

91st Congress
UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 16

JULY 28, 1969, TO AUGUST 4, 1969

(PAGES 20847 TO 22196)

ment of Health, Education and Welfare, *Vital Statistics of the United States and Mortality Statistics*. See chart, p. 8.

¹⁸ Federal Bureau of Investigation Uniform Crime Reports, 1967 (to be released to the public in August 1968).

¹⁷ Same as ¹⁸ above.

¹⁶ Same as ¹⁸ above.

¹⁵ Statement of Senator Robert F. Kennedy on July 11, 1967, Hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, Judiciary Committee, United States Senate, 90th Congress, p. 158.

¹⁴ *Principal Wars in Which the United States Has Participated*, Director of Statistical Services, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Nov. 7, 1957; Department of Defense Press Release, No. 644-68, July 11, 1968.

¹³ See chart, p. 8.

¹² FBI Uniform Crime Reports 1966, p. 6.

¹¹ FBI Uniform Crime Reports 1966, p. 4.

¹⁰ Statement of New Jersey Attorney General Arthur J. Sills before the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, United States Senate 90th Congress, June 26, 1968.

⁹ Statement of California Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch before the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, United States Senate, 90th Congress, June 28, 1968.

⁸ Statement of Carl K. Miller, Chicago Police Department, Chicago, Illinois, On June 2, 1965, Hearings before the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, Judiciary Committee, United States Senate, 89th Congress, p. 278.

⁷ Statement of Arthur J. Sills, Attorney General, New Jersey, on June 3, 1965, Hearings before the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, Judiciary Committee, United States Senate, 89th Congress, p. 405.

⁶ Statement of John B. Layton, Chief of Police, Washington, D.C. on June 2, 1965, before the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, Judiciary Committee, United States Senate, 89th Congress, p. 290.

⁵ Letter from George A. Everett, Superintendent, Indiana State Police, letter dated April 22, 1964, Hearings before the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, Judiciary Committee, United States Senate, 89th Congress, p. 3712.

⁴ Letter from Leslie W. Williams, Department of State Police, Connecticut, Dated April 13, 1964 to the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, Judiciary Committee, United States Senate, 89th Congress, p. 3701.

³ Statement by Richard R. Caples, Commissioner, Department of Public Safety, Boston, Massachusetts, Exhibits 84, 85, on June 13, 1965, Hearings before the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, Judiciary Committee, United States Senate, 89th Congress, p. 346-347.

² Statement by William L. Cahalan, Prosecuting Attorney, Wayne County, Michigan, on July 18, 1967, Hearings before the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, Judiciary Committee, United States Senate, 90th Congress, p. 369.

¹ Federal Bureau of Investigation Uniform Crime Reports, 1967 (to be released to the public in August 1968).

¹⁴ Federal Bureau of Investigation Uniform Crime Reports, 1966, page 7.

¹³ Federal Bureau of Investigation Uniform Crime Reports, 1965, page 6.

¹² Federal Bureau of Investigation Uniform Crime Reports, 1964, page 6, 7.

¹¹ Federal Bureau of Investigation Uniform Crime Reports, 1966, page 6.

¹⁰ Survey conducted by the Staff of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, Judiciary Committee, United States Senate, dated March 15, 1966, entitled "Resume of Subcommittee Questionnaire on Rifle and Shotgun Mistake in Cities of 100,000 or More."

EVERGLADES JETPORT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the disasters facing Everglades National Park from federally financed projects is one of the real tragedies in the long history of our degradation of the environment. As my colleague, Senator GAYLORD NELSON, has pointed out, we cannot tolerate any further delay in putting a halt to this unnecessary destruction of the third largest national park in this country. With remedies easily at hand, both to Congress and to the executive branch, there is ample opportunity for a resolution of this critical matter.

