

Democratic party guidelines: full role for blacks?



Perspective

THE CHANGE of emphasis from street protest to political participation at all levels of government, was the unique black response in the 1970s to the developments and achievements of the 1960s.

Within this context it is clear that 1973 was the year of the black mayor, and indications are that in the 1974 congressional elections blacks will attempt to significantly influence the decision over who comes to the House and who stays home. If the 1974 prediction comes true, and its realization is based upon a number of important assumptions, it will provide yet another sign of a turning point in the civil rights movement. It will indicate that for us, politics and political participation, are more than clubhouse clichés. They are raw and elementary exercises in the art of survival. They offer what may be a last chance—but perhaps the most promising chance—to make the system work for us.

The latest JCPS survey shows that there are 107 black mayors in 22 states, representing towns as small as Taft, Oklahoma, and as large as Los Angeles. Ten of the nation's 153 largest cities, including five of the top 50, are now governed by black chief executives.

This new development is significant for several reasons. It reflects the continuing increase in black elected officials, now numbering almost 3,000. It also says that blacks can be elected in areas which are not predominantly black. It also demonstrates yet another way of gaining a powerful voice on the national scene.

But what about the future? A number of important elections will occur this year, and black candidates will compete in quite a few of them. It is particularly encouraging that to date at least four candidates are on record to seek statewide office in California, Ohio, and Wisconsin. Excluding judgeships, there are only three blacks in the country who were elected to statewide office. They are U.S. Senator Edward Brooke (R—Mass.), California Superintendent of Public Instruction Wilson C. Riles and Michigan Secretary of State Richard H. Austin.

However, as the thrust toward greater political par-

ticipation continues, 1974 looms as the year of congressional district impact.

JCPS SURVEYS show that blacks comprise 25 per cent or more of the population in 58 congressional districts, only 16 of which are now represented by blacks. Even where the population is now sufficient to elect black candidates, it is large enough to become a balance of power capable of influencing not only campaign agendas but the outcome of elections involving white candidates. This balance of power becomes increasingly important as Watergate spurs disenchantment among white voters.

JCPS research also shows that in 93 of the 435 congressional districts, 15 per cent or more of the families have incomes below the poverty level. These are black, white, Puerto Rican, and Chicano families with a common interest in a variety of social and economic policies and programs. The political implications of their economic condition have been apparent for some time. The late George Wiley formed the Movement for Economic Justice to foster coalitions based on economic interests. Senator Brooke speaks often and persuasively about the need to develop "free-floating coalitions" across racial lines to affect political decisions and public policies.

Whether this congressional district potential can be realized and whether the coalitions will in fact occur are major challenges for black and white leaders. Ways must be found to turn voters on to political participation the way they were turned on to non-violent protest in the 60s. Ways must be found to expand the education and registration of minority voters and to motivate them to actually vote when the time comes. If this is done, it will represent a new turning point in the civil rights struggle.

Demonstrating political potential is a lot like using brinkmanship. It is a meaningless gesture if we are not fully prepared to follow through, no matter how great the sacrifice

Eddie N. Williams
President

FOCUS

Copyright © 1974 Joint Center for Political Studies
The monthly newsletter of the **Joint Center for Political Studies**, 1426 H Street N.W., Suite 926 Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 638-4477 JCPS, sponsored by Howard University and the Metropolitan Applied Research Center, is a private, non-profit and non-partisan organization which provides research, education, technical assistance and information for the nation's minority elected officials. JCPS is funded by foundations, other organizations, and private gifts. Contributions are tax exempt.

president: Eddie N. Williams
director of governmental affairs: Clarence L. Townes, Jr.
director of research: Herrington J. Bryce
director of administration: Francis Chaney
director of public affairs: John H. Britton, Jr.
director of special projects: John Dean
Focus editor: David L. Aiken

Board of Governors

Louis E. Martin, Chairman — Vice President and Editorial Director, Sengstacke Publications, Chicago
Andrew Billingsley — Vice President for Academic Affairs, Howard University, Washington, D.C.
Hon. Edward W. Brooke — U.S. Senator from Massachusetts
James E. Cheek — President, Howard University, Washington, D.C.
Kenneth B. Clark — President, Metropolitan Applied Research Center, Inc. (MARC), New York
Eleanor Farrar, Secretary — Vice President and Washington Office Director, MARC, Washington, D.C.
Wendell Freeland, Esq., Pittsburgh

Drive for desegregation in new stage

ANOTHER STAGE in the drive for the desegregation of public schools has begun.

