corporation board, because this would look like resigning himself to the organization's continued existence. When it became clear that Congress wasn't going to let the corporation go away, Mr. Reagan moved to take control of it by making some recess appointments of his own.

In the meantime, some progress was being made in scaling legal services down. The board was getting ready to revise the regulations and make it harder to launch the class actions that were driving everybody crazy. Congress seemed ready to make it easier to suspend grants to local legal services organizations that were behaving obnoxiously.

But the legal services establishment, permitted a continuing lease on life by the delay in the Reagan appointments, had been organizing. It managed to turn around the rules on defunding local organizations and made it harder, not easier, to cut them off. And it went public with its charges against the Reagan board.

What do these charges amount to? Well, you never know with these things; an OMB investigation has now been started to determine who has been putting up his pet duck at the local Holiday Inn. The Reagan crew is said to have charged the government much more for their part-time consultants' services than previous boards did. This looks true. It also looks true that this board, as opposed to previous ones, was a new board that had confirmation hearings to prepare for and go to. It further seems true that the present board held a lot more meetings than its predecessors did, in part because it had to control a hostile staff. It is even true that its pay scale was effectively raised 15% by Congress this past year, which may have had at least a little something to do with the big numbers. Nor does the board president's contract look a great deal different from his predecessor's.

Don't get us wrong; for all we know investigations may turn up some padding, as they would in most government agencies, Congress not excluded. But anyone who thinks that what's going on here is a hunt for expense-account abuses must have been born yesterday. These charges come up only as a weapon which opponents of the current Reagan policies are trying to use to deprive the board of the legitimacy it needs to make the changes it wants in legal services operations.

Let no one confuse these accusations with the substance of the legal services struggle. The fight is over whose notion of poverty law is going to prevail in this country, and the expense issue is nothing but a low tactic.

Capital Briefs

★ Gaining nationwide publicity, Rep. Robert Kastenmeier's (D.-Wis.) Judiciary oversight subcommittee roasted conservative members of the **Legal Services Corporation** last week for allegedly pocketing excessive consulting fees. But in a scorching response, Board member **William J. Olson** argued there was good reason for those fees: both he and his fellow conservatives were actually doing the oversight work that previous Board members—and Congress—had failed to perform.

★ Olson charged that this was a "vicious" attack by Kastenmeier and certain subcommittee members who have long participated in the "**coverup of the illegalities** of the Corporation and the waste of the taxpayers' money through the funding of the Left. If his subcommittee had ever done its job to provide proper oversight to Legal Services, the work that this Board has been forced to do to bring this program in line with the law would have been unnecessary."

★ Every honest observer of the Corporation, said Olson, "knows that we have devoted **more time to this job** than prior Boards because we want to end the cover-up of LSC abuses." Moreover, stressed Olson, the Board doesn't set the fees it is paid, the Congress does. And there's "something **morally wrong** about these congressmen attacking us for following the laws that they write."

WASH TIMES
12/20/82 3A

JOHN LOFTON'S JOURNAL

Selective outrage at Legal Services

"Kiss my ---!"

With the blank filled in, this was the eloquent closing summary argument of Christopher Whittingham — a staff attorney for Neighborhood Legal Services here in D.C. — just before he slammed the phone down in my ear last Saturday night. Gosh. I hope Mr. Whittingham doesn't talk like this in court.

You may have seen Whittingham late last week on the NBC Nightly News denouncing the employment contract of Donald Bogard, President Reagan's choice to head the Legal Services Corporation. Or, you may have read the UPI story in which Whittingham also blasted Bogard. In fact, as Whittingham notes with a little aw-shucks-it-wasn't-nothing laugh, he has been quoted "all over" criticizing Bogard's contract.

The Bogard contract, among other things, pays him $57,000 a year. It gives him a paid membership in a private club of his own choosing. And it guarantees him severance pay for a full year if he is fired; six months of severance pay if he should resign. Says Whittingham at a public hearing of the Legal Services Board of Directors regarding this contract:

"(It is) a contemptuous act. It would spit in the face of our clients. Aren't you embarrassed with this contract? My boss would fire me if I negotiated this contract."

Now, this is tough talk anyway you look at it. But, is Whittingham's diatribe an intellectually honest outburst motivated by a genuine outrage against a truly unjust contractual arrangement? Or is Whittingham just taking a cheap shot at Bogard because he is an appointee of Ronald Reagan, who is trying to reduce the funding for and depoliticize the Legal Services Corporation? Alas, I fear the latter is closest to the truth.

I hasten to explain that I raise these questions because it just so happens that the LSC president prior of Bogard — Dan Bradley, the self-identified homosexual who since his "coming out" has traveled the country on "a tour of celebration," as Harper's magazine describes it — has an employment contract almost identical to Bogard's. Here's the way it went when I attempted to learn if Whittingham also considers Bradley's contract to have been "a disgrace":

Me: Are you aware that Bradley had a contract very similar to Bogard's?

