

Weakened with smoke inhalation and the intense heat, Tarrant was further disoriented because of his failure to rouse Mr. Dean. Yet he managed to pull Miss Jacob over Mr. Dean and tried to put her over his shoulder. Twice she slipped from his grasp. When he finally had a hold on her, he panicked with the thought that he would not be able to get through the living room. But persons outside had managed to remove furniture and clear the opening to the bedroom door. Tarrant then dragged Miss Jacob 3 feet out the door.

After taking several deep breaths, Tarrant returned to get Dean who by then was partially revived. Tarrant emerged with Dean less than 1 minute after having entered the trailer. About 10 seconds later an explosion of flames filled the bedroom, and firemen arrived 3 minutes later.

The fire was brought under control in 2 minutes, but the trailer had been gutted. Miss Jacob, with first and second degree burns over 10 percent of her body, was hospitalized for 2 weeks while Dean required treatment for second-degree burns only.

These two people may well not be alive today were it not for the heroic efforts of John R. Tarrant. He is a very special person: for, as Laurence Sterne wrote, "The best hearts are ever the bravest."

RURAL HOUSING THREATENED

HON. BOB BERGLAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. BERGLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Farmers Home Administration Bulletin No. 4816(440) dated December 13, 1973 allocated fiscal year 1974 funds among the various housing programs. Both the allocation between "existing" and "new" dwellings and the very high reserves are without precedent. As a Member of Congress representing a congressional district which has much to gain or much to lose from the allocation of these funds for housing, I would like an explanation for the allocations and assurance that they will not result in slowing down the rural housing program or constitute a form of impoundment.

There has been a significant change in the Farmers Home Administration housing program and for a good summary of these changes and the problems these changes pose, I recommend the following article by Kenneth Harney. The article which appeared in the January 12 Washington Post and is entitled "Housing Policy Seen on New Tack" follows:

EVEN SUBSIDIES POSSIBLE: HOUSING POLICY SEEN ON NEW TACK
(By Kenneth Harney)

The U.S. housing industry—in a depressed mood for months over high interest rates, a credit crunch, environmental restrictions and energy—is puzzled over some contradictory signals coming from the Nixon administration.

On the one hand there are indications that the White House finally is listening to builders' warnings that a serious slump in

housing could speed the country towards a recession. In meetings with representatives of the National Association of Home Builders and other trade groups, White House budget and domestic policy leaders have begun putting out the word: We're concerned. We don't want to see you belly up.

On the other hand, builders have just been hit with a budget axe in an area they thought would be one of 1974's few bright spots: rural housing.

Without the usual public announcement that accompanies a significant policy change the Farmers Home Administration informed its 1,750 field offices before Christmas that most of the \$1.1 billion Congress appropriated for low and moderate income single family housing this year won't be spent on construction of new units. \$350 million of it, said an internal memorandum issued by the agency, is being placed in "reserve." Another \$400 million is being set aside for rehabilitation and purchase of existing rural housing units one year or older. The remaining \$350 million is for new housing. What upsets builders is that the Farmers Home Administration traditionally has spent the bulk of its available loan funds for construction of new units—and almost no one believes it can spend anywhere near \$400 million on rehab and existing housing by the fiscal year-end deadline, June 30.

The combination of the \$350 million "reserves" and the \$400 million that can't all be spent amounts to a "1974-style impoundment of a big chunk of the subsidy appropriations," says the head of one rural housing group in Washington.

"It's much subtler than the 1973 moratorium," he added. "They give you a dead end rather than a stop sign. Maybe they've gotten a new lawyer."

Even James R. Neville, who was an Assistant Administration at Farmers Home from 1971 until his retirement Dec. 31, concedes that it will be difficult to spend all the subsidy money because "there simply isn't a rehab industry out there," and because the field offices aren't geared up for such a big switch.

What's going on here? Does the Nixon administration spokesman you can get hold of, housing is high on the agenda. But housing on the administration's terms, not necessarily on the home builders'.