For years it has been apparent that segregated schools not only resulted from explicit policies and decisions of educational authorities, (*de jure* segregation), but also reflected segregated housing patterns and other manifestations of a racist society (*de facto* segregation). The Supreme Court, however, has studiously avoided ruling on the issue of what constitutes *de facto* segregation and on whether or not segregation thus caused was unconstitutional and subject to the same remedies applied to *de jure* segregation.

But on January 28, 1974, U.S. District Court Judge Jack B. Weinstein issued a desegregation decision which not only acknowledged the relationship between housing patterns and racial imbalance in the schools but also ordered city, state and federal housing authorities to cooperate in the desegregation efforts.

The judge ruled that the school in question "*can be characterized as reflecting neither de facto nor de jure segregation. Rather it reflects both these characteristics. Demographic trends have been extenuated by government choices. . . . Failure to take available steps to reverse segregative tendencies has made a bad situation worse.*"

He also stated that he believed that no effective and lasting remedy is possible without the participation of the various housing authorities.

It must be assumed that the order, which also includes a number of other innovations, will be appealed and that a final decision by the Supreme Court lies somewhere in the future. Meanwhile, however, the door has been opened to a more comprehensive approach to school desegregation.

ANOTHER CASE, which will be decided by the Supreme Court this spring, also raises the possibility of a different remedy for segregated school systems. The issue in the so-called Detroit case is whether a state can be required to integrate its schools across district lines in order to achieve desegregation. A decision to that effect by a District Court in Detroit was upheld by the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, which declared that "district lines are simply matters of political convenience and cannot be used to deny constitutional rights."

The importance of this case is that Detroit is a typical urban center, with a rapidly growing proportion of non-white students, surrounded by predominantly white school districts. Substantial school integration in these areas can only be accomplished through a metropolitan solution, merging the city schools with those of some of the surrounding rural or suburban territories.

THE OUTCOME of the Detroit case appears particularly uncertain, because in the only other metropolitan desegregation case to reach the high court, involving Richmond, Va., no definitive decision was issued. Because Justice Lewis Powell abstained, the Supreme Court split, four to four. This left intact a

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals decision barring the merger of Richmond schools with the schools of two neighboring counties.

The appeals court had reversed an earlier school merger decision by District Judge Robert R. Merhige of Richmond on the ground that a federal court did not have the power "to compel one of the states of the union to restructure its internal government for the purpose of achieving balance in the assignment of pupils to the public schools [unless there was] invidious discrimination in the establishment or maintenance of local governmental units. . . ." The appellate court decided that this was not the case in Richmond and that therefore no constitutional rights were being violated.

In the Detroit case, however, the district court did find a violation of constitutional rights and this finding was upheld by the Court of Appeals. Thus it is difficult to anticipate what the Supreme Court will do now.

However, even if the decision rejects a metropolitan approach, Northern cities will have to find the means of desegregating their school systems. This was affirmed in the case of the Denver, Colorado, school system, the first major Northern school case to reach the Supreme Court.

The court found that even though the city had no history of statutory or other officially professed segregation, various techniques had been used by school officials in Denver to maintain racial segregation in one section of the city. This determination would, in any case, require action leading to the desegregation of the schools concerned.

What is most important about the Denver decision, however, is that the Supreme Court also ruled that "a finding of intentionally segregative school board actions in a meaningful portion of a school system, as in this case, creates a presumption that other segregated schooling within the system is not adventitious [accidental]." By a vote of seven to one, the case was sent back to federal district court for resolution with the requirement that unless the school board could prove that it did *not* deliberately segregate students by race in drawing school boundaries and in other actions, it would have to desegregate the entire school system.

Once again, the Supreme Court did not touch the issue of the constitutionality of *de facto* segregation. Instead, it tied its decision in support of desegregation to deliberate acts by the governmental body responsible for the schools. Judge Weinstein's decision in Brooklyn now raises the question of to what extent other governmental institutions whose programs and policies support segregated school systems can be required to alter their policies. How this question will eventually be answered remains to be seen. Meanwhile the courts continue to be the most effective force in the drive to eradicate racism from public schools — North and South.

