

UNITED STATES
Congress



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 29

NOVEMBER 16, 1973 TO NOVEMBER 29, 1973

(PAGES 37439 TO 38794)

at length on Saturday. He told Dr. Logan that the way had finally been cleared for the relocation of a city bus depot now at Amsterdam Avenue and West 129th Street near Kickerbocker Hospital. The relocation of the terminal would allow for the expansion of the hospital—a move that Dr. Logan, a member of the hospital's board, had been seeking for several years.

Mr. Sutton said that Dr. Logan had told his wife before leaving home that he was going to the hospital, at 70 Convent Avenue, and then to look at the new bus terminal site, on 12th Avenue between 133d and 134th Streets, near where his body was later discovered.

"The last thing in the world this guy would do would be to commit suicide. He had everything going for him and nothing against him," Mr. Sutton said.

Mayor Lindsay, who like former Mayor Robert Wagner before him, had named Dr. Logan to a number of committees serving the city, issued a statement calling him "a civil leader of extraordinary intelligence and devotion who somehow found the time and energy to express the widest range of social concerns while carrying the full load of medical practice and involvement in the medical community."

DR. KING'S PHYSICIAN

One of the first black graduates of Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons, Dr. Logan acted as personal physician to many noted people, including the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and Duke Ellington. During the Poor People's March on Washington in 1967, he mobilized a medical team to treat the demonstrators camped out in tents in "Resurrection City."

He was one of the original partners in the Upper Manhattan Medical Group, serving the community in lower Washington Heights for more than 20 years. In addition, he found time to be active in his West Side neighborhood, helping to form an organization to lobby against what the group saw as the overbuilding of low-income housing in the West Side Urban Renewal Area.

Dr. Logan was born in Tuskegee, Ala., where his father was treasurer of Tuskegee Institute. He graduated from Williams College.

Besides his wife, Dr. Logan is survived by a daughter, Mrs. Adele Logan Alexander of Washington; a 10-year-old son, Warren Arthur; two brothers, Harold K. Logan of Tuskegee, and Paul H. Logan, of Lafayette, Calif.; and two sisters, Miss Louise T. Logan and Mrs. Myra Logan Alston, both of New York.

FINANCING POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed the most far-reaching and significant piece of campaign reform legislation ever adopted by either House of Congress. This legislation seeks to rid our political system of the corrupting influence of big money by providing for public financing of Federal elections.

The compelling case for public financing is already well known. It has been most forcefully and effectively made by some of the fundraising practices used in the 1972 Presidential election.

Recently Frank Wright of the Minneapolis Tribune interviewed a campaign official who worked closely with Maurice Stans, President Nixon's chief fund raiser. This official outlines the way in which money was solicited from businessmen on behalf of the President's campaign; it can only be described as a shakedown and an outrage.

I commend this article to anyone who doubts the necessity of fundamentally overhauling our present compromising system of financing political campaigns through large private contributions. More persuasively than anything I have read to date, it makes an irrefutable case for public financing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wright's article appearing in the November 25 edition of the Minneapolis Tribune be printed in the RECORD.

STANS TACTICS SHOCKED GOP FUND RAISERS

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Increasing attention has focused on the record \$60 million raised for President Nixon's 1972 reelection campaign. Much interest has centered on Maurice Stans, the Minnesota native who resigned as Mr. Nixon's secretary of commerce and became chief fund-raiser, serving as chairman of the Finance Committee to Re-elect the President. Here is the story of how he operated, especially with big businessmen, as told to Frank Wright, Minneapolis Tribune staff correspondent, by a campaign official who worked closely with Stans in a major state.)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Before Maury came in we decided there would be no quotas put on at all. We felt that really all we had to do is set up a little budget for our state campaign that would be fairly modest.

This was early in 1972, but it was already looking like (George) McGovern might be the Democrat's guy instead of (Edmund) Muskie, and it was just obvious that it was going to be very, very easy.

There wasn't any sell with businessmen whatsoever. We decided that we would have sort of a \$1,000 club, a very innocent, modest thing. And we would have a lot of guys, a lot of small businessmen, a lot of larger businessmen, and they would get a little stick-pin or something else.