One of the White House Office of Management and budget's housing specialists, Ronald Landis, says for example that "no one should have been surprised" by FHA's new emphasis in existing housing and rehabilitation.

"Anyone who read the President's September (1973) housing message to Congress would have known that he said the policy henceforth would be to reach and serve more lower income families through better use of existing units."

"Look," said a high official at the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), "we spent eight months last year (during the moratorium on subsidized programs) showing why the old construction-oriented programs were bad, and indicating where we should put our money from now on."

The Administration, he said, is really worried about the plight of home builders, especially during the first two quarters of 1974, when the annual housing starts rate may drop to 1.3 million units, 40 per cent below 1972's high rate.

"But we're not going to throw out our principles in trying to bail them out. They're going to have to do without gravy trains like (Section) 236."

The Section 236 program, which subsidized the mortgage interest rates paid by developers of lower-income apartment projects, was one of HUD's two largest programs between 1969-1972, accounting for as high as 200,000 new units a year. It was criticized as in-

ordinately expensive and inefficient by HUD's housing policy review team last year because it allegedly provided windfall profits and tax shelters to everyone from architects to builders to the investors who bought syndicated shares in projects. The program's basic design was so poor, according to the HUD review team, that one out of five Section 236 projects will go into foreclosure before 1980.)

The Nixon administration's intended replacement program for Section 236—one of the ideas being worked on—is known as Section 23 leasing.

HUD's FHA chief, Sheldon Lubar, has his office pushing for funding of some 130,000 units of Section 23 in the next six months, and up to 300,000 units from July, 1974 to June 1975. Under the program housing units in a variety of building are leased by lower income families who pay one quarter of their monthly income to the building's owner. Through payments from a local housing authority to the building owner, the federal government provides the difference between the going market rent and the subsidized tenant's 25 per cent. Normally, no more than 20 percent of the units in a building can be covered by Section 23 contracts, thereby avoiding the concentration of low-income tenants in vertical ghettos that characterize many federal projects.

Because the leasing program permits families to choose their own housing and this resembles President Nixon's long-range preference for a housing allowance, it is likely to be the largest (if not the only) subsidized housing vehicle for the foreseeable future.

Some builders say they aren't enthusiastic about a program that can only fill up 20 per cent of a projects units. Also the U.S. pays only when a family actually moves in. But Lubar answers that the days of "the government getting ripped off" (paying developers for empty space in subsidized units) are over.

Other ideas being worked on within the Administration to boost housing market activity also follow the policy guidelines offered by the President last September:

A major new emphasis on rehabilitating existing housing units in urban and suburban areas including possible below market rate loans.

Stimulating home buying by pumping new mortgage funds into the market through some form of temporary or "emergency" mechanism.

Pushing HUD-FHA mobile home insurance volume from the present 31,000 units per year level to more than 80,000.

A dark horse possibility, according to some officials, might be limited resumption of a subsidized home-ownership program, the old Section 235. Although oriented towards new construction, it got a relatively good review in HUD's 1973 housing policy report. With an estimated \$212 million in contract authority funds still impounded by the administration, Section 235's resumption could put between 150,000-170,000 new single family units on the market—and give some home builders what they really want.

(The writer, Kenneth Harney is managing editor of Housing and Development Reporter, an information service published by the Bureau of National Affairs Inc.)

A DECADE OF ASSASSINATIONS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, a great number of Americans are not convinced that President John F. Kennedy was

killed by a lone assassin. There has been lingering doubt among black Americans that the killer of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., acted without the collusion of others. The succession of assassinations and assassination attempts over the last 10 years has left all of us skeptical, I believe, whether each one of these crimes would have been solely the work of a single individual.

Over last Thanksgiving weekend a private group, the Committee to Investigate Assassinations, sponsored a conference on the subject at Georgetown University. I was represented at the conference by a member of my staff whose subsequent report I found revealing and disturbing.

