

ST. CROIX NATIONAL SCENIC WATERWAY

Printing of S. 897 - Jan. 29

Amendments to St. Croix bill - Sept. 8

Water shortage and the St. Croix -
Sept. 29

President's Great Message on
Natural Beauty: by Sen. Nelson -
Feb. 9

Senate

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1965

(Legislative day, January 29, 1965)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Father of our spirits, who hearest prayer: Breathe upon us now, we beseech Thee, the benediction of Thy holy calm, as those in this forum, to whose hands has been committed the stewardship of public affairs, face the demands of another week.

Lift the burdens of drab duty from jaded hearts, changing stern statutes into glad songs. Soothe the anxieties of our baffled minds, so that with the shield of Thy peace and the sword of Thy truth, we may face—free and fearless—whatever tests this day may bring.

If there is any kindness we can show the comrades by our side, may we not neglect or defer it, seeing that we pass this way but once. Spurning and scorning anything unworthy of our best, may we find our joy only in honor untarnished.

Y. k in it the dear Redeemer's name.
A

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 29, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 66)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Fourth Annual Report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

In this report, submitted pursuant to law, the Agency describes its activities for the calendar year 1964.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 1, 1965.

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961—Public Law 87-256, the Fulbright-Hays Act—I transmit herewith the annual report on the international cultural exchange program for the fiscal year 1963.

This report deals with the influence for peace and progress which exchange-of-persons activities have become in the world of the 1960's.

The varying stages of nationhood in the world today require a varying range of relationships on our part. I am convinced that exchanges of persons are uniquely appropriate and unusually effective activities for the needs and opportunities of these times. Such exchanges touch our societies at many points—involving students, teachers, professors, research scholars, athletes, government leaders, judges, economists, labor leaders, social workers, actors, authors, coaches, and many others—a broad panorama of professions and the arts.

In the single year covered by this report, some 10,000 people were overseas from this country, or here from other countries, in the friendly, constructive interchange the United States now sponsors. This exchange involved more than 130 countries and territories.

Congress can take particular and proper pride in this program. Since World War II—with full bipartisan support, as in Public Law 87-256—Congress has fathered and fostered this activity. Many Members of both Houses have a special knowledge of the vital role which exchanges now play in our relations and understandings with other nations. All along the way, the articulate leadership of the Congress has been a major strength for the program's success.

The warm and strong support of the American people likewise deserves our praise. The volunteer services and family hospitality which our citizens and communities give to thousands of students and visitors from other countries is of incalculable value to the interest of international understanding.

I hope that our exchange activities, public and private, may grow. An enlarging investment means an enlarging return—not merely from the understanding others may acquire of us, but from the understanding we acquire of those with whom we share the hopes of these times and the destiny of this planet.

We in the United States have an abiding faith in the value of education to our own society's success, and we are affirming that faith with a new and strengthened commitment to education in America. But education as a force for freedom, justice, and rationality knows no national boundaries—it is the great universal force for good. Our efforts in the exchange programs give that force added strength and justified support. For when we help other peoples achieve their highest and best aspirations, we truly work for understanding, for progress, and for peace. In this work, let us continue with new enthusiasm and confidence, for out of the understandings among peoples will grow peace among nations.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 1, 1965.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

OMISSION FROM THE RECORD OF JANUARY 29, 1965

On page 1520 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, January 29, 1965, Senate bill 897, introduced by Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. MONDALE), was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. Through inadvertence, the bill was not printed.

Senate bill 897 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) (1) for the purpose of preserving the portion of the Saint Croix River, beginning at the dam near Taylors Falls, Minnesota, and extending upstream to the dam near Gordon, Wisconsin, and its Namekagon tributary in Wisconsin, as a wild river in a primitive condition, or restoring it as nearly as possible to such condition, in order to conserve its unique scenic and other natural values;

(2) for the purpose of promoting broad recreational use and more intensive types of recreational use of the portion of the Saint Croix River downstream from the dam near Taylors Falls, Minnesota, to its confluence with the Mississippi River; and

(3) for the purpose of protecting, developing, and making accessible the nationally significant outdoor recreation resources of such river segments for the use and enjoyment of all of the American people, the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway is hereby established.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") may acquire lands and waters or interests therein for the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway as follows:

(1) Along the lake created by the dam on the Saint Croix River near Taylors Falls, Minnesota, the Secretary may acquire not more than six hundred and forty acres which may include not to exceed two miles of lake frontage;

(2) From the north end of the lake created by the dam on the Saint Croix River near Taylors Falls, Minnesota, upstream to the dam near Gordon, Wisconsin, the Secretary may acquire an average of not more than three hundred and twenty acres per mile;

(3) From the dam on the Saint Croix River near Taylor Falls, Minnesota, downstream to its confluence with the Mississippi River, the Secretary may acquire an average of not more than three hundred and twenty acres per mile: *Provided*, That the Secretary's authority to acquire lands by condemnation, with the exception of not more than one thousand and six hundred acres which may include not to exceed five miles of river frontage that the Secretary determines are needed for public access to the river, shall be suspended so long as the appropriate local zoning agency shall have in force and applicable to such property a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance that is satisfactory to the Secretary;

(4) On the Namekagon tributary of the Saint Croix River, from the dam at Lake Namekagon downstream to its confluence with the Saint Croix River, the Secretary may acquire an average of not more than three hundred and twenty acres per mile, except that not more than six hundred and forty acres which may include not to exceed two miles of lake frontage may be acquired along the lake created by the dam at Trego, Wisconsin.

(c) The Secretary may acquire lands and waters or interests therein pursuant to subsection (b) by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise.

(d) Lands owned by the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota may be acquired by the Secretary only with the consent of such States, and the Secretary may agree with said States to refrain from exercising any authority to acquire lands not owned by the said States that are within the boundaries of an area administered by them, or proposed for such administration, for such time and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem to be in the best interests of the preservation and development of the area.

(e) The Secretary's authority to acquire lands by condemnation shall be suspended with respect to any lands within the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway which are located within an incorporated city, village, or borough when such entities shall have in force and applicable to such lands a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(f) The Secretary shall not exercise any authority to acquire county-owned lands within the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway as long as the county is following a plan for the management and protection of such lands that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(g) (1) Any owner or owners (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as "owner") of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition of such acquisition, retain for themselves and their successors or assigns a right of use and occupancy of the improved property for noncommercial purposes for a definite term not to exceed twenty-five years, or, in lieu thereof, for a term ending at the death of the owner, or the death of his spouse, or the death of either of them. The owner shall elect the term to be reserved. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner.

(2) A right of use and occupancy retained pursuant to this subsection shall be subject to termination by the Secretary upon his determination that such use and occupancy is being exercised in a manner not consistent with the purposes of this Act and upon tender to the holder of the right and amount equal to the fair market value of that portion of the right which remains unexpired on the date of termination.

(3) The term "improved property", as used in this subsection, shall mean a detached, one-family dwelling, the construction of which was begun before January 1, 1965 (hereinafter referred to as "dwelling"), together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the land so designated.

SEC. 2. (a) In order to carry out the provisions of section 1, the Secretary shall issue regulations, which may be amended from time to time, specifying standards that are consistent with the purposes of this Act for zoning ordinances which must meet his approval.

(b) The standards specified in such regulations shall have the object of (1) prohibiting new commercial or industrial uses other than commercial or industrial uses which the Secretary considers are consistent with the purposes of this Act, of all property within the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway, and (2) promoting the protection and development for purposes of this Act of the land within the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway by means of acreage, frontage, and setback requirements.

(c) Following issuance of such regulations the Secretary shall approve any zoning ordinance or any amendment to any approved zoning ordinance submitted to him that conforms to the standards contained in the regulations in effect at the time of adoption of the ordinance or amendment. Such approval shall remain effective for so long as such ordinance or amendment remains in effect as approved.

(d) No zoning ordinance or amendment thereof shall be approved by the Secretary which (1) contains any provisions that he considers adverse to the protection and development, in accordance with the purposes of this Act, of the area comprising the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway; or (2) fails to have the effect of providing that the Secretary shall receive notice of any variance granted under, or any exception made to, the application of such ordinance or amendment.

(e) If any property, with respect to which the Secretary's authority to acquire by condemnation has been suspended according to the provisions of this Act, is made the subject of a variance under, or becomes for any reason an exception to, such zoning ordinance, or is subject to any variance, exception, or use that fails to conform to any

applicable standard contained in the regulations of the Secretary issued pursuant to this section and in effect at the time of the passage of such ordinance, the suspension of the Secretary's authority to acquire such property by condemnation shall automatically cease.

SEC. 3. Any portion of the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway which is within a national forest shall be administered in such manner as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture. Lands owned by an Indian tribe may be included in the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway with the consent of the Indian tribe involved, and with respect to such lands the Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the Indian tribe to encourage the protection and development of such lands in accordance with the purposes of this Act. The cooperative agreement may provide that the Indian land will be developed and administered in accordance with the laws and rules applicable to the recreation area, subject to any limitations specified by the tribal council and approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 4. The Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway shall be administered, protected, and developed in accordance with such statutory authorities as may be available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources; utilizing to the fullest extent such authorities he finds will best further the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 5. In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, their political subdivisions, and other Federal agencies in formulating and implementing, through agreements or otherwise, comprehensive plans for the use, development, and conservation of the resources of the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the boundaries of the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway in accordance with the appropriate laws of the State in which the lands and waters are located to the extent applicable, except that he may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting or fishing shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish or wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies, any regulations prescribing any such restrictions shall be put into effect only after consultation with the appropriate State agency responsible for hunting and fishing activities.

SEC. 7. The Federal Power Commission shall not have authority under the provisions of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.), to license the building of any dam or other structure which the Secretary determines would adversely affect the segments of the Saint Croix and Namekagon Rivers included in the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway unless the application is referred to the Congress and the issuance of the license is expressly authorized by statute. Any application referred to the Congress shall include the objections of the Secretary.

SEC. 8. The Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, and the Secretary of the Army shall not have authority to issue permits for, or to undertake directly, the construction of any dam, dike, structure, or activity which the Secretary determines would adversely affect the segments of the Saint Croix and Namekagon Rivers included in the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway unless the proposal is referred to the Congress and is expressly authorized by statute. Any proposal submitted to the Congress shall include the objections of the Secretary of the Interior.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe the manner in which the length, breadth, and depth shall be measured and the appropriate coefficients to be applied, taking due account of variations in vessel construction, to the end that, taken as a group and so far as practicable, the resulting gross tonnages shall reasonably reflect the relative internal volumes of the vessels admeasured and the resulting net tonnages shall be in the same ratio to the corresponding gross tonnages as the net and gross tonnages of comparable vessels if admeasured under subsection (c) of this section.