That is the usual way we always work with this stuff. My state chairman has a list, and half of them went to Princeton and half of them went to Yale, and they all sort of get together at the club and have a drink and kick in their thou, or whatever it is, and that is it. Very much the old wealth sort of thing.

But while we were waiting for Stans to become national chairman we had this guy from Minnesota, Newell Weed, who was already a vice chairman or something in Washington, running in and saying, "All this will cave in, and you will go out on your rear." That was one of the great things he said to me. "You're not doing it right. You're not doing it right," he'd say. "What you have to do is raise your sights."

Well, Maury finally did come in, and he did change it all around. He told us a number of times that our sights were too low. And then he told us that he would give us a quota to raise, and all the money would go to the national committee. And he would allocate us enough just to run the local political office.

Our first quota was \$1 million. That was the figure Stans gave us. And as we raised the money, Stans would up the quota. So we never were really sure as to what the quota was. It was never really set in any kind of concrete.

By the time we were through we had raised at least \$5.5 million in this state, almost 10 percent of everything, not counting stuff Stans may have raised in here on his own that we never knew about.

The thing that Stans disliked the most was the way we depended on old money. He really hated this. He came in, and he said, "This thing is terrible. Old wealth is dried out, largely. That was great in 1920. But now they are going to give you \$500, and you are going to put their name on a letterhead.

"You have got to get new wealth," he'd

say. "You have got to get the Pallaftos." And we asked what is a Pallafto.

Stans said that is the name of a businessman in Wisconsin who has reached new wealth, who did in a very unostentatious way, without anyone else knowing. He achieved remarkable success, but he wasn't in the social swim.

The Nixon fund-raisers in Wisconsin didn't tap him, but it so happened that the Nixon finance chairman in Nebraska had heard of him and knew that he had arrived with new money. A contact was made, and the guy gave \$30,000. Just like that.

(Robert Pallafto is president of National Health Enterprises of Milwaukee, a firm that operates nursing homes and provides supporting services.)

Stans was very, very democratic about that. He just hated the idea of the social register eliminating all of this new untapped wealth that he really saw. So he was always fighting for that, and that was one of the sound things he did. I thought he was right on that.

Stans was also very much vexed with us because we didn't know how to get the money out of the old-wealth people that we did have on our lists, people who had given to campaigns all their lives and who really didn't want anything out of it.

So one day he decided he was going to show us there is a "new way," as he put it, to do this. He wanted a breakfast set up for me, our state chairman, the guy who was our professional fund-raiser, for himself and a "guinea pig, a guy who ordinarily wouldn't give a lot of money."

So I picked a guy I knew whose family owned a big company in a basic industry. He had given some to the Democrats before, but he never had given much to the Republican Party.

Well, I have never sat through anything like that before. I always thought a fund-raiser had to be somebody who would be able to sell, but Stans never tried to sell. He was cold, and he dominated the conversation. It was not a warm thing. He was intimidating.

He started by mentioning all the trouble he had had with Ruckelshaus while he was still secretary of commerce. (William Ruckelshaus at that time was head of the Environmental Protection Agency.)

He mentioned Ruckelshaus, I guess, because Muskie was still in the running for the Democrats and because this guy we had in for breakfast, his company was dumping just an awful lot of stuff into the lakes.

And so Stans talked about how he had finally gotten Ruckelshaus to loosen up on some regulations, and how he had been forced to vie for the president's ear because Ruckelshaus didn't understand the system that "we businessmen are here to preserve, including the environment, and that means that you have to be able to make some money to pay these taxes and everything. We can't let this environmental thing just take us right over the cliff."

Stans said he knew this would be of concern to "all Americans, but especially to guys like you," meaning the guy from the company.

And then he just berated the guy for ignoring his invitation to join some sort of industrial advisory commission—I believe it was headed by Bert Cross of Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing—that Stans had set up to lobby in the administration for pollution laws they could live with.

