

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 19

SEPTEMBER 11, 1967, TO SEPTEMBER 20, 1967

(PAGES 24929 TO 26292)

afflicted more than 30 of our nation's cities, we in Washington who represent all Americans have no one but ourselves to blame.

Senator JOSEPH C. CLARK. The bloodshed, burning and looting in the recent riots is outrageous and must be abruptly and finally halted. But at the same time we must also deal with the conditions which permitted criminals and hoodlums to create anarchy and lay siege to large sections of our cities. . . . The purpose of this legislation is not to bribe malefactors but the very opposite—to cut them off, isolate them, leave them without their demagogic appeals, ignored and powerless.

#### SENATOR MONDALE CALLS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE VOYAGEURS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, last Friday, September 16, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] called for the establishment of the proposed Voyageurs National Park in the Kabetogama Peninsula in northern Minnesota.

The proposed Voyageurs National Park would be a superlative addition to the string of national parks and recreation areas which will someday be completed in the Great Lakes area. Already established parks include the Indiana Dunes, Isle Royale, and Pictured Rocks and the famous Boundary Waters Canoe Area. Sleeping Bear Dunes National Park is in the planning stages as is the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore which recently was approved by the Senate.

The amount of park quality land remaining in the Midwest is rapidly dwindling, while the population, and the resultant demand for recreational land, is increasing tremendously. We must move promptly to establish the Voyageurs National Park and the other parks which are under consideration, or it will be too late.

Speaking at the 15th Annual Assembly of the Minnesota Conservation, Senator MONDALE so well stated the case for the Voyageurs Park that his speech deserves much wider attention. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE AT THE 15TH ANNUAL ASSEMBLY, MINNESOTA CONSERVATION FEDERATION, DULUTH, MINN., SEPTEMBER 16, 1967

The most fundamental conservation issue facing our state today involves the creation of the proposed Voyageurs National Park. I favor the creation of a National Park in Minnesota, as does most everyone involved in the controversy.

And why shouldn't we all favor a National Park? I wonder how many stop to realize what it would mean to Minnesota to have a National Park within our State. The National Parks of this Nation are what some have called the crown jewels of our national heritage; and, I might say, jewels that citizens of this Nation and other Nations of the world are visiting in greatly increasing numbers. Only thirty-three areas have so far been recognized by the Congress of the United States as being worthy of this classification, and most of these areas are in the West. Completely aside from the honor of having resources in our State that qualify for such a designation, and the privilege of being able

to share in helping such an effort, we as a people would have much to gain economically.

An area as outstanding as a national park with its great drawing power, and the monies that go into development of facilities for the public and the maintenance of the area is like your receiving a windfall of cash which when invested would generate enough interest to satisfy the needs for you and your children as long as you all live. The preservation, under wise management, of a nationally important Park resource is like this capital in the bank because the basic resource does not diminish and yet the locale, the State and the Region can continue to benefit from its presence in all the years to come through the economic returns that result from the visitor use of the area.

The only question is whether the Park should be located at the site proposed by the National Park Service at the Kabetogama Peninsula or, as proposed by others, at the Lac La Croix area now a part of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area of the Superior National Forest. For some time, under the leadership of Congressman Blatnik, we have tried to resolve this issue, as well as others, before introducing the required legislation. Last week Congressman Blatnik pointed out that we are now nearing the point when a decision must be made. He mentioned his hope that there might be substantial agreement by next March permitting him to introduce a national park proposal in the United States Congress. While some have expressed concern at the delay, I believe it will actually save us time.

I favor a national park on the Kabetogama Peninsula as recommended by the National Park Service.

I don't have to tell you about the magnificent qualities of the proposed Voyageurs National Park at Kabetogama. It possesses outstanding waterscapes and landscapes. This area has been selected in the worlds of the Park Service for "its significance to the Nation as a superlative scenic resource. The proposed park contains an unusually beautiful system of lakes, streams, and forests; representation of Precambrian geology and a land surface shaped by continental glaciation and historical associations with the fur trade and the era of exploration along the International Boundary. Such a combination of scenic, scientific, and historic resources should be preserved for the enjoyment and use of the present and future generations."

