

UNITED STATES

U.S. Congress.



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 19

JULY 13, 1973 TO JULY 19, 1973

(PAGES 23745 TO 25050)

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 again: I do not 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 elder citizens—many of whom can barely afford to pay for housing of any kind, and for whom Congress has established a long-standing commitment to provide adequate housing at a reasonable cost. With new housing projects specifically designated for the elderly, under 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 provisions which could affect this HUD freeze, I would like to remind my colleagues how crucially important it is that we not overlook the housing needs of our elder citizens. In this connection, therefore, I commend to the attention of my colleagues 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

Senate Resolution on behalf of the senior citizens of Maryland, recognizing their need for proper housing; and its dissatisfaction of the Federal Administration's policy of impoundment of funds for housing programs designed to meet the need of elderly citizens

Whereas, The senior citizens of this State have been for many years productive and participating members of our society, contributing to the well-being of our State; and

Whereas, Great numbers of our senior citizens find it increasingly difficult, if not impossible, to live in this great State of Maryland on a fixed income through this period of inflation; and

Whereas, There are specific housing programs designated for the elderly, under local Housing Authorities and non-profit sponsorship; and

Whereas, The need for such housing has been demonstrated time and time again; and

Whereas, In Montgomery County alone over 700 elderly persons await decent, safe, and sanitary housing at a price they can

afford with a similar need existing in every area of the State; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Maryland, That the Senate expresses its dissatisfaction of the Federal Administration's policy of impoundment of funds for housing programs designed to meet the need of elderly citizens for decent housing and of the freeze on the acquisition and construction of dwelling units by local Public Housing Authorities; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the entire Maryland Delegation in the Congress of the United States.

PUBLIC FINANCING OF PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the July 16 St. Paul Pioneer Press contained an excellent article discussing the need for public financing of Presidential 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 exposures 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.

I could not agree more. I shall, therefore, introduce legislation next week that will provide for public financing of Presidential campaigns, including both primaries and the general election. This legislation will build on the \$1 checkoff system of financing Presidential general elections—which is already in the law—and will permit modest private contributions to supplement public funds.

I ask unanimous consent that the full 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

Many questions raised by the Watergate investigations must naturally be left unanswered pending further developments, but there is one aspect of the scandals which already is definite and conclusive. This is the expose of dangers to honest government which arise from current methods of financing presidential election campaigns.

While Watergate has produced evidence of illegal and unethical fund collections by President Nixon's reelection organization, such abuses are not limited to one political party. The temptation to barter political favors for cash contributions is built into the system.

Sen. Walter Mondale of Minnesota, an advocate of public campaign financing, made this point in a talk to the Texas AFL-CIO convention last week. Watergate revelations, he said, "have effectively dramatized just how corrupting big money is in the political process." But he added: "My own (Democratic) party's record of political fund raising—while never in the same league as the Republicans in 1972—has not always been as open and forthright as I would like it to have been. The chief fault lies in the system itself, a system which forces candidates to rely on excessively large contributions if they hope to compete effectively in a modern presidential campaign."

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 providing substantial public funds for national campaigns.

Congress has often considered this approach in the past, but has not agreed on effective action. The Watergate exposures, 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.

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 assistant professor 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 opposed to any minimum price support legislation that would help keep farmers from going bankrupt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hall's article "Woodrow Wilson, Herbert Hoover, and Food Price Control," as reprinted in the Washington Agricultural Record of June 27, 1973, on wheat supplies and prices be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article 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 twentieth-century as they are to us in the 1970's. Like today, consumers were responding to inflated food costs. From 1900 to 1914 prices increased moderately. 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. Poor harvests in 1916 coupled with enormously expanded foreign demand had so reduced domestic reserves that it was doubtful whether the country could supply the Allies. At the same time, civilian discontent over prices threatened the war effort and President Woodrow Wilson's administration.

President Wilson had to stabilize prices and expand production. In doing so he singled out wheat for special consideration, for the 1916 and 1917 grain harvests were