Whittingham: No answer. Silence.

Me: Hello? Are you there?

Whittingham: "I'm here."

Me: Well, did you know this?

Whittingham: He reiterates the disgracefulness of Bogard's contract.

Me: Fine, but what about Bradley?

Whittingham: "I am not aware of Bradley's contract."

Me: But, you don't seem very interested in Bradley's contract.

Whittingham: "I'm interested in Mr. Bogard's contract."

Me: Why just Mr. Bogard's contract?

Whittingham: "I think it's a disgrace and you can quote me. He's a poor choice for the president of legal services."

Me: But, your outrage seems very selective. Why no interest in Bradley's contract?

Whittingham: "Mr. Bogard's contract is a disgrace."

Me: But what about Bradley?

Whittingham: "I'm not familiar with his contract."

Me: But, I've already described its provisions to you. Suppose I bring you a copy so you can see it?

Whittingham: Silence. No answer.

Me: Hello?

Whittingham: "I think Bogard is a poor choice —"

Me: I understand. Why do you sound like a tape-recording?

Whittingham: "...and it's an abomination and every right-thinking person should feel the same way."

Me: You are really going to look stupid in my column on Monday. Whittingham: "Kiss my...!" He slams down the phone.

Well, Christopher Whittingham can't say I didn't warn him. No more questions, your honor. The prosecution rests — but not very comfortably knowing that your poor are further impoverished by legal counsel so utterly lacking in judicial temperament.

ATTACKS AGAINST MEMBERS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

● Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, I have been perplexed to read the recent attacks against members of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for their acceptance of compensation for their time spent on Corporation business. I have looked into this matter and have learned this is not a new practice. Members of the Board have been paid a daily consultant fee since 1975.

What is new apparently, is that this Board is taking seriously its statutory responsibility to insure that the Legal Services Act is complied with by those who received over $225 million in grants and contacts from the Corporation this year. In vigorously enforcing the act and instituting reforms this Board stepped on the toes of those who profited from the status quo, and I cannot help wondering if this attack on the Board members, over the consulting fee issue, retaliation for the reforms this Board has instituted such as the prohibition on the practice of laundering Legal Services Corporation funds through its local programs to fund other organizations; prohibition of lobbying with taxpayer funds which strictly enforces the terms of the last continuing resolution; and the action taken by this Board to force local programs to either or properly expend over $41 million in unspent fund balances which this Board discovered had been improperly banked by local programs.

It appears to me the $150,000 paid in fees to 11 Reagan appointed Directors has not been wasted, it may even be the best spent money in the Legal Services budget. It was spent to insure that the $241 million given by the Congress to this program was lawfully used. To insure this, the Reagan Board had to work harder, spend more time, and therefore spend more money to change the status quo than the prior Boards which maintained the same status quo which Congress found totally unacceptable.

For example, one Board member, William J. Olson, was compensated $19,000 for over 650 hours devoted to Corporation business. He attended 21 of 28 of the Board's Committee and Board hearings and meetings in 1982—only 9 meetings of any kind were held in 1981—he served as Chairman of the Board from January through March, coauthored regulations with complicated procedures on denial of refunding for recipients and limitations of class actions, participated in the review of over 350 applicants for the position of President of the Corporation, worked with the Justice Department to defend successfully the Reagan Board against five separate judicial attacks by former Board members, participated in protracted confirmation hearings before the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, and worked on all aspects of Corporation business, almost always at total odds with the holdover staff at the Corporation.

Rather than profiting on this work, he lost substantial income in the process. The $29 per hour paid to Board members was of course well below his hourly billing rates as a private attorney, but it was also below the cost of his office overhead expenses. Therefore, for every hour he worked for the Corporation in 1982 he had to subsidize the costs of maintaining his law office from other legal work.

Mr. Olson has devoted to Legal Services almost one-half of this year's billable time at these same rates, while spending substantial sums to hire other lawyers at much higher billing rates to do work for his other clients.

When we ask an individual to serve on the Board of a quasi-governmental corporation such as Legal Services, or the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, or the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, or the Board of Governors of the Postal Service, we ask them to devote the time necessary to perform their statutory responsibilities. During the Senate confirmation hearings these Board members were asked to commit the time necessary to do the job. This Board did what we expected, and performed better than any prior Board of the Corporation.

It may be easy to demagogue about the money paid to Directors to govern a quasi-public Corporation but it is not fair. But with the flagrant violations of the law by this Corporation that have been addressed by this body on many occasions, to not have spent substantial time to bring the program into line with the law would have been unforgivable.

Those who oppose reform at the Legal Services Corporation can be ex-

pected to attack the reformers. But I urge those who support reform at the Corporation to look twice before they criticize those who have fought daily for 1 year to successfully achieve those reforms which the Congress had been unable to otherwise obtain for a decade.