Eleanor Farrar

Mrs. Farrar is director of the Washington office of Metropolitan Applied Research Center.

Democratic party guidelines: full role for blacks

By Ronald Walters

Dr. Walters, chairman of the political science department at Howard University, has maintained close contact with the Delegate Selection Commission of the Democratic National Committee as it has designed the new mechanism for ensuring minority participation in party affairs.

THE FUTURE of black political participation within the Democratic party may well be decided between now and next January.

The issue has been raised as a result of the defeat of Sen. George McGovern's presidential candidacy and the subsequent attempt of the "regular" wing of the party to eliminate what it alleges to be quotas for blacks, women and other minorities. It was the "quotas" in the 1972 delegate selection rules, this wing felt, that was one of the factors that resulted in a temporary ascendance of the "new politics" reform wing.

In response to this pressure from the regulars, the Democratic National Committee established a special commission, chaired by Baltimore City Councilwoman Barbara Mikulski, to design new ground rules for selection of delegates to the party's national convention.

The 74 members of the commission, including 10 blacks, held several stormy sessions which dramatized the depth of the conflict within the party on this issue. Nevertheless, they reached agreement last October.

Under the commission's recommendations, 1972 language was eliminated which called for state delegations to "encourage minority group participation, including representation of minority groups on the national convention delegation in reasonable relationship to the group's presence in the population of the state."

The commission report, however, also reaffirmed a commitment to an "open party," pledged itself to a policy of non-discrimination in all party affairs, including delegate selection, and called for state parties to implement "affirmative action programs" in an effort to encourage minority participation. These programs will be monitored by a new Compliance Review Commission (CRC) of the Democratic National Committee.

The commission's recommendations were adopted with only a few changes at a March 1 meeting of the Democratic National Committee.

ATTENTION HAS focused on the new commission, which will have a decisive role in the new procedures.

Of the commission's 17 members, five were to be appointed by the chairman of the national committee, Robert Strauss, five by Mrs. Mikulski, and one each by the Senate and House majority leaders, the chairman of the Democratic Governor's Caucus, and the president of the National Association of Democratic State Chairmen. In addition, Mrs. Mikulski and her two vice-chairpersons will automatically have seats on the new commission, and the Democratic mayors have asked to select one member.

The National Committee expanded the membership of the CRC to 25, of whom six will be black.

In the words of the Mikulski commission report, the CRC will "administer and enforce affirmative action requirements for the national and state Democratic parties; review affirmative action and delegate selection plans submitted by state parties and approve or recommend changes in such plans; conduct periodic evaluations and provide technical assistance to state parties on affirmative action and delegate selection implementation; hear and recommend solutions to affirmative action complaints unresolved by appropriate state party bodies; and serve as a preliminary credentials committee to hear delegate challenges and propose remedies."

THIS GIVES the CRC a broad mandate covering generally the behavior and structure of state parties and specifically the process of delegate selection.

Each state party must file an affirmative action plan by December 15, 1974, and begin to implement it by March 15, 1975. In addition, each state party must submit a delegate selection plan by July 1, 1975. Before it submits each plan, the state party must provide an opportunity for public comment, and must include minority views in its submission.

The CRC must decide whether to approve these plans within 60 days after it receives each one.

While these processes are going on, the party is also preparing for a mid-term convention this December in Kansas City, Mo., to enact a charter for party structure and procedures. Blacks should now be participating in the selection of delegates to that convention to make sure they are well represented.

Any 15 members of a state party can file a challenge with the CRC if they feel the state party has failed to implement its affirmative action program. Such a challenge can be filed any time up to 30 days before the beginning of the state delegate selection process, which begins July 1, 1975. This procedure also covers challenges to the right of a state party to sponsor a delegation.

Black Democrats may therefore find it in their interest to organize a 15-person task force to monitor implementation of their state's affirmative action plan, without waiting for a specific violation to occur. This would not only put them in a position to file a complaint quickly should such a violation occur, but might also discourage any violations.

A procedure has also been established to challenge the make-up of a delegation, if a violation of an approved delegate selection plan has occurred. The challenge first goes to the appropriate state party body, which must act on it within 21 days. An appeal can then be made to the CRC within 10 days after the state body's decision.

This is a sophisticated process, and it is clear that it will require the most intensive scrutiny at the state level for it to work in favor of black participation.

IN EFFECT, what the Democratic party has done is take its old system of "quotas" or "goals" — which was similar to quota plans for hiring of minorities — and has de-emphasized it in favor of "negotiated" solutions

As in the case of hiring plans, however, the success of such solutions depends on two things: what each side will accept, and whether the people in strategic positions to manage the negotiations are sympathetic to one side or another.

But will the change from a system in which minority participation was assured to one in which that participation will be subject to negotiation be as beneficial to blacks who want to participate in the Democratic party? It is highly questionable.

Nevertheless, the changes have already been made, so black Democrats really have little choice but to try to make the new system work for them.

The success of the new system will depend on whether all groups within the party increase their level of participation. Blacks and other minority groups must be vigilant as state parties establish their affirmative action and delegate selection plans and must develop their own positions on the contents of these plans. They must seek to find ways to place blacks and other minorities in strategic positions in the state parties, and within the national administrative structure of the CRC.

BLACKS MUST also push for an effective voice on the Compliance Review Commission itself. Mrs. Mikulski's list of nominees, which was altered somewhat after party regulars complained it was weighted toward the "new politics" wing, includes one black person, Mrs. Arie Taylor, a Colorado State legislator. Mayor Richard Hatcher of Gary, Indiana, will also sit on the commission since he was a vice chairperson of the Mikulski commission.

But for blacks to have a truly influential position on the CRC, one in which they would hold the balance of power between the regular and reform wings, they would probably have to have at least five seats on a 17-person commission, and even more if the size of the commission were expanded. Mayor Hatcher has suggested to Strauss that there should be five blacks out of 17, given the strength of black support for the Democratic ticket in 1972 and their sensitivity to questions of equal participation.

Black participation on the CRC is especially important because the commission not only oversees implementation of rules for fair representation of minorities, but also will function as a credentials committee, until just before the national convention, when it will pass on any unresolved questions to a functioning credentials committee of the convention.

This will allow any debates over the seating of a delegation to be heard in a forum removed from the immediate convention setting. Such challenges as the one raised in 1964 by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party can now be heard in a more thorough manner.

At the same time, it may require a sizeable new bureaucracy within the national party to handle complaints and challenges. Many will undoubtedly come from Reform Democrats struggling to regain the status they held in 1972, while the Regulars try to keep the control they now have. But since complaints will come from black party members about inequities in the struc-

ture or function of state party affairs, a black person should be appointed at the upper level of the administrative structure of the CRC sensitive to such issues.

THREE OTHER FACTORS are important as blacks move to increase their participation in Democratic affairs. They are:

1) The Kansas City charter conference will discuss the issue of proportional representation in the delegate selection process for supporters of each presidential candidate. The procedures approved by the National Committee allow proportional representation for a candidate's supporters if they amount to as least 15 per cent of the number of delegates in a given precinct, congressional district or other level. They point out that this sort of feature made it possible for Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm to come to the 1972 convention with some delegate strength.

2) State laws regulating political parties may interfere with implementation of some steps of the restructuring of state party operations called for by the Mikulski report. This could occur especially with laws on voter registration and party primaries. The report recognized this, and called for state parties to try to change state law where necessary to conform to the charter.

Some state legislators, however, may attempt to pass legislation or obtain state court action to block or violate party charter regulations. Such attempts should be cause for challenges by local groups or possibly sanctions by the national party.

3) Another threat to the reforms has arisen — the possibility that party conservatives will challenge the affirmative action program concept at the Kansas City charter convention. Blacks should be prepared for such a challenge.

If past programs of "affirmative action" are any guide, the party machinery now being established will be only as effective as the sanctions that might be levied against those who violate it.

The ultimate sanction against a state delegation is to refuse to seat it at the national convention, but this sanction can be applied only once every four years. Other sanctions must be applied at the time state parties or individuals violate procedures of equal participation.

These could include national party efforts to influence the source of state campaign funds, or to establish some clear control by the national over state party operations. The proposed charter which will be considered in December vaguely provides for such sanctions, but they should be clearly defined and made substantive if the new structure is to meaningfully expand and is to safeguard the exercise of political rights by blacks within the party framework.

