

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 10

APRIL 23, 1970, TO MAY 4, 1970
(PAGES 12657 TO 14096)

newal and offers the prospect for a dramatic "New Town" in the central city.

The usual criticism of urban renewal is that it destroys more housing than it replaces, lowers the supply of low-income dwellings and leaves vacant land that produces no taxes. In this case, a private group known as Cedar-Riverside Associates plans in the first phase to build 1,260 housing units in place of the existing 92 units. Of the total, 100 units will be low-rent public housing for families and 500 units will be for low- and moderate-income occupants under a federal subsidized-interest program. Rent supplements could be used on some of the 500 units to bring down monthly charges even more. The rest of the units will be for middle- and upper-income tenants to provide a good economic mix and a full range of housing for students, faculty, university and hospital employees of the area.

Another criticism of urban renewal is that it too often produces projects that are poorly designed and lacking in cohesion. In this case, Cedar-Riverside Associates called upon top-rate consultants who have planned and designed an impressive project combining cohesiveness and diversity. The project includes high-rise and low-rise buildings, parking facilities, commercial space, a plaza and walkways. The developers also plan to provide facilities for a public school, recreation, health and other social services.

The proposed public outlay in the initial project seems reasonable when compared with costs in other renewal programs and the amount of private investment being generated. A requested land write-down of \$700,000 for the subsidized housing is only half of the usual renewal write-down on a total-project basis. Another \$490,000 is sought for site improvements and \$1.3 million is requested for the public plaza and walkway system. These costs would be quickly repaid and then some in the estimated annual tax return of \$600,000 from the completed first stage.

The so-called Cedar West project appears to be a promising start for redevelopment of private properties in the Cedar-Riverside area. If local and federal approvals are given on funding proposals, and financing is obtained as expected, the city's West Bank renewal will be under way, at long last.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD AFRICA

Mr. BROOKE, Mr. President, some weeks ago the Secretary of State spent more than 2 weeks touring many of the nations of Africa. His tour was followed with a great deal of interest by the African peoples and by many of us here at home.

Since his return, the Secretary has reported his findings to the President in a widely circulated and discussed policy statement which reveals his personal interest in, and sensitivity to, the issues confronting this emerging continent. I have heard many fine reports from African friends, from journalists who accompanied Secretary Rogers, and from "Africanists" in this country, on the Secretary's trip. I have also had an opportunity to read the policy statement for myself. Its emphasis on economic development, its expressions of concern and support for self-determination, are all indications of a renewed and determined American commitment to support change and improvements in the conditions of African life.

I commend the Secretary for his interest and involvement in shaping our pol-

icy toward an area of the world which has contributed much to world culture and which offers great promise for the future.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent that an article on our African policy, written by William C. Selover of the Christian Science Monitor, be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. HEEDS REALITIES ON AFRICA

(By William C. Selover)

WASHINGTON.—In markedly subdued tones, the Nixon administration has quietly launched its "new approach" to the troubled, emerging continent of Africa.

Unfortunately, even the State Department's own experts on Africa are left wondering what's so new.

In the long-awaited report on his precedent-setting tour of Africa, Secretary of State William P. Rogers outlined the administration's Africa policy.

Essentially, it is this:

Continue to provide foreign aid at "not less than the present level."

Create a fresh "climate" in Africa's developing nations where U.S. private investors may freely do business.

Actually, most observers agree that little in the report is new.

EMPATHY GENERATED

But it comes on the heels of the first visit ever by an American secretary of state to that continent. And the Rogers statement does, in fact, go into some detail about precisely the steps the United States Government can take to aid Africa by indirect means, such as relaxed trade and tariff policies.

This is considered here all to the good.

Mr. Rogers reportedly empathized deeply with the sentiments of emerging black-led nations during his visit. The U.S. decision to close the American consulate in Rhodesia was reportedly urged by the Secretary of State in strongest terms on his return.

All of this gave some hope to African diplomats here that the United States was genuinely interested in an area that has always suffered from U.S. neglect.

But informed State Department sources are concerned that America's first veto ever, cast last month at the United Nations (It was against an Afro-Asian proposal condemning Britain for failing to use force to overthrow the white minority regime on Rhodesia) may have destroyed all the goodwill built up by the Rhodesian decision among the African leaders. In this context, African reception to the Rogers statement here is cautious—even disbelieving.

U.S. sources argue privately that the veto was not necessary, since Britain blocked the resolution by its negative vote anyway.

On the other hand, the veto signaled a new era of candor and realism in U.S. relations with Africa. And this may gain some points for the United States, officials here speculate.

"We were arguing against the resolution in the halls of the United Nations. Everybody knew that," said one State Department official. "To abstain after that would have been hypocritical."

Apparently, the Secretary of State also believes that it would be hypocritical to promise an enlarged foreign-aid package to Africa, while sentiments in Congress are set against such moves.