Those who have given of their time and talent at substantial personal financial loss, such as Mr. Olson, deserve our appreciation. They have mine.●

Legal Services

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release January 21, 1983

The President has recess appointed the following individuals to be Members of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation:

MILTON M. MASSON is currently Executive Vice President and Treasurer of Sullivan and Masson, Inc, consulting engineers, architects and construction managers based in Arizona. He is also a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Synthetic Fuels Corporation. He led the development of Sun Eagle Development Company in Colorado and serves as a Board Member and Vice President. He graduated from Christian Brothers College (B.S., 1964). He is married, has two children and resides in Scottsdale, Arizona. He was born July 27, 1941. He would succeed Harold R. DeMoss, Jr.

ROBERT E. McCARTHY has been Senior Partner in the firm of Bohnert, McCarthy, Flowers, Roberts & Damir, in San Francisco, California, since 1955. He served as a consultant to the Office of Policy Development, The White House, in 1981-1982. He graduated from the University of California at Berkeley (B.A., 1941) and the University of California, Boalt Hall School of Law (J.D., 1949). He is married, has five children and resides in San Francisco, California. He was born February 16, 1920. He would succeed Clarence V. McKee.

DONALD EUGENE SANTARELLI is an attorney with the firm Santarelli & Gimer in Washington, D.C. He is currently serving as a member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. He served as a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and was Chairman of its Program Advisory Committee. He graduated from the University of Virginia Law School (LL.B., 1962) and the University of Virginia Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (M.A., 1964). He is married, has two children and resides in Alexandria, Virginia. He was born July 22, 1937. He would succeed Annie Laurie Slaughter.

E. DONALD SHAPIRO has been serving as Dean and Professor of Law at New York Law School since 1973. He was a Partner in the law firm of Andersen & Company in 1971-1973. He served as Director of the Practicing Law Institute in 1968-1971. He graduated from Dickinson College (A.B., 1953) and Harvard Law School (J.D., 1956). He is married, has four children and resides in Short Hills, New Jersey. He was born November 1, 1931. He would succeed Howard Dana.

###

Legal Services Corp

RUSH!

The Heritage Foundation

Executive Memorandum

513 C Street N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-4400

9/28/82 Number 6

DEADLINE NEARS FOR LEGAL SERVICES CORP.

Congressional failure to schedule before adjournment a confirmation vote for all nine of Ronald Reagan's nominees to the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation will mean "business as usual" at Legal Services, the government-funded public corporation that administers civil legal aid for the poor.

Eight of the existing Board members are presidential recess appointments made in December 1981. The Constitution requires that recess appointments (appointments made when Congress is not in session) expire at the end of the congressional session, unless they are approved by the Senate. If the Senate fails to act on these appointments, the Corporation will be left with only one functioning Board member--Mrs. Josephine Worthy, a Carter holdover.

Senate Democrats, however, have declined to enter into a time agreement for consideration of the nominations by the entire Senate, thus perverting the traditional "advice and consent" function of the Senate regarding presidential nominations. When the Senate adjourns <u>sine die</u> these appointments will expire.

The nine presidential nominees awaiting a confirmation vote are William Harvey, William Olson, Robert Stubbs, Annie Slaughter, Harold de Mosse, Clarence McKee, Howard Dana, George Paras and William Earle. Eight of these nominees were voted favorably out of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee on July 15. A Committee vote on the recess appointment of George Paras was deferred at the White House's request.

Failure to schedule a confirmation vote will preclude Board nominees from taking effective control of the Corporation and its grantmaking activities. Intense congressional concern over the operations of the Legal Services Corporation is illustrated by the rider to appropriations bill H.R. 6957, restricting lobbying and other activities by Legal Services lawyers. Should the Corporation have to function with a one-member Board of Directors, serious oversight of the local programs and staff will be extremely difficult.

Sensing the possibility that a confirmation vote will not take place, Corporation staff have seized the opportunity to protect their pet local programs by speeding up the grant allocation process. On September 15, Acting President Gerald Caplan announced his resignation, effective September 27. Furthermore, he proposed to delegate all of his presidential authority to Clint Lyons, former Director of the Office of Field Services. This transfer would include the power to make grants and enter into contracts for local programs. This would permit Lyons, an old legal services hand, to commit 1983 funds to programs immediately after passage of H.R. 6957, or the Continuing Resolution now before Congress. The resolution calls for an appropriation in fiscal 1983 of $241 million to the Legal Services Corporation. A number of Board members, including Chairman William Harvey, view Caplan's purported delegation as remarkably inappropriate, if not unauthorized under the Corporation's by-laws. The ultimate resolution of these maneuvers remains in doubt. Nonetheless, once the Corporation formally enters into these grants, control of local program activities probably will be lost for yet another year.