A clear alternative to ineffective sanctions might be that if black Democrats find the new structure unworkable, they may reconsider their entire relationship to the party. They might even seek another framework for political participation where equality and inclusion are not issues.

Blacks seek statewide offices

BLACKS IN THREE STATES HAVE entered races for offices elected on a statewide basis.

In California, State Sen. Mervyn M. Dymally seeks the Democratic nomination for lieutenant governor. He has been in the legislature since 1962, representing a district of Los Angeles in the senate since 1966. The primary will be held this June.

In Ohio, Akron City Councilman James R. Williams is running for lieutenant governor in the May Democratic primary. And in Wisconsin, Eugene Parks, an alderman from Madison, has made a bid for the Democratic nomination for secretary of state.

Seeking the Republican nomination for U.S. Senate in California is James E. (Johnny) Johnson, a conservative from Orange County. He recently resigned as assistant secretary of the Navy and is a former U.S. Civil Service commissioner. If nominated, he would oppose Democratic Senator Alan Cranston, who seeks his second term.

At present, Michigan Secretary of State Richard H. Austin and California Superintendent of Public Instruction Wilson Riles are the only blacks in elected executive office in state governments, and Edward W. Brooke (R—Mass.) is the only black United States senator. C. Delores Tucker, Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, holds an appointive office.

Voting rights violations charges

THREE BOROUGHES of New York City and the small town of Sandersville, Ga., are involved in charges of violations of the voting rights of minorities.

The boroughs of Manhattan, Brooklyn and the Bronx have come under the jurisdiction of the Justice Department, under provisions of the Voting Rights Act. Although the Act has in the past applied primarily to areas of the South, it was written to cover any county in which fewer than half of the potential voters participated in the most recent presidential election, and which in the past used a literacy test or some other device to screen potential voters.

A 1969 study estimated that in some sections of these three boroughs with heavy black and Puerto Rican populations, as few as 35 per cent of voting age residents were registered. Until the Voting Rights Act was passed in 1965, an English literacy test was required for those who did not have a sixth grade education.

The Voting Rights Act was applied to the three boroughs by the U.S. District Court in Washington, in a suit brought by the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. As a result, it is expected that district lines for congressional and state legislative seats will be redrawn. It has been speculated that at least one more black or Puerto Rican may be sent to Congress from these boroughs and as many as nine blacks or Puerto Ricans may win state legislative seats under potential new districting.

The area covered takes in 2.2 million black and Puerto Rican voters, but has only one Puerto Rican and two black Congress members, one Puerto Rican and three black state senators, and three Puerto Rican and nine black state assemblymen.

IN SANDERSVILLE, a town of 5,400 in southeast central Georgia which is nearly evenly divided between blacks and whites, all seven black candidates for town office were defeated by whites in last December's election. The blacks included a candidate for mayor and three incumbent councilmen.

Now a suit has been filed in federal district court in Macon, Ga., charging that many blacks were secretly purged from the voter roles and not given an opportunity to re-register, and that several blacks who asked for absentee ballots were not given them.

Mrs. Bernice Turner, a lawyer in Macon representing the five black voters who are acting as plaintiffs in the suit, said a council-appointed committee purged the voter roles with no apparent official rules or guidelines. In some cases, she said, one committee member purged dozens of voters without telling the other committee members or letting them vote on it. The committee had two black and two white members.

More and more black mayors

AT LAST COUNT, as of the end of February, the total of black mayors currently in office in the United States had reached 107, according to a tally by the research office of the Joint Center for Political Studies.

A year ago, at the time the 1973 *Roster of Black Elected Officials* was compiled, the count stood at 82.

In the last few months, black mayors have been chosen in such cities as Boulder, Colo., where Penfield Tate was chosen from among the members of the city council; Pontiac, Mich., where Wallace Holland was elected by voters last fall, and New Brunswick, N.J., where former council president Aldridge B. Cooper became mayor when the former mayor resigned.

Errata — An article on the National Black Caucus of Local Elected Officials in the January *Focus* stated that the speech by Rep. Ronald Dellums to the 1973 Congress of Cities was the first such speech by a black. This is incorrect. Kenneth B. Clark, president of the Metropolitan Applied Research Center, was keynote speaker in 1966, Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley, then a councilman, was keynoter in 1972, and other blacks have given major speeches, according to National League of Cities Executive Vice President Allen E. Pritchard, Jr.