A similar report appeared in the January 3, 1974, issue of *Rolling Stone* magazine, I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, particularly those parts of it dealing with the responsibilities of Congress in the whole sad affair:

[From *Rolling Stone*, Jan. 3, 1974]

ASSASSINATION—MURDER IN THE CATHEDRAL

(By Robert Blair Raisin)

"That was a golden time for us back in the Sixties," said Sylvia Meagher, reminiscing over the early days when the critics of the Warren Commission Report were doing their homework, trading their arcane information with one another and writing their books on their conspiracy. "Then we started fighting among ourselves. . . ." Her voice trailed off, the violins came up there in the bar of the Colonial Inn in Georgetown and she pondered her drink (tomato juice, no vodka, on the rocks).

"Right," said Josiah (Ting) Thompson, stirring his whiskey sour. "In fact, all the critics have fought with one another so bitterly that many are still not speaking to this very day. I think that Sylvia and I are among the few who are still on friendly terms."

Thompson, a Haverford College philosophy professor, wrote *Six Seconds in Dallas*, a seminal work which demonstrated that one lone rifleman on the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository couldn't possibly have fired the bullets that killed President John F. Kennedy on November 22nd, 1963. No one has ever refuted that book, and it's one of the reasons why an overwhelming majority of Americans believe that President Kennedy was done in by a conspiracy.

Meagher is the UN official and independent researcher who indexed the Warren Commission's 26 volumes and then wrote *Accessories after the Fact*, an opus which gave the authorities reason enough to reopen several investigations into JFK's murder, reasons, however, which they found themselves able to resist.

The two of them were relaxing over drinks after a full day's meeting at Georgetown University to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the President's death. But they would soon have to revise their views on the bickering critics, for if anything came out of the two-day meeting there in the frescoed auditorium of old Gaston Hall, it was this: The conference marked a real change for the buffs. Critics who hadn't spoken to each other for years now started talking: Popkin to Weisberg, Weisberg to Pollicoff, Pollicoff to Sprague. And, later that evening, at a party given by Bernard Fensterwald, the director of the Committee to Investigate Assassinations, everyone talked to everyone.

It was a time of renewal and reconciliation for all the old critics and, more importantly, a time when it was clear that many other new, respectable researchers had joined the club. "I'm encouraged," said Jerry Pollicoff, referring specifically to the climate newly established here in Georgetown, and adding,

vis-a-vis a new national climate moderated by the winds of Watergate, "people don't call me a lunatic any more." Pollicoff, who is a media analyst in New York, had been working on the JFK assassination for years, but finally, out of sheer frustration, put all his materials in cartons and sealed them up and said the hell with it.

The years from November, 1963, to November, 1973, were an exhausting decade for the critics. They worked, they produced findings which were hard to ignore and yet public officials did ignore them, gave them so little of a hearing that the critics began to feel that maybe they were lunatics.

Norman Mailer, who keynoted the conference and hung around for the entire two days, focused right on the mark when he compared the obsessed critic to a jealous lover, who in his affliction careens between the two extremes of hating his unfaithful wife for her unspeakable conduct and hating himself for his unspeakable imaginings. "What has made this history unendurable," said Mailer, "were two opposed hypotheses: 1) that it was just an accident, which leads to a philosophy of the absurd, and 2) any one of the grand conspiracy themes. And anything in between."

But now it was obvious from what was happening here at the conference (and from the daily news reports about all the malfeasance and the misfeasance in government not so very far away from Georgetown) that the times are indeed changing.

Here at Georgetown, new critics came forward with evidence to create new doubts, old critics presented items which could trigger new tries for the truth.

Dr. Cyril Wecht, the coroner of Pittsburgh and one of the leading pathologists in the U.S., spent hours on the podium explaining why he does not believe that any single human being could have handled the shooting of JFK.

Wecht is a man whose looks and vigor reminded me of no one so much as Vince Lombardi. He has had the almost singular benefit of access to many medical and pathological reports on the JFK assassination which are still technically secret and he doesn't buy the Warren Commission's keystone theory of the single bullet, based on the evidence he has now. What more does he need? Among other things: a spectrographic analysis of the bullet fragments removed from both Kennedy and Governor Connolly. The FBI, he says, has the evidence, but the FBI won't cough it up. (Harold Weisberg, author of *Frame Up*, told the conference that he has had a tip-off on that spectrographic analysis: It, too, will destroy the single-bullet theory.)