In its July 1969 Bulletin, the Sierra Club does an excellent job of putting this situation in perspective, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE EVERGLADES JETPORT—ONE HELL OF AN UPROAR

(By Gary A. Soucie)

The nation's third largest national park is in trouble, serious trouble. As Undersecretary of the Interior Russell Train stated at the June Senate Interior hearings on the Everglades, "Everglades National Park has the dubious distinction of having the most serious preservation problems facing the National Park Service today. . . ." Everglades National Park is in as much jeopardy as the 22 endangered species of fish and wildlife that find refuge within its boundaries.

The fragile, unique ecology of Everglades National Park is utterly dependent on a reliable supply of pure, fresh water. But the sources of this supply exist outside the park's boundaries, in the sloughs and sawgrass savannahs of the Everglades to the north, in the strands and marshes of the Big Cypress Swamp to the north and west, in Lake Okeechobee almost 70 miles north, and even in the Kissimmee Prairie beyond the lake. And, ever since the 1880's, man has been busy as the proverbial beaver draining, diking, ditching, and otherwise "managing" this water.

The real trouble began in 1948 when Congress authorized the construction of a gigantic flood control, drainage, and reclamation project north of Everglades National Park. Still under construction (at latest count it was \$170 million old and still only 48 per cent complete), the project already has the capability of completely shutting off the park from its source of surface water, which was proved during the long and severe drought of the early 1960's.

Designed and built by the Army Corps of Engineers, the project is administered by a state agency, the Central and Southern Florida Flood Control District (FCD). Both of these agencies have been notably more understanding of the project's other water users: citrus growers, beef ranchers, sugarcane growers, vegetable farmers, real-estate developers, and municipal water users. However, since the appointment of conservation-minded Chevrolet dealer Robert W. Padrick to the chairmanship of the FCD's board of governors, the national park has fared considerably better.

But there is no way to insure that the next FCD chairman will be as understanding of the park's problems as Bob Padrick; so the only long-range solution is to secure for Everglades National Park a guarantee to its minuscule, but absolutely necessary share of the project's water. The Corps has several times entered into agreement with the National Park Service, but has backed off each time. The people of the United States have

been waiting 21 years now for this guarantee, and in each of those 21 years Congress has appropriated several millions of public dollars to advance construction of the flood control project. It's high time for Congress to secure for the people of the 49 other states their interest in Everglades National Park. That's precious little to ask for all that equity in the water project.

THE NEW ENEMY

But, while conservationists and the National Park Service were engaged in this long struggle to secure the park's water supply, Everglades National Park took a mean blow below the belt from an entirely different foe. On September 18, 1968, ground was broken in the ecotone between the Everglades and the Big Cypress Swamp for the world's largest airport. Just imagine, an airport of 39 square miles, large enough to hold Kennedy, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Washington national airports with plenty of room left over to spare; with runways six miles long, capable of handling the largest and fastest jet transport aircraft—and just six miles away from, and "upstream" of, Everglades National Park.

Though not exclusively a water problem, the jetport certainly will have an impact on this resource. First consider the degradation of the waters flowing into Everglades National Park from the use of pesticides, fertilizers, and detergents on the airport site, from the inevitable fuel spills, from the effluent of the 35 to 40 million passengers it is expected to serve by 1985. Then, consider the tons of hydrocarbons, petrochemicals, and carbon particulates from unburned and partially burned fuel that will be dumped into water on its way to the park during approach, landing, takeoff, and climbout.

Perhaps even more important is the broad threat to both water quality and quantity posed by the massive development of the Big Cypress Swamp that will be spurred by the construction and operation of the world's largest jetport. It has been estimated that a city of 500,000 to one million inhabitants will spring up in the wilderness of the Big Cypress Swamp. The drainage required by a development of this magnitude (remember, this is Florida swampland) would siphon off a substantial portion of the park's Big Cypress water supply. And the potential pollution of the rest is fantastic.

In April of this year, the Sierra Club joined with 20 other conservation organizations to oppose the jetport's development at the present site and requested Secretary of Transportation John Volpe to withdraw his department's support and to actively encourage the relocation of the facility.