"(c) A vessel not admeasured under subsection (b) of this section, or a vessel admeasured under subsection (b) which is thereafter to be documented for use other than exclusively as a pleasure vessel, shall be admeasured as prescribed in sections 4150, 4151, and 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U.S.C. 74, 75, 77).

"(d) When a vessel documented under the laws of the United States undergoes a change affecting tonnage, or its owner or the Secretary of the Treasury alleges error in its tonnage, it shall be readmeasured to the extent necessary and its tonnage redetermined under this section.

"(e) The tonnage of a vessel for which a document or certificate of record has been issued before the effective date of this subsection need not be redetermined solely because of amendments to Federal law enacted at the same time as this subsection; but if it is eligible for admeasurement under subsection (b) of this section its owner shall have the option of having it readmeasured under that subsection.

"(f) The Secretary of the Treasury shall make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and intent of this section and of sections 4149, 4150, 4151, and 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U.S.C. 72, 74, 75, 77)."

Sec. 2. The following statutes and parts of statutes are repealed:

(a) Section 4152 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 76).

(b) The second and third paragraphs following paragraph (1), and the first sentence of the last paragraph, reading "The register of the vessel shall express the number of decks, the tonnage under the tonnage deck, that of the between decks, above the tonnage decks; also that of the poop or other enclosed spaces above the deck, each separately.", of section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U.S.C. 77).

(c) Section 4181 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 73).

(d) Section 4331 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 273).

(e) Section 2 of the Act of March 2, 1895 (ch. 173, 28 Stat. 743; 46 U.S.C. 78).

(f) Section 4 of the Act of March 2, 1895 (ch. 173, 28 Stat. 743), as amended (46 U.S.C. 79).

Sec. 3. This Act shall take effect upon the expiration of ninety days after the date of its enactment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of S. 2142?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the bill was introduced at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury. The legislation is identical to that introduced at the Treasury Department's request in the 88th Congress, S. 2793, which was not acted upon because it was submitted late in the session. A hearing was held on S. 2142 on August 6, 1965, by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee. Favorable testimony was received by representatives from the Treasury Department. No opposition has been expressed to the legislation.

Under the present law, vessels, regardless of their size, must be measured before the vessel may be registered or documented. The measurement of vessels is a responsibility of the Bureau of Customs and involves a rather intricate system of tonnage computation based on detailed and time-consuming physical measurement of the hull and deck structure. The bill would permit the substitution at the owner's option of a simplified method of admeasurement for small pleasure craft. The Treasury Department estimated that formal admeasurement of pleasure vessels, under the present law, takes an average of 7½ hours of an admeasurer's time. Under the simplified admeasurement requirements, this time will be reduced to less than 1½ hours a vessel. Based on a conservative estimate of employing the simplified admeasurement principle in the documentation of 1,200 pleasure craft a year, the Department anticipates an annual savings to the Government of approximately \$45,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the bill deals merely with the measurement of vessels and has nothing to do with licensing.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. These bills have been considered thoroughly by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2142) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 677), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill, S. 2142, is to simplify the admeasurement of small vessels for the purpose of expediting documentation.

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The bill was introduced at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury. The legislation is identical to that introduced at the Treasury Department's request in the 88th Congress, S. 2793, which was not acted upon because it was submitted late in the session. A hearing was held on S. 2142 on August 6, 1965, by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee. Favorable testimony was received by representatives from the Treasury Department. No opposition has been expressed to the legislation.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Under the present law, vessels, regardless of their size, must be measured before the vessel may be registered or documented. The measurement of vessels is a responsibility of the Bureau of Customs and involves a rather intricate system of tonnage computation based on detailed and time-consuming physical measurement of the hull and deck

structure. The bill would permit the substitution at the owner's option of a simplified method of admeasurement for small pleasure craft. The Treasury Department estimated that formal admeasurement of pleasure vessels, under the present law, takes an average of 7½ hours of an admeasurer's time. Under the simplified admeasurement requirements, this time will be reduced to less than 1½ hours a vessel. Based on a conservative estimate of employing the simplified admeasurement principle in the documentation of 1,200 pleasure craft a year, the Department anticipates an annual savings to the Government of approximately \$45,000. In addition to saving the Government money, the enactment of the bill will speed up the documentation of small vessels freeing Treasury Department personnel for faster processing of the admeasurement of commercial vessels and reduce the cost of documentation to small pleasure craft owners.

The committee amended the legislation to delete sections 2, 3, and 4. The reason for these deletions was that identical changes in the law are proposed in S. 906, a bill to provide for the measurement of the gross and net tonnages for certain vessels having two or more decks, which has also been favorably reported by the committee.

ANALYSIS

Subsection 1(a) provides for the admeasurement of vessels generally, permits a consolidation of the pertinent provisions of 46 U.S.C. 71, 73, and provides that a vessel need not be readmeasured to obtain another document unless it is one assigned a formula tonnage which is to be documented for use other than exclusively for pleasure.

Subsection 1(b) provides for the admeasurement of pleasure vessels by means of assigning tonnage based on a formula. This subsection also preserves to the owner the right to choose formal admeasurement under subsection 1(c).

Subsection 1(c) provides for the admeasurement of vessels now or henceforth to be used for other than pleasure purposes, and of pleasure vessels whose owners so choose, by the procedure for formal admeasurement heretofore applicable.

Subsection 1(d) adds a new provision to existing law so as to provide for tonnage adjustments in accordance with existing administrative practice.

Subsection 1(e) gives the owner of a vessel which has already been formally admeasured the option of retaining his present tonnage outturn or of requesting a formula tonnage assignment if his vessel is pleasure vessel. Thus any change in the tonnage of existing vessels will depend on the owners' option.

Subsection 1(f) grants regulatory authority to the Secretary superseding the authority formerly contained in section 4 of the act of March 2, 1895 (46 U.S.C. 79), which is repealed in subsection 5(f).

Section 2 eliminates the statutory prescription for the form and execution of a certificate of admeasurement and substitutes authority in the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe how and by whom evidence of admeasurement shall be given.

Section 3 gives the Secretary of the Treasury authority to eliminate unnecessary admeasurement data from the vessel document. This is particularly necessary in the case of vessels to be covered by formula admeasurement, which will use dimensions more readily ascertainable by owners and builders than register dimensions. This overrides specifications in 46 U.S.C. 25, 259, as to dimensions to be shown in vessel documents.

Section 4 restates at the beginning of 46 U.S.C. 77 the location of the "tonnage deck" and the requirement that measurements be

taken in feet and decimal fractions of feet, both from 46 U.S.C. 74, as it stood before amendment by section 3.

Section 5 repeals those parts of existing law superseded by the bill. They are:

(a) 46 U.S.C. 76—Admeasurement limited to documented vessels or others specially provided for. Covered by section 1.

(b) 46 U.S.C. 77—Second and third paragraphs and first sentence of last paragraph following paragraph (1)—Statutory requirements for specific admeasurement data on vessel document repealed to permit regulation by Secretary under section 3.

(c) 46 U.S.C. 73—Provision for admeasurement of recorded vessels. Covered by section 1.

(d) 46 U.S.C. 273—Authority for admeasurement of 5 to 20 net ton licensed vessels superseded by section 1.

(e) 46 U.S.C. 78—Provisions for readmeasurement required by 1895 act. Now obsolete.

(f) 46 U.S. 79—Existing regulatory authority superseded by subsection 1(f).

Section 6 provides for an effective date 90 days after enactment.

While it is certain that adoption of the bill would result in substantial savings of admeasurers' time, it is impossible to project the budgetary effect with any precision.

THE ST. CROIX NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 897) to provide for the establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Waterway in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 12, after the word "Scenic," to strike out "Waterway" and insert "Riverway"; at the beginning of line 13, to insert "The boundaries of the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway shall be as generally depicted on map numbered NRS-STC-7100-C, revised July 15, 1965, in seven sheets, and entitled 'Proposed Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway Preliminary Boundary Plan'. The Secretary may thereafter revise such boundaries from time to time, but the acquired lands and waters or interests therein within the revised boundaries may not exceed the limits mentioned in subsection (b) of this section."; in line 24, after the word "Scenic," to strike out "Waterway" and insert "Riverway"; at the top of page 3, to strike out:

(1) Along the lake created by the dam on the Saint Croix River near Taylors Falls, Minnesota, the Secretary may acquire not more than six hundred and forty acres which may include not to exceed two miles of lake frontage;

At the beginning of line 6, to strike out "(2)" and insert "(1)"; in line 10, after the word "than," to strike out "three hundred and twenty" and insert "four hundred"; in the same line, after the word "per," to strike out "m" and insert "mile"; at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)"; in the same line, after the word "the," to insert "north end of the lake created by the"; in line 15, after the word "River," to insert "except for lands which are located within an incorporated city, village, or borough as of January 1, 1965."; in line 21, after the word "thousand," to strike out "and six hundred"; in line 22, after the word "of," to insert "lake and"; on

page 4, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "(4)" and insert "(3)"; at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "three hundred and twenty acres per mile, except that not more than six hundred and forty acres which may include not to exceed two miles of lake frontage may be acquired along the lake created by the dam at Trego, Wisconsin." and insert "three hundred and twenty acres per mile: *Provided*, That the Secretary's authority to acquire lands by condemnation along the lake created by the dam at Trego, Wisconsin, with the exception of not more than six hundred and forty acres which may include not to exceed two miles of lake frontage, shall be suspended so long as the appropriate local zoning agency shall have in force and applicable to such property a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance that is satisfactory to the Secretary."; in line 24, after the word "otherwise," to insert "In the exercise of his exchange authority the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway, and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal. The properties so exchanged shall be of approximately equal value: *Provided*, That the Secretary may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged."; on page 5, line 11, after the word "Minnesota," to insert "and Wisconsin county forest lands"; in line 22, after the word "Scenic," to strike out "Waterway" and insert "Riverway"; on page 6, after line 3, to insert:

(f) The Secretary's authority to acquire improved property by condemnation shall be suspended, notwithstanding the absence of a valid zoning ordinance that is satisfactory to the Secretary, if the owner thereof uses such property solely for noncommercial residential use unchanged from the character of the use as it exists on the date of passage of this Act, and if any modification of the structures on the property is consistent with the standards regarding acreage, frontage, and setback requirements issued pursuant to section 2 of this Act. Such owner may sell, mortgage, lease, or devise said property, and such suspension shall remain in effect as long as such property is so used.