The Sielaff study has indicated the impressive investment, new employment and improved tourist attractions that would flow from this national park. This report points out that tourist expenditures in the area would double in the next 10 years. The Service would spend nearly \$9 million in the first five years and there would be substantial new expenditures for new tourist facilities outside the park by private individuals and firms. It would provide an advertising and publicity advantage of very great value to the region and the increased private investment in the area would tend to offset losses in assessed values and taxes and would create greater job opportunities in the region and a broader base for employment and income.

These are not theoretical projections but are conclusions substantiated by similar studies made in the past at Glacier, Great Smokies, and other national parks.

A study completed early this year by the University of Wyoming showed that the basic source of income for Wyoming's Teton County is recreation and tourist trade. It concluded that the estimated 2.7 million visitors to Grand Teton National Park last year had "a tremendous impact on the Economy of the County." Estimated tourist expenditures increased from \$6 million in 1958 to \$13 million in 1964, and, moreover through "dollar turnover" the total income accruing

to the County because of recreation and tourist trade was about \$15 million. This study went on to say that "as more people become acquainted with the scenic grandeur of the Teton area and with the variety of recreational facilities available there, the number of visitors will continue to increase and this growth will add more basic dollars to the County's economy."

If one wonders about the attractiveness of national parks for the tourist dollar I offer in evidence this AAA U.S. road map which lists two things—U.S. roads and the major National Park System areas.

Some argue that they favor a national park but it ought to be located at the Lac La Croix Area. This site has been opposed by the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture which administers this land as part of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area.

Last week John Wernham, Forest Supervisor, stated 15 impressive reasons why the Lac La Croix Area should remain a part of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. He points out, among other things, that Lac La Croix portion of the BWCA has an especially high value as a part of the Boundary Waters Program and that the creation of a national park in that area would for many reasons be "a crippling blow to a less valuable and smaller BWCA". There is only one BWCA in the country and it is in Minnesota and each year it is gaining tourist attraction.

Not only is the Lac La Croix Area necessary to a sound BWCA but to make it a national park would require the agreement of both the Secretary of Interior and Agriculture who have a long-standing agreement by which they stand behind a policy of not encroaching on each other's territory except in extremely compelling circumstances. (The much discussed North Cascades National Park exception was reached as a part of the original agreement). Moreover, Congressman Blatnik last week accurately stated: "I sense that Congress would not want to see this land juggled from one use to the other."

Thus to urge the Lac La Croix Park site and oppose the Kabetogama site is not only to support a proposition that in all likelihood cannot be achieved but to place in serious jeopardy the only site that stands a reasonable chance of acceptance.

Moreover, even if by chance we could succeed, we would jeopardize the adequacy of the BWCA. The one could go far to destroy the adequacy of the other. The National Park Service's recommendation permits us to have both the Park and BWCA. We should be delighted by this opportunity.

And even if all of us here today, the State of Minnesota, and all of the Congressional Delegation were in complete accord that we wanted this National Park, no one could give you assurance that the Administration and the Congress of the United States would definitely support it. I understand that today there are some 50 areas of various kinds under some stage of consideration from the standpoint of possible addition to the National Park System. Add to this approximately 50 National Park System areas that have been authorized by the Congress since 1961 and you can begin to appreciate the great demands being placed on the Federal budget for land acquisition monies for parks alone. And The Land and Water Conservation Fund which has been so extremely helpful in providing money for acquisition of public recreation lands, isn't going to be enough to do the job that must be done even under the most optimistic projections of income.

We are not operating in a seller's market, and if you don't believe this you should just look at a list of the bills before Congress today for projects such as this, most being pushed by strong constituencies and their Congressional Delegations. If we are to have

due consideration of our park proposal we must agree as a State soon and do everything possible to get this project in line for consideration as soon as we can.

Recent newspaper articles carried the report that the Boise-Cascade Company was on the verge of acquiring a corporation known as the U.S. Land Inc., which specializes in land and lakefront development for homes and resorts. This article quoted an official of the U.S. Land company to the effect that the Kabetogema Peninsula offered the possibility of development either "on the conventional subdivision basis" or as a "sort of a club program" where homeowners would share resort facilities. In fairness to Boise-Cascade it has not indicated what course it would want their new subsidiary to follow, if any, with respect to the Kabetogema Peninsula. However, since the possibility of such a development exists, I think we must understand that such development could jeopardize, if not destroy, the opportunity for a national park on the Kabetogema Peninsula.

We must understand that we cannot alone determine whether we shall have a national park or where it will be. Others are involved—the National Park Service, the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, the United States Congress and the President. The Park Service has some very clearly defined criteria if natural areas are to be eligible to become a part of the National Park System. Among them is the requirement that they must possess national significance and the area must reflect integrity, that is, that it must be a true, accurate and essentially "unspoiled" national example.

Although certain areas cut over in the past have been included in some of the National Parks, these were mainly lands which if preserved were capable of returning to a basically original state. I am told that much of the Shenandoah and Great Smoky Mountains National Parks were cut over at one time, as was Kabetogema Peninsula, but following protection as National Parks, the areas have restored themselves to a condition much like that originally existing there. Although you and I might not live to see the day when the tall pines would bend again in the wind on Kabetogema Peninsula, future generations will if this area is set aside as a National Park.

Where an area has been developed commercially with substantial construction of physical facilities, the possibility of satisfying either the Park Service or the Congress are far more remote. As Congressman Blatnik put it last week, "time is not on our side" and the news story further reflected the Congressman's fears that home building and subdividing on the Peninsula might cause the Federal Government to drop their proposal for a park and I agree.

In addition to this, if the Peninsula were developed as threatened and we later created a Park, we know from sad experience of the dislocations and other problems required to return the area to an unspoiled condition. Such a development would create misunderstanding and bitterness that would be with us for years to come.

For all these reasons I would hope everyone owning property on the Peninsula—public and private—would give us a chance to work out these basic policy issues before developing the Peninsula.

Under Congressman Blatnik's leadership we have tried to fully understand the needs of the many interests that would be affected by the creation of this proposed Park. We have tried to listen to all sides, we have tried to provide the time necessary for better understanding and for a full exploration of all of the factors before introducing legislation in the Congress.

I do not wish to be misunderstood on this point. In Minnesota we pride ourselves in the healthy business climate we have and

our willingness to understand and work with businesses in dealing with their problems. I would hope, however, that this period we have taken to consider all relevant matters would not be used by some to destroy those characteristics of the Peninsula essential to the establishment of a Park.

If we were to (1) preserve the integrity of the BWCA, (2) contribute to the growing vitality of the Crane Lake Recreational Area and to the health and profitability of the many fine resorts and other tourist oriented facilities there and (3) add to it what would be the only truly water based National Park in our country, Northern Minnesota would become one of the Nation's top tourist attractions.

The variety of natural, scenic, cultural and recreational resources, with its unique water-based orientation—and all available to the public—would offer an unmatched tourist attraction. There would be nothing like it in the country. We would not only preserve the magnificent features of the area but profit from the increasing flow of tourists who would contribute enormously to the economic vitality of the area.

We would be the envy of the Nation. More than that we would become a symbol of a state able to wisely balance the needs of business against the desperate need to conserve our natural beauty before it is destroyed and gone forever. This objective must stand as one of the most fundamental and compelling needs of our time. Throughout the Nation, river after river, lake after lake, forest after forest, historical sites one after another, and points in America of the greatest natural beauty are being destroyed by the thousands for short-term economic or political reasons. It is a national scandal.