Jetport backers, including not only the Port Authority but also other Miami and Dade County economic interests and several major airlines, are quick to point out to conservationists that the Big Cypress lands in Collier and Monroe counties are subject to undesirable development whether or not the jetport is developed at the present site. True, but the jetport will accelerate and magnify the development. As Nathan P. Reed, special assistant to Governor Claude R. Kirk, pointed out to the Senate Interior Committee:

"For years competent biologists and ecologists have wondered what would happen to the park if the peripheral Big Cypress lands were ultimately developed. Due to the money squeeze, the problem remained insoluble. In my opinion, the park cannot be saved for future generations if the Big Cypress is allowed to be developed. Even 'planned development' will surely wreak havoc with the water route."

Without the development catalyst of the jetport there might, just might, be time to acquire enough of the Big Cypress and to zone enough of the rest to preserve the west-

ern Ten Thousand Islands section of Everglades National Park. With the jetport, that slim chance is lost.

TRANSPORTATION ACT VIOLATED

Last year, at the urging of Senator Henry M. Jackson, Congress amended the Transportation Act to require consultation between the Secretaries of Transportation and Interior prior to approval of any transportation program or project which uses park, wildlife, or recreation lands of federal, state, or local significance. This language was designed to prevent just the sort of disaster that now threatens the Everglades. The FAA has made an airport construction grant of \$500,000 to the Dade County Port Authority without the required consultation between the Secretaries of Transportation and the Interior, and without the required demonstration that (1) there was no "feasible and prudent alternative" and that (2) the airport program included "all possible planning to minimize harm" to Everglades National Park and State Water Conservation Area 3, an important state outdoor recreation area. Not only that, but the Department of Transportation's Federal Railway Administration has announced a \$200,000 grant to study high-speed ground transportation connecting the jetport with Miami, 52 miles to the east, and plans are under way to route Interstate Highway 75 connecting Tampa-St. Petersburg and Miami past or through the jetport site.

Port authority and FAA officials have lately been given to public expression of conservation platitudes, but the record is clear: it's the same old flim-flam. The memorandum from the Port Authority staff to the Dade County commissioners recommending the jetport project mentions Everglades National Park just once: "The Everglades National Park south of the site at Tamiami Trail assures that no private complaining development will be adjacent on that side." This great national park was seen exclusively as a buffer, "with no one to complain about the noise except the alligators." And as for the "environmental concern" the jetport sponsors profess to share with the Interior agencies and private conservation organizations, *Aviation Week & Space Technology* published the following statement in their May 22, 1969 issue—before the rising tide of public concern began to well up:

"The bulk of the takeoffs will be out over the 15 miles of clear zone of the undeveloped state-owned water conservation area. . . . Climbouts could then turn south over the Everglades National Park, providing what the airport officials believe to be optimum environmental operating conditions."

This doesn't pass muster as sound environmental planning.

At present the air over Everglades National Park is pure and clear. But what will

it be like if the jetport is developed at the present site? Figures on pollutant emissions from jet aircraft engines are readily available from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Society of Automotive Engineers and are highly reliable. But some inside-outside figure can be calculated to provide an idea of the magnitude of the air pollution problem. Based on 900,000 flights a year—the projected operation level as a full-blown commercial jetport—the airport's annual contribution to the Everglades atmosphere will be something like this:

Carbon monoxide: 9,000 to 72,000 tons.

Nitrogen oxides: 4,150 to 6,000 tons.

Hydrocarbons: 13,000 to 40,250 tons.

Aldehydes: About 1,000 tons.

Particulates: 1,260 to 3,250 tons.

That is big-league air pollution.

And the prognosis for noise pollution isn't much rosier. The supersonic transports the jetport is being built to accommodate (the sign at the gate bills it as "the world's first all-new jetport for the supersonic age") are expected to be noisier than the current generation of jets. And how noisy is that?

