

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 121—PART 19

JULY 22, 1975 TO JULY 26, 1975

(PAGES 23935 TO 25194)



The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I have cleared this request with the Republican leader (Mr. HUGH SCOTT), and it has been cleared with Mr. GRIFFIN and with Mr. MATHIAS, the ranking minority member on this bill. I have cleared it with Mr. JAVITS, who is the minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and with the appropriate Senators on this side of the aisle who are directly involved.

I ask unanimous consent that there be a 30-minute limitation on the debate on the President's veto message on S. 66, the nurses training bill, that the 30 minutes begin to run at 1 p.m. today; and that the vote occur then at 1:30.

Mr. HELMS. Reserving the right to object, where does my amendment fit in?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. The Senator, I am sure, can call up his amendment immediately after the disposition of this amendment. If the half-hour period intervenes, he could call it up following the vote.

Will it be agreeable with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, if he decides that he wants a rollcall vote on his amendment, that that go over until after the vote on the veto message, so the distinguished Senator from North Carolina can call his up?

Mr. MONDALE. I am ready to vote right now so we can have the vote out of the way, unless the committee objects to an earlier vote.

Mr. HELMS. Is the Senator willing to agree to a unanimous-consent request that debate start at 1:30 p.m.?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. HELMS. That will only allow me 30 minutes.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. We can make it 1:15, then?

Mr. HELMS. Very well.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT-INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1976

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8070) making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent executive agencies, boards, bureaus, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent that its reading be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is as follows:

On page 20, line 13, strike out "\$370,766,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$410,766,000".

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this amendment is offered on behalf of myself and my colleague from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY, to add \$50 million to carry

out section 314 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

I am authorized to say that Senator MUSKIE, the chairman of the Budget Committee, has looked at this amendment and has authorized me to say that it is clearly within the budget resolution that we adopted earlier this year and that he strongly supported this fresh water community lakes program—and of course he did so repeatedly in earlier authorization efforts.

Last year, the Senate appropriated \$75 million for this program. The bill was vetoed. Then, under tremendous pressure, we were able to gain only a modest, almost insignificant, appropriation of \$4 million. This year, the Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended \$10 million.

I am proposing that we compromise with last year's figure and with the administration and come up with a figure which is two-thirds, or \$50 million, rather than the \$75 million that we appropriated a year ago.

This money would help to clean up and help to keep from pollution one of the most cherished recreational resources in America—our freshwater community lakes. There are literally thousands of these lakes which are being destroyed through pollution, siltation, algae growth, sedimentation, and the rest.

This program was enacted 3 years ago and has never been funded adequately. The distinguished manager of this bill has been one of the chief sponsors of this program over the years, because, like Minnesota, Wisconsin is a great freshwater State, and his State is probably further ahead in this program than any other State in the Union. Therefore, I hope that the distinguished floor manager of the bill will accept this amendment.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President—on my time—I wish I could accept this amendment, and I certainly would, if I felt I possibly could, but I cannot do so.

I say that although the Senator from Minnesota made an excellent presentation before the subcommittee. He convinced me that this program is badly needed and that we should have it.

But let us look at the facts. As of June 30—and that is the latest date for which we have information—the Environmental Protection Agency has not obligated the \$4 million provided in fiscal 1975 for the clean lakes program. They are just now proceeding with the first round of the program. Based on applications received from States for use of the \$4 million in 1975, it seems that it will be very difficult to expect them to be able to obligate more than the \$10 million the Senate has provided.

Furthermore, it is my understanding that we need more time to evaluate the cost effectiveness of the lake restoration programs now under consideration before greatly accelerating the activity.

In his veto message in the 1975 Agriculture, Environmental and Consumer Protection Appropriation Act, the President said:

The feasibility of this cleanup program has not yet been proven. Furthermore, study is

essential if we are to avoid ineffective Federal spending for these purposes.

I think the President may well be wrong and the Senator from Minnesota right. The appearance of the Senator from Minnesota was very convincing. However, this is a program that will accelerate more than 100 percent if we simply provide the \$10 million in the bill. We are providing only \$4 million now. They ask for nothing in the budget, so we would be \$50 million over the budget. Even if we put in the \$50 million and got it through the House, there would be very little chance that the administration would proceed any faster than they would if we provided \$10 million.

For these reasons, I think it would be a mistake on the part of the Senate to accept the amendment and go another \$50 million over the budget. With the adoption of the Stevenson amendment a few minutes ago, we are now well over \$300 million above the budget and above the House. There is some prospect that if we put more than \$10 million in the budget it might be an additional reason for a veto.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY).

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Senator MONDALE and I are offering an amendment to increase the appropriation for section 314 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act from \$10 million to \$25 million. We are offering this amendment because of our conviction that our Government must live up to its commitment, enacted in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, to help our States and cities clean up our lakes.

The amendment which we are offering will not provide full funding for the clean lakes programs. It will not enable us to meet all of the needs which exist. But it will be a step in the right direction.

Last year, Congress appropriated \$75 million for the clean lakes programs, but as a result of a Presidential veto, that \$75 million was scaled down to \$4 million. Even that \$4 million was not used for the purpose which we intended—cleaning up our lakes—but rather was used for a research program which I found indistinguishable from section 104(h) of the same Pollution Control Act.

This year, the administration made no request for funding of the clean lakes program. The Senate Committee on Appropriations, however, did recommend some funding for this program.

I believe the Appropriations Committee should be commended for its wisdom in continuing to provide funds for this program and for increasing the funding above the current level. But I think we should fund this program at an even higher level.

The need certainly is there. My own State of Minnesota estimates that it will need to spend \$44.7 million over the next 4 years to clean up our lakes. Other States, I am certain, have similar needs. The national eutrophication survey, in examining 242 lakes in just 10 States, reached the conclusion that 80 percent

of the lakes are in bad condition or going dead.

We possess the skills to clean up our lakes. But to date, we have not possessed the commitment at the Federal level to do so. Our amendment to increase funding for this important program will be a step in the right direction.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will have to call the attention of the gallery to the fact that they are invited visitors and guests and, therefore, conversation will have to be kept down so that the Chair can maintain order.

The Senator will proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The point that I seek to emphasize is that a judgment has been made on this item at a larger figure on an earlier occasion. That is No. 1.

Second, when the EPA and the OMB does not have money available, they always have excuses. If money is made available, hopefully, they will be able to use it in a constructive fashion. If we have only \$10 million for all the lakes in the United States of America for clean-up, at a time when everybody knows that this precious resource is being destroyed in place after place and State after State, I think that we would be inviting the criticism that we do not care. As I understand my colleague, the Budget Committee chairman (Mr. MUSKIE) who has responsibility here as the budget officer for the Senate, did not find himself in opposition to this but felt it was agreeable. Is that correct?

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is correct. When we were marking up the budget resolution in our calculations, that, of course, did not show in the resolution itself. But our calculations easily accommodate this amendment. In other words, what we are proposing with this modest amendment is that we appropriate only two-thirds as much as we appropriated last time, and that we appropriate only one-third of the authority.

This seems to be a modest approach. The program is finally getting started. The total requested already is \$10 million, with several other new projects coming in. This is a program that is at least 40 years late in America. All over our Nation, these cherished fresh-water community lakes are being destroyed by pollution, siltation, and algae growth. It is one piece of the total environmental picture that has been ignored. Finally, the agency is beginning to move, these applications are beginning to be received and processed. Just at a time when the program should be taking off and when, incidentally—I must argue with the distinguished floor manager on this—when we are learning a great deal about very effective techniques of cleaning up and protecting these lakes—this is the time when we should have a modest increase in the program in order to get moving. That is all we are proposing to do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in order that we can hurry on so we can get the rollcall vote on it I wish to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MONDALE. Let me modify my amendment first.

I modify my amendment to provide for an additional \$15 million for the program so that the amendment will read, on page 20, line 13, strike out \$370 million plus and insert in lieu thereof, \$385 million.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What we are talking about here is a very small amount. It gives the Government a chance to move ahead. The States are ready to move ahead. Localities are ready to move ahead. The only problem is, again, the dead-end street, Dullsville, Washington, D.C.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been called for. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is all time yielded back on this amendment?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield back my time. Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have not yielded back my time yet.