Again Mr. Roger's strong endorsement of greater private investment is another signal of cold realism creeping into United States policy in Africa.

In effect, without any hope of increasing direct government aid, which runs to about

\$350 million a year, the Secretary of State simply salvaged the situation by finding an alternative.

PRIVATE INVESTMENT STRESSED

"We believe," he reported, "that private investment can and should play a growing role, above and beyond public assistance, in African development."

At the same time, Mr. Rogers shifts some of the burden on African governments.

Businessmen, he said, "pay great heed to African government programs to foster a favorable investment climate."

He suggested that "an investment code, assurances from the African government and reasonable entry, work, and tax arrangements can make the difference between an American's willingness or unwillingness to work out an investment."

In 1968, the last year for which figures were available, U.S. foreign investment in Africa amounted to \$2.673 billion. But an enormous part of that went to areas outside of the developing, black-led nations. Some \$692 million, for instance, went to South Africa and, \$678 million went to oil-rich Libya.

GROWTH SOUGHT

But there has been a steady growth of private investment in nations recently independent. By the end of 1968, for example, the total value of U.S. private investment in member countries of the Organization of African Unity amounted to about \$2 billion.

Mr. Rogers believes this figure can be increased dramatically.

Already, according to Mr. Rogers, programs are under way to stimulate private American investments in manufacturing, agro business, and commerce.

Mr. Rogers believes that the U.S. has been increasingly successful in getting American investors to look at large-scale agriculture projects in Africa. In the last three years, he says, American companies have conducted 27 preliminary studies of such projects which led to 10 in-depth studies and 4 investment commitments. Several more, he says, are being negotiated.

OTHER FIELDS URGED

Also, he reports new efforts to get "medium-size American investors" to explore other African markets—such as flour milling, bus transportation, food processing, shrimp fishing, and plywood manufacturing.

The Secretary of State also believes that the new Overseas Private Investment Corporation, which will provide guarantees, equity, local currency loans, and investment advice, will be "an important element in stimulating further American private investment in Africa." The Overseas Private Investment Corporation was proposed earlier and approved by Congress in Mr. Nixon's overall foreign-aid reform.

TARIFF STEPS WELCOMED

He also offered the President's "generalized tariff preferences for all developing nations" as one step to freer trade with African states, and he welcomed the steps by the Central African Customs and Economic Union to reduce general tariffs on most imported goods by 50 percent.

"This measure," he says, "offers the prospect of greater American trade with these countries."

"We seek a relationship of constructive cooperation with the nations of Africa," Mr. Rogers explains, "a cooperative and equal relationship with all who wish it. . . . We want no military allies, no spheres of influence, no big-power competition in Africa."

SUPPORT FOR CLEAN LAKES

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, this month, concern over our environment reached its highest level in history.

Millions of citizens rallied across the Nation April 22 to dramatize the urgency of the crisis. I am hopeful that this great display of public support for a better environment will be translated into affirmative action by the Congress this year. Passage of a number of pending bills could lead to the stabilization and improvement of the condition of our air, land, and water.

I am particularly concerned about the steady decline of our waterways in recent years. Earlier this month I introduced a measure designed to revitalize the polluted lakes of America, and I am gratified by the support it has received.

Twenty-six Senators are cosponsoring it. I have received favorable mail on it. The bill has also been editorially endorsed by several major newspapers in my home State.

The latest editorial is from the Rochester, Minn., Post-Bulletin of April 16.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

MONDALE'S BILL OFFERS HOPE FOR MINNESOTA'S, NATION'S AILING LAKES

Sen. Walter Mondale's introduction last week of legislation in Congress to speed lake improvement and restoration could do much to soothe Minnesota's troubled waters.

Following in the wake of the recently passed Water Quality Improvement Act—which provides pilot research on lake pollution abatement—the new legislation would increase federal aid to upgrade treatment plants now discharging effluent into endangered lakes. It also provides funds to aid reclamation of presently polluted lakes.

With an estimated 100,000 lakes throughout the nation in trouble, the legislation is obviously of more than just Minnesota's interest, but this state could certainly benefit from its passage.

Under Mondale's proposal, federal grants for treatment plants located near lakes could amount to 65 per cent of the cost, provided the state furnished 20 per cent. To be eligible, enforceable water quality standards must be set and maintained. Only treated water could be discharged and pre-treatment of industrial waste would be required where necessary.

Other provisions would authorize cooperation between the state and the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, and would call for added research in lake reclamation. A separate fund could provide, over a four-year period, for dredging and removal of sludge and for shoreline improvement.

Minnesota—with many lakes—has many problems, and the soft-water lakes in northern Minnesota are particularly vulnerable to pollution. One reason is that they lack minerals to precipitate out some of the pollutants, as is the case in the hard-water lakes of this area.

But even in southern Minnesota—with higher populations, more industry and intensified agriculture—the problem of lake pollution is acute, largely because lakes have no means of disposing of chemical additions as do rivers.

Belated recognition of the state's lake problems is found in the Minnesota lakeshore zoning provisions, now going into effect. But this is a preventive measure, and of little benefit to the lake already in trouble. It is here that the Mondale legislation could prove of real value to lakes in Minnesota and many other states.

Pollution from growing numbers of lakeside homes, municipal and industrial waste

and agricultural runoff have clogged too many Minnesota lakes with silt, weeds and algae. Their reclamation is generally beyond local means and the Mondale legislation holds the only present prospect of any substantial relief of the problem.

A few years ago a bill to reclaim lakes, without offering industrial or agricultural benefits, would have stood scant chance of passage. But newer awareness of broader ecological values has increased its chances substantially. Certainly it would be of benefit to Minnesota and many other states and deserves support.

HELIUM CONSERVATION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, a decade ago, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) played an important part in launching a program to stop the needless waste of a rare and unique resource, namely, helium. This wondrous natural resource was contained in certain natural gas deposits in high enough quantities to make it economically extractable prior to the burning of the natural gas. Ultimately, these particular natural gas fields will be exhausted; but, the purpose of the helium conservation program is to extract and store as much of this vital resource as can be cheaply extracted from these unique gas fields which are rich in helium content.

As originally envisioned, the program was to be totally self-financing. The Government would buy the helium at approximately \$11 per thousand cubic feet and would sell it for \$35 per thousand cubic feet. The price spread was intended to take care of the storage charges and the cost of borrowing money, since Government purchases would exceed annual helium requirements. Government storage now exceeds 24 billion cubic feet of contained helium.

However, as we all know, the cost of borrowing money has gone up dramatically over the past few years and this has cast a heavy burden upon the self-liquidation of the helium conservation program. In addition, certain of our short term space and military needs have fallen off sharply, thus reducing revenues from sales. Further, some Government contractors have purchased helium from private suppliers at a price lower than \$35, but considerably more than the \$11 paid by the Government. This has tended to further reduce Government sales of helium. It should be noted, however, that supplies of helium outside of the Government conservation program are quite limited by comparison. Nonetheless, this temporary incursion on the helium market with respect to Government contractors has weakened the fiscal posture on the conservation program, at least temporarily.

There are those who have advocated the termination of the helium program and the liquidation of the helium asset. I reject such suggestions and believe that it would be folly to follow such a course. Senators know that helium has many exciting potential uses, many of which will have a direct bearing upon the restoration of the quality of our environment and the improvement of our standard of living. To mention just a

few of the many environmentally oriented applications of helium would include: the generation of electrical power by both nuclear and magnetohydrodynamic methods, super conductive transmission of electricity, and helium is essential in cryogenics and in the exploration of the deep sea.

Mr. President, on March 23 and 24 at the Helium Symposium, held in Washington, D.C., many important papers were presented concerning future uses and sources of supply of helium. I recommend them to all who are interested in the important role helium will play in our quest for a more livable environment.

I ask unanimous consent that one of those statements, an address by Senator GORDON ALLOTT at the symposium luncheon, be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GORDON ALLOTT

As a co-author of the 1960 Helium Amendments, the Act which set up the Helium Conservation Program a decade ago, I have more than a passing familiarity with the wondrous natural resource and its value for the future.

Speaking before this group presents an almost irresistible temptation to make some jokes about the relationship between your product and the politician's job. I am going to resist that temptation. I do not want to do anything that would lead you to believe that politicians specialize in speeches that are—like helium—lighter than air. Besides, I can't think of one that would get off the ground.

But if I might be permitted a pun, I want to say how pleased I am to be addressing such a "resourceful" audience. You are the sort of people who turn America's natural materials into real natural resources. You are responsible for keeping America productive.

This is a great responsibility.

As part of your task, you must spend a good deal of time thinking about underground matters. But, as I am sure you know, you and others like you are right in the middle of an above-ground storm. This storm is associated with this year's magic word—"ecology".

There are those who think we honor the earth—and do mankind a favor if we left the earth—including the material beneath the surface untouched by human hands.

There are some extremists who would like to cast people like you in the role of villains. Well, I want to leave no doubt where I stand on this matter. I support the resourceful people who are developing America's resources.

You know, the West is still one area of America where opinions are firm and clear—where men are not afraid to say what they think—and where differences can sometimes be pretty stoutly battled, at least in the political arena.

But one area in which we have developed a common concern is the importance of natural resources, whether they be water, timber, grazing lands or minerals in the earth.

There is a very basic cause for this common theme—it is a matter not only for the growth development of our respective states, but of survival.

Some of our western states are very arid and the matter of water supply has been a vital concern ever since the land was settled. In fact, the settling of the West would not have been possible had it not been for the adoption of an innovative concept of water law and conservation. It remains so today. In any case, we in the West know by hard lesson that water is life.

The great national park system got its start in Yellowstone, Wyoming, and Taylor Grazing Act resulted from western desires to