The confirmation crisis is aggravated by laggard White House action in filling the outstanding vacancy on the Board--a position previously held by Marc Sandstrom, a recess appointee who withdrew in May. Administration and Senate inaction is also responsible for the presence of the remaining Carter holdover, Josephine Worthy. Her term expired almost two years ago but she will continue to serve until replaced by a Reagan nominee.

A speedy vote on confirmation is needed to ensure that a full Board is in place to govern the Corporation before the 1983 funds are committed. The appointment of the new Board members will also strengthen the hand of concerned citizens trying to prevent "business as usual" within the Legal Services Corporation. Time is of the essence.

Stuart Butler
Director of Domestic
Policy Studies

For further reading:

1 Samuel J. Brakel, "Legal Services for the Poor in the Reagan Years," American Bar Association Journal, vol. 68, July 1982, pp. 820-822.

2 Marshall Breger, "Legal Aid for the Poor: A Conceptual Analysis," North Carolina Law Review, vol. 60, January 1982, pp. 282-363.

3 Jerry Flint, "Friends in Court," Forbes, December 21, 1981, p. 34.

4 Neal R. Peirce and Carol Steinbach, "Some Friends in High Places May Save Legal Aid for Poor from Extinction," National Journal, June 6, 1981, p. 25.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

MEMORANDUM August 2, 1982

To: Ed Harper
Joe Wright
Ken Cribb

From: Mike Horowitz MH

I am attaching a marvelously useful letter received today from Marshall Breger (incidentally, my candidate for President of the Legal Services Corporation). (The attachments referred to by Breger will be sent along on request.)

Breger is a first-rate law professor whose suggested initiative is politically exciting as well as absolutely correct.

The issue — revision of child poronography laws — is one which the Administration should jump on as quickly as possible — it is also a real winner we could give to someone up for reelection like Hatch. As Breger points out, last month's Supreme Court decision allows us to considerably tighten the federal law on the subject.

cc: Mort Blackwell

State University of New York at Buffalo

FACULTY OF LAW AND JURISPRUDENCE

July 27, 1982

Michael Horowitz, Esq.
Office of Management and
Budget
Executive Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20013

Dear Mike:

The recent Supreme Court decision in People v. Ferber, 50 U.S.L.W. 5077 (July 2, 1982) affords the Administration an opportunity to make a major political bow to the Christian right and the Catholic community at no or little political cost.

As you know, the Supreme Court in Ferber upheld a New York child pornography statute which proscribed the distribution of materials depicting children engaging in explicit sexual acts without any requirement that the material be found obscene. In contrast, The Protection of Children Against Sexual Exploitation Act of 1977, 18 USC 88 2251-2253 (Supp. III 1979) only prohibits the distribution of child pornography if it meets a legally "obscene" standard. Put simply, the Supreme Court has found a "stricter" anti-child pornography standard than that presently enshrined in federal law to be constitutional.

I propose that you consider urging the Administration to rewrite the federal law so as to track the stricter New York State standard.

As you will readily see, for the Administration to author such legislation would have a variety of political benefits. As the Supreme Court has already found an obscenity standard unnecessary in the child pornography context and we are dealing with the use of children in explicit sexual exploitation the downside risk from civil libertarian criticism is nil. Announcement of this legislation can provide the opportunity for a media event and a pro-family anti-pornography statement or speech. All this you understand far better than I.

I enclose a copy of the New York State law, the present federal law and a list of existing legislation in various jurisdictions taken from one of the Ferber briefs.

If I can be of any help in this matter feel free to call on me.

Very truly yours,

M.

Marshall J. Breger
Associate Professor of Law

MJB/aa

Legal Services Corp.

Legal Panel's New Year's Resolution

By STUART TAYLOR Jr.

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Jan. 8 — Of all the Reagan Administration's efforts to bring to heel Federal agencies born in more liberal times, few have generated more confusion and conflict here than the lightning move on New Year's Eve to take control of the board of the Legal Services Corporation.

The corporation, which finances legal services for poor people, is perhaps the Federal agency most maligned and disliked by leading conservatives and top officials of the Administration. But it is a favorite of many liberals, and they are determined to save it, either through Congressional action or, possibly, a lawsuit or two.

The latest struggle over the corporation's future has the makings of a classic Washington dust-up. It began Dec. 31 when, with Congress in recess, President Reagan, from his holiday base in Palm Springs, Calif., suddenly replaced seven appointees of the Carter Administration on the 11-member corporation board. The Administration thereby effectively gained control of an organization that it considers to be the root cause of many troublesome and frivolous lawsuits against government and big business.