At the beginning of line 16, to strike out "(f)" and insert "(g)"; in line 18, after the word "Scenic," to strike out "Waterway" and insert "Riverway"; at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "(g)" and insert "(h)"; on page 7, at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "and" and insert "an"; at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "subsection" and insert "Act"; on page 8, line 13, after the word "Scenic," to strike out "Waterway" and insert "Riverway"; in line 15, after the word "Scenic," to strike out "Waterway" and insert "Riverway"; on page 9, line 3, after the word "Scenic," to strike out "Waterway" and insert "Riverway"; at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "Waterway" and insert "Riverway"; in line 24, after the word "Scenic," to strike out "Waterway" and insert "Riverway"; on page 10, line 7, after the word "the," to strike out "re-

creation area" and insert "scenic riverway"; after line 9, to strike out:

SEC. 4. The Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway shall be administered, protected, and developed in accordance with such statutory authorities as may be available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources; utilizing to the fullest extent such authorities he finds will best further the purpose of this Act.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 4. The Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway shall be administered, protected, and developed in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented; except that any other statutory authority available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

On page 11, line 5, after the word "Scenic," to strike out "Waterway" and insert "Riverway"; after line 5, to strike out:

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the boundaries of the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway in accordance with the appropriate laws of the State in which the lands and waters are located to the extent applicable; except that he may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting or fishing shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish or wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies, any regulations prescribing any such restrictions shall be put into effect only after consultation with the appropriate State agency responsible for hunting and fishing activities.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 6. Nothing in this Act shall affect the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the States under other provisions of law with respect to fish and wildlife.

After line 20, to strike out:

SEC. 7. The Federal Power Commission shall not have authority under the provisions of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.), to license the building of any dam or other structure which the Secretary determines would adversely affect the segments of the Saint Croix and Namekagon Rivers included in the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway unless the application is referred to the Congress and the issuance of the license is expressly authorized by statute. Any application referred to the Congress shall include the objections of the Secretary.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 7. The Federal Power Commission shall not authorize the construction, operation, or maintenance of any new dam or any project work unrelated to an existing project under the Federal Power Act (41 Stat. 1063), as amended (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.), in the wild river segment of the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway except as specifically authorized by the Congress.

On page 12, after line 13, to strike out:

SEC. 8. The Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, and the Secretary of the Army shall not have authority to issue permits for, or to undertake directly, the construction of any dam, dike, structure, or activity which the Secretary determines would adversely affect the segments of the Saint Croix and Namekagon Rivers included in the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway unless the proposal is referred to the Congress and is expressly authorized by statute. Any pro-

posals submitted to the Congress shall include the objections of the Secretary of the Interior.

At the beginning of line 24, to change the section number from "9" to "8"; on page 13, line 4, to strike out "Waterway" and insert "Riverway"; at the beginning of line 5, to change the section number from "10" to "9"; and, in line 7, after the word "this", to strike out "Act." and insert "Act, not to exceed \$6,500,000"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) (1) for the purpose of preserving the portion of the Saint Croix River, beginning at the dam near Taylors Falls, Minnesota, and extending upstream to the dam near Gordon, Wisconsin, and its Namekagon tributary in Wisconsin, as a wild river in a primitive condition, or restoring it as nearly as possible to such condition, in order to conserve its unique scenic and other natural values;

(2) for the purpose of promoting broad recreational use and more intensive types of recreational use of the portion of the Saint Croix River downstream from the dam near Taylors Falls, Minnesota, to its confluence with the Mississippi River; and

(3) for the purpose of protecting, developing, and making accessible the nationally significant outdoor recreation resources of such river segments for the use and enjoyment of all of the American people, the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway is hereby established. The boundaries of the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway shall be as generally depicted on map numbered NRS-STC-7100-C, revised July 15, 1965, in seven sheets, and entitled "Proposed Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway Preliminary Boundaries." The Secretary may thereafter revise such boundaries from time to time, but the acquired lands and waters or interests therein within the revised boundaries may not exceed the limits mentioned in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") may acquire lands and waters or interests therein for the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway as follows:

(1) From the north end of the lake created by the dam on the Saint Croix River near Taylors Falls, Minnesota, upstream to the dam near Gordon, Wisconsin, the Secretary may acquire an average of not more than four hundred acres per mile;

(2) From the north end of the lake created by the dam on the Saint Croix River near Taylors Falls, Minnesota, downstream to its confluence with the Mississippi River, except for lands which are located within an incorporated city, village, or borough as of January 1, 1965, the Secretary may acquire an average of not more than three hundred and twenty acres per mile: *Provided*, That the Secretary's authority to acquire lands by condemnation, with the exception of not more than one thousand acres which may include not to exceed five miles of lake and river frontage that the Secretary determines are needed for public access to the river, shall be suspended so long as the appropriate local zoning agency shall have in force and applicable to such property a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance that is satisfactory to the Secretary;

(3) On the Namekagon tributary of the Saint Croix River, from above the dam at Lake Namekagon downstream to its confluence with the Saint Croix River, the Secretary may acquire an average of not more than three hundred and twenty acres per mile: *Provided*, That the Secretary's authority to acquire lands by condemnation along the lake created by the dam at Trego, Wisconsin, with the exception of not more than

six hundred and forty acres which may include not to exceed two miles of lake frontage, shall be suspended so long as the appropriate local zoning agency shall have in force and applicable to such property a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary may acquire lands and waters or interests therein pursuant to subsection (b) by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise. In the exercise of his exchange authority the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway, and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal. The properties so exchanged shall be of approximately equal value: *Provided*, That the Secretary may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

(d) Lands owned by the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota and Wisconsin county forest lands may be acquired by the Secretary only with the consent of such States, and the Secretary may agree with said States to refrain from exercising any authority to acquire lands not owned by the said States that are within the boundaries of an area administered by them, or proposed for such administration, for such time and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem to be in the best interests of the preservation and development of the area.

(e) The Secretary's authority to acquire lands by condemnation shall be suspended with respect to any lands within the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway which are located within an incorporated city, village, or borough when such entities shall have in force and applicable to such lands a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(f) The Secretary's authority to acquire improved property by condemnation shall be suspended, notwithstanding the absence of a valid zoning ordinance that is satisfactory to the Secretary, if the owner thereof uses such property solely for noncommercial residential use unchanged from the character of the use as it exists on the date of passage of this Act, and if any modification of the structures on the property is consistent with the standards regarding acreage, frontage, and setback requirements issued pursuant to section 2 of this Act. Such owner may sell, mortgage, lease, or devise said property, and such suspension shall remain in effect as long as such property is so used.

(g) The Secretary shall not exercise any authority to acquire county-owned lands within the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway as long as the county is following a plan for the management and protection of such lands that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(h) (1) Any owner or owners (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as "owner") of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition of such acquisition, retain for themselves and their successors or assigns a right of use and occupancy of the improved property for noncommercial purposes for a definite term not to exceed twenty-five years, or, in lieu thereof, for a term ending at the death of the owner, or the death of his spouse, or the death of either of them. The owner shall elect the term to be reserved. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner.

(2) A right of use and occupancy retained pursuant to this subsection shall be subject to termination by the Secretary upon his

determination that such use and occupancy is being exercised in a manner not consistent with the purposes of this Act and upon tender to the holder of the right an amount equal to the fair market value of that portion of the right which remains unexpired on the date of termination.

(3) The term "improved property", as used in this Act, shall mean a detached, one-family dwelling, the construction of which was begun before January 1, 1965 (hereinafter referred to as "dwelling"), together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the land so designated.

SEC. 2. (a) In order to carry out the provisions of section 1, the Secretary shall issue regulations, which may be amended from time to time, specifying standards that are consistent with the purposes of this Act for zoning ordinances which must meet his approval.

(b) The standards specified in such regulations shall have the object of (1) prohibiting new commercial or industrial uses other than commercial or industrial uses which the Secretary considers are consistent with the purposes of this Act, of all property within the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway, and (2) promoting the protection and development for purposes of this Act of the land within the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway by means of acreage, frontage, and setback requirements.

(c) Following issuance of such regulations the Secretary shall approve any zoning ordinance or any amendment to any approved zoning ordinance submitted to him that conforms to the standards contained in the regulations in effect at the time of adoption of the ordinance or amendment. Such approval shall remain effective for so long as such ordinance or amendment remains in effect as approved.

(d) No zoning ordinance or amendment thereof shall be approved by the Secretary which (1) contains any provisions that he considers adverse to the protection and development, in accordance with the purposes of this Act, of the area comprising the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway; or (2) fails to have the effect of providing that the Secretary shall receive notice of any variance granted under, or any exception made to, the application of such ordinance or amendment.

(e) If any property, with respect to which the Secretary's authority to acquire by condemnation has been suspended according to the provisions of this Act, is made the subject of a variance under, or becomes for any reason an exception to, such zoning ordinance, or is subject to any variance, exception, or use that fails to conform to any applicable standard contained in the regulations of the Secretary issued pursuant to this section and in effect at the time of the passage of such ordinance, the suspension of the Secretary's authority to acquire such property by condemnation shall automatically cease.

SEC. 3. Any portion of the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway which is within a national forest shall be administered in such manner as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture. Lands owned by an Indian tribe may be included in the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway with the consent of the Indian tribe involved, and with respect to such lands the Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the Indian tribe to encourage the protection and development of such lands in accordance with the purposes of this Act. The cooperative agreement may provide that the Indian land will be developed and administered in accordance with

the laws and rules applicable to the scenic riverway, subject to any limitations specified by the tribal council and approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 4. The Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway shall be administered, protected, and developed in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented; except that any other statutory authority available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 5. In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, their political subdivisions, and other Federal agencies in formulating and implementing, through agreements or otherwise, comprehensive plans for the use, development, and conservation of the outdoor resources of the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this Act shall affect the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the States under other provisions of law with respect to fish and wildlife.

SEC. 7. The Federal Power Commission shall not authorize the construction, operation, or maintenance of any new dam or any project work unrelated to an existing project under the Federal Power Act (41 Stat. 1063), as amended (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.), in the wild river segment of the Saint Croix National Scenic Waterway except as specifically authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with the appropriate State water pollution control agencies, to prepare and develop agreements for eliminating or diminishing the pollution of waters within the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, not to exceed \$6,500,000.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am delighted to have this opportunity to recommend to the Senators the passage of S. 897, the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway bill.