Dr. Robert Foreman, a chinless anthropologist from Toledo, Ohio, presented his study of a simulated JFK "skeleton." According to all reports, the bullet that entered JFK's upper back existed just below his Adam's apple, without striking any of the President's bones. Dr. Foreman showed on a series of elaborate photographic charts that such a shot, fired from the sixth floor of the book depository, couldn't have hit JFK at the angle it did and still have continued on to hit Governor Connolly.

Pete Noyes, a corpulent TV news producer from L.A. who is the model for the Edward Asner character on *The Mary Tyler Moore Show*, has been working for at least six years on the Mafia connections to the JFK assassination. Here, at last, after several publishers canceled their contracts to publish his conclusions, Noyes proudly presented his just-published account, *Legacy Of Doubt* (a Pinnacle paperback). Noyes doesn't solve the conspiracy in the book. But he names names, he tells how he knows what he knows and he points out the directions that authorities must take—if they really want to do their jobs.

Peter Dale Scott, a tall, ascetic and schol-

arly professor of medieval literature at the University of California at Berkeley, and the author of a book on the Vietnam War, *The War Conspiracy*, pointed out to the audience that there are ways we can all learn from Watergate some significant things about the methodology of a cover-up. "The physical evidence presented by Dr. Wecht is good" he said, "but that won't tell us who the real suspects are. Examining the cover-ups in the Dallas affair will help us find our suspects."

George O'Toole, a former CIA computer specialist who looks like Santa Claus with a black beard, showed the audience how he has used a new "truth machine" called the Psychological Stress Evaluator (PSE) to evaluate previously recorded statements about the assassination by former Chief Justice Earl Warren; James E. Humes, the chief autopsy surgeon at Bethesda Naval Hospital who burned his original notes on the autopsy; Howard Brennan, the man who told the Warren Commission he had seen Oswald shooting at President Kennedy from the window of the book depository, and several other Dallas officials who were involved in the initial investigation of the shooting. All these men showed great stress, said O'Toole (pointing to slide projections of their voice patterns as recorded by the PSE) which might mean they were not telling the truth. The PSE, he said, was 94% accurate in the hands of an expert. O'Toole said he has been working for a year on these analyses; sometime next year he will turn over his findings to the Justice Department and to members of Congress.

Congress. That way be where all these new investigations will wind up. Unofficially, this conference at Georgetown (which was sponsored by the private Committee to Investigate Assassinations) issued no white paper or set of conclusions. But almost every speaker implied that only a subcommittee of Congress could get to the bottom of things—because only Congress or the courts had the power to subpoena witnesses under oath or levy penalties on those who wouldn't talk. The Watergate committee is, of course, something of a model.

What chances that a congressional committee will take over from the lonely critics? Slim now, I think, but growing, as the consciousness of a wider public grows that there are some answers out there and that this nation needs them. While the so-called "straight press" has largely ignored the critics for years now, the Washington Post reported this Georgetown conference as soberly as it has reported anything on the Watergate scandal. And three staff members of Congressmen Morris Udall's office looked in on the discussions at Gaston Hall so they could report to Udall, a brother of Stewart, JFK's Secretary of the Interior and himself a key figure among the so-called "Kennedy Democrats" in Congress.

During the Sixties, before the Garrison charges against Clay Shaw in New Orleans, before the assassinations of Martin Luther King and Senator Robert F. Kennedy, before, in sum, the information overload short-circuited the critical faculties of those who liked their thinking neat and tidy, there was a measured receptivity among many to this, that or another theory on the conspiracy to kill JFK. But what good are theories that multiply as the years pass and lead nowhere? Did any of the conspiracy theories about the death of JFK, for instance, save the life of his brother?