In the table which appeared in the February *Focus* supplement on potential influence of low income voters in congressional districts, a typographical error resulted in an incorrect figure for the median family income of blacks in Alabama. The correct figure is \$4047, not \$8047. Also, double asterisks should have appeared next to the names of Reps. Cardiss Collins of Illinois and Louis Stokes of Ohio to indicate that they are black members of Congress.

The federal budget and the blacks

THE PRESIDENT HAS proposed a federal budget for fiscal year 1975 (beginning July 1, 1974) of \$304.4 billion. This is an increase of nearly \$30 billion over the current budget.

But don't look for many increases in programs to benefit blacks and other minorities. Much of the increase simply covers inflation, especially for programs over which neither the President nor Congress have any real budget control. These include Social Security, veterans' benefits, unemployment compensation, Medicare, and highway trust funds. They add up to about \$224 billion in the proposed budget. Inflation will also cut heavily into money distributed under the revenue sharing program.

A total of \$87.7 billion is earmarked for defense, including both controllable and uncontrollable expenditures. This is an increase of \$7.1 billion from the current fiscal year.

This leaves only \$26 billion for controllable expenditures on domestic programs. But there seems to be a new conciliatory mood, probably precipitated by the administration's Watergate troubles, compared to last year's "take it or leave it" budget slashing strategy. Black elected officials can take advantage of this mood by aggressively seeking both money already in the pipeline and previously impounded money that has recently been released, as well as newly budgeted program money.

FOLLOWING ARE highlights of the controllable areas of the proposed fiscal year 1975 budget of greatest interest to blacks and other minorities. Where possible, the figures include comparisons to the current level of funding, but analysis is often difficult because of "budget cosmetics." For example, about \$1.2 billion in money for Health, Education and Welfare programs was impounded from the fiscal year 1974 budget, then released after a series of adverse court decisions, and Congress allocated about \$1.1 billion for Labor and HEW, in fiscal year 1974, that the administration had not requested. Portions of this old money have been deceptively included in the budget for health programs in fiscal year 1975.

Manpower — About \$4.064 billion is proposed for all programs, about the same as the current fiscal year but a drop from the \$5 billion spent in fiscal year 1973. Most of this reduction of almost \$1 billion is caused by the demise of the Emergency Employment Act (EEA) program, which provided public service jobs for nearly 200,000 persons.

About \$1.7 billion is proposed under Title I and Title II of the new Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. Part of this money will be distributed under a form of revenue sharing to state and local governments for use as they see fit (Title I). About \$350 million of the \$1.7 billion is reserved specifically for public service jobs (Title II). In addition, \$381 million is earmarked for national training programs and program support (Titles II, IV and V).

The Work Incentive Program (WIN) is slated for \$280 million, about \$190 million directed to placement and

training activities. This is \$60 million less than the current year, but unspent money from this year will carry over to next year.

Summer Youth Employment programs are budgeted at a nominal level — about \$300 million, the same as the current year. Of the current year's figure, about \$91 million is money left over from fiscal year 1973. A variety of smaller programs, such as vocational rehabilitation and the Federal-State Employment Service, are budgeted at their current levels.

Housing and community development — Total outlays for the Department of Housing and Urban Development are projected at \$5.68 billion for next fiscal year, not much more than the estimated \$5.45 billion for the current year.

Much of the budget is built on the assumption that the administration's proposed "Better Communities Act," which would consolidate a number of community development programs into a form of special revenue sharing, will be in place by the beginning of the 1975 fiscal year. Congressional opposition makes this unlikely. About \$2.3 billion is budgeted for programs under the proposed Better Communities Act — about the same as appeared in the budget three years ago when the BCA was first proposed, despite subsequent inflation.

Housing programs which were frozen a year ago will remain frozen. The only program in the budget to provide low- and moderate-income housing is a revised Section 23 leased housing program. It would authorize about 300,000 units — 225,000 of them new, the remainder existing structures. However, the homebuilding industry reports little interest in this program, and the projected units are likely to stay where they are — on paper. Revised guidelines for this program have only recently been circulated for comment, and no homes have yet been built under them.