The bill represents the hard work and careful thought of many of us about the best way to mold into legislation our common concern that action be taken now to preserve for future generations this priceless resource.

The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] cosponsor of this bill has worked with imagination and vigor to perfect it.

The St. Croix bill presents a magnificent opportunity to preserve forever this river, one of the most beautiful in the Nation.

Its loveliness is made the more valuable by the fact that it runs within an easy half-hour's drive of the rapidly expanding Twin Cities area. Water-based facilities near large cities are the recreation resource in greatest demand and shortest supply in the Nation.

The need to protect such magnificent resources as the St. Croix demands imaginative legislation.

The St. Croix bill, while it does not include any new or untested techniques, does represent a significant advance in Federal, State and local cooperation for conservation.

The bill, in effect, will supply a Federal umbrella over this interstate river under which local agencies and authorities can

cooperate in the development and preservation of the area.

The most concise way to explain the bill is, perhaps, to quote from the unanimous Interior Committee report. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from that report appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, in its landmark report urging a great expansion of our Nation's outdoor recreational facilities to meet the threefold increase in outdoor recreation activities by the year 2000 pointed out that the facilities in shortest supply and greatest demand were water-based recreation areas near centers of population. Among its specific recommendations were the following:

Immediate action should be taken by Federal, State, and local governments to reserve or acquire additional waters, beach, and shoreline areas, particularly near centers of population.

Certain rivers of unusual scenic, esthetic, and recreational values should be allowed to remain in their free-flowing state and natural setting without manmade alterations.

The Federal Government should assist in meeting interstate demand situations.

Pursuant to these and other recommendations, the Congress has authorized the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore on the Atlantic coast, the Point Reyes National Seashore on the Pacific coast, the Padre Island National Seashore on the Gulf of Mexico, and the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Other areas will be needed if the demands of the next 35 years are to be met, particularly in the north-central census region where, according to the ORRRC report the greatest demand for outdoor recreation facilities in the Nation will be found by 1970.

THE ST. CROIX AND NAMEKAGON RIVERS

The St. Croix River, running south to the Mississippi River at Prescott, Wis., marks the Minnesota-Wisconsin border for some hundred miles.

The upper St. Croix and its Wisconsin tributary, the Namekagon, have been carefully studied by the wild river study team and recommended for inclusion in the National Wild River System. These spectacularly beautiful streams run through mixed conifer-hardwood forests interspersed with small swamps and farm openings.

White-tailed deer abound, bear, game birds, and furbearing animals are at hand.

Fly fishing for small mouth black bass has given the St. Croix River a national reputation. Trout fishing on the upper Namekagon is considered excellent. Unusual diversity is provided by the occurrence of large muskellunge sturgeon, channel catfish, wall-eyed pike, northern pike, rock bass, and perch.

For some 70 miles above the dam at Taylors Falls, Minn., the Northern States Power Co. has owned the land on both sides of the river for 50 years and has maintained it in a primitive condition.

The lower St. Croix has been described as the last large clean river near a major population center in the Midwest. It runs within an easy half-hour's drive of the burgeoning 1.7 million population Twin Cities area. A broad, a beautiful river, its level maintained by lock and dam No. 3 on the Mississippi, the lower St. Croix is already one of the most popular boating waters in the Nation.

THE ST. CROIX NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAY PROPOSAL

S. 897, herein recommended by the committee, would incorporate not more than 85,000 acres of land and 21,200 acres of water, including 152 miles of the St. Croix River and

90 miles of the Namekagon River, into the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway. The riverway would be a narrow strip, a quarter mile wide, along the banks of the rivers. The boundaries are indicated on Interior Department map NRS-STC 7100-C. Of the total acreage, 15,000 is already in State park and county forest land.

Aside from 31,270 acres of the Northern States Power Co. land, fee acquisition as now contemplated would be held to less than 3,000 acres in the entire riverway. The Northern States Power Co. has indicated its willingness to sell.

On privately held land along the upper St. Croix and Namekagon Rivers the Secretary of the Interior would acquire scenic and recreation easements, not disturbing the existing use patterns. On the lower St. Croix, the same recreational zoning technique that has worked well at the Cape Cod National Seashore would be utilized. In the event that zoning does not meet the Secretary's standards, the acquisition of easements rather than the purchase is intended.

Plans call for six access points on the lower St. Croix and eight sites on the upper St. Croix and Namekagon. On the lower St. Croix these sites would affect some 635 acres, not over 20 ownerships and not more than 10 improvements. On the upper riverway, exclusive of the Northern States Power Co. holdings, 1,173 acres, 20 ownerships, and 9 improvements are involved. On the upper St. Croix and Namekagon scenic easements would be purchased on 18,200 acres. There would be a total of 16,825 acres protected by zoning.

The bill provides that land within incorporated areas on the lower St. Croix are exempt from the riverway entirely.

The bill also provides that owners of improved property in areas to be acquired may retain the right of use and occupancy for noncommercial residential purposes until the death of the owner or spouse, or the death of the survivor or either of them, or else a 25-year transferrable right to use and occupancy.

On the lower St. Croix, where the Secretary of the Interior's right to condemn is suspended as long as zoning ordinances satisfactory to him are enforced, private residential, noncommercial property owners are further protected from condemnation in the event that zoning ordinances are either not in effect or not enforced. The Secretary is precluded from acquiring their property by condemnation as long as they use it in a manner in keeping with his standards including regulations covering new construction, acreage and setbacks.

State land within the riverway would not be acquired by the Secretary of the Interior without the consent of the State involved, and the Secretary may agree not to acquire any land which the State indicates it plans to acquire.

Hunting and fishing shall be permitted in the area in accordance with the laws of Minnesota and Wisconsin.

The bill includes provisions to facilitate cooperative planning for the recreational and conservation development of the riverway between all levels of government involved.

COST

The cost of acquisition of lands over a 5-year period for the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway is estimated at \$3,450,000. Development costs are estimated at \$3,500,000 for a total of \$6,950,000. Operating costs in the fifth year are estimated at \$230,030. Since these estimates were made the number of access sites to be acquired in fee has been reduced by four and it is expected that the \$6,500,000 authorized by the committee for acquisition and development will be adequate.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, a final word about zoning. There as been some

misunderstanding that zoning is aimed at prohibiting the economic development of the St. Croix. This is absolutely false.

First of all, land lying within incorporated areas on the lower St. Croix would be excluded from the riverway entirely.

Second, the riverway would extend only about a quarter mile back from the bank of the river.

Finally, and most important economic potential of recreation has been conclusively demonstrated. For the entire St. Croix area, the beauty of the river is the chief capital for this growth industry.

The St. Croix National Scenic Riverway represents another step forward in our efforts to improve this Nation's black record in conservation.

It will, if approved, add luster to the already fine record compiled by this Congress in the field of conservation. I wholeheartedly recommend it to the Senators.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, during the last 7 months, following the introduction of the St. Croix national scenic riverway bill on January 29, public and private interest in preserving the historic character and scenic beauty of the river has been very encouraging to me.

I am pleased to announce that the bill has been reported recently by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with a favorable recommendation. We have worked long, hard hours on the bill to improve it, and trying to account all the reasonable and legitimate interests affected by the bill.

Representative JOSEPH E. KARTH has introduced companion legislation, similar in purpose and scope to the bill we passed through committee. He will work for House backing.

The bill, as reported from the committee, seeks to protect the entire St. Croix-Namekagon River system. But it does so by two wholly different methods. Along the river north of Taylors Falls, the scenic and natural beauty will be protected by treating it as a "wild river," and by acquiring land and scenic easements from private property owners.

South of Taylors Falls, however, the wide range of governmental units and private property owners required different concepts. The closest possible cooperation between the Federal Government and the local governments was made necessary, and therefore an entirely new principle of creative federalism was used. Local zoning will protect the river, with Federal standby enforcement authority, to guard both scenic and recreational values.

Since the provisions of the bill affecting the lower river represent a new approach to natural resource conservation, this report will explain in brief fashion how the bill will operate in the lower St. Croix Valley.

The St. Croix River is the last major unpolluted river in the United States today. Its beauty is without question. It is clear, swiftflowing waterway—within easy access to thousands of Minnesotans. But if we are to stop the flood of pollution and destruction of this river,

we need the cooperation and assistance of the Federal Government. This is first of all an interstate waterway, lying between Minnesota and Wisconsin. There are dozens of local governmental units along its shores. It would be difficult for all of them, on both sides of the river, to agree on a course of action to follow.

So the Federal umbrella of protective zoning, providing local bodies with back-up authority to keep the river safe, will guarantee that we protect this magnificent natural heritage of ours.

We used to fight our battles against floods, destruction of topsoil, and decimation of forests. We still face these threats. Our new challenges are even more serious, involving possible loss of those common resources that are the irreplaceable heritage of tomorrow's America—the air, the water, and the land itself.

It is up to each one of us to do our part—because only together can we prevent this from happening in Minnesota and in the Saint Croix Valley. No one person can be blamed for the death of our rivers, lakes, and natural resources, and so we must all act together.

But, as every person insists upon his economic right to waste a tiny portion of our resources, and cries for conservation elsewhere, the American people are discarding their birthright—committing collective murder of our natural wealth and beauty.

We cannot allow the Saint Croix to go the way of our other polluted, detergent-foam-filled, sewage-filled rivers in the United States simply because we could not see that we are losing each little skirmish to save the Saint Croix, and before long, it will be too late.

We have seen the death of rivers by small inches elsewhere. The mighty Hudson River in New York is called an open, running sewer. Lake Erie, fed by the chemical and industrial wastes, of Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York, is choking and is almost a dead lake, in which vegetation and fish life would be impossible.

If this were only a question of preserving some small portion of the great natural riches this country once had, it would be reason enough. But we are beginning to discover facts explaining the dollar value of green space, trees, and clean rivers and lakes. A special commission told the President that outdoor recreation is a business bringing in \$20 billion annually—and the end is nowhere in sight. We are now realizing that recreation is going to be the single biggest dollar-earner in many water-based areas of our Nation, holding out more hope than any amount of short-range industrial development.

In the face of ever-increasing urban sprawl, in the face of the oppressive nature of concrete, steel, and auto exhaust gases in our cities, we need more than ever a place of refuge and natural beauty, removed from the clamor of the towns and cities. We must move now to protect that river.