I believe Senator Gaylord Nelson described the nature of the dispute which we must decide when he said:

"Everyone, or nearly everyone, is in favor of conservation—in principle. But in fight after fight, the general public interest in conservation has lost out to the specific local interest in commercial development.

"In most conservation contests—whether over the use of the Indiana Dunes, of the Redwoods of California, or the St. Croix—there is usually a sizable group of local people willing to grant the validity of the conservationist's arguments, but bowing in this specific instance to the strong local economic interest in the 'development' of a specific forest, river or bit of lakeshore.

"The fight has been unequal—eloquent spokesmen preaching lofty conservation generalities on the one hand, determined people seeking their bread and butter on the other.

"The country has always seemed so vast, its resources so endless, and economic 'progress' so American, that the conservation interests, except in areas of marginal economic utility, have almost always lost the contest. No single one of these lost contests loomed large in the total picture. But down through the decades these thousands of lost contests have spelled the destruction of a major portion of America's resources."

What will our answer be?

#### INSURANCE INDUSTRY RESPONDS TO THE PRESIDENT'S CALL

Mr. HART, Mr. President, with the decision by the Nation's leading life insurance companies to invest \$1 billion in slum real estate—mostly in rent supplement housing projects—private enterprise has recognized that improvement of our cities is everyone's responsibility, not the Government's alone.

Their decision provides a special stimulus to the rent supplements program. In the words of a recent New York Times editorial, this "could spark a chain reac-

tion that would really produce a massive private drive to raise ghetto housing and living standards."

This Nation will not achieve true greatness until its urban slums are eradicated. And urban ghettos will not completely disappear until private industry and government—at all levels—harness their resources to help the disadvantaged.

President Johnson is to be congratulated on achievement of a major breakthrough in his efforts to obtain help from the private sector to heal our ailing cities. His call for large-scale private investment in the future of our urban areas have paid a handsome dividend.

A start has been made which, in the words of the New York Times, "could radically alter the character of American cities in the years ahead."

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial of September 14, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Sept. 14, 1967]

#### BREAKTHROUGH IN THE SLUMS

The long-discussed need to apply the vast resources of the private economy to the problems of slums has finally been met with action. This is the meaning of the decision of the nation's life insurance companies to invest \$1 billion in ghetto real estate.

The \$1 billion will make possible a small, though appreciable, start toward eradicating cancerous slum conditions. But even more vital than the amount involved is the lead given by the traditionally conservative insurance industry to the nation's banks and other large sources of private capital. It could spark a chain reaction that would really produce a massive private drive to raise ghetto housing and living standards.

What the life insurance companies have done is to subordinate short-run economic interest to the nation's and their own longer-run interests. Much of their investment will be insured by the Federal Government, but at a time of high interest rates and capital stringency there is no doubt that funds now being diverted to financing slum housing could be invested more profitably elsewhere.

Immediate effect of the plan is to give needed stimulus to the Administration's flagging rent-supplement program. Until now there had been scant hope that Congress would provide more funds to pay part of the monthly rent for slum tenants because of the reluctance of private industry to participate. But since the industry has specifically pledged to put funds into this program, there is no excuse at all for Congress to continue to drag its heels.

It is no denigration of the insurance companies to note that their decision would have been impossible had it not been for a major policy change by the Federal Housing Administration. Prior to last month the F.H.A. had effectively excluded many of the worst housing areas of the country from its mortgage insurance program as excessive risks. Its conservative lending policies had made it the target of civil rights leaders who accused it of drawing a "white noose" around the nation's urban centers by stressing white-collar housing in the suburbs.

This policy was changed in August, when the Department of Housing and Urban Development announced that mortgages would be insured for "credit-worthy" individuals even if they lived in areas already affected or threatened by riots.

The pattern now set of creative private-government partnership to help attack the problems of the urban disadvantaged could