One of the new appointees, William J. Olson, a 32-year-old Washington lawyer and conservative Republican, was designated acting chairman, pending replacement of the four remaining Carter appointees. While New Year's Eve champagne corks were popping in the imaginations of many corporation employees, Mr. Olson convened a late afternoon board meeting. Things happened so fast, in fact, that six board members were forced to participate by telephone.

The New York Times/Teresa Zabala

William J. Olson, the acting director of the Legal Services Corporation.

A 'Review of Criteria'

The apparent purpose of all this haste was to adopt a resolution before the end of the year that would bar Dan J. Bradley, the corporation's president, from awarding any legal aid grants in the new year until a "review of the criteria" had been conducted by the board's new majority. The resolution carried easily.

In Mr. Bradley's view, however, its passage came "several weeks too late" to accomplish its objective. He said that many grants for 1982 had already been made and that the Reagan Administration was legally bound to honor them.

And one of the remaining Carter appointees, Steven L. Engleberg, contended that the new Reagan majority had violated the letter and spirit of the law that established the legal aid corporation. He called the action "unbusinesslike" and "shocking."

Mr. Engleberg has an ally in a group called the Coalition for Legal Services, which sent a letter to Mr. Olson this

'We will carry out the letter and the spirit of the law.'

week, asserting that the Reagan appointments were "not legally authorized" and that "any action taken pursuant to those appointments would be a legal nullity."

Confirmation Question

The letter also says that the 1974 law that put the legal services program into the hands of an independent corporation requires Senate confirmation of any new board members. And, the letter adds, the corporation was meant to be free of political meddling.

Mr. Olson said that he respected the letter and spirit of the 1974 law and that he had not violated it. He is fully backed by the White House, which argues that the President has the power, under the Constitution, to make "recess appointments" whenever Congress is not in session. The White House also argues that new appointees may take office immediately and serve through the end of the following Congressional session without being confirmed.

As for the new board's hope of heading off any new legal aid grants until it can review them, Mr. Bradley said that grants totaling almost $230 million were approved by the old board in early December. About 350 local and state legal aid groups, which are responsible for distributing the funds, are involved, he added, and contracts already have been mailed to many.

The recipients include California Rural Legal Assistance, an antagonist of Mr. Reagan's since his days as Governor of California, which received a pledge of $3.3 million, and Community Action for Legal Services, a New York City group, which was pledged $7.5 million.

Abolition Move Failed

Those contracts represent a 25 percent cut in funding from awards for 1981, the result of a bitter Congressional fight in which the Reagan Administration sought to abolish the corporation. That move failed, but the White House did win a reduction in annual appropriations, from $321 million for 1981 to $241 million for 1982.

Mr. Bradley, who was in Florida on New Year's Eve and learned of the unscheduled board meeting after it was over, said he subsequently told Mr. Olson at a "very cordial" three-hour meeting that he had made "legally binding obligations" and that the corporation was "legally bound to meet them."

Mr. Olson does not agree, asserting instead that the commitment letters issued by Mr. Bradley were effective Jan. 1, the day after the new board's resolution was passed.

Otherwise, Mr. Olsen will say very little about what the new board has in mind. He refused to discuss whether it might rescind any of the Bradley grants, and he would not discuss reports that, as chairman of the Administration's transition team for legal services, he advocated abolition of the corporation he now heads.

"We've got to have a certain amount of time to get our feet wet before we begin to make our own personal pronouncements of policy," he said. "Inevitably there will be changes, but we will carry out the letter and the spirit of the law."

crimination in Federally assisted housing with "the stroke of a pen." It took 21 months for President Kennedy to make good. Candidate Jimmy Carter resisted decontrol of oil and gas prices. President Carter, to his great credit, led the long and fierce battle to decontrol both.

Now, everyone is having fun introducing Candidate Ronald Reagan to President Reagan on the subject of draft registration. The emphasis on contradiction is probably inevitable, but it distracts from an important question: does the United States need draft registration?

•

Mr. Reagan could not have reversed himself more plainly. President Carter revived draft registration after the Russians plunged into Afghanistan. A meaningless gesture, Mr. Reagan said then: "Perhaps the most fundamental objection to draft registration is moral." Now, he finds a fundamental argument *for* draft registration and it is practical: "It could save the United States as much as six weeks in mobilizing emergency manpower."

Regardless of which side of the argument one prefers, there's something appealing about Mr. Reagan's ability to swallow pride for practicality. Would that he behave as flexibly when it comes to the need for new taxes.

Why did he feel compelled to change his mind now? No meter is ticking, no law or order is expiring. Was it the decline in registration, from 90-plus per- Afghanistan, a diplomatic card to play, this time concerning Poland?

•

The Administration insists that Poland had nothing to do with it; while the registration decision may have symbolic overtones, the motive was practical. If registration would in fact save six weeks in an emergency, it would be very hard to argue with. But the argument would be much more persuasive if the Administration had documented that case. It would be more effective still if presented in a larger context of what to do in an emergency. The nation's second line of defense in an emergency does not consist of raw recruits but reservists, and their depleted ranks are not mentioned.