"Just as the liberals have lobbying groups to our government, we have to have lobbying groups in government, too, to keep the president on the right track on Ruckelshaus," Stans said. "And you didn't join us when there were guys there giving up days in their business, going down to Washington to work on this thing."

Then he switched to Muskie, who was, you know, big on the pollution stuff. "We have had a terrific struggle with Ruckelshaus," Maury said, "but you imagine what would happen if we had Muskie in.

"Our system has to be preserved, the kind of balanced system that has allowed you to get where you are. Now we are on the front lines, and it is mighty serious. The president isn't going to have an easy time. There are to be armies out there, and now I am asking you again to come into this thing.

"And your assessment is \$10,000." That was the word and the figure he used. I can still see the business guy's face.

"Gee," he said, "I never gave the Democrats anything like that." That was the only thing I remember him saying. But the next day he gave us his check for \$10,000. We only had the guy down for \$500.

After that Maury gave us his three rules that he always worked by.

Number one, know your man and to what extent he can give. He would always research what problems a company had with the government, know them inside out. It is sort of terrifying when a solicitor that you're talking to knows the fact that you have problems, and it looks like he is looking at your soul.

Number two, name your amount before he can name his. That was the thing he told us often. If you allow the guy to name his own price, you have lost the game, he would say. He would rather we resigned than do it that old way.

He said, "You should say that we want you to be one of the key people, and we are presumptuous enough to ask you for X amount." Nobody, he would say, ever has gotten mad at being asked to give too much.

Sometimes he would just shame them into it. He said that is one thing about them they can't stand, the status thing. Under no circumstance should anyone feel embarrassed in asking for too much money. It is an honor, he would say. And, like, are you up to our standards? That kind of thing.

In other words, if you figure the guy could give \$10,000, ask usually for \$30,000 or \$40,000. Otherwise the guy would get away with giving \$5,000 or \$6,000.

Number three, Maury said you must say what is in it for the contributor not to have the Democratic guy in as president. First it was Muskie and then it was McGovern, mostly McGovern.

He would describe a contribution as an "insurance premium against McGovern." The premium was all figured out. If a guy had \$1 million net worth, he should give \$10,000. On a scale of \$50 million, he should give \$50,000. And \$100 million, \$250,000.

There was a reward system, too. Some of it was the usual stuff. For \$1,000 they should get a letter from Stans and a Nixon pin. For \$5,000 you get a letter from Stans and a Nixon pin with a diamond in it marked "RMN 72." For \$10,000 a letter from Stans, a diamond pin and a pen and pencil set with a seal and the president's signature embossed on it.

And for \$25,000, in addition to all the rest, the contributor is invited to be a member of a presidential commission. Or maybe make a deal to have a potential business client, a guy you take out golfing, be on a presidential commission.

That really offended me, that he used that before the solicitors right out—do you want to be a member of a presidential commission?

Above that, there were the White House parties. He says, now you may want to take a customer to a White House party with his wife. The customer usually doesn't care; a lot of guys are sophisticated. But, he says, a lot of guys are not and their wives are not, so he says you can get them to go to the White House parties, and the president will know that you gave money. He was really using that.

We were doing our thing, raising money, but we knew that Maury was operating on his own, too. We'd get a call from the Secretary—Maury was always called Mr. Secretary, which was still another thing that he used with guys who'd never met a Cabinet member before—or one of his people to go over and see such and such a guy and get a contribution, a really big one.

And it was often a guy we hadn't heard of or a guy we didn't have down for that much; and for a while we would approach these a little bit fearfully, but it always turned out to be just a matter of going in and picking up the check. Maury had already been at the guy.

A couple of these guys, at least, gave a quarter of a million. One of them, a kind of new guy who had built up the family business and is worth about \$200 million, said Stans came to him and told him that fundraising in the state was in "terrible shape, that the old wealth wasn't giving, that it was a shame, and he had to ask the guy for a lot so that the little guys would have something to look up to."

Maury asked him for \$200,000. The guy told me later he was stunned, just stunned. He'd never given more than about \$5,000 before. But this time he gave it all. He was a true believer in Richard Nixon, and that helped.

