

LINDA GUSTITUS
Interview #1: Eye on Washington
September 24, 2012

KATE SCOTT: Welcome Linda. Thank you for joining us.

LINDA GUSTITUS: Happy to be here.

SCOTT: It is September 24 and this is our first interview. I thought we could start with some basic biographical information. Where did you grow up?

GUSTITUS: Okay. I grew up in Rockford, Illinois, which is a town of about 150,000 people, 90 miles north of Chicago. It was a tool and die manufacturing town. It was very conservative when I grew up there. I was the middle of three daughters of a couple where my father was an All-American football player. A big personality. He basically raised the three of us as boys.

SCOTT: Is that right? In what ways?

GUSTITUS: We fished, we put on the worms. We even dug for the worms in the yard at night. We played sports. We didn't play football, but we were expected to [play sports] and we wanted to. We were a very athletic, physical outdoor family. I think he never saw any limits to what we could do. We were always equals to him in a sense of where we could go, and he hoped that we went further than he went. He was a foreman in a factory. He also coached a semi-pro football team called the Rockford Golden Eagles. On the side he ran an equipment repair business for all the high school athletic equipment. I would help him repair football shoes and cleats and do all sorts of very oily, messy things, and all these big football players would come over to the house to pick up their shoes. I was raised in a very male-oriented family even though we were three girls, my mom and three girls. But my dad was, for me, the role model.

SCOTT: What did your mom do?

GUSTITUS: My mom was a homemaker, as most women were at that time, in the 1950s and 60s. She was smart and cared very much about grammar and writing, and English, good English. She played kind-of second fiddle to my dad but not in a demeaning way, more in a "oh, let him have the limelight, I enjoy it also" kind of way.

SCOTT: Did she attend college?

GUSTITUS: No, she didn't go to college. My dad did go to college. He graduated because he was an All-American football player. So he went on a scholarship, a football scholarship to St. Ambrose [University]. But his parents were so poor, he got a scholarship to Grinnell College but it would cost \$50 more, \$50 period, to go to Grinnell and my grandfather said, "You can't go there because that's too much." They were poor, really, really poor. They were the ones, my father always said, who got the Thanksgiving baskets from the church, you know, at Thanksgiving time.

SCOTT: Was church a part of your—

GUSTITUS: Church was a part of my upbringing, not because of my parents. My parents were not religious, at all. But they sent us to a little local Lutheran church for Sunday school just to get us started. Truly, they never went to church. But I loved church. I was a big church person all through my high school years. It was a big part of my life. I was a church leader. I gave sermons. But, I gave it up as soon as I went to my first year of college and took the first year of Western Philosophy. That changed my whole life.

SCOTT: Really? Interesting.

GUSTITUS: It did, very much. My Lutheran church was very strict about who Jesus was, that if you sin you go to hell and if you aren't baptized you go to hell. Once I got to college, that didn't really make sense to me. But now I'm a strong Unitarian Universalist, which is more of a humanist kind of religion.

SCOTT: That is interesting that you have come back around to it. You attended college in Ohio. What made you do that?

GUSTITUS: As I say, Rockford was really conservative. And I mean my government teacher was scolded for giving us *Time* magazine because it was so edgy, lefty. I think we had more cells of the John Birch Society than any other town. It was one of our things of renown—that we were that conservative. I had an older sister who was four years older than I am, although she is now deceased. For some reason, and nobody can quite figure it out, she ended up being an intellectual on her own. She just started to read and got into classical music and poetry and everything like that. She went to Cornell College in Mt. Vernon, Iowa, and because she was such a good academic, she was offered and took up the opportunity to go to the London School of Economics her junior year abroad. We had never heard of the London School of Economics. Seriously, this is so far afield from my family and our culture. But, she went to London for her year abroad. This was when you took the ship to London instead of [flying] and this is when we had one phone call with her an entire year because it was so expensive.

SCOTT: Of course she didn't come back for holidays.

GUSTITUS: She did not come back. Christmas was the phone call. Anyway, she got exposed to so much at the London School of Economics, including leaders from all around the world. I was a junior in high school when she went, and I was a senior when she came back. She told me there are two schools I should go to, either Reed College or Oberlin College. Those were her criteria. I adored her and followed everything she said so those are the two colleges I applied to, the only two schools I applied to. My parents knew nothing about college, they were completely uninvolved. Not in a mean way, they just thought it was all our responsibility. I applied. I never went to visit Oberlin. Nothing. Now, you know, everyone goes ga-ga over visiting schools. No, no, no. The first time I saw Oberlin was when my parents took me there. That's how I ended up at Oberlin.

One of the life changing events for me was when I was a senior in high school and I was the editorial editor of my school newspaper and I got a press pass to hear and see Lyndon Johnson's Air Force One fly into greater Rockford airport. It was 1964, and President Johnson was running for president after Kennedy's assassination. All the press people came off the plane. I was there as this little high school student—I was completely dazed by the whole thing. George Reedy, who was Lyndon Johnson's press secretary, saw me and just kind of took me under his wing for about whatever time it was, maybe 35-45 minutes that they were there. He introduced me to all the press guys—mostly guys—and they had little typewriters, portable typewriters, and they were doing their stories and everything. I got so affected at that point. My sister had always been talking politics and public policy and political philosophy. I just said, "I want to go to Washington, D.C. I want to work in Washington, D.C. I want to be part of this." That is when—it wasn't an epiphany exactly—but it was something that really excited me and I got a vision that it was so exciting, that that's where I would like to go.

SCOTT: What year was this, again?

GUSTITUS: Nineteen-sixty-four.

SCOTT: It was the [presidential] campaign.

GUSTITUS: That's why Johnson was in Rockford. He was campaigning.

That was high school. So then I ended up going to Oberlin. With my thought of Washington, D.C., in the background, in October of that year, my freshman year—I was a government major—they posted a little sign on the board that said two students are

eligible to go to Washington, D.C., for a weekend in October—I forget the dates—and go to Georgetown University to a big international conference on the Atlantic Alliance. I knew nothing about the Atlantic Alliance, and I thought if I wrote a paper on the Atlantic Alliance I could maybe get an all-paid trip to Washington, D.C. So I did, I wrote this paper on the Atlantic Alliance. This other guy and I were probably the only two people who wrote the paper and tried to go! It wasn't a big topic at the time. I submitted my paper and I got picked. As I say, it was probably by default, there weren't that many people. We got bus tickets and got to stay at the Key Bridge Marriot and went to this big conference at Georgetown. People were from all over Europe, since it was about the Atlantic Alliance.

SCOTT: They were primarily students?