The registration announcement also skirts what may be the hardest draft question: equity. The military services could not absorb more than a fraction of the four million young people who now turn 18 each year. Which of them should serve? There may be no fair way to draft for the military; even lotteries have loopholes. But there is a fair, larger solution — require all young people to serve in the military or in a national service corps.

Finally, though Mr. Reagan insists that registration "does not foreshadow a return to the draft," he provides no definition of the kind of emergency that would justify a draft. Without one, the most important question of all remains. It is not whether Mr. Reagan has switched to support draft registration but whether he has switched to support the draft.

Topics

Matters of Law

Stacked Deck

Stymied in its effort to eliminate the Legal Services Corporation, the White House has stacked the organization's 11-member board with seven recess appointees. The action seems innocent on its face; recess appointments are intended to insure continuity until the Senate can confirm permanent appointments. There's a risk, though, that in the meantime, hostile interim directors will eviscerate this invaluable program.

It is no secret that the Reagan Administration dislikes Legal Services. It didn't bother to replace 11 directors of the program when their terms expired last year. Instead, it proposed dissolving it altogether. Legal Services survived in Congress, but with its budget cut by a quarter, to $241 million. Only then did the Administration start naming directors. With the Senate away for the holidays, these were made as recess appointments. Then, at a hastily convened meeting on New Year's Eve, seven new directors ominously elected William Olson chairman. Mr. Olson headed the Reagan transition team that was openly hostile to the program.

The haste leads Legal Service supporters to fear that the President means to give the recess appointees freedom to control grants and recipients without first establishing, through confirmation hearings, that they have the best interests of the program and its clients at heart.

There is a ready answer to such fears: for the President promptly to nominate permanent directors. Mr. Reagan won the election; he has the right to nominate people of his philosophy — but not to thwart the Senate's duty to advise and consent.

■

Buyer's Market?

If you believe the anguished cries of Marvin Miller, the executive director of the Major League Baseball Players Association, baseball stars who have declared themselves free bargaining agents will soon be standing in line for unemployment checks.

Though baseball salaries soared in recent years, this year's free-agent market has followed Wall Street into the doldrums. Even the celebrated Reggie Jackson remains without a serious suitor. And the suspicious Mr. Miller threatens to sue the teams for colluding to keep their wages down.

We do not dare enter that legal thicket. But we must confess gratitude for whatever restraint allowed the Yankees to retain pitcher Ron Guidry and still hope slugger Reggie also remains in New York. We needed to collude with no one to conclude that the salaries routinely demanded and commanded by some players had become absurd.

■

Court Relief

A dispute resolution center is a place where trained mediators ventilate grievances between warring neighbors or a shopkeeper and his customers before the conflicts erupt into civil suits or even violence. Reformers have long believed that the centers ease the load on overworked courts.

So it is good to learn that the first 17 grants to support and expand such centers have now been made under a new New York law. The recipients in New York City include the Young People's Information Service of Staten Island and the Institute for Mediation and Conflict Resolution of Manhattan and the Bronx.

When inconsequential cases clog city courts, they squander scarce judicial resources and rob litigants and witnesses of time and income. This kind of relief was long overdue.

stroke of a pen." It took 21 months for President Kennedy to make good. Candidate Jimmy Carter resisted decontrol of oil and gas prices. President Carter, to his great credit, led the long and fierce battle to decontrol both.

Now, everyone is having fun introducing Candidate Ronald Reagan to President Reagan on the subject of draft registration. The emphasis on contradiction is probably inevitable, but it distracts from an important question: does the United States need draft registration?

•

Mr. Reagan could not have reversed himself more plainly. President Carter revived draft registration after the Russians plunged into Afghanistan. A meaningless gesture, Mr. Reagan said then: "Perhaps the most fundamental objection to draft registration is moral." Now, he finds a fundamental argument *for* draft registration and it is practical: "It could save the United States as much as six weeks in mobilizing emergency manpower."

Regardless of which side of the argument one prefers, there's something appealing about Mr. Reagan's ability to swallow pride for practicality. Would that he behave as flexibly when it comes to the need for new taxes.

Why did he feel compelled to change his mind now? No meter is ticking, no law or order is expiring. Was it the decline in registration, from 90-plus per- ... concerning Poland?

•

The Administration insists that Poland had nothing to do with it; while the registration decision may have symbolic overtones, the motive was practical. If registration would in fact save six weeks in an emergency, it would be very hard to argue with. But the argument would be much more persuasive if the Administration had documented that case. It would be more effective still if presented in a larger context of what to do in an emergency. The nation's second line of defense in an emergency does not consist of raw recruits but reservists, and their depleted ranks are not mentioned.