Once again, I say I appreciate the presentation of the Senators from Minnesota. I agree that Wisconsin is particularly anxious to get this kind of legislation. We would benefit greatly from it. But there is no question in my mind at all that the administration is not going to proceed that fast. \$10 million would mean a rapidly escalating program, a more than 100-percent increase, and I doubt if we are going to get more action.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that this is an amendment which I think can be misinterpreted, under the circumstances the Senate would be better served if I moved to table the amendment.

Mr. MONDALE. Will the Senator withhold?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought he was through.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, all we are asking for in this modified amendment is that we appropriate \$25 million to help the communities around the Nation to clean up their fresh water community lakes. Last year, we appropriated \$75 million, but regrettably, the bill was vetoed. There are already many applications—good applications—from the State of Washington, from Wisconsin, from Minnesota, from Florida—all over the country—in this crucial area. To ask for a modest \$25 million for this national program, when we already know how to deal with them, and when the program is finally getting going, seems to me to be the most modest kind of request. As a matter of fact, I had hoped that the distinguished floor manager would accept the amendment. In any event, I hope the Senate will accept it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I understand it, we did appropriate the \$75 million. That was vetoed. The second time around we appropriated \$4 million.

Mr. MONDALE. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Now we are going to \$10 million. I hope we do not get a veto. The total of \$10 million, as I say, would be more than a 100-percent increase.

I move to table the amendment, Mr.

President, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE). The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. MORGAN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) is absent because of illness.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BARTLETT), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 336 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Allen	Fannin	Montoya
Baker	Fong	Nunn
Beall	Garn	Pastore
Bentsen	Griffin	Pearson
Brock	Hansen	Proxmire
Buckley	Helms	Roth
Byrd	Hruska	Scott,
Harry F., Jr.	Johnston	William L.
Byrd, Robert C.	Laxalt	Sparkman
Cannon	Mansfield	Stennis
Curtis	Mathias	Talmadge
Dole	McClellan	Thurmond
Domenici	McClure	Tower
Eagleton	McGee	Young

NAYS—40

Abourezk	Huddleston	Pell
Brooke	Humphrey	Randolph
Bumpers	Inouye	Ribicoff
Case	Jackson	Schweiker
Chiles	Javits	Scott, Hugh
Clark	Kennedy	Stafford
Cranston	Leahy	Stevenson
Culver	Magnuson	Stone
Ford	McGovern	Taft
Gravel	McIntyre	Tunney
Haskell	Mondale	Weicker
Hatfield	Moss	Williams
Hathaway	Muskie	
Hollings	Packwood	

NOT VOTING—19

Bartlett	Glenn	Morgan
Bayh	Goldwater	Nelson
Bellmon	Hart, Gary W.	Percy
Biden	Hart, Philip A.	Stevens
Burdick	Hartke	Symington
Church	Long	
Eastland	Metcalf	

So the motion to lay on the table Mr. MONDALE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President—
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-

pore. The question recurs on the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I was going to suggest to the distinguished floor manager that the sponsors of the amendment would be willing to compromise further.

The original amendment would have added \$40 million. This amendment added \$15 million. We would suggest reducing it another \$5 million, so we would be adding only \$10 million.

I would hope the Senator from Wisconsin, who has been one of the Nation's champions on this program, could, on this lovely Saturday afternoon, accede to that request.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to my good friend from Minnesota, the Senator goes more than 100 percent over what we did last year. He wants to go 400 percent over what we did last year.

Mr. MONDALE. The truth of it is that we went \$75 million, this year we are going only \$10 million, so I do not know—

Mr. PROXMIRE. In view of the fact that we lost the tabling motion, I am perfectly willing to accept this compromise provided we do it by a voice vote and not waste the time of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Great, let it go.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The yeas and nays are withdrawn. The amendment is modified to the figure of \$380 million.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 20, line 13, strike out "\$370,766,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$385,766,000".

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order. At this time, Senators will withdraw to the cloakroom or take their seats. The Senate will be in order. Staff members will take their seats.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HELMS. Yes, I am happy to yield to the able Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Frank Gorham of my staff be granted the privilege of the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place add the following new section:

"Sec. (). Prior to December 1, 1975, no part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used directly or indirectly to provide Federal financial assistance, including grants, loans, or loan guarantees, to or for the benefit of Soul City New Community Project in Warren County, North Carolina, which is under investigation and audit by the General Accounting Office."