Most of the guys Maury handled were not. Most of them were giving between \$10,000 and \$50,000, pretty big money for them, and some of them would give you the check and look up to heaven as if they were saying, "Well, I have just been visited by an angel of Christ's death." They always looked to me like they had been sort of extorted.

Most of them tended to be in fairly big businesses that were fairly heavily regulated by the federal government.

Maury was a cold, hard SOB. He lived on fear. But it got results.

A lot of those guys didn't like him, but even today there is not much guilt about maybe their money going for burglary tools and blackmail and that kind of stuff and that boatload of prostitutes at Miami Beach. They are unhappy with Maury because it turned out this way and was so inefficient and all.

But you take my guy, who was the state chairman and a big businessman and old wealth. He is not worried about whether or not there is any sin committed or any great ethical problem. He would be upset if Maury had run away with a broad and gone to Mexico with the money. But Maury never did that.

And so, consequently, they sort of regard it as—at least the people that I know—something that naughty, dirty work but nevertheless necessary to save the system from McGovern. There isn't any real sense of remorse yet about it, not in any sense. You don't find it here in this state or anywhere else that I know of.

There is a feeling among businessmen now, after a while, that they are starting to say maybe Nixon should resign. But it is more a feeling of resigning because you are in a way not effective any more in running the system and not because you have done something immoral.

I just don't think these guys here are all that pure. I mean a businessman in order to get a lot of money has to do an awful lot of things. He has to be an awfully sharp bidder, and I think he can get insured to this sort of stuff.

Let the issue again be made as dramatic as it was about preserving the system against McGovern—and let Maury back into the room—and they will all be back. They have to.

SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senate Judiciary Committee on Monday next will report two bills providing for the ap-

pointment of a Special Prosecutor, S. 2611, as amended, and S. 2642, as amended. These proposals provide two distinctly different approaches regarding appointment of a Special Prosecutor and I believe the Senate Judiciary Committee, under the leadership of our colleagues, Senators EASTLAND and HRUSKA, is to be commended on providing the Senate with alternatives to this most complex and important issue. Senator JOHN McCLELLAN's work and interest in this legislation before the committee also is to be commended as he and his staff have been most active in obtaining committee consideration of different viewpoints.

S. 2611, introduced by Senators BAYH, HART, and others, provides that the Special Prosecutor be appointed by a panel of judges from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia with removal only by such judges.

S. 2642, which I introduced, provides for appointment of a Special Prosecutor by the Attorney General, with removal by the Attorney General only for neglect of duty, malfeasance in office, or a violation of the act by the Special Prosecutor. Before such removal could occur the Attorney General would have to notify both Houses of Congress 30 days in advance of such removal, stating the reasons for dismissal. The districts courts would have original jurisdiction of any action brought by the Special Prosecutor with respect to removal or attempted removal and could issue an order blocking such removal, if appropriate. Further, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia would have the power to appoint an interim Special Prosecutor if a vacancy did occur, with the provision that the Attorney General then could appoint a successor.

I am of the opinion that S. 2642 is a far superior proposal from both a practical and constitutional viewpoint and have testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee stating my reasons for such a position. Also at that time I stated my intent to file a formal legal brief supporting my position on this issue. That memorandum has been completed and I am today filing it with the Judiciary Committee. I believe, however, due to the importance of the Special Prosecutor issue some of my colleagues may wish to have an opportunity to review it before the hearing transcript is printed; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that Chief Judge John Sirica's letter, dated November 15, 1973, to Chairman EASTLAND regarding this issue, exhibit II; an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Protecting the Special Prosecutor," November 16, 1973; and the statement of Roger C. Cramton, dean, Cornell Law School, before the Senate Judiciary Committee on the Special Prosecutor issue be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF LAW OF U.S. SENATOR ROBERT TAFT, JR., IN SUPPORT OF S. 2642. BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY OF THE U.S. SENATE

On the constitutional considerations in the establishment of a special prosecution office or agency to investigate and prosecute al-