The registration announcement also skirts what may be the hardest draft question: equity. The military services could not absorb more than a fraction of the four million young people who now turn 18 each year. Which of them should serve? There may be no fair way to draft for the military; even lotteries have loopholes. But there is a fair, larger solution — require all young people to serve in the military or in a national service corps.

Finally, though Mr. Reagan insists that registration "does not foreshadow a return to the draft," he provides no definition of the kind of emergency that would justify a draft. Without one, the most important question of all remains. It is not whether Mr. Reagan has switched to support draft registration but whether he has switched to support the draft.

Topics

Matters of Law

Stacked Deck

Stymied in its effort to eliminate the Legal Services Corporation, the White House has stacked the organization's 11-member board with seven recess appointees. The action seems innocent on its face; recess appointments are intended to insure continuity until the Senate can confirm permanent appointments. There's a risk, though, that in the meantime, hostile interim directors will eviscerate this invaluable program.

It is no secret that the Reagan Administration dislikes Legal Services. It didn't bother to replace 11 directors of the program when their terms expired last year. Instead, it proposed dissolving it altogether. Legal Services survived in Congress, but with its budget cut by a quarter, to $241 million. Only then did the Administration start naming directors. With the Senate away for the holidays, these were made as recess appointments. Then, at a hastily convened meeting on New Year's Eve, seven new directors ominously elected William Olson chairman. Mr. Olson headed the Reagan transition team that was openly hostile to the program.

The haste leads Legal Service supporters to fear that the President means to give the recess appointees freedom to control grants and recipients without first establishing, through confirmation hearings, that they have the best interests of the program and its clients at heart.

There is a ready answer to such fears: for the President promptly to nominate permanent directors. Mr. Reagan won the election; he has the right to nominate people of his philosophy — but not to thwart the Senate's duty to advise and consent.

■

Buyer's Market?

If you believe the anguished cries of Marvin Miller, the executive director of the Major League Baseball Players Association, baseball stars who have declared themselves free bargaining agents will soon be standing in line for unemployment checks.

Though baseball salaries soared in recent years, this year's free-agent market has followed Wall Street into the doldrums. Even the celebrated Reggie Jackson remains without a serious suitor. And the suspicious Mr. Miller threatens to sue the teams for colluding to keep their wages down.

We do not dare enter that legal thicket. But we must confess gratitude for whatever restraint allowed the Yankees to retain pitcher Ron Guidry and still hope slugger Reggie also remains in New York. We needed to collude with no one to conclude that the salaries routinely demanded and commanded by some players had become absurd.

■

Court Relief

A dispute resolution center is a place where trained mediators ventilate grievances between warring neighbors or a shopkeeper and his customers before the conflicts erupt into civil suits or even violence. Reformers have long believed that the centers ease the load on overworked courts.

So it is good to learn that the first 17 grants to support and expand such centers have now been made under a new New York law. The recipients in New York City include the Young People's Information Service of Staten Island and the Institute for Mediation and Conflict Resolution of Manhattan and the Bronx.

When inconsequential cases clog city courts, they squander scarce judicial resources and rob litigants and witnesses of time and income. This kind of relief was long overdue.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 30, 1983

MEMORANDUM TO: DENNIS R. PATRICK

FROM: Morton C. Blackwell MB

SUBJECT: Claire Lizana

I have checked out Mrs. Lizana. It happens that I am well acquainted with L.S.U. Law Professor, John Baker, who recommended her. We discussed her at some length; I am quite satisfied that she is a solid supporter of the President's political philosophy and would be an excellent choice for appointment. Her resume makes her hard for the liberals to attack, but I do not think we would have anything to worry about in her performance on the Legal Services Corporation Board.

MCB:jet

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

DATE: June 24, 1983

TO: Morton Blackwell

FROM: DENNIS R. PATRICK
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF PRESIDENTIAL PERSONNEL
ROOM 153 EXT. 7146

SUBJECT: Claire Lizana

COMMENTS: Another candidate for Legal Services Corporation from Louisiana. She had all the right answers in our interview. We'd appreciate any help you could provide in "referencing" her in Louisiana.

MAY 31 1983

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

PAUL M. HEBERT LAW CENTER
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70803

Law Faculty

(504) 388-8701
(504) 388-8846

766-4322

May 26, 1983

Mr. Dennis Daugherty
Vice President
Legal Services Corporation
733--15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Dear Dennis:

Enclosed is the resume of Ms. Clarine Lizana, about whom we spoke, as well as my expanded background statement.

Sincerely,

John S. Baker Jr.

John S. Baker, Jr.

kb

Enclosures

Clarine L. Lizana

PERSONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

September, 1977 First female apprentice member of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in Mississippi.

September, 1979 Volunteer leader of Red Cross Shelter at West Elementary in Gulfport, Mississippi during Hurricane Frederick. Oversaw efforts to secure and control over 250 men, women and children from surrounding area, including 8 pregnant women, 7 paraplegics and 4 heart patients.