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, this amendment is directed to the appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It provides that prior to December 1, 1975, none of these funds shall be used directly or indirectly to provide Federal financial assistance, including grants, loans, or loan guarantees, to or for the benefit of the Soul City new community project in Warren County, N.C., which is currently under investigation and audit by the General Accounting Office.

That project is being investigated and audited by the General Accounting Office because, along with the distinguished House Member from the Second District of North Carolina (Mr. FOUNTAIN), I requested such action. Let me emphasize at the outset that while the Senator from North Carolina has some tentative conclusions about the project which he is about to discuss, I shall withhold final judgment until all of the facts are in. But it is essential, at this time, that some information already available be presented to the Senate.

In 1968 when the plans for the creation of Soul City were first announced, there were grandiose plans indeed. The developer, Floyd McKissick, and others widely advertised that it would be a haven for black people, apparently the idea was that blacks needed to have a city that was all theirs. This project, it was said, would be a new, "freestanding" community with its own industrial base to be developed by black-controlled corporations.

It was to be established in my State, North Carolina, about 50 miles northeast of Raleigh in Warren County. Indeed, travelers along Interstate Highway 85 may see the large sign indicating its proximity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is not in order. The Chair requests the visitors in the galleries to cease from conversing so that the Senate can be in order.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

During the earlier years, Soul City officials assured that the project would house 44,000 residents in 13,000 homes. Of course, that was a long range projection. That was 7 years ago.

The city was to cover some 5,000 acres including a 928-acre industrial park which, it was said, would ultimately employ 8,200 people. To achieve all this, the Soul City foundation and a proliferation of other organizations created by Mr. McKissick for the obvious purpose of applying for Federal funds have been awarded numerous large grants, provided loan guarantees, and the like, to develop programs in education, manpower training, health services and rec-

reation, industrial development, and many other areas.

The level of Federal financial assistance to Soul City, directly or indirectly, has indeed been a remarkable manifestation of social engineering, and another unmasking the tired old concept that enough money thrown helter-skelter at any problem will make it go away, or when thrown in similar fashion at any proposal, will make it happen. In one form or another over the past 6 years, the Federal Government has thrown millions of the taxpayers' dollars at this project through the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, the National Endowment of the Arts, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Transportation. No one is certain how much money is involved, but estimates run as high as \$19 million or more.

The operators of this project—which, by the way has the appearance of a family enterprise, of course, wanted the new city to have fine streets and roads, proper water and sewer facilities, adequate housing, and educational opportunities as well as employment training so that individuals can learn how to work. And, of course, there had to be recreational and cultural facilities. Hence, the involvement of all those Federal Departments and agencies at the taxpayers expense. One wonders how many of those taxpayers, footing the bill for all of this, were taught how to work under some Federal project or spend their evenings absorbing the kind of so-called culture that is supported by the National Endowment of the Arts, but then that is another matter. The point here is that you name it, and it seems that the Soul City developers found some Federal agency with funds to finance it.

The General Accounting Office recently provided me with a list of grants, contracts, agreements, loans, and loan guarantees benefiting Soul City that had been identified as of May 15, 1975. I understand that it required weeks to compile this list. And, of course, who knows how many more they may ultimately identify?

The list of the individual items is lengthy and complicated. It is informative to note a few, however. For example, on February 26, 1974, the Soul City Co. received a loan guarantee from the HUD-New Communities Administration in the amount of \$14 million for land acquisition and land development. Of this amount, \$5 million in federally guaranteed bonds have been sold. Between July 1, 1971, and June 30, 1972, the Office of Economic Opportunity through its Community Services Administration, provided grants to the Soul City Foundation in the amount of \$98,934 to plan and develop a comprehensive health delivery program. Between March 1, 1973, and June 30, 1974, OEO, again through its Community Services Administration, provided a grant in the amount of \$90,000 for a social planning project.

Between July 1, 1973, and August 30, 1974, the Office of Education of HEW