Operating subsidies for public housing authorities are proposed to be \$400 million, about \$50 million above the current fiscal year.

Credit for rural housing programs will amount to about \$2.1 billion in fiscal year 1975. This is about the same as in the current year, but there will be greater emphasis on the purchase, repair or rehabilitation of existing units and less construction on of new units. Many of the poorest families cannot afford even the one per cent interest rate on new housing.

Health — A proposed National Health Insurance Plan, which would include a privately financed government assurance program, may cost as much as \$5.8 billion during its first year. But it is not likely to be in force before fiscal year 1976, so will have little impact on the 1975 fiscal budget.

The 1975 budget calls for reducing or eliminating several traditional public health programs, such as regional medical programs, Hill-Burton hospital construction, and comprehensive health services delivery systems. The administration would consolidate them

Continued on page 8

Budget

Continued from page 7

and spend only \$75 million on the new package, compared to the present total spending level of \$304 million.

Institutional support for nursing schools would be cut from \$58 million to \$20 million, and aid to nursing students would drop from \$57 million to \$25 million. The administration argues that nursing students can expect higher earnings, but anticipated income does nothing to pay for tuition now. Many black and minority nurses may be hurt by these cuts.

OEO and economic development — As expected, the administration has not requested a renewal of authority for the Office of Economic Opportunity. Funding of community action agencies would be left up to the states. Other OEO programs would be shifted to other federal agencies. About \$33 million is requested for the phase-out and transfer operation. The administration failed to terminate the Economic Development Administration last year; under the 1975 budget, funds for its long-range economic development aid would be cut by one-third, and multi-state commissions would lose about \$7 million.

Education — Aid to school systems undergoing desegregation would be slashed drastically. It is now funded at \$234 million, under the Emergency School Assistance Act. When that act expires at the end of this fiscal year, the administration proposes to replace it with new legislation aimed at specific projects in selected districts, with a budget of only \$75 million.

A variety of current elementary and secondary education programs would be consolidated into a few broad categories — the third year the administration has sought a form of educational block grants. At the same time, education programs would be "forward funded," so that school systems would know how much money would be available well before the start of each school year.

Funds for programs for disadvantaged students

would go up slightly — an increase of \$166 million for fiscal year 1975, and a further increase of \$15 million for the following fiscal year under the "forward funding" plan.

Most other programs would either stay at current levels or be cut slightly. Some serious cuts, however, would be made in teacher training (from \$97 million to \$46 million), the Follow Through program for lower elementary grades (from \$41 million to \$35 million), and bilingual education (from \$50 million to \$35 million). Funds for ethnic heritage studies, now budgeted at \$2.4 million, would be ended. Career education funds would go from zero to \$10 million.

Food stamps — This program would be shifted from the Agriculture Department to HEW, and outlays will rise from \$900 million to \$3.9 billion to cover increases in eligible recipients and rising food prices.

Income maintenance — Total spending for such programs as social security, other retirement programs, unemployment insurance and welfare will go up by \$15 billion, to about \$100 billion. This is due to the new Supplemental Security Income plan for the aged and disabled; growth in the number of eligible recipients, and inflation. The administration is expected to submit in April a guaranteed income program, which would substitute a cash payment system for existing welfare programs. If enacted, it would not take effect before July 1, 1976.

Further reading — *Citizens Guide to the Federal Budget*, published by Coalition for Human Needs, 2030 M Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. *The Federal Budget and the Cities*, published by National League of Cities/U.S. Conference of Mayors, 1620 Eye Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006. \$8.00 per copy.

— Barbara Williams

Ms. Williams, a lawyer, is executive director of the Coalition for Human Needs, composed of 100 diverse national groups concerned with federal budget priorities.

FOCUS

ADDRESS
CORRECTION
REQUESTED

JOINT CENTER FOR POLITICAL STUDIES

SUITE 926 • WOODWARD BUILDING • 1426 H STREET, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D C 20005 • (202) 638-4477

NOTICE TO READERS: Please notify Focus of any change of address or title. YOU MUST INCLUDE YOUR OLD ADDRESS AND ZIP CODE along with your new address and zip code. No change can be made without this information.

FIRST-CLASS MAIL
U.S. POSTAGE
1 Ounce PAID
8 cents
PERMIT No 44958
Washington D C

FIRST-CLASS MAIL