Curious, strange, remarkable thing: It was only the amateurs, the philosophy profs and the private citizens who had the theories, who tried to map new avenues of investigation. But they had no resources to travel. What about the FBI and the CIA and the whole so-called intelligence community? Wasn't there a single agent who had theories of his own? Any of them asking questions? And if so, why weren't any of them given

some kind of go-ahead to run down some answers?

Some conspiracy buffs said the reason was obvious: because the intelligence community itself was complicit in either the assassination or the coverup. But the events of the past year or two (the Pentagon Papers, the Watergate business and all the other inside stories about the way the secret government has worked) suggest another, less sinister answer: that the intelligence community was neither intelligent nor a community—i.e., that the patterns of secrecy within government precluded open exchanges of information, frequently not even among themselves, never with the public at large.

That kind of operational secrecy is changing (not nearly fast enough, but it is changing). The conference's media panel (of which I was a member) agreed that the press is putting on unprecedented pressures to blast open the secret government. A craggy character like Sherman Skolnick, the paraplegic from Chicago who successfully agitated for the conviction of Judge Otto Kerner, with that most subversive of all tools, information, could well be emulated by other information commandos.

Radical youth may take this kind of lead and run with it. Norman Mailer prophesies that a growing movement on the nation's campuses—gathering political intelligence—could become as big as the peace movement. That may help the assassination critics get an official reopening of the investigations into the assassinations of two Kennedys and a King.

Then again, no amount of agitation may win a public constituency large enough to demand that Congress do something very special (and without the public demand, Congress usually does nothing).

The reason: Assassinations are more ghastly than burglaries and assorted other political dirty tricks, and if many think that impeaching a President is obscene, what are they to think about dredging up thoughts of having his brains blown out? They don't want to think about it. And the very people who should think about it most—the Kennedy clan (and that includes the Salinger and the Schlesingers and the Mankiewiczes who refuse to even read my book on the Robert Kennedy assassination)—want to think about it least.

On this ground, apparently, the Washington, D.C. appeals courts have so far been denying the Committee to Investigate Assassinations access to key records the Committee and its members need. "Requiescat in pace," wrote Judge John Anthony Danaher in a recent opinion denying Harold Welsberg a look at the FBI's spectrographic analysis.

The Judge has a point. During the Georgetown conference, the experts spent a full afternoon on bullets, brains and ballistics and when they turned on the lights to show the audience their ghoulish slides and the afternoon rays shone in the high stained glass windows of Gaston Hall, I jotted in my notebook, "Murder in the Cathedral." It was too much for me and for many of the several hundred spectators who were there, unused to such a cool, scientific treatment of such a hot, emotional subject. Some became visibly uneasy, almost ill. I went for a walk.

And then that night at the Fensterwald party, Robert Grodin, a young filmmaker from New Jersey who is working with a group intending to do a documentary on the assassination of JFK, showed up with another generation of the film shot by Abraham Zapruder in Dallas. Grodin and an optic technician had spent exhaustive hours enlarging the central detail, i.e., the President and Mrs. Kennedy, of each frame of the Zapruder film and here, toward the end of the party, Grodin ran the enlarged version several times. It is clear from this film (which eliminates to a large extent the shaky effect of a hand-held camera) that the shot

which took the top off President Kennedy's head came not from the direction of the book depository but from the grassy knoll.

The realization drove some of us to tears and then to whiskeyed inebriation. Later, about 3AM at another gathering back in Georgetown, I almost got into a fistfight with an asshole who was claiming that Senator Robert Kennedy was also killed in a crossfire.

But irrationality is the easy way out. No matter how much it hurts, we have to consider any and all evidence which may be germane to the issue. Of course, we could withdraw from the issue entirely. But, as Mailer said at this conference, that would make us less interesting as human beings. And being mired in secrecy would make our society a frightful place.

THE RULE OF LAW

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the December 1973 issue of the American Bar Association Journal strongly supports the principle of independence of prosecution. Citing the chain of events surrounding the Watergate Special Prosecutor, the article reaffirmed the ABA's position that the Special Prosecutor must be wholly independent of the executive branch of Government:

THE RULE OF LAW

The deep attachment of the American people to the principle of the rule of law and not of men could not have been exemplified better than by the outpouring of public disapproval that greeted President Nixon's action in late October when he declined to follow the adverse Watergate tapes decision of the court of appeals and then dismissed the special prosecutor for refusing to temper his investigation and to accept the president's alternative to turning over the tapes.

The public outrage, which political reporters have said was not expected by the president, demonstrated that the people have an ingrained trust in and respect for our system of justice as administered by fearless and independent judges and lawyers, and that they feel that the established judicial means for the settlement of disputes are to be preferred over methods grounded on political power and position. These events serve to point out again the awesome yet integral role the legal profession plays in our nation's life, and they should be the occasion for a reaffirmation of our determination to fulfill that role.

It is elementary that the investigation and prosecution of wrongdoing must be independent, free of conflicts of interest, and not subject to the influence of those who might fall under suspicion and investigation. This problem was present from the beginning in the investigation and prosecution of the events that comprise what has been called "Watergate," but it became more acute as higher officials were implicated last April. Robert W. Meserve, then president of the American Bar Association, told a National Press Club luncheon on April 30 that an "independent special prosecutor, having no connection with the government or any of the parties in the case, should be appointed to direct the grand jury inquiry and any criminal prosecution that might result." After referring to the Code of Professional Responsibility and the Standards Relating to the Prosecution and the Defense Functions, Mr. Meserve added that the "appointment

of a special prosecutor of recognized professional stature and integrity would do much to clear the air and reassure the country that the facts will be brought out and those involved dealt with fully and fairly."

The special prosecutor's office as established was a part of the Justice Department, a circumstance that did not remove the inherent anomaly of investigatee having ultimate dismissal power over investigator. But the Senate was satisfied with the assurance of the new attorney general, Elliot L. Richardson, that the prosecutor would have an unusual degree of independence and could not be removed except for "extraordinary improprieties," which would be determined by the attorney general. These assurances were expressed in "guidelines" that became the foundation of the special prosecution force.

This compact between the executive branch and the people was abrogated by the president in late October when he directed Archibald Cox, who had been appointed special prosecutor, "to make no further attempts by judicial process to obtain tapes, notes, or memoranda of presidential conversations," discharged Mr. Cox when he refused to accept this interference in his prosecutorial function, and abolished the independent status of the prosecution force. Mr. Richardson did not find Mr. Cox guilty of "extraordinary improprieties." Indeed, he declined to discharge the special prosecutor and himself resigned. Neither President Nixon nor anyone for him has charged Mr. Cox with "extraordinary improprieties."

In a statement issued October 22, Chesterfield Smith, president of the Association, declared that President Nixon's actions were an "intolerable assault upon the courts, our first line of defense against tyranny and arbitrary power. . . . I express my hope and confidence that the judicial and legislative forces of this nation will act swiftly and decisively to challenge, repeal, and correct this damaging incursion . . . upon the system of justice and therefore upon the basic liberties of the citizens of this country." A few days later the Association's Board of Governors endorsed Mr. Smith's statement and went on record favoring the re-establishment of the office of the special prosecutor by appointment of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. (For the text of the resolution and the statement, see the article on page 1389 of this issue.)

The principle of independence of prosecution is one that needs to be remembered and preserved. No better successor for Mr. Cox could have been selected than Leon Jaworski, the former president of the American Bar Association, whose appointment was announced on November 1. But the question is not one of men but of independence of the prosecutorial function. In the unusual circumstances of this situation, that principle requires a prosecutor not beholden in any way to the executive branch of government.

HON. DOLPH BRISCOE, GOVERNOR
OF TEXAS, ADDRESSES THE
TEXAS AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT
STATION STAFF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to be in attendance at a staff conference of Texas Agricultural Experiment employees on Wednesday, January 9, 1974, at College Station, Tex. The Governor of Texas, the Honorable Dolph Briscoe delivered the main address, and