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Congress, before viable alternative programs have been prepared and approved under law.

In the intervening months, I have repeatedly expressed this view to Secretary Romney's successor, Secretary Lynn, and I would like to take this occasion to emphasize it. I believe that we can afford to allow progress in our cities to grind to a halt merely because we do not yet have the final answers or most perfect solutions while our hard-pressed citizens search for decent housing. It seems to me that even in cases where programs admittedly are not going to the root of the problem, they have at least provided the means of continuing the life of the cities and their citizens from day to day, and we must consider that before we arbitrarily suspend them. In the long run, such a start-stop tactic can only cost the Nation more money, not less, and cause more hardship, not less, in all those efforts that must be undertaken to provide decent housing for all our citizens.

One of the groups hardest hit by this policy is our elderly citizens—many of whom can rarely afford to pay for housing or food. Maryland has established a long-standing commitment to provide adequate housing at a reasonable cost. With new housing projects specifically designated for the elderly, we have both local housing authorities and non-profit sponsorship, indefinitely held up under the HUD freeze, their problem is becoming critical.

At this time, Mr. President, with both Houses of Congress considering a variety of anti-impoundment bills, I remind my colleagues how vitally important it is that we not overlook the housing needs of our elderly citizens. In this connection, therefore, I commend the attention of my colleagues to a resolution which was formally adopted by the Maryland State Senate on April 9, 1973, under the sponsorship of State Senators Schweinhaut and Hodges. I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**SENATE RESOLUTION No. 66**

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be printed in the Record, as a part of my remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Pioneer Press editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**MONEY ROLE IN POLITICS**

There are many questions raised by the Watergate investigations. There must be a definite and conclusive answer. This is the expose of dangers to honest government which arise from current methods of financing presidential election campaigns.

The Watergate affair, the editorial notes, illustrates the "dangers to honest Government which arise from current methods of financing presidential election campaigns."

The editorial continues:

"The Watergate affair is not about to go away. Congressmen who have passed legislation which they know to be illegal, are not about to let the matter drop. It is clear that the time has come to face up to the situation. The editorial notes that the Watergate affair is not about to go away. Congressmen who have passed legislation which they know to be illegal, are not about to let the matter drop. It is clear that the time has come to face up to the situation."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Pioneer Press editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**FOOD PRICE CONTROL**

Mr. Young. Mr. President, farmers in general have had their ups and downs—mostly downs, at least during this century. An interesting article entitled "Woodrow Wilson, Herbert Hoover, and Food Price Control" was written by Mr. Tom G. Hall, an historian of history at California State University, and reprinted in the June 27, 1973, edition of the Washington Agricultural Record. Mr. Hall's article concerns wheat shortages and price problems previous to World War I.

It is interesting to note that many of the same tactics were used to hold down prices then as are used now; tactics such as limiting imports and setting maximum prices.

Farmers are caught in an unhappy position of having their markets curbed and price ceilings imposed when shortages occur. Usually these same people who are instrumental in imposing these restrictions on farmers are subjected to any minimum price support legislation that would help keep farmers from going bankrupt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Pioneer Press editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**WOODROW WILSON, HERBERT HOOVER, AND FOOD PRICE CONTROL**

(BY TOM G. HALL)

Complaints about the "high cost of living," suspicions that farmers and food processors were hoarding food, and demands for government action were as familiar to Americans living in the early 1910s as they are to us in the 1970s. Like today, consumers were responding to inflated food costs. From 1914 to 1916, prices rose 30 percent.

But after 1914 they became erratic and then suddenly shot up by 46 percent between July 1916 and April 1917, rising another 45 percent by December.

By the time the United States went to war in April 1917 the country faced a food crisis. The Watergate affair had been the most momentous expansion of foreign demand had so reduced domestic reserves that it was doubtful whether the country could supply the Allies. At the same time, wheat discontent over prices threatened the war effort and President Woodrow Wilson's administration.

President Wilson had to stabilize prices and federal government agencies responded by singling out wheat for special consideration, for the 1916 and 1917 grain harvests were

President Mondale's recommendation for reform, which agrees with the views of numerous others in both major parties, is for severely limiting the size of individual contributions while simultaneously increasing the extent of public funds for national campaigns.

Congress has often considered this approach in the past, but has not agreed on recommendations. The combination of increasing contributions to campaigns, combined with other unsavory funding episodes of the past, should be sufficient to bring about enactment of legislation strong enough to assure future presidential campaigns a healthier financial atmosphere. No other single reform would do more to protect the integrity of the national political system.