Many people have asked how zoning will actually work under the bill. In areas within the riverway, the Secretary of the Interior will consult with State

and local officials to determine what standards of protection are necessary to preserve that part of the river and its values.

Standards will then be established to prohibit new commercial and industrial expansion and uses outside cities and villages where such would be inconsistent with the beauty of character of the riverway. Standards would also establish agreement on setback, frontage, and acreage limitations for new construction of residences and other buildings.

Then, any localities that passed zoning ordinances doing these things would be exempt from regulation, in the same manner as are cities, villages, and individual residences.

If the towns or counties failed to pass ordinances or granted variances to the detriment of the river, the Secretary could then, and only then, buy such lands or interests in land as might be necessary to keep the river in its present beautiful and uncluttered state.

Of necessity the bill will demand the closest cooperation between Federal, State and local agencies, and private citizens. The necessity for Federal involvement is, however, clear.

There has been some confusion on the exact effect of the bill, and I think it would be helpful to the residents of the St. Croix Valley and neighboring areas to know what the bill does not do:

First. It does not affect individual homeowners of cottages, cabins, or other dwellings within the riverway as long as: They do not convert their property to commercial or industrial uses, and as long as new residential structures meet the minimum standards for setback and frontage.

Second. It does not wipe out or destroy present business, commerce, or industry. It prevents only new construction or expansion which is inconsistent with the preservation of the riverway.

Third. It has absolutely no effect on the local tax base, or the collection of local taxes. In any event, preservation of land values may cause property values and the tax base to rise.

Fourth. It does not affect any person or business living outside the clearly defined boundaries of the riverway.

Fifth. It does not affect any person or business within the boundaries of incorporated cities or villages.

Sixth. It does not allow unlimited acquisition of public access. In fact, only two such properties will be used. One is an overlook near Bayport, the other an access at Trout Brook.

Seventh. It does not prevent hunting and fishing with the riverway, and this remains within the exclusive authority of the States.

Eighth. It does not deprive the Federal Power Commission of authority in connection with dams and other existing structures.

Ninth. It does not prevent the Corps of Engineers from carrying out their statutory responsibilities and duties.

Tenth. Last of all, it does not allow arbitrary zoning by the Secretary, but depends upon cooperation by local zoning agencies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to provide for the establishment of the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes."

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which S. 662 was passed.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

SHIP MORTGAGE BONDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2118) to clarify sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O(d) of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 U.S.C. 808), is amended by inserting a new paragraph between the existing third and fourth paragraphs thereof as follows:

"The issuance, transfer, or assignment of a bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness which is secured by a mortgage of a vessel to a trustee or by an assignment to a trustee of the owner's right, title, or interest in a vessel under construction, to a person not a citizen of the United States, without the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, is unlawful unless the trustee or a substitute trustee of such mortgage or assignment is approved by the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce shall grant his approval if such trustee or a substitute trustee is a bank or trust company which (1) is organized as a corporation, and is doing business, under the laws of the United States or any State thereof, (2) is authorized under such laws to exercise corporate trust powers, (3) is a citizen of the United States, (4) is subject to supervision or examination by Federal or State authority, and (5) has a combined capital and surplus (as set forth in its most recent published report of condition) of at least \$3,000,000. If such trustee or a substitute trustee at any time ceases to meet the foregoing qualifications, the Secretary of Commerce shall disapprove such trustee or substitute trustee, and after such disapproval the transfer or assignment of such bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness to a person not a citizen of the United States, without the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, shall be unlawful. The trustee or substitute trustee approved by the Secretary of Commerce shall not operate the vessel under the mortgage or assignment without the approval of the Secretary of Commerce. If a bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness which is secured by a mortgage of a vessel to a trustee or by an assignment to a trustee of the owner's right, title, or interest in a vessel under construction, is issued, transferred, or assigned to a person not a citizen of the United States in violation of this section, the issuance, transfer, or assignment shall be void."

Sec. 2. Section 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 U.S.C. 835) is amended as follows:

(a) By relettering the existing subsections (c), (d), and (e) as (d), (e), and (f) and by inserting a new subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) To issue, transfer, or assign a bond note, or other evidence of indebtedness which is secured by a mortgage of a vessel to a trustee or by an assignment to a trustee of the owner's right, title, or interest in a vessel under construction or by a mortgage to a trustee on a ship yard, drydock, or shipbuilding or ship-repairing plant or facilities, to a person not a citizen of the United States, unless the trustee or a substitute trustee of such mortgage or assignment is approved by the Secretary of Commerce: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary of Commerce shall grant his approval if such trustee or a substitute trustee is a bank or trust company which (1) is organized as a corporation, and is doing business, under the laws of the United States or any State thereof, (2) is authorized under such laws to exercise corporate trust powers, (3) is a citizen of the United States, (4) is subject to supervision or examination by Federal or State authority, and (5) has a combined capital and surplus (as set forth in its most recent published report of condition) of at least \$3,000,000; or for the trustee or substitute trustee approved by the Secretary of Commerce to operate said vessel under the mortgage or assignment: *Provided further,* That if such trustee or a substitute trustee at any time ceases to meet the foregoing qualifications, the Secretary of Commerce shall disapprove such trustee or substitute trustee, and after such disapproval the transfer or assignment of such bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness to a person not a citizen of the United States, without the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, shall be unlawful; or."

(b) By inserting a new paragraph between the existing second and third paragraphs thereof as follows:

"If a bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness which is secured by a mortgage of a vessel to a trustee or by an assignment to a trustee of the owner's right, title, or interest in a vessel under construction, or by a mortgage to a trustee on a shipyard, drydock or shipbuilding or ship-repairing plant or facilities, is issued, transferred, or assigned to a person not a citizen of the United States in violation of subsection c of this section, the issuance, transfer or assignment shall be void."

Sec. 3. Subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. 961), is amended by relettering the existing paragraph (e) as paragraph (f) and by inserting a new paragraph (e) as follows:

"(e) No bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness which is secured by a mortgage of a vessel to a trustee may be issued, transferred, or assigned to a person not a citizen of the United States, without the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, unless the trustee or substitute trustee of such mortgage is approved by the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce shall grant his approval if such trustee or substitute trustee is a bank or trust company which (1) is organized as a corporation, and is doing business, under the laws of the United States or any State thereof, (2) is authorized under such laws to exercise corporate trust powers, (3) is a citizen of the United States, (4) is subject to supervision or examination by Federal or State authority, and (5) has a combined capital and surplus (as set forth in its most recent published report of condition) of at least \$3,000,000. If such trustee or a substitute trustee at any time ceases to meet the foregoing qualifications, the Secretary of Commerce shall disapprove such trustee or substitute trustee, and after such disapproval the transfer or assignment of such bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness to a person not a citizen of the United States, without the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, shall be unlawful. If a bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness which

is secured by a mortgage of a vessel to a trustee is issued, transferred, or assigned to a person not a citizen of the United States in violation of this paragraph, the issuance, transfer, or assignment shall be void."

SEC. 4. Bonds, notes, and other evidence of indebtedness which are secured by a mortgage of a vessel to a trustee or by an assignment to a trustee of the owner's right, title, or interest in a vessel under construction which have heretofore been issued, transferred, or assigned, or are issued, transferred, or assigned within one year after the enactment of this Act, to a person not a citizen of the United States without the approval of the Secretary of Commerce are valid in the hands of such person and the validity and preferred status of such mortgage and the validity and lawfulness of such issuance, transfer, or assignment shall not be affected by such issuance, transfer, or assignment if the trustee or a substitute trustee is approved by the Secretary of Commerce within one year after enactment of this Act, under the standards for trustees specified in the amendments made by this Act to sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and to subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920. This section shall not apply to any bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness, mortgage, or assignment if the validity of such bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness, mortgage, or assignment, or the foreclosure, validity, or preferred status of such mortgage, is in litigation on the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the bill, S. 2118, was introduced by request on June 10, 1965. The purpose of the legislation is to meet certain problems created by a recent U.S. court decision, *Chemical Bank New York Trust Company* against the *Steamship Westhampton*, that could affect trust indentures and bond financing on American-flag vessels.

Hearings were held on the bill on June 23, July 15, and July 23 by the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The legislation as introduced was supported by the Maritime Administration, the Committee of American Steamship Lines, the American President Lines, and several trust companies including the Chemical Bank New York Trust Co., which is a party in the *Westhampton* case. The trustees of *Seatrade Corp.*, also a party in the *Westhampton* case, supported the bill if amended to save certain rights in litigation on the date of enactment. The *Seafarers International Union* opposed the bill as introduced on the grounds that it would nullify the *Westhampton* decision and would enable aliens to acquire control of American-flag vessels through the trust indenture mortgage device. The bill has been amended by the committee to meet these objections.

The policy of the United States has been to encourage low-interest rates in financing the construction and reconstruction of U.S.-flag merchant vessels and, at the same time, to prohibit foreign control over the American merchant marine fleet. The purpose of the bill, as amended, is the same.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. MUSCHEL], a member of the Committee on Commerce, is well aware of the purpose of the bill.

diana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

SELF-GOVERNMENT IN PACIFIC ISLANDS

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, because of its remote location and the subsequent dearth of news about its activities, I will attempt from time to time to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues certain articles about the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Although it may be some years in coming, the day will surely arrive when the U.S. Senate will be directly concerned with the political future of these far-flung islands. It is our hope that the U.S. Government, as administrator of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands by virtue of the authority of the United Nations, will enable the inhabitants of these islands to intelligently prepare for the time when they will be asked to make a major political decision about their future in the world society.

Our establishment of the Congress of Micronesia is one of the major preparatory steps in this direction.

The September 21 issue of the Christian Science Monitor published an Associated Press article which gives a well-balanced view of the road ahead for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. I am in unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 21, 1965]

PACIFIC ISLES DEFY MOLD

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The United Nations is finding it much harder to bring self-government to the islands of the Pacific than it did to the African mandates it inherited from the League of Nations.

The seven African territories now are independent. There is still a long road ahead for some of the islands under U.N. trusteeship.

The toughest of all may be the U.S. administered Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 2,100 islands scattered over 3 million square miles between Hawaii and the Philippines.

After 18 years of joint U.S.-U.N. effort to weld the territory's 88,000 inhabitants into a politically responsible unit, American officials will not guess when they will be ready for self-government.

AREAS DIVERGENT

A U.N. mission which visited the territory in 1964 found that "among the local inhabitants no fully matured opinions on the future of the territory had emerged."

This is one of the three territories still under the U.N. trusteeship system. The others are eastern New Guinea and tiny equatorial Nauru Island, both administered by Australia.

New Guinea covers about 93,000 square miles and has a population of 1.5 million. Nauru covers only 8 square miles and has a population of 5,000.

Nauru may gain its independence within 2 years, but it probably will remain closely linked to Australia.

INDEPENDENCE SEEN

It is assumed that New Guinea and Papua, which are administered jointly, will eventually become an independent nation of some 2 million inhabitants.

But it is also likely that Indonesia, which got western New Guinea away from the Netherlands, will eventually lay claim to the eastern part of the big island.

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands includes three main groups—the Carolines, the Marianas (except Guam) and the Marshalls. It was mandated to Japan by the League of Nations. The United States occupied the islands in World War II. They were placed under U.N. trusteeship in 1947.

INCORPORATION URGED

Many of the islands are volcanic and picturesque; many are little more than coral reefs. Only 96 are inhabited. The population is mainly Micronesian. The eastern boundary of the territory lies about 1,800 miles west of Hawaii.

Senator Hiram L. Fong, Republican, of Hawaii, has introduced a resolution to put Congress on record as favoring incorporation of the islands into Hawaii, but the United States is committed to a policy of allowing the residents to determine their own future.

American officials say it will be some time before the Micronesians will be ready for a decision. The slow progress toward self-government is attributed to dispersal of the population, lack of political education, and the difficulty of creating a Micronesian identity.

When the time does come to change the territory's status, the views of the population may be determined by any one of several methods.

CONGRESS ESTABLISHED

The United States has established a Congress of Micronesia as the first legislative organ of the territory. The congress might eventually ask for independence or for self-government within the framework of the United States. The territory also might be asked to express its opinion by voting under U.N. supervision.

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is unique in that it has been designated as a strategic area and, under the U.N. Charter, the U.N. Security Council has the final say.

This means that the big-power veto would apply. The Soviet Union's demands for independence of all dependent territories might make it difficult to win approval of any proposal that did not offer independence.

REDUCTION OF FREIGHT RATES ON GRAIN INTO THE SOUTHEAST

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on September 10, the Interstate Commerce Commission approved the Southern Railway System's right to reduce rates on grain into the Southeast. This will mean much to the economy of the South. The South is a deficit area in both red meat and grain. It also means a lot to the Midwest opening up new markets for grain with higher prices for the growers.

Each year, the South must import 1 billion pounds of beef and 1.3 billion pounds of pork to meet its needs. Also, each year the South imports 12 million tons of grain to meet its needs in producing poultry, cattle, and hogs that it now produces. This decision by ICC will be a stimulus to the livestock producers in the Southeast and will be of tremendous help in raising farm income.

I ask unanimous consent that this

statement by Mr. D. W. Brosnan, president of the Southern Railway System, on the decision rendered by ICC, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SOUTHERN RAILWAY'S GRAIN RATES

The Interstate Commerce Commission on September 10 approved, upon reconsideration, Southern Railway system's greatly reduced freight rates for grain transported in the railway's Big John 100-ton cars. The reduced rates, which have been in effect since May 11, 1963, average 60 percent under rates formerly used. The Commission had previously ordered that the rates be increased by 16 percent.

President D. W. Brosnan, of Southern Railway, said "the Interstate Commerce Commission deserves the highest praise and thanks of the American people" for its approval today, after further study, of Southern Railway's greatly reduced rates for the transportation of grain. He added: "This is regulation in the public interest, benefiting all consumers, and particularly the grain-deficit South and farmers in the grain-surplus Midwest."

"This clears the way for the fast growth of our billion dollar baby, the South's livestock industry," Brosnan said. "Nourished by Southern's low grain rates livestock production in the South, now deficit by more than 2 billion pounds annually, will take off like a rocket and put some \$2 billion of new money in circulation in the area. The grain for this will come from the Midwest and will greatly benefit the farmers in that area. Incidentally, the savings to the public in present transportation costs alone from these rates add up to \$40 million each year."

In its report today, the Interstate Commerce Commission found Southern's rates just and reasonable, without prejudice to Tennessee River ports, and that they do not result in destructive competition against barge line protestants.

THE WATER SHORTAGE AND THE ST. CROIX NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, during the last 2 weeks, the Senate has acted on legislation of key significance to the preservation of fresh water as one of our most precious natural resources. The St. Croix National Scenic Riverway bill provides for the protection and preservation of the scenic and recreational aspects of that river.

And on Tuesday, September 21, the Senate adopted a conference report on the water pollution control bill, S. 4, which I cosponsored, which will enable us to begin now to take steps to preserve our water resources.

Two fine editorials in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on the subject of water pollution and on the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway bill are worthy of the attention of the Senate, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press, Sept. 19, 1965]

MONDALE ST. CROIX BILL IS SOUND

The absence of antipollution standards and the lack of any comprehensive State policy

on the preservation of Minnesota's heritage of natural beauty has brought the Federal Government into the picture on the St. Croix River.

The St. Croix is included in a clean water bill, authored by Representative JOHN BLATNIK, of Minnesota, which is almost certain to be enacted in this session of Congress. It will provide for the setting of antipollution standards and controls which will be imposed on interstate waters if the States themselves fail to act.

The House and Senate passed slightly different versions and the final bill was worked out in conference.

Another bill, passed by the Senate, affects the St. Croix more directly. Coauthored by Senators WALTER MONDALE, of Minnesota, and GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, the St. Croix Scenic Riverway Act would protect the scenic and recreational assets of the river.

The measure will go before the House next session, under sponsorship of Representative JOSEPH KARTH, of St. Paul, who, with MONDALE, eliminated through amendment many of the more objectionable features of the original legislation.

It is unfortunate that Federal legislation should be necessary. It is unfortunate that Minnesota and Wisconsin have not worked out air and water pollution standards for the river they share along with a plan for some sort of civilized development for the river valley. But they have not.

As it stands now, however, the Mondale-Nelson bill is a sound piece of legislation which should provide a suitable framework in which the States, counties, and local communities involved can work with the Federal Government in the development and preservation of the valley.

It is not completely satisfactory either to the dedicated conservationist or to those who have hoped for unabated industrial development along the river. But it does permit reasonable development of the river for commercial use while protecting valuable and irreplaceable recreational resources.

The act would apply to a quarter-mile strip on both sides of the river. The area north of Taylors Falls would be preserved as a "wild river," as would 90 miles of the Namekagon River. Federal land acquisition will amount eventually to about 34,270 acres, including 31,270 acres to be purchased ultimately from Northern States Power Co.

It no longer has application to land within cities and villages—as they were constituted as of last January 1—and does not affect existing industrial or commercial development.

It is in regard to the unincorporated areas along the river that some unhappiness remains. The bill calls for the adoption of zoning ordinances in areas outside of municipalities on the lower St. Croix. These would have to conform to standards set by the Secretary of the Interior, standards which would be consistent with the recreational purposes of the act.

Critics point out that the act spells out no specific standards. They are concerned that they might be imposed at the whim of the Secretary and exclude all new industrial and commercial development in these areas regardless of their character.

The bill's author should make some clarification of this point and produce a clear congressional intent, for the Interior Department is given enormous powers under this bill and Congress should leave as little interpretation as possible up to bureaucrats.

The Secretary of the Interior, for example, would have the power to condemn land for acquisition. This authority would be suspended in areas where proper ordinances in regard to standards are in force. Any attempts to breach the ordinances or to promote undesirable development would serve to reinstate the condemnation power.

Exempt from condemnation and acquisition are individual homes, cottages, and cabins used for residential purposes. The authors, along with exempting villages and cities in the amended bill, also eliminated any confusion about whether the new NSP plant on the St. Croix would be affected. It will not.

In urging passage of the bill in the Senate, MONDALE stated:

"We cannot allow the St. Croix to go the way of our other polluted, detergent-filled, sewage-filled rivers in the United States."

"The St. Croix River is the last major unpolluted river in the United States today. Its beauty is without question. It is a clean, large, swift-flowing waterway, within easy access to thousands of Minnesotans. But if we are to stop the flood of pollution and destruction of this river, we need the cooperation and assistance of the Federal Government."

One would think that this would be the fervent desire of almost everyone. We feel that this bill goes a long way in saving the St. Croix before it is too late.

It has been an extremely complicated undertaking, with attention given to both individual rights of entrepreneurs and to the rights of the public to have and keep a heritage that is priceless beyond measure. The authors are to be complimented.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press, Sept. 7, 1965]

WATER, WATER EVERYWHERE?

There is a certain sickening irony that should not be lost on Minnesotans in the fact that while New York City is turning into a dust bowl because of a water shortage, the mighty Hudson River continues to roll by it at a rate of 11 billion gallons of fresh water a day.

Almost every schoolboy knows why the Hudson River can't be used. It's a sewer, just like the Potomac River, just like about every major river in the United States including our Mississippi.

And at a time when large thinkers are contemplating the clean rivers and streams of Canada, and wondering if, like gods of some sort, they can make these streams flow backward, we sit and look at our own contamination and shrug. That, at least, is the general pattern. Some noteworthy results at cleanup have been obtained because of determined municipal-State action in some areas of the country. But these praiseworthy efforts are dwarfed by plans for further "development" along our rivers, which "development," with our misused concept of progress, threatens further contamination.

How to bring this home, to make the people thoroughly angry at this misuse of their property seems to be the project of the hour. Fishermen get annoyed when industries and municipalities turn previously clear and clean streams into flowing garbage dumps. You would think that those who can remember when it was possible to swim in the Mississippi would become similarly annoyed at being chased out by the flow of sewage and industrial waste. You would think that Minnesotans would become quite concerned over what lies in the planning and on the drawing boards for the St. Croix River, the least of which is the generating plant to be constructed on its banks by the Northern States Power Co.

Well, you might say we have plenty of water, good clean water. It may be difficult to worry about water when we are surrounded by lakes, when the lawn may still be soggy from the last rain. But New York didn't worry much about water, either, until suddenly New Yorkers were asked to ration themselves.

It is the same with air. There is always enough to go around, until, finally, there isn't.

It was on these two subjects—water and air pollution—that the legislature let Minnesotans down the hardest at the 1964 session. And it is on these two subjects that the municipalities of the Twin Cities must devote themselves to energetic cooperative action, forgetting, for example, such apparent boosts to civic pride as one's own sewer system, and uniting on studies, standards, and enforcement policies on both air and water pollution. Waiting for the legislature seemingly is like waiting for the horse-drawn stages which used to operate here long ago: they don't run anymore.

VENEZUELA CELEBRATES BIRTH OF ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, during the past several weeks, the anniversary of the birth of the Alliance for Progress has been celebrated in many places all over Latin America. One such celebration occurred in Venezuela on September 15.

Among the speakers at the event in Venezuela was Mr. Patrick F. Morris, Director of the Agency for International Development's operations in that country. Mr. Morris has directed the Venezuelan AID program since its inception and, I have it on good authority, there is a no more able or more dedicated Director than Pat Morris.

Mr. Morris is being transferred back to Washington to assume wider responsibility. I hope that he will have ample opportunity to use his abundance of skill and experience in his new assignment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Morris' speech, as printed in the Record, I bring his thoughtful speech to the attention of the Senate because it illustrates the kind of economic progress and institution building for which the Alliance for Progress was created.

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

MOBILIZATION OF NATIONAL SAVINGS TO INCREASE HOME CONSTRUCTION IN VENEZUELA
(Speech by Patrick F. Morris, Director of the Agency for International Development, in Venezuela)

It is a widely accepted fact that petroleum is the most important economic activity of Venezuela. Which should be the next most important? Iron? Petrochemicals? Manufacturing? Agriculture? All of these are important, but I believe that the construction industry should be considered very close behind the first industry.

I believe this because the construction industry makes such a major contribution to direct employment and, in addition, requires increased employment for the production of the many items and materials that are involved. From cement to tile, from plumbing fixtures to electrical fixtures and, in addition, after a structure is completed, furniture, rugs, and all of the things that are needed to make a house a home. And the home is the foundation of any community and any nation. A man can have a job, be well clothed and well fed but if he does not have an adequate place in which to live and enjoy the material and spiritual values he is not a complete man. Yet, housing continues to be one of Venezuela's most critical problems. The lack of adequate housing contributes to other social and economic problems. The solution of the housing problem would, likewise, contribute to the solv-

Number receiving an increase, annual cost, and average increase, Department of Defense

	Number receiving increase			Number receiving no increase	Annual cost (thousands)			Average increase ¹					
	Total	Under 2	Over 2		Total	Under 2	Over 2	Percent		Monthly		Annual	
								Under 2	Over 2	Under 2	Over 2	Under 2	Over 2
C/S	0	0	0	5				0	0	0	0	0	0
O-10	0	0	0	32				0	0	0	0	0	0
O-9	0	0	0	110				0	0	0	0	0	0
O-8	0	0	0	495				0	0	0	0	0	0
O-7	0	0	0	643				0	0	0	0	0	0
O-6	6	0	6	15,365	\$2		\$2	0	3.3	0	\$25.20	0	\$302.40
O-5	10	0	10	37,451	4		4	0	4.8	0	32.10	0	385.20
O-4	122	10	112	56,162	52	\$17	35	33.6	4.7	\$145.80	26.52	1,749.60	318.24
O-3	3,299	2,527	742	102,974	3,546	3,348	198	31.2	4.9	110.40	22.20	1,324.80	266.40
O-2	23,775	4,861	18,914	31,976	15,198	6,142	9,056	37.4	10.4	105.30	39.90	1,263.60	478.80
O-1	43,833	37,113	6,720	7,061	52,306	47,564	4,742	44.3	19.1	106.80	58.80	1,281.60	705.60
W-4	12	0	12	3,354	9	0	9	0	12.6	0	60.25	0	723.00
W-3	4	2	2	4,623	4	3	1	41.3	13.0	135.60	54.00	1,627.20	648.00
W-2	206	7	199	4,793	55	10	45	41.2	4.9	118.50	19.01	1,422.00	228.12
W-1	213	81	132	2,559	145	107	38	46.1	7.6	109.80	24.18	1,317.60	290.16
Total officers	71,450	44,601	26,849	267,663	71,321	57,191	14,130	42.8	12.3	106.86	43.86	1,282.32	526.32
E-9	0	0	0	13,546				0	0	0	0	0	0
E-8	0	0	0	33,795				0	0	0	0	0	0
E-7	1,815	0	1,815	108,806	216		216	0	3.1	0	9.87	0	118.44
E-6	3,395	0	3,395	227,889	342		342	0	3.1	0	8.41	0	100.92
E-5	21,266	4,125	17,141	384,126	5,984	3,948	2,036	54.9	4.6	79.76	9.90	957.12	118.80
E-4	40,658	40,658	0	410,259	29,615	29,615	0	49.6	0	60.70	0	728.40	0
E-3	496,072	347,156	148,916	89,682	245,925	230,914	15,011	55.8	5.7	55.43	8.40	665.16	100.80
E-2	345,891	300,830	45,061	0	149,232	147,286	1,946	47.6	2.9	40.80	3.60	489.60	43.20
E-1 over 4 months	56,467	47,072	9,395	0	19,769	19,262	507	41.0	4.0	34.10	4.50	409.20	54.00
E-1 under 4 months	103,804	103,804	0	0	48,954	48,954	0	50.4	0	39.30	0	471.60	0
Total enlisted	1,069,368	843,645	225,723	1,268,103	590,037	479,979	20,058	51.1	4.9	47.41	7.41	568.92	88.92
Grand total	1,140,818	888,246	252,572	1,535,766	571,358	537,170	34,188	50.7	5.7	50.40	11.28	604.80	135.36

¹ For personnel receiving an increase.

S. —

A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services within each pay grade are set forth in the following tables:

"Commissioned officers

Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-10 ¹	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,502.10	\$1,503.00	\$1,503.90	\$1,504.80	\$1,506.00	\$1,506.90	\$1,506.90	\$1,614.30	\$1,614.30	\$1,722.00	\$1,722.00	\$1,829.70	\$1,829.70
O-9	1,380.00	1,382.10	1,384.20	1,386.30	1,388.40	1,390.50	1,392.60	1,395.00	1,397.10	1,399.20	1,399.20	1,506.90	1,506.90	1,614.30	1,614.30
O-8	1,269.90	1,272.30	1,274.70	1,277.10	1,279.50	1,281.90	1,284.30	1,286.70	1,289.10	1,291.50	1,291.50	1,399.20	1,399.20	1,455.60	1,455.60
O-7	1,160.10	1,162.80	1,165.50	1,167.90	1,170.60	1,173.30	1,176.00	1,178.40	1,181.10	1,183.80	1,183.80	1,266.00	1,266.00	1,266.00	1,266.00
O-6	773.40	774.00	774.90	775.50	776.40	777.00	777.60	778.50	779.10	779.10	779.10	902.10	902.10	1,025.10	1,112.10
O-5	676.80	680.40	684.00	687.60	691.20	694.80	698.40	702.00	705.60	709.20	712.80	804.60	808.20	907.20	907.20
O-4	579.90	583.80	587.70	591.60	595.50	599.40	603.30	607.20	611.10	615.00	618.90	738.00	741.90	758.40	758.40
O-3	464.10	473.10	481.80	490.50	499.20	507.90	516.60	525.30	534.00	542.70	551.40	666.30	666.30	666.30	666.30
O-2	386.70	424.20	461.40	476.70	488.90	502.20	516.50	530.80	545.10	559.40	573.70	588.00	592.30	592.30	592.30
O-1 ²	348.00	366.30	384.30	394.30	410.10	425.40	440.70	456.00	471.30	486.60	501.90	517.20	532.50	547.80	563.10

¹ While serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps, basic pay for this grade is \$2,019.30 regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of this title.

² Does not apply to commissioned officers who have been credited with over 4 years' active service as an enlisted member.

"Commissioned officers who have been credited with over 4 years' active service as an enlisted member

Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205											
	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-3	\$533.10	\$558.60	\$579.00	\$609.90	\$640.50	\$666.30	\$666.30	\$666.30	\$666.30	\$666.30	\$666.30	\$666.30
O-2	476.70	489.90	502.20	528.00	548.40	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70	563.70
O-1	384.30	410.10	425.40	440.70	456.00	471.30	476.70	476.70	476.70	476.70	476.70	476.70

"Warrant officers

Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
W-4	\$579.90	\$581.40	\$583.20	\$584.70	\$586.50	\$588.00	\$589.80	\$591.30	\$593.10	\$594.60	\$609.90	\$630.30	\$651.00	\$702.00	\$702.00
W-3	464.10	465.30	466.50	468.00	469.20	471.60	471.60	486.90	502.20	517.50	533.10	553.50	573.90	594.60	594.60
W-2	405.90	408.30	410.70	413.10	415.50	417.90	420.30	425.60	450.90	466.20	481.80	497.10	517.50	517.50	517.50
W-1	348.00	349.50	351.00	352.20	353.70	359.00	384.30	399.90	514.20	430.50	445.80	461.40	461.40	461.40	461.40

"Enlisted members

Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205														
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 24	Over 30
E-9							\$445.80	\$456.00	\$466.50	\$476.70	\$486.90	\$497.10	\$522.90	\$573.90	\$573.90
E-8						\$374.10	\$384.30	\$394.50	\$405.00	\$415.20	\$425.40	\$435.60	\$461.40	\$512.40	\$512.40
E-7	\$323.70	\$325.20	\$326.70	\$328.50	\$330.00	\$331.50	\$333.00	\$343.50	\$358.80	\$369.00	\$379.20	\$384.30	\$410.10	\$461.40	\$461.40
E-6	267.30	269.70	272.10	274.50	276.90	287.10	297.30	312.60	322.80	333.00	338.40	338.40	338.40	338.40	338.40
E-5	225.00	225.30	225.60	235.80	251.10	261.30	271.50	282.00	287.10	287.10	287.10	287.10	287.10	287.10	287.10
E-4	183.00	184.50	194.70	210.00	220.50	230.50	240.50	250.50	250.50	250.50	250.50	250.50	250.50	250.50	250.50
E-3	154.80	156.90	159.00	169.20	169.20	169.20	169.20	169.20	169.20	169.20	169.20	169.20	169.20	169.20	169.20
E-2	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60	126.60
E-1	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30	117.30

Estimated cost of proposed increases in basic pay for personnel with less than 2 years of service¹ (12 months)

Active duty personnel:

Basic pay	\$571,358,000
Officer candidates:	
Basic pay	6,487,000
Social security	235,000
Reenlistment bonus, terminal leave, severance pay, death gratuity	5,000,000
Social security	20,000,000
Total, active duty	603,080,000

Reserve personnel:

Basic pay	70,537,000
Social security	2,500,000
Total, reserve personnel	73,037,000

Retired personnel:

Retirement occurring after effective date	25,000
Total, retired personnel	25,000

Total, Department of Defense	676,142,000
Coast Guard	10,000,000
Public Health Service	3,500,000
Coast and Geodetic Survey	150,000
Grand total	689,792,000

¹ Including personnel with more than 2 years of service when necessary to align the scales.

[From the Journal of the Armed Forces, February 1965]

MOONLIGHTING MARINES OMINOUS SYMPTOM

The fact that thousands of Marine Corps officers and enlisted men must "moonlight" to make ends meet—the story is the same in all other services—is symptomatic of a sickness in military pay scales, according to Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr.

When Commandant Greene and the other JCS members appear before congressional committees during the weeks immediately ahead, they will be questioned closely on the "moonlighting" aspect of financial hardships and inequities being encountered by Armed Forces members.

A 6,300-man survey reveals that 23 percent of Marine Corps enlisted men—32 percent in the Washington area—are holding down outside jobs. The survey shows that this is true for 3 percent of officers.

"I do not know what the specific answer to the pay problem is," General Greene said in an interview, "but I view this data and other evidence as clear symptoms that something is seriously wrong. It's as if a patient had a fever of 104. The doctor might not know immediately the cause and treatment, but he surely knows that there is an illness which must be treated."

Commandant Greene noted that the problem of retaining skilled NCO technicians is becoming increasingly acute. "In some areas," he said, "we are forced to maintain our combat readiness with only 40 to 50 percent of our requirements."

As one possible solution to this NCO retention problem, General Greene is hopeful that support will grow for a variable skills reenlistment bonus. Under this proposal, previously advocated by Vice Adm. William R. Smedberg, II, U.S. Navy (retired), former Chief of Naval Personnel, an enlisted man in a hard-skill area would receive a higher reenlistment bonus—perhaps as much as \$6,000.

General Greene believes that such a program would bring with it considerable savings to the Government and would ease the manning problems in all services.

First cruise enlistments in the corps, General Greene reported, are "most satisfactory. We are able to meet our recruiting quotas, and the low attrition rate at our recruit depots indicates that we are getting good men."

The problem is, however, that the Marines are falling far short of meeting reenlistment quotas for these young men.

The corpswide target is a first cruise re-up rate of 23 to 24 percent. This compares with only a 15 to 18 percent rate achieved in recent months.

General Greene, who has taken a keen personal interest in the pay plight of his men, said that "moonlighting" is most prevalent among officers and NCO's, particularly the latter, who wish to send their children to college.

"I know of many cases," he said, "where topnotch NCO's who want very much to remain in the corps are leaving us to accept much higher pay in industry because they and their wives feel that such action is essential to provide adequately for their children. This hurts the most—to lose men who want to stay in the service."

In related areas of military morale, General Greene has been forceful in supporting Secretary McNamara's drive to obtain more military family housing. The Commandant also has urged action to improve medical care for all military people and their families, active and retired.

Lacking the staff resources of the other services, the Marines are not making any comprehensive report on specific actions to improve the military pay situation in the fighting forces, but are pursuing, at General Greene's direction, the task of compiling pertinent data that will be of great potential value to the Presidential pay panel and to congressional committees.

THE PRESIDENT'S GREAT MESSAGE ON NATURAL BEAUTY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments on the remarkable natural beauty message the President sent to the Congress on Monday. I was necessarily absent yesterday, and so was not able to make my comments at that time.

The President's message is of historic importance. It brings recognition from the highest level of Government of the crucial importance of conservation as a national issue and of the need to meet the crisis headon.

As the New York Times editorialized this morning:

The Nation once had clean and beautiful rivers but they are rarities today. The problem of impure air is as close as the next breath you take. It spares nothing and no one. Against these and other forms of ugliness, the President has now issued an inspiring order of battle.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, from the February 9 issue of the New York Times, be printed in full at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the growth of technology and the inevitable squeeze on our resources forced by population increase indeed demand a new conservation.

Fortunately, there is at least a widespread popular demand, as well, for wise conservation policy. Now most people have the leisure in which to enjoy the countryside, and the knowledge that our cities can be made places of beauty.

In this great message, the growing popular demand for wise policy has finally found a national voice. Only the President can bring together the scattered conservation programs and policies of our Government, and can provide a national perspective. The President's message covers at least four major departments of the Federal Government. It is an excellent start toward a united conservation policy.

The crucial importance of urban conservation is a key idea in the message. Not only clean air and clean water, but also ample green recreation areas, are necessary to truly civilized city life. We have begun to move in this area. The President pledges renewed and coordinated action.

His proposals for roadside beauty and investigation of new ways to utilize junked automobiles will find wide support.

His legislative proposals on water pollution received overwhelming Senate approval when Senate bill 4 was passed by a vote of 68 to 8.

Federal licensing and factory inspection authority for pesticide production are badly needed.

Those of us who have been fighting to save, for recreation, the clean, spectacular St. Croix River, on the Minnesota-Wisconsin boundary, are greatly encouraged by the President's proposals for the Potomac. It is just such a combination of Federal, State, and local action—scenic easement, public access acquisition, and protective zoning—that our bill

to establish a St. Croix National Scenic Waterway (S. 897) proposes. The differences between the two rivers make quick action on the bill I introduced, with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], all the more important.

On the Potomac, we face a multimillion-dollar cleanup job; but the St. Croix is the last really clean large river near a metropolitan area in the Midwest. Action now can preserve this river before it becomes fouled.

The proposal for a national system of hiking trails is especially close to my heart. I have introduced a bill (S. 622) to provide Federal recognition for the Appalachian Trail, from Maine to Georgia. I shall soon propose in Wisconsin a statewide system of hiking trails. The route for one trail, across the northern tier of Wisconsin counties, from Minnesota to Michigan, largely running through county, State, and national forest land, has already been marked out.

All of us in the conservation movement are looking forward eagerly to the White House conference in May. The selection of Laurance Rockefeller, the illustrious Chairman of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, as conference chairman is most welcome. The ORRRC report, as it is called, has become the indispensable tool of all those who work in the area of the new conservation. I am confident the conference will prove most valuable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post for Tuesday, February 9. The editorial entitled "The President's Great Message," expresses my thoughts.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 9, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT'S GREAT MESSAGE

President Johnson's great congressional message on conservation no doubt will take its place among the state papers that have shaped and fixed national policy over decades and generations. It is a declaration of national purpose that surely will stir appropriate response in Congress, in State legislatures, and in the hearts of the American people.

We have already gone so far in the defacement of our environment that much of the task has become that of restoration, as the President points out. But it certainly is not beyond the means of our society to make beauty more than "just a holiday treat," but "a part of our daily life," to use the President's words.

Much of the President's message deals with programs already in being, but it serves a useful purpose to bring the references to them together and to relate them to each other in a way that binds them into a consistent national program.

The land acquisition program will enrich the life of every area of the country, and his region will be particularly pleased to have Assateague Island National Seashore included. Of equally great local interest is the reference to faulty strip and surface mining practices which may be expanded in our own vicinity. Appropriate steps are not taken. The way beautification program will touch every part of the country. The Presidential remarks on the Nation's great rivers will hearten citizens fighting to preserve the

Hudson in New York, the St. Croix in Minnesota and Wisconsin, and other streams. The President surely is right in saying that the "time has also come to identify and preserve free flowing stretches of our great scenic rivers before growth and development make the beauty of the unspoiled waterway a memory." The President's proposals for the Potomac area will excite the interest of this whole region, and his objectives for this watershed are well put: "Clean up the river," "protect its natural beauties," "provide adequate recreational facilities," and "complete the presently authorized George Washington Memorial Parkway." It is to be hoped that the review to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior will have the same multifaceted approach, mingling all the many values of the stream and its watershed and not falling into the single purpose plans of the Army Engineers.

The message deals with air and water pollution in a comprehensive way and promises Federal progress toward remedial measures that have always had hard sledding on the Hill.

The White House Conference on Natural Beauty, which will meet next May, ought to be a great forum at which national sentiment can be assumed behind the Presidential purpose. Each of five specific areas of inquiry will arouse the enthusiasm of individual groups struggling alone to preserve some aspect of national beauty. It is good that the conference is to look into the problems of automobile junkyards, underground installation of utility transmission lines, the relation between taxation and conservation, Federal assistance to the States, and national tree planting programs.

The President has made an eloquent and moving appeal to the Nation to "rebuild and reclaim the beauty we inherited," and we hope that appeal will be heard and acted upon, in Congress, in State legislatures, and in local governments.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Feb. 9, 1965]

AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL?

President Johnson's message on beauty, both natural and manmade, draws the issue sharply. Is this country going to be America the beautiful or God's own junkyard?

The outcome is in doubt. As of now, the United States is losing to the forces of ugliness. There are fewer good-looking new buildings being constructed in most cities than there are handsome old landmarks being torn down. The suburban sprawl produces vast groups of identical little houses which look as if they were all stamped out of a monstrous machine by a mindless idiot.

The Nation once had clean and beautiful rivers, but they are rarities today. The problem of impure air is as close as the next breath you take. It spares nothing and no one. Against these and other forms of ugliness, the President has now issued an inspiring order of battle.

Mr. Johnson proposes to continue and to extend in many useful ways the protection of woodlands, wildlife and natural beauty begun 60 years ago under Theodore Roosevelt. He also calls for "a new conservation" that will encompass our manmade urban environment. He is probably the first President to tell Americans they should "salvage the beauty and charm of our cities." The steps he urges in this direction are modest, but he has promised to recommend additional measures in a forthcoming message.

The central weakness in the national effort to combat ugliness is that the problems are so diverse and many sided. What is everybody's business too often becomes nobody's business. For that very reason, the most important fact about the President's message is that he sent it at all.

In so doing, he has provided the public with a proper sense of underlying coherence in the diffuse struggle to create beauty in our man-made environment and to defend it in our natural environment. By defining Government's responsibility, he stimulates a new awareness of the responsibilities of individuals and interest groups. The White House Conference on Natural Beauty which he has scheduled for May will also help in the long and arduous effort to rescue the physical appearance of this country from the mess that man has been making of it.

TOWARD ENDING RELIANCE ON THE MILITARY DRAFT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the defense message sent to Congress last month includes the news that this year the Department of Defense will go ahead with its special training enlistment program.

I welcome this news as an indication that ways are already being found to reduce our reliance on the inequitable and outmoded draft system. The special training enlistment program has as its purpose the physical and educational rehabilitation of men who fