

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 121—PART 15

JUNE 16, 1975 TO JUNE 20, 1975

(PAGES 18945 TO 20188)

"I was supposed to have graduated in economics and, while I don't have any prejudice about it, I just tell the people at Kerr-McGee it's a little bit premature for us." Mr. Kennedy said. "At first the availability factor was not very good; now it's better. But a new plant, we want it to be 100 per cent available. I think we'll wait to see if they can work up some more economical methods."

A DAY FOR THE GREEDY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last Thursday an editorial appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press regarding the defeat of the override attempt on the strip mining bill. It is appropriately entitled, "A Day for the Greedy."

As one Member who has consistently supported legislation to provide more effective control over the devastation that can result from unrestrained strip mining of coal. I was deeply disappointed by both the original veto and the narrow defeat of the effort to override the veto last week in the House of Representatives.

In my judgment there is no question but that we must now begin again to develop not a weaker bill, but a stronger coalition in the Congress, one that can prevent a small but determined minority from forever blocking overwhelmingly popular measures of this kind.

Mr. President, 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:

A DAY FOR THE GREEDY

Tuesday was a great day for the greedy in America. Democratic "leadership" in the awesome veto-proof Congress collapsed again and President Ford's veto of the strip mining control bill was sustained.

The failure to override had been anticipated, but it was a blow nonetheless. White House and "energy establishment" spokesmen had lobbied mightily to chip away at the size of the congressional majority favoring strip mining control. Backers of the bill never succeeded in countering the "jobs and inflation" attack against it.

It takes a two-thirds vote of each house to override a presidential veto. The Democrats have two-thirds of the seats in the House of Representatives, but could not hold that force together in this critical test. It was nothing new. The vote was 278 to override the veto and 143 to sustain it—three votes less than the required two-thirds. Fifty-six Republicans joined 222 Democrats in voting to override the veto, while 57 Democrats slid over to join 86 Republicans in voting to sustain.

We berate Congress here, although it was the President who stopped the bill, because our hope was with the Congress. Congress has twice passed needed bills to prevent total rape of coal lands and twice the bills have been vetoed. This most recent bill was a modest one that would have set minimum federal standards to protect the land against strip mining ravages. Environmentalists were not satisfied with it, but the coal producers hated it. President Ford carried the ball for the energy industry.

"If the White House had laid off, the bill would be on the way to enactment now," said Rep. Morris Udall, D-Ariz. Udall blamed the final vote on misleading figures about effects on coal production and employment that were widely published in the weeks between veto and Tuesday's vote. "This thing

isn't dead," Udall said after the vote. "The fight has to go on. A large majority of Congress and of the American people still want this bill."

Udall is probably right in his assessment of the wishes of the American people. Who wants Appalachia spread to the Dakotas, Wyoming, Colorado? But as for the fight continuing, we're afraid Udall is wrong. If this "veto-proof" Congress cannot pull itself together enough to get an immensely popular environmental bill past an unelected President bent on keeping the energy industry happy, the future for America the Beautiful looks grim indeed.

THE IMPORTANCE OF GOOD HOUSING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate an excellent article by Mr. Roger Skophammer of the editorial staff of the Minneapolis Tribune.

This editorial correctly notes that housing is the No. 1 priority in Minneapolis, Minn. It also very appropriately reminds us that good housing holds neighborhoods together and good neighborhoods hold the city together.

I believe it would be well for those in the administration that are responsible for the administration of housing programs to read this editorial very carefully. It should be noted that the city of Minneapolis has developed its own local housing program, utilizing local funds, emphasizing rehabilitation of older housing units, and constantly promoting individual homeownership. The city of Minneapolis has an urban homesteading program. Under this program the city acquires old houses and resells them for \$1 on the condition that the buyers fix them up. This is a new effort, but it is beginning to take hold.

There are many other housing endeavors under way in the State of Minnesota and in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area. What is needed now is a national housing policy that will promote housing rehabilitation, housing construction, and homeownership as well as an adequate supply of rental units for people of low and middle income. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOUSING: HOLDING THE CITY TOGETHER

(By Roger Skophammer)

Housing is the "No. 1 priority" in Minneapolis, Mayor Hofstede and city aldermen frequently proclaim. Notice that it is "priority," not "problem," because in large part city officials are trying to prevent a problem rather than solve one.

The city does not have the miles of run-down houses and acres of blighted neighborhoods that have plagued other large American cities. But city leaders believe that Minneapolis could go downhill quickly if housing were not maintained.

Only about 12 percent of the city's dwelling structures have been built since 1960, compared with about 85 percent in the suburbs. Many houses that aren't already deteriorating are on the verge of doing so. The city's planning department says that of 173,000 dwelling units in the city, 39,000 need some rehabilitative work. The Housing and Redevelopment Authority calls that a sig-

nificant number, and one that will increase unless corrective action is taken.

There is another kind of problem: Most people can't afford to build or buy new houses. The average cost of a new house is now \$45,000. This means, according to one city study, that a family would have to earn \$22,000 a year to afford principal and interest payments on a new house. But only 4.1 percent of families in Minneapolis have incomes over \$25,000, and only 16.5 percent make between \$15,000 and \$25,000. So the average buyer can afford only an older house, or to stay in an apartment.

In the past, the federal government worried about such things. The government helped people get cheap housing after World War II, and there have been various numbered and acronymed urban-renewal, public housing and other programs. Most of these have ended or are being phased out. As Richard Brustad, executive director of the HRA, points out, "Now we have to figure out ways of our own. The responsibility of developing and executing programs has fallen on local people."

But, as a city statement prepared for a legislative proposal pointed out, "Home building, purchase of a home and refinancing a home for . . . rehabilitation are severely limited today because of the tight money market, high interest rates and the hesitation of lending firms to make mortgages in certain parts of the city. Yet the city must continue its building of new homes . . . as well as encourage individual home ownership and constant rehabilitation of homes."

City government, in other words, has to take the initiative if, in the words of City Council President Louis DeMars, it is going "to stay ahead of the problem." DeMars said he feels that the city has "a pretty good grasp of the situation" through its present programs, even though some problems, such as what to do about absentee landlords who neglected their property, have yet to be dealt with. These are the major existing city programs:

Local loans. The city has \$10 million in bonding authority to provide low-interest loans and grants for home rehabilitation. So far 469 projects are under way, and the city's monthly loan total is triple that of the federal loans of a decade ago.

New housing (formerly spot renewal). The city buys old houses, tears them down and resells the property at written-down costs for new construction. So far 113 properties have been purchased, 58 resold and 44 houses started.

Home ownership. The plan is carried out with the Greater Minneapolis Metropolitan Housing Corp. Houses are purchased, rehabilitated and resold at market rates, usually about \$20,000, to young, small families—"the people who a few years ago were buying in Apple Valley," says Brustad. So far work has started or been completed on 166 houses.

Urban homesteading. The city acquires old houses and resells them for \$1 on the condition that the buyers fix them up. Work is under way on only four houses, but Hofstede says, "I think we could make it work here."

Federal programs have basically been trimmed to two. The Section 8 program has replaced several other federal plans. The government pays the difference between market rates for rent and what it determines the renter can afford to pay. The program is new, and its impact on the Minneapolis housing situation is still uncertain.

The other major federal program is Community Development block grants, using revenue-sharing funds. Minneapolis will put three fourths of its \$16.7-million grant this year into housing programs. The largest projects are in Willard-Homewood, with \$3.7 million and Model City, with \$3.5 million for rehabilitation of single and multiple dwellings.

In the last legislative session, the city also