

persons to serve as observers on behalf of the McBride slate. Indeed, defendant AUD refused, when requested, to provide like services to the McBride slate or to representatives chosen by it. The cost of recruiting and training of observers is a routine campaign expense incurred by all candidates for union office; in this instance, however, the Sadlowski slate obtained an unlawful advantage by reason of defendants' illegal expenditures...

(b) Defendant AUD prepared and printed tens of thousands of copies of an election manual instructing observers and other union members about their election rights. That manual was distributed exclusively to Sadlowski slate supporters. McBride slate supporters were refused copies of the manual when they requested them....

(c) Several lawsuits were filed during the course of the 1977 election campaign. At the request of the Sadlowski slate, defendant AUD assigned its legal director, Judith Schneider, and other AUD lawyers, to work as the Sadlowski slate's representatives. Through Schneider and its other lawyers, defendant AUD provided free legal assistance to the Sadlowski slate...

(d) Located in an office adjacent to Sadlowski slate headquarters, defendant AUD, acting through its legal director, Judith Schneider, and other employees, provided, without cost to the Sadlowski

slate, campaign services for the slate....held press conferences, monitored rival press conferences, represented the Sadlowski slate at meetings of the candidates, drafted campaign literature, provided day-to-day administrative assistance and support to the Sadlowski slate campaign, and otherwise participated in the development and implementation of the Sadlowski slate's campaign strategy. Defendant AUD's legal director was so closely associated with the Sadlowski slate campaign that she was variously described in the press as a "part of the informal Sadlowski entourage" and as a campaign "spokesman," and she was reported in the press as referring to Sadlowski as "her man."...

29. Defendants have pursued and are continuing to pursue a policy of unlawfully spending vast sums of money and other assets to influence the outcome of union elections. The expenditures in the 1977 USWA elections were just one of a number of instances in which illegal expenditures have been made by defendants on behalf of candidates for union offices. Defendants are committed to a general policy of spending employer monies to elect union officers sympathetic to the defendants-employers' views. AUD has continued to spend its own monies, and monies conduited to it by the other defendants, even after the conclusion of the 1977 election, in order to maintain the viability of its candidates for future USWA elections.

## Strauss To 'Anti-Inflate' Environmental Agency

At a closed-door White House meeting with chief executives of leading U.S. corporations on April 20, President Carter promised that he "would set up a mechanism within the White House to ease their federal regulatory problems as a trade-off for price moderation."

Specifically, Carter meant that Robert Strauss, the President's recently appointed "anti-inflation counselor," had already been meeting with officials of the Environmental Protection Agency to discuss business complaints that their regulations have been adding "inflationary costs" to production. Strauss reportedly met directly with EPA's administrator, Douglas Costle, to seek ways to "cut costs and curb inflation." Immediately afterward, the executive director of the environmentalist Environmental Defense Fund, Arlie Schardt, accused Strauss of trying to make the EPA, which is a notorious haven for Naderites and antinuclear fanatics, a "scapegoat in the fight against inflation."

Business leaders attending the meeting were apparently more than satisfied with this attention to one of the real zero-growth causes of production cutbacks and, thus, inflation. Thomas A. Murphy, chairman of General

Motors, said he was gratified that the "problem of added costs resulting from federal regulatory requirements was discussed in such depth."

In a related Administration move, Attorney General Griffin Bell last week personally presented the government's case to the Supreme Court in opposition to the Endangered Species Act which has prevented the Tennessee Valley Authority from completing the Tellico Dam because of the "snail darter," an endangered species of perch. Last February, a United States Court of Appeals enjoined the TVA from further construction on the dam, which would add 200 billion kilowatt hours of electricity yearly to the overall U.S. energy supply and would vastly stimulate industrial development in the Mississippi Valley.

The day after Bell laid out the government's reasons why the Tellico Dam should be built, Secretary of the Interior Andrus issued several press releases opposing Bell's decision. But, as columnist Pat Buchanan commented regarding Bell's brief to the Supreme Court: "Carter, it seems, has decided that environmentalism is bad politics."