May, 1980 Appointed Press Secretary for Local 903 in Gulfport, Mississippi.

August, 1980 One of several guest speakers at 5th District Regional meeting of Labor Department Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. Asked to address specific problems and successes of women in trades.

May, 1981 First female Journeyman Wireman member of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in the state of Mississippi.

August, 1982 Assissted in the co-ordination and staff and equipment for Problem Pregnancy Center in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

September, 1982 Formed boys under eight soccer team, the Flames. Coached them to the State Tournament in May, 1983.

RESUME

Clarine L. Lizana
600 E. Roosevelt #351
Baton Rouge, LA. 70802
(504) 344-3322

Born: June 22, 1952
Height: 5'8"
Weight: 135
Hair & Eyes: Brown

Married
Robert V. Lizana

1 child
Damien Lizana
Feb. 17, 1975

EDUCATION:

September 1958 - June 1966 Holy Rosary Elementary, Republic, PA.

September 1966 - June 1970 Father Kolb Memorial High School, Masontown, PA.

September 1970 - June 1974 Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL. B.A. Sociology. Major course work in Political Sociology.

June 1974 - August 1974 Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. Summer course work in French.

September 1974 - June 1975 University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH. Part-time coursework in Economics and Advanced French.

June 1975 - August 1975 Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies, Monterey, CA. Summer course work in Advanced Russian.

September 1977 - May 1981 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Apprenticeship Shcool. Weekly classes in electrical theory and application at Local Union 903 in Gulfport, MS.

HOBBIES:

Designing and sewing clothes. Culinary arts. Coaching boys under eight soccer team. Volunteer work at local church and Pregnancy Problem Center.

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY:

September 1970 - June 1972 STUDENT SUPERVISOR in Business Office of Daily Egyptian. Responsible for accounts reveivable, classified section and personnel in office. Also responsible for training new personnel and compiling a job description and function book.

September 1972 - June 1974 DIRECTOR'S AIDE in Financial Aid Office at S.I.U.. Responsible for applications and correspondence concerning financial aid programs. Gerry White, supervisor.

REFERENCES ON REQUESTS

September 1974 - February 1975 CO-ORDINATOR of Women's Studies Center at University of Cincinnati. Job entailed accumulation and filing of information pertinent to women's studies, also involved co-ordinating efforts between various offices of university toward a similar goal.

September 1977 - March 1981 APPRENTICE JOURNEYMAN WIREMAN. Entered International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers apprenticeship program at Local 903 in Gulfport, MS.

September 1977 - August 1978
Kennedy Electric of Pascagoula, MS. Three months at NATCO and PACECO jobsites in Gulfport. Nine months at Dupont Plant in Delisle,MS. Jobs were both industrial in nature. Bill Hepler, superintendent.
August 1978 - December 1978
Sharp Electric, Gulfport, MS. Air conditioning of public schools, commercial work. Troy Herring, superintendent; Tom Morgan, owner.
April 1979
Gulf Electric, Biloxi, MS. Wiring of water pump tower and concret mixing machinery. Billy Jordan, superintendent.
May 1979 - November 1980
Kennedy Electric, Pascagoula, MS. Keesler Air Force Base Hospital in Biloxi, MS. Ray Kennedy, superintendent.
January 1981 - March 1981
SEPCO, Pascagoula, MS. Shutdown of Moss Point Paper Mill. Leo Foster, General Foreman.

March 1981 - August 1981 JOURNEYMAN WIREMAN. Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant, Port Gibson, MS. Start up for Bechtel Corporation. Jim Lewis, General Foreman.

September 1981 - May 1982 JOURNEYMAN WIREMAN. Newtron, Inc., Baton Rouge, LA. Installation, maintenance and repair contract at Kaiser Aluminium Plant. Dan Stewart, General Foreman.

July 1982 - October 1982 JOURNEYMAN WIREMAN. Commonwealth Electric of Lincoln, NB. Strategic Oil Preserve at Bayou Choctaw in Louisiana. Robert Sterling, superintendent.

November 1982 - December 1982 JOURNEYMAN WIREMAN. Saia Electric, Baton Rouge,LA. Installation,maintenance and repair contract at Exxon Corporation in Baton Rouge, LA. Glenn Redd, superintendent.

January 1983 - April 1983 JOURNEYMAN WIREMAN. Fountain Electric of Jackson, MS. Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant at NASA Test facilities. Randy Brown, General Foreman.

Reasons for leaving all but one of these jobs was a reduction in force. I have never been fired from any job.

JOB PROSPECTUS:

I am seeking a position which will employ both my mental and mechanical skills. I am a very responsible person and function well under stress. I am very capable in communicating both orally and on paper. I am also good with figures and drawings.