GUSTITUS: No, they weren't actually. A lot of them were foreign affairs officers. They were serious people and they presented their papers. I remember that at some point I had to present my paper, which felt ridiculous and I just barely remember doing that. I was in Washington, D.C., and Georgetown and all those people who were dealing with these big issues of how Europe and the United States relate to each other. That was another reinforcing moment of how much I really liked government and Washington, D.C., and public policy.

SCOTT: This is probably 1965?

GUSTITUS: That was '65 because I graduated high school in '65.

SCOTT: This is an exciting time, too. The anti-war movement wasn't yet too hot in '65 and Washington was a pretty exciting place to be. Politics weren't quite yet divided on that issue.

GUSTITUS: Right. So then I heard from somebody else at school that you could be an intern in Congress. Congress was always where I wanted to be. I was most intrigued by Congress. My member at the time was John. B. Anderson. If you'll remember, he was one of the first independents who ran for president. Eventually, remember? He proposed the gas tax. That was way, way back when. So I applied to be an intern that summer with him and got accepted. So as soon as school was out, I came to Washington, D.C. Now again, unlike helicopter parents now and how much attention we pay to kids—if my kids were going to New York City I'd want to know where they are, what their apartment is, what's the neighborhood—my parents thought it was great I was going to go work for the congressman; they thought it was terrific. They didn't take me

here, they never visited me here, they never saw where I was, there was no e-mail, no pictures home, nothing.

SCOTT: How did you get here?

GUSTITUS: I guess I got here by the bus. That's what I'm thinking. Bus or train, maybe the train. I found an apartment, a furnished apartment on my own. Lived by myself. It was so loose. But I did it. I was here for two months, probably was the length of the internship, and worked in Congressman Anderson's office.

SCOTT: What did you work on?

GUSTITUS: Mostly I did secretarial or administrative type work. I was front desk, I answered some letters. He had an extremely conservative administrative assistant at the time, really conservative. He probably reflected the district at the time, but I was shocked at how conservative the administrative assistant was. I didn't think that John B. Anderson was that conservative. He was a decent man, and I liked him. But his administrative assistant was vehemently anti-U.N. At some point he said something about "U Thant should be assassinated." He said something horrible about that. I was just shocked. I was pretty—confident is not quite the word—maybe just naïve. I just said what I thought. I would take him on.

SCOTT: Really?

GUSTITUS: I just thought that's what you did, you engage in these things. That was a good summer. It was a good introduction to Congress. It reinforced my love for it. I can't really explain except that I really liked it.

SCOTT: Did your ideas about Washington live up to the reality of Washington?

GUSTITUS: I think so. I say that because it was exciting. People were going back and forth to vote. Going outside between the House and the Capitol and in the tunnels. I thought it did live up to my expectation. I was never, in that internship, really involved in anything super substantive or watched a bill progress or a piece of legislation that was meaningful succeed. That was a very short period of time anyway. But, I knew that this was where the action was, that this was where things were being decided and people's futures were being shaped. Yes, it did live up to that.

SCOTT: Did you have a good sense of your own personal politics at the time? Did you feel like you were decidedly a Democrat?

GUSTITUS: I always knew I was a Democrat.

SCOTT: Did that come from your family background? Were your parents Democrats?

GUSTITUS: My father ended up being a Republican, although he was a common sense, moderate, liberal Republican. My dad was basically somebody who just had a lot of common sense. What's going on now, he couldn't even begin to understand it, that you don't come to the table and talk and do what's best. That you don't ask what makes sense. That's where he came from.

The boss of the company that he worked for was a strong Republican. He adopted that. He ended up being an alderman in Rockford, Illinois, after he retired. They really wanted him to be mayor of Rockford but my mother didn't want him to run for mayor. At that late stage she didn't want him to do that. But, yes, he was a Republican.

My sister was almost socialist, not in an extreme way, but because she thought it made sense—to share wealth to help everybody. There was that drumbeat from her and then going to Oberlin, pretty liberal.

SCOTT: I wanted to ask you, what was it like going to Oberlin in the mid-'60s?

GUSTITUS: It was the four years of the most intense transformation in a college campus, I think, probably in the history of college campuses. That's my guess. We literally went from a very conservative social situation where you had girls' and boys' dorms, we had family style dinners, we had to dress for dinner. Girls had to wear skirts, boys had to wear jackets and ties.

SCOTT: Each night?

GUSTITUS: Every night. We had 10 to a table. It was very restrictive and from some people's perspective—to me it was orderly and I loved it, I just loved it—uncomfortable and unnecessary. I really see myself as a kind of social conservative but on budget and fiscal issues very, very liberal. I'm kind of an odd mix. I liked the sit-down dinner, the order and all of that. By the time I left we had co-ed dorms, no sit-down meals, no dress code whatsoever. In four years. We had cafeteria style. We started with students who had no role in the governance of the school and ended up with the school putting some students on, it was called a 4-4-2 committee that I was involved [with], to have some kind of involvement in policy for the school. That was a huge transformation

in the school itself. It was also the four years of, well, Kent State was later but this was where it all started with huge anti-war demonstrations. At Oberlin, which is a very small school, small community, the students surrounded a recruiter's car and almost turned it over. It was a big deal. The politics were intense.

There was also the introduction of drugs. Drugs just started to get into the campus. Everybody was doing marijuana. But also LSD was huge at that time. That was this very popular thing, at least for the government major types. Probably the science people were—we also had a big conservatory of music—they were more conservative. But for those of us who were in government and the social sciences, it was more edgy. And the pill for contraception was just coming into popularity. Contraception just hit. The pill was coming into vogue in a big way, more accessible. So there was a huge sexual revolution. There was an Ob-Gyn person in Cleveland whom everybody could go to and get a prescription for birth control. All of that really hit between '65 and '69.

SCOTT: That is a huge transformation.

GUSTITUS: It was a huge transformation.

SCOTT: I know that on other campuses, the transformation from *in loco parentis* to co-ed dorms and things like that came as a result of a lot of upheaval and demonstrations on campus. Was that the case at Oberlin as well?

GUSTITUS: Yes. We went after the president of the college, and I think he eventually resigned. He was an accursed person to the students who did not like him. There were a lot of us for whom the classroom wasn't what was happening. You didn't care so much about the classroom. It was really what was going on socially and politically, that was really the focus. Let's say this: we had to graduate so we had to do the work. But the real action was what was going on on campus, in general.

SCOTT: While you were getting your government degree, were you thinking ahead to getting that law degree? Did you already have a sense that you wanted to get a law degree so that you could come and work in Washington? Did you know what the next step was?

GUSTITUS: I think so. I was thinking a little bit about law, but it wasn't clear. I was mostly thinking about the Foreign Service. I wanted to go into the Foreign Service, which is counterintuitive if I was so interested in Congress. It was more that I wanted to travel. I wanted some opportunity to go abroad. I didn't go abroad while I was in college. Instead of going abroad, in my junior year I went back and worked for John Anderson

again, [during] the second semester of my junior year. I was pretty unhappy at Oberlin and I wanted to get out. A very easy option for me was to go to Washington again and work for John B. Anderson. I did that for a semester.

SCOTT: And that was 1968?

GUSTITUS: Yes.

SCOTT: A very tumultuous time in Washington.

GUSTITUS: Very tumultuous.

SCOTT: Were you here when [Dr. Martin Luther] King was assassinated?
[Senator Robert] Kennedy?

GUSTITUS: Yes.

SCOTT: What was that like, to be here at that time?

GUSTITUS: I don't think I was here when Bobby Kennedy was—that was in June, right?

SCOTT: Right, that might have been too late for you.

GUSTITUS: I think that was too late.

SCOTT: But you were here when King was assassinated?

GUSTITUS: I can't remember. We had this poverty town. Jesse Jackson had brought that—I forget what they called it—poor people were camping out. I can't remember if that coincided with the King assassination or not. I may not have been here when he was actually assassinated because it may have been when we were on break. It was in April, right?

SCOTT: Right, April [4], I think.

GUSTITUS: That may have been Easter break that week because I think I was in Florida with my parents when that happened.

SCOTT: Nevertheless when you came back things would still have been smoldering.

GUSTITUS: Yes. I don't know if it was unique for us. I think the whole country was feeling the same. [But it may have been after King's assassination that we had what was called Resurrection City in Washington, D.C., which was a large number of demonstrators and poor people camped out on the mall to advocate for programs for people.]

SCOTT: You mentioned that you were unhappy at Oberlin. Why?

GUSTITUS: It was so intense. I shouldn't have gone to Oberlin, I don't think, in the first place. It wasn't a match for my personality. The idea espoused at Oberlin was that you should be who you want to be. But the real message in those years was you had to be a radical leftie who was angry at everybody. I didn't really match that. I was opposed to the war, but I wasn't as aggressive. I marched with Dr. [Benjamin] Spock and all these people but not with the vehemence or the level of anger that a lot of the leadership carried, I thought. You had to dress a certain way. You had to have a green vinyl book bag and you had to have blue jeans and a blue work shirt. It was sort of—

SCOTT: That's counterintuitive—

GUSTITUS: It was counterintuitive. And there were other people who didn't let that affect them, and they did what they wanted to. But I was sensitive to that kind of thing so I ended up feeling very constricted, like I had to be like that. I wasn't grown up enough in my own self to fight it in a way that would have been healthy. I got overwhelmed by it. I really didn't like being that way and I'm not a drug person at all. I didn't like drugs. It wasn't a good match for me. I never really got that connected with my professors like I really should have, in part because of this political turmoil. The academics for me were not enough. I didn't pay enough attention to the academics. I'd love to go back and do it all over again.

SCOTT: What was the second internship like with Anderson? Was it different in any way?

GUSTITUS: It was different. I was here for three months. I was paid. I was more of an employee. I was older. They gave me more responsibility. I would go cover a hearing or handle an issue in terms of constituent responses, or represent Congressman Anderson in some very minor event. It was more real.

SCOTT: Did you work on any issues in particular that stick in your head?

GUSTITUS: Not that I remember, no.

SCOTT: When you came that time, did you also have to find your own apartment and things like that?

GUSTITUS: Oh yes. Nobody helped me. I had to find my own. I ended up living in a basement apartment in Glover Park where my bedroom was a converted coal bin. It was pretty grungy [both laugh]. I wouldn't let my kids go into an apartment like that. Somehow it was fine for me.

SCOTT: It was furnished.

GUSTITUS: It was furnished.

SCOTT: The congressman's [office] didn't help you make any of the arrangements?

GUSTITUS: No.

SCOTT: I think things have changed a bit in that case. There might be a little more support on site now from the office to help interns find something.

GUSTITUS: There was no support whatsoever on that. It was all on your own.

SCOTT: At the end of that internship, did you leave with the sense that you definitely wanted to come back? It hadn't changed your view of Washington?

GUSTITUS: I still loved Congress. I also loved the city. I've always just loved the city. I'm not a New York City person. I don't like huge skyscrapers. I love the 10-story limit, or whatever it is now, although they are working to defeat that now. It has such an openness. It's so livable. Rock Creek Park, it's just beautiful! That was the other part about it. Back then it was a very slow city.

SCOTT: Is that right?

GUSTITUS: Oh my god. It was like a small southern town where at 10:30 everybody was home. There were few clubs. There were nice restaurants, but everything closed up around 10:30. It was very conservative, very serious.

SCOTT: People have mentioned in the past that even as late as the late '60s and early '70s this did feel like a southern city in the sense that there was a lot of racial tension, there was still a great deal of segregation just by practice. Did you have a sense for that then?

GUSTITUS: I think the town has always had such huge racial issues. I think there is always a racial tension in D.C. Even now, I think the politics are complicated in D.C. because of race. I think that's real. But we didn't have that whole club scene, or young restaurant scene. All these theaters, plays, we just didn't have anything like that.

SCOTT: There is a vibrant art community here now.

GUSTITUS: Very vibrant. It really is competitive with New York. No, it was much more quiet.

SCOTT: So what then? To finish out your government degree you just went back and finished that final year?

GUSTITUS: I did go back and finish my year although I had missed a couple courses so I had to take some summer school courses. I was going to go to summer school at Harvard. My girlfriend and I were going to go to Boston and I was going to go to summer school and finish up two or three courses at Harvard. Two courses, I guess it was. But then we were in Boston, or we were on the Cape and it was just about before I was supposed to start summer school there and we said, you know what, we're not ready for this. I'm not ready for this. Long story short we decided to camp, to get a car and camp all the way across Canada to the West Coast and then go all the way down the West Coast to Los Angeles.

SCOTT: Wow!

GUSTITUS: And take the summer to do that, take three months to do that. My parents, that was their graduation gift to me was this old station wagon. That's what we did. That was in 1969. It was just an incredible time. People hitchhiked then. We would pick up hitchhikers all across Canada and had wonderful times with meeting new people. One unbelievable experience after the other in a time when there was this whole "love child" concept. We were all going to have a better society and everybody loved each other. That whole trip was part of that. We had just great experiences picking up hitchhikers and camping with them. Somebody whom we had just met at one campsite

gave us their apartment in San Francisco for a weekend. They were going away for the week. Just one thing after the other. It was a very unusual time.

SCOTT: Did you get a different perspective from the Canadian travelers about the United States? Different ways of thinking about American politics? Were you talking about politics with them?

GUSTITUS: Not too much. My girlfriend wasn't a political person. She was a singer. We met a lot of people from Europe actually, they were touring Canada. I have remembrances that there were a fair number of Europeans whom we came in contact with. If anything, my memory would be that we all thought the Vietnam War was terrible and the U.S. government was just completely wrong and we should get out of it. And nobody liked Richard Nixon.

SCOTT: I was going to ask you—

GUSTITUS: No. It was just, "How could he ever possibly have been elected?" It was almost like preaching to the choir, everybody felt the same, all these young people. We all felt the same way that it was just a mess. Government was a mess and Nixon was a terrible person to be president.

SCOTT: Did that change at all your thinking about your goal to come to Washington and work for Congress?

GUSTITUS: No, not at all. If anything it was that fix it mentality. No, I never got into "oh, it's such a mess. I never want to participate." No.

SCOTT: Was the 1968 presidential election your first chance to vote in a presidential election? Was that your first time?

GUSTITUS: I guess so.

SCOTT: Do you remember voting in it?

GUSTITUS: Where would I have been? I would have been on campus. I do not remember voting on campus but it would have been my first. I'm almost positive that I voted because I followed that election.

SCOTT: Were you involved in any way? Any get out the vote kind of activities?

GUSTITUS: No. I may have been, but I don't remember.

SCOTT: While you were at Oberlin, were you going home every summer? Or the summers that you weren't interning in Washington?

GUSTITUS: Yes.

SCOTT: Did you ever have political conversations while you were at home with your parents, given that they had a different perspective?

GUSTITUS: Yes, it was the only—well not the only thing, there were also a few other issues—but mostly my parents and I got along really, really well. But the Vietnam War-Nixon era we had a couple really bad fights. My father was really angry at my anti-war views. He had served in World War II. I don't think he could get his arms around opposing the president as vehemently as people opposed Nixon. And he hated stories from Oberlin about the demonstrations. As a matter of fact he told me at one point that he had called the Oberlin administration and said, "If my daughter is in one of those I want her out. I'm going to take her out of college. If I see her in one of those—" They never communicated that to me, the college didn't. But my father was really against the demonstrations and it was a complete turn-off for him to see the Abby Hoffmans of the world.

I've gone back and listened to some of the rhetoric that Abby Hoffman and others were using, and it was really offensive. And somehow as young people we felt we had to be supportive of the Abby Hoffman types, or Jerry Rubin, and those guys. But when I go back and listen to what they said—and I just did it about six or eight months ago—I was astounded at the language they used. They swore. They used really horrible language. It was outside the political dialogue—well now unfortunately it probably isn't. From my dad's perspective and my mom's, they were just appalled at what was happening. We, however, all thought that it was hip, that we were on the right side of things.

SCOTT: Did your father have an opinion about the Vietnam War policy itself? Or was his defense of it more about the president?

GUSTITUS: I think he trusted the president. And there were soldiers over there. It was the Cold War. I think he just trusted the president. I think the more he got entrenched in doing that the more he opposed the demonstrations because they were so offensive to him. They had to be wrong. The message got lost and it was more, which side do you want to look like or be like. What's more attractive to you? It was divisive for a lot of people. And remember, at that time, guys were being drafted. They had to

make all these horrible decisions. Do they fight in this horrible war that they don't believe in? Do they try to become COs [conscientious objectors]? Or do they go to Canada? Those were all real-life decisions for those people. We were all touched by that. We all knew when people's draft numbers were up.

SCOTT: Looking back, would you consider yourself an activist at this time?

GUSTITUS: I would say I was a modest activist. I would go to Cleveland, there would be buses to Cleveland, for demonstrations. Dr. Spock had a big demonstration there and I would go to that or if there was a really big one in Washington. But I didn't participate in the demonstration of the recruiter car. I didn't like it. I didn't feel it was fair to the man in the car. It was over the top to me. A radical group did a play at school that I was supposed to be in where they were really very abusive about the president of the college. I didn't feel comfortable in that either. That was too much for me. I would say that I was a moderate demonstrator.

SCOTT: A participant, but not perhaps the most radical.

GUSTITUS: Not just perhaps, clearly not. Way into the middle. But I was sick about the Vietnam War.

SCOTT: You graduated then in 1969 from Oberlin?

GUSTITUS: Yes.

SCOTT: At what point did you decide to go to law school? Did you apply during your senior year of college?

GUSTITUS: Right after college I moved to Chicago, after we did that big trip, I was in Los Angeles until October. So that trip went from July to October. I came back and I moved to Chicago. I was going to apply to the Foreign Service. I took the big Foreign Service exam and then I was in Chicago waiting for my oral interviews and the rest. In the interim I met my now husband who was an executive director of a Saul Alinsky community organization in Northwest, D.C. Do you know Saul Alinsky?

SCOTT: No, I don't.

GUSTITUS: He's the father of community organizing, one of the people President Obama followed when he was young. And that's who my husband followed. Alinsky-style organizers went into neighborhoods to try to empower people by getting

them to identify what really matters to them in their communities and then helping them organize to try to effect the change that they want. For example, they might work on a new elementary school.

SCOTT: Or economic issues.

GUSTITUS: More jobs. A big thing in Chicago at the time was getting rid of slum landlords, really, really bad landlords. My husband was the executive director of one of those Saul Alinsky type community organizations.

SCOTT: Here in Washington?

GUSTITUS: In Chicago. I was in Chicago but I had to get a job while I was waiting to see what the Foreign Service was going to do. I ended up, long story short, working for him—Bob—as his administrative person in the community organization office as a secretary. I saw a whole different type of society and work—that was an awakening of a political opportunity, situation. I had never seen working in an organization like that with normal people, not the radical student kids who are always mad and angry and demonstrating. But really working class and lower income people who were wanting to get things from the government and were fighting for them. I learned all about the Chicago political system and Mayor Daley and the ward bosses. That was the first education I had on politics at the street level, how elections were conducted in Chicago. How it all worked, the graft, the paybacks. So that was really interesting to me. I worked with Bob there.

I did get accepted into the Foreign Service and I was thrilled. It was so much what I wanted to do at that point in time because I was hoping to go to Germany and to Europe. I don't know why I thought I would get that position! [Scott laughs] Then Bob said to me, and I got convinced by it, that the real action was in the streets in the United States. He said the Foreign Service was kind of frou-frou stuff. What really mattered was in neighborhoods like the one we were working at in Chicago. I had fallen in love with him at the time so that argument had more power than a neutral person. I ended up not doing the Foreign Service.

I stayed and worked with him for another year or so. Then I worked on an unconventional newspaper in Chicago. Unconventional newspapers were a big deal then. There was *The Seed* in Chicago, which was considered an “underground” newspaper. There were others. Then there was this thing called sea-level newspapers, which included the *Phoenix* in Boston and now the *Chicago Reader* in Chicago. We had one that we started, a couple of us, called the *Chicago Daily Planet*. *The Reader* came out after us.

There is a whole other story about why the *Planet* didn't make it and the *Reader* did, but I ended up working on the *Chicago Daily Planet* for a year. It was just in the back of my mind that I've got to do something more intellectually challenging. I really should go to law school. It was about two or three years after college that I went to law school.

SCOTT: What kind of stories were you working on at the *Daily Planet*?

GUSTITUS: The stories were great, they were interesting political stories about Chicago or the art scene. We were really big in the art scene. I agreed to be the business manager so I was the advertising person. I sold all these ads. I ended up in the rock and folk world a lot. I could go to concerts for free because I was selling ads. It was an interesting little bit where I did that for a year or so. Mostly we were trying to do a few investigations. *The Seed* was the super-druggy counterculture newspaper. We were trying to be the alternative newspaper to the big papers where we could give an assessment more mainstream than *The Seed* and more candid than the big newspapers.

SCOTT: Like an alternative voice, but authoritative at the same time. Real investigative journalism.

Do you want to say something about why the *Reader* made it and the *Planet* didn't?

GUSTITUS: No, it's too long of a story.

SCOTT: You decided to apply to law school. Did you think about any—

GUSTITUS: No, I didn't think about anything except that I wanted to do it as easily as possible in Chicago because I wanted to keep working. I ended up applying to DePaul, which had a downtown campus, easy to get to. It was an okay law school. It was mid-level, I guess, at the time. My grades at Oberlin hadn't been that great. I didn't do a really good job as I should have. They were Bs.

SCOTT: There was a lot of distraction.

GUSTITUS: A lot of distraction. I was an unhappy person for the most part. I even had to talk my way into getting into DePaul. I said, "I really want this. I really care about this." So I got in. I was at DePaul for one year and then my husband got a job in Detroit. Again it was more, what is the convenient law school to where we lived in Detroit? We were right in Detroit. So I ended up going to Wayne State University.

SCOTT: You were already married at this point?

GUSTITUS: Yes. I went to Wayne State for two years, at the law school there.

SCOTT: What is Wayne State like? I've never been to the campus.

GUSTITUS: It's urban. It's right in the heart, it's not downtown but it's about a mile or two miles out from the center of the city. It's maybe not even that much, maybe not quite a mile. It's a very urban campus but it has a lot of property. It's not all buildings, like NYU or something. It's got some space. The law school had just built a new building. It has a very good law school. It's a serious law school. They get some good professors. They were really working at improving themselves. I felt really good about the legal education that I got there.

SCOTT: What was it like to be in Detroit? You had a good sense of the Chicago scene at that point. Was it hard to make that transition to a new place?

GUSTITUS: In Chicago the little people had no voice in the politics. We were all so removed. It was governed by the Daley machine. You were either in it or you were out of it. We worked with the independent movement to try to penetrate the Daley machine in Chicago. My husband and I were both part of that in our local ward. In our ward we ended up having an independent alderman. But in Detroit when we got there—I told Bob when he had a choice of two jobs, one was Detroit and the other was Newark. I said, "Those are the two armpits. So which armpit are we going to go to?" Honestly, I was so upset.

SCOTT: Right, the '67 riots, both those cities had burned.

GUSTITUS: What great choices!

SCOTT: But it makes sense, doesn't it? Given what he is doing?

GUSTITUS: Absolutely, he was going to start a community organization in a working class neighborhood in Detroit. It was a fabulous experience. And, as it turned out, I loved Detroit! Go figure. Coleman Young was the mayor then and there was a lot of energy around him and the city. There were a lot of racial tensions, serious racial tensions. But the government was approachable. It was not locked up like Chicago. The government there, you could work it. You could relate to it. They would listen to you at some point. It was much more of a community, I thought. It was a big community even though it was loaded with problems.

We lived in an area of Detroit that was a big apartment building area. There were these beautiful old art deco, art nouveau, buildings. Great brick work and stone work. We ended up having a lot of crime. People were really nervous. Being the organizers that we were, I spearheaded with my husband's support an organization to fight crime in our neighborhood. We called it the Palmer Park Citizen's Action Council. The area was Palmer Park. The PPCAC, as we called it, became hugely successful. We ended up with one big meeting with 500 people in the local temple. We were fighting for new lighting in the city, in our area. We did a whistle blowing thing, where everybody wore a whistle. If you were being robbed or mugged or thought you were, you could blow your whistle and people would open their window and they would blow their whistles. It was called whistle stop. It became a big deal in Detroit. We were pretty successful at that.

At the time Carl Levin was the chair of the Detroit City Council. One of the things we did was at that big meeting of 500 people we invited the Detroit City Council out. Carl Levin was there and a couple of other members came out. I was the leader of that whole thing, the speaker and moderator. We had the City Council members take a tour of our neighborhood to show them where we needed lights. That was one early contact I had with Senator Levin. The other was when I was in law school, there was a professor who had a course on legislation. I decided to take that. He and I clicked in terms of our interest in politics. He had an opportunity, there was a woman named Diane Edgecomb and she was the head of what was called the Central Business District Association of Detroit. She was the mother hen of growth in downtown Detroit. She was in on everything. She did the People Mover, which they now have. She tried to do festivals and concerts to bring people to downtown Detroit. She worked very closely with Coleman Young. All these businesses downtown contributed to this organization so that she could do the work that she did.

She was trying to get a tax increment financing piece of legislation enacted for Detroit, which would give somebody who invested in Detroit a lower tax rate to encourage them to come into downtown Detroit. She was looking for a couple of law students whom she could pay—not a lot—to come down and help her. The professor suggested that I do it, and this other woman, my co-student, and I would go there and do that. For the two years I was there, of the last two years of my law school, I worked with Diane Edgecomb at the Central Business District Association and really helped draft this statute, which was the tax increment financing legislation, and worked to try to get it passed. In that capacity I got involved in the mayor's office and the Detroit City Council. We were connected to the government in a big way. I loved that work. I loved Diane Edgecomb. She was fabulous, and we developed a very close relationship.

I was going to law school. I was doing Palmer Park Citizen's Action Council and I was working with the Central Business District Association. I was really active politically in Detroit.

SCOTT: And this is what, '72-'73?

GUSTITUS: This is actually '74-'75. Seventy-three was when I went to law school in Chicago, at DePaul. Seventy-four, '75 because I graduated from law school in May of '75.

That's what happened in Detroit, it was a fairly political involvement. And then we went back to Chicago after law school. As soon as I graduated from law school Bob and I moved back to Chicago.

SCOTT: Why?

GUSTITUS: It was home for him. We had friends there. We had a couple who had a house and we were going to share an apartment building, a three-story with three apartments. It was just time. It felt good to go back. Bob had started this organization and had gotten somebody else to be the new executive director. We never had thought about moving permanently to Detroit. It was just a temporary thing. We went back to Chicago. We were there from '75-'77, for two years. At which point Bob got another job offer.

What's so funny is I was the one who wanted to go to Washington, but he got the job offer in Washington to work as a national consultant for a community organization consulting entity. I was happy—let's go! At which point I then immediately applied, since I was a lawyer, to the Justice Department. I had been practicing as a lawyer for two years in Illinois, I had worked as a staff attorney for the Fair Employment Practices Commission doing case work and building cases to present to the commission on fair employment issues. I had also worked as a prosecutor for the Cook County state's attorney's office. For a year and a half I had done that.

SCOTT: You were doing both at the same time?

GUSTITUS: No, one after the other. One I had done for maybe six months, the years aren't really clear. Then I was a prosecutor for a year and a half, two years, maybe.

SCOTT: What kind of work were you doing at the fair employment commission? What kind of cases were you handling? What was coming across your desk?

GUSTITUS: It was pretty much standard issue, people who felt they had been discriminated against for lack of promotion for race or sex.

SCOTT: I was going to ask if gender, if you were seeing some cases like that.

GUSTITUS: We had one lawyer who was particularly skilled in the sex discrimination cases. But it wasn't that interesting work for me. It was pretty much working in a little office and reading these cases, and I wasn't that excited about it. Actually, I ended up working on the campaign of the person running for state's attorney, Bernard Carey, who was the independent, non-machine person. As a result of that, when he got elected, I became an assistant state's attorney.

SCOTT: What does a state's attorney do?

GUSTITUS: They are the district attorneys. They prosecute all the crimes in Cook County, any crime from traffic stop to a murder and anything in between and consumer fraud. I started out doing consumer fraud. That's where freshmen state's attorneys get their sea legs. We did minor consumer fraud cases. Somebody bought something that wasn't as represented and they feel it is criminal behavior. But that lasted only for a couple months that I did that, maybe three or four months. Then I ended up being chosen to be an attorney—one of two attorneys—for a special hand-to-hand narcotics group. It was called MEG. They were an undercover narcotics team who dressed like street people and made hand-to-hand narcotics transactions. I would go around the county wherever their preliminary hearings were and prosecute these drug dealers, basically.

SCOTT: That's very interesting.

GUSTITUS: It was very interesting.

SCOTT: Was there a big drug problem at that time?

GUSTITUS: Absolutely. PCP was especially popular at that time. People were selling it to high school students, a lot. PCP is mind-destroying. It is such an awful, awful thing. Cocaine wasn't so popular at the time, some heroin, it was PCP and heroin as I recall, and marijuana, of course. PCP was big. What happened was these cops were focusing on high school, people selling to high school students, which was great and I felt terrific about prosecuting people who sold to high school students. That was interesting.

SCOTT: What kinds of things did you learn there that may have been helpful to you when you went to work on Capitol Hill, for example? Were there issues that you learned about that you later picked up?

GUSTITUS: Oddly enough, while a lot of people don't trust the cops, I ended up trusting them a fair amount. Even when I knew they weren't telling the truth to the exact question, I knew that they had gotten somebody who they thought was really dirty and needed to be prosecuted. They had their limits as to what they could and couldn't do. All the Miranda warnings and the search limits. Those are all wonderful things, but it's really hard for a cop in a few seconds to make these split-second decisions that courts take months to say whether it was right or wrong. I have always been very sympathetic to cops. I think they have an incredibly tough job. And there are some bad cops, like there are bad secretaries, or whatever. But for the most part I thought they really cared. They put themselves at risk. They basically knew who the bad guys were and they wanted to get them off the street. I could tell that—they would say these lines that were almost memorized. "We put the perpetrator in the car. There was no use of physical force." You're going, "Yeah, right." I just had sympathy for how hard it is to be a cop and working in law enforcement.

The other thing I observed was that most of the judges I saw didn't really care that much. I wasn't impressed with the judges. They really deferred to me to do the sentencing. "What does the state want for this?" We'd say, "We want 12 months in prison." "Fine." I was at a very low level of judges, and given it was the Daley machine, a lot of political hacks were probably judges.

SCOTT: So in the two years that you had been gone not a lot had changed in terms of the political machine?

GUSTITUS: No, it was so entrenched.

SCOTT: So you applied at the Justice Department for a position?

GUSTITUS: When I came to D.C. I thought I would apply to the Justice Department. I had a little trial experience, a little real life experience from those two jobs. I got hired to be a trial attorney at the Justice Department. The area in which they were hiring was the civil fraud section. Those are cases where the government sues people who have defrauded the government. You use what is called the False Claims Act, which allows for triple damages. If you find that somebody has defrauded the government we can seek triple damages.

SCOTT: I didn't know that.

GUSTITUS: It's a [meaningful penalty]. You can also, if somebody helps you identify the case, if they become a whistleblower, whistleblowers can get up to—I don't think it was 25 percent at the time, they have increased it—it was like 10 percent of the damages. So you reward a whistleblower who identifies fraud. I went and worked there for a couple years. I loved it.

SCOTT: What was that like? It must have been really interesting work.

GUSTITUS: I learned a couple things, by the way, for my work on the Hill, which were really important. One, the people at the Justice Department were profoundly talented. I mean really good lawyers. There was a professionalism that was terrific, really terrific. I admired it so much. I say that now because I think so much of it has been lost. I think it's been politicized. My personal opinion is that the [George W.] Bush administration did a lot to hurt the professionalism, the talent pool, for the Justice Department. What was so great is you could always rely on the apolitical staff people who were completely apolitical in their work. They were good lawyers, really good lawyers. There was a review system that was really challenging. They made sure that your brief, all the references were right, and sourced perfectly. You couldn't slip much by them.

SCOTT: Did they have a mentoring system there when you were—

GUSTITUS: No, they didn't.

SCOTT: How did you learn?

GUSTITUS: It was organized down to small groups. One more experienced lawyer wasn't my mentor, but he was my supervisor. They didn't call them mentors, but it was the person you could go to all the time who had been there for a good amount of time who could teach you. Plus, I was placed in an office with somebody who had more experience. They were two-person offices when I was at the main Justice building, and that person you watched and learned from. That was good.

The other thing, on the other hand, is that it was also very bureaucratic. You had to go through a chain of command to get approval for something. You couldn't move that quickly. There was definitely a bureaucracy. I didn't really like that part of it.

Thirdly, there was one more thing that I learned, which was really important for up here. The agencies are so afraid of Congress because they don't trust us, they don't trust Congress. They shouldn't, because sometimes we do really stupid things. We say we'll protect your confidence and we don't protect their confidence. Mostly we are out to get them. It's true. If they do something wonderful, we don't usually hold a hearing and say how great that is. We hold hearings when they've done something bad. So we are always looking for something, for the most part, that is bad.

SCOTT: Checks and balances tend to focus on the problems rather than the things that seem to be going well.

GUSTITUS: There aren't that many hearings lauding something that was wonderfully successful. When an executive branch person picks up the phone and hears it's a member of Congress on the other end of the line, they are not thinking good things. They are not thinking this is a good call. For me, this naïve person back in John B. Anderson's office, "We just talk about all issues and we're honest about—" at the Justice Department I was stunned by the reluctance of the Justice Department to fix statutes that would have helped our ability to recover damages or to stop the fraud in the first place. You'd get a case and you'd see that the contract elements were not there or there was some legal requirement that was frustrating the execution of the contract. I would always say, "Why don't we tell them to fix that law? It's not necessary and it's only hurting us. We could stop the fraud." "That's not really our job." The Justice Department does the cases for these other departments. All they do is the cases. So you'd say, "This is a HUD [Department of Housing and Urban Development] case. Why don't we go back to HUD and say, 'Look, if you put this in your contract, or you put this in the law, we can avoid this fraud in the future.'" It was really hard to get anybody to want to do that.

SCOTT: In that case it's agency to agency. What were the reasons against making that contact?

GUSTITUS: It was a challenge to get anybody to want to do something at the policy level. It was I think out of fear. It brings attention. "We'll just keep doing our job." They all move through the legislative affairs office. God forbid a staff person should call a member of Congress and say, "You could fix it this way." You can't do that. You have to go through legislative affairs. That was frustrating on that end, and it's frustrating on this end. You always have to go through legislative affairs. What you want to do is take the online attorney and say, "Tell me. What is wrong? What is it that we need to do to fix it?" I have a lot of faith in a lot of the executive branch front line people.

SCOTT: The practitioners.

GUSTITUS: The practitioners, yes. They know what is going on. Sometimes they get so frustrated that they can't fix it themselves. When I had legislative fellows up here, the first thing I would say when I had them was, "If you see something that is broken, that you think could be fixed by a change in the statute, or policy, I want you to tell me that because I want to try to work on it. If there is anything in your agency that you have been trying to fix, tell me about it and let's try to work on that." That was foreign to them. That's not how they think because they are not trained to think that way. That was the same at the Justice Department. I thought it was very frustrating that you'd see these cases and you'd say, "If we just changed the law we could probably avoid this type of fraudulent action." It didn't really happen.

SCOTT: How did you get to Levin's office from that position? Were you in some ways still looking to get into Congress?

GUSTITUS: Yes. I was still always looking to the Hill. I still had Congress in the back of my mind. I didn't like the bureaucracy of the Justice Department. I didn't like having to go through the layers. Congress sure isn't a bureaucracy. That's the great thing about this place. [both laugh]

SCOTT: It's very different here.

GUSTITUS: So what happened was, in '78, Carl Levin got elected senator from Michigan. When I saw that, I thought, "That is the closest I'll ever come to knowing a senator and having people I work with who know him. It's probably my best shot at getting on the Hill." I called Diane Edgecomb, my friend from the Central Business District Association. I don't know whom else I called back in Detroit. Then I applied for a position and got it. I got a position as a legislative assistant. I think Diane helped with her recommendation and probably my law school professors, a couple of them who were political, probably helped.

SCOTT: Did you have an interview with the senator?

GUSTITUS: Yes. He came here. I think he wore a three piece suit for the first and only time in his life that I've ever seen him wear a three piece suit. So we went to [Donald] Riegle's office. Riegle was in the Dirksen Building over in the corner and he gave his office to Carl for interviews. I walked in and interviewed with him.

SCOTT: He remembered you, I'm sure?

GUSTITUS: I think so, yes. I can't remember exactly but I know that I had given them a three-ring binder on me. There were stories from the *Detroit Free Press* of my work with Palmer Park Citizen's Action Council and pictures. I was community person of the week. I put that stuff in there. They had a three-ring binder on me. We had a good interview. It was very comfortable.

SCOTT: What is he like as a person? What did you recall at the time? Is this someone you felt like you would like to work with?

GUSTITUS: I think the first thing that comes across is that he is so down to earth. What I do actually really remember from the meeting was I walked in. I'm thinking this is highfalutin, serious, pomp-and-circumstance. He's sitting there, he had the three piece suit, very odd for him. Not that I knew that at the time, but now I do. We start talking and we don't talk for very long and he says, "You know what? I've got to go to the bathroom." [both laugh] So he just gets up and goes to the bathroom. He comes out and says, "I'm sorry for that," and continues the interview. I thought "That's pretty down to earth."

SCOTT: [Laughs] Was that your style?

GUSTITUS: Yes. That was a match.

SCOTT: You become a legislative assistant. Were you hired with the idea that you would be working on any specific issues?

GUSTITUS: I was hired as the lawyer, doing Judiciary Committee issues. Immigration was probably one, anything that was in the Judiciary Committee and women's issues and I had HUD issues also. That may be because I did some of that at the Justice Department.

SCOTT: This is 1979, right?

GUSTITUS: Well, I was hired in 1978 and then started February 1, 1979. The beginning of that Congress.

SCOTT: Just to back up a bit, were you in Washington when the Watergate hearings were going on? I don't think you were. You were probably back in Detroit, or maybe in Chicago.

GUSTITUS: Right. I saw all that on the TV.

SCOTT: Did that change the way you thought about Congress in any way? Did it make you want to be here even more? As historians we always point to the Watergate Committee as a fine example of bipartisanship and real investigative work, and a very careful inquiry and a good use of the press to get the public interested and involved in these issues of national importance. Did you have a sense for that at the time? Were you watching the Watergate hearings?

GUSTITUS: Absolutely. I was captivated by the Watergate hearings, but I don't know that I was looking at it in terms of myself. It was so compelling. What was being revealed, I don't know that I—I have always been intuitively somebody who wants the facts, the truth. That is just my nature that you always have to get the truth. That to me was the right thing to do. Of course we've got to get to the truth. We have to find out what happened. It was shocking. It was unbelievable.

It changed the world. It changed the United States of America. We all talk about 9/11. Absolutely, 9/11 did. The other big thing that changed America was Watergate. It just changed it in so many different ways. My father, look at that faith he put in a president. I didn't see it as, "I wish I could be there with Sam Ervin and Howard Baker." I didn't see that. I just was impressed with how it was conducted and I was impressed with what they unearthed. It was really powerful.

SCOTT: It strikes me, too, that when you join Senator Levin's office in 1979, this is that post-Watergate Senate, a Senate that has been empowered in some ways by these hearings, a Congress that has been empowered by first the House considering impeaching the president and a president that is forced to resign as a result of all of this work which Congress feels itself to be responsible for in some way. I wondered if you had a sense for that post-Watergate era. Congress is going to exercise checks and balances. "We are going to look into the presidency in a new way. We are going to ensure that the president doesn't abuse the power of his office, going forward." Did you have a sense for that?

GUSTITUS: No, I didn't have that big picture sense of the president versus Congress. What we did have, and it may have been because of Senator Levin's comments to me, was this notion of the need for the Democrats to get control over the programs that they created, the idea that [Speaker of the House] Tip O'Neil and the House Democrats were always throwing money—give programs more money, give programs more money. There was this drumbeat that these programs are less popular, there is too much waste. Paul Tsongas [D-MA] and Carl and a couple of others were really starting to say, "We have to oversee what is going on." I don't know if they got that out of Watergate so

much, it could have played a role, not so much in presidential authority as oversight being an important tool. I think we called that the oversight Congress. Wasn't that the oversight Congress, the 96th Congress?

SCOTT: It was the 96th Congress. My sense is that the "Watergate Baby" class, the folks who come in after Watergate for the next couple of congresses, all feel the sense that "we need to have more oversight."

GUSTITUS: I think they call the 96th Congress the "Oversight Congress," in part that's because people like Tsongas and Levin came in. Levin gives a speech to the ADA in which he says, "If you want these programs, you better manage them." Tsongas gave a big speech also to the ADA, Americans for Democratic Action, and it was a scold or a warning that the American people aren't going to put up with all these programs if we don't show that we are careful about how we manage them. Part of that was the HUD disaster, there were all those mortgage programs that especially hit Detroit.

SCOTT: I was wondering if it was also Senator Levin's experience back in Detroit that informed him?

GUSTITUS: It was a huge piece of his experience. It was devastating to Detroit. [George Romney was secretary of HUD under Richard Nixon, and many of the HUD mortgage programs got focused in Detroit, because Romney had been governor of Michigan.] Detroit had a huge number of homes that went belly-up and stood vacant and just caused so many problems. At one point Senator Levin rented a—what do you call them—a tractor with a plow and on his own tore down a home. They couldn't get them torn down. HUD wouldn't approve tearing them down on a timely basis. So Levin just said, "It has to happen!" So in his own demonstration he got a big plow and went in and tore down a home.

SCOTT: This is when he was a senator?

GUSTITUS: No, no. He was [in] the city council. He fought this HUD issue a lot, trying to get HUD to do something with these abandoned homes that had been foreclosed on. He couldn't get them to do it. This was his argument, I didn't experience it personally, but this is what he said. He would go to Congress and ask his members of Congress to do it and they couldn't do it because they say it was HUD. HUD had these regulations. But there was nobody he could hold accountable, he felt. The employees at HUD are not elected. He really got on to that issue of the unelectable bureaucrat and that we have to keep them accountable. He would much rather have these programs in the hands of Congress where you could throw the bastards out if they were doing the wrong

thing, as opposed to the executive branch where you can't get to them. That was the big thing coming into the 96th Congress. [Abraham] Ribicoff [D-CT] was part of that. Ribicoff had just either done or was in the middle of a big review of regulations, government regulations. His staff had done I think a seven part study on regulations. There was a lot of that, a lot of how do we control this bureaucracy. What's going on over there?

SCOTT: What are some of the issues that you remember working on during that 96th Congress? How long were you in that LA position?

GUSTITUS: I was in it until October of '80. I was there for a year and a half and then I moved over to the subcommittee [Oversight of Government Management].

SCOTT: Do you remember any issues that were particularly interesting?

GUSTITUS: Yes, there were a couple big issues. One big issue for Senator Levin was the Panama Canal implementation treaty, implementation legislation. I just read that in Ira's book¹ about the Panama Canal and how it was the third rail and nobody wanted to do it. Something like 87 percent of the American people felt we shouldn't give the Panama Canal back.

SCOTT: And a number of those members were not reelected who voted to [ratify the treaty].

GUSTITUS: It was serious.

SCOTT: It was very serious.

GUSTITUS: I guess that was the year before, in '78. Well then in '79 they had to do the implementation legislation. I remember we heard the bad news that Carl had been picked to be involved in managing the bill on the floor. [both laugh] It was not something that he wanted to do.

SCOTT: Interesting that they would pick a freshman member.

GUSTITUS: We had to gear up for it. I wasn't involved in it, but I remember that was something like, "Oh my god, how did that happen?" So there was that, that year.

¹ Ira Shapiro, *The Last Great Senate: Courage and Statesmanship in Times of Crisis*, (New York: Public Affairs), 2012.

The other big thing was the legislative veto. That was huge. The Federal Trade Commission had issued about five or six rules that had been hugely unpopular. One was automobile sale warranties and the other was the funeral industry. They had imposed these requirements on the funeral industry, I think a big part of which was just disclosing costs. The funeral industry went ballistic. Something happened with auto sales also, a couple of things that they did. Business was just nuts about these rules. This was Mike Pertschuk. Mike was head of the FTC at that time. Anyway, the FTC hadn't been reauthorized for several years because everybody was so mad at it for doing these aggressive things. One idea at the time was to have a legislative veto over rules so that the FTC could issue a rule but it couldn't take effect for 90 days until Congress could review it. These rules were like legislation and no bureaucracy should have that much power. Senator Levin supported that. I'm going to stop now. But we need to get into because that was a very important issue at the time.

SCOTT: Okay, we'll just stop there.

GUSTITUS: Good.

[End of First Interview]