When the Anglo-French Concorde made its maiden flight this past winter, NBC reported, "On takeoff, the roar of its four engines could be heard in villages 20 miles away." And the Concorde is expected to be even noisier on approach. Last year *Aerospace Technology* reported, "It is expected that the Concorde will exhibit sideline noise levels of about 118 PNdB [decibels or perceived noise], according to U.S. engineers, and may show a rather startling 124 PNdB figure during approach. . . ." Boeing's studies show that its larger, faster, and more powerful SST will probably generate a sideline noise level of 122 PNdB. As a yardstick, 120 decibels is considered the threshold of pain. The current subsonic commercial jets at takeoff generate noise levels three miles away in the range of 120 PNdB.

It is difficult to determine what the noise levels would be within Everglades National Park, but it's a safe bet that they would be considerably higher than a typical national park "noise"—the rustling of leaves, which is rated at 10 decibels. Talk about uproar; if the jetport is developed at the present site, it will turn the wilderness quietude of Everglades National Park into bedlam. Nine hundred thousand flights a year averages out to more than 100 flights an hour, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

NEEDED: ONE HELL OF AN UPROAR

Fortunately, Section 4(f) of the Transportation Act gives the Department of Transportation a clear mandate to move the jetport if a "feasible and prudent alternative" exists. At the June 3 hearing before the Senate Interior Committee, alternative sites were identified by two state witnesses: Nat Reed of the governor's office and FCD Chair-

man Padrick. The sites they identified are both on state-owned land, so a land swap with the Port Authority would make things relatively simple.

But the push for another site isn't going to come from Miami, not while either alternative would benefit Fort Lauderdale, West Palm Beach, and other cities north of Miami along Florida's Gold Coast. The push is going to have to come from Washington, by shutting off the federal subsidy for development at the present, destructive site. And Washington isn't likely to push too hard without a push from the general public. Everglades National Park might well become the first national park to be dis-established, unless the American people stand up in its defense. So far, through the various federally supported programs and projects of diverse agencies and departments, the American public has unwittingly been subsidizing the destruction of Everglades National Park.

As long as the various federal departments and their agencies pursue their separate ways, ignoring the several laws that exist to promote—and that even require—inter-departmental coordination and sound environmental planning, there can be no hope for preserving and restoring the American environment. In many ways the Everglades problems are symptomatic of an even larger problem. Hopefully, President Nixon's new Environmental Quality Council will roll up its collective shirtsleeves and go to bat for Everglades National Park. For if the Everglades are lost, America will have gone one hitless inning toward losing the whole environmental ballgame.

The first step down the long road toward saving Everglades National Park is moving the jetport away from the park. As Senator Nelson observed, moving the jetport will cause one hell of an uproar in Dade and Collier counties. But the jetport isn't likely to be moved unless there is one hell of an uproar in the 50 states of the Union over the threat to Everglades National Park. Conservationists who want to see Everglades National Park given at least a fair chance of survival, are writing President Richard M. Nixon, as well as their senators and congressmen. If the jetport isn't moved, say goodbye to the continent's only subtropical national park and to the world's only Everglades.

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, August 1, 1969, at 11 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, July 31, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Henry E. Pressly, Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, Charlotte, N.C., offered the following prayer:

Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.—Matthew 28: 20.

O God, our Heavenly Father, Thou who art above us in the vast space of which we are so aware; Thou who are about us in this beautiful world in which we live; Thou who art within us by the still small voice of Thy spirit, we pause at this noon hour to invoke Thy blessing upon this assembly.

Let Thy divine favor which is life, and Thy loving kindness which is better than

life, rest upon our great Nation and the nations of the world at this the most crucial hour in human history. We thank Thee for the freedom which we enjoy and pray Thee to send peace and freedom to our world.

And now, we implore Thee to give to these dedicated men and women vision to see what needs to be done, faith to believe it can be done, and courage to rise up and do it.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2678. An act to amend section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 to provide for optimum development at Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir project; and

S.J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to provide for the striking of medals in honor of American astronauts who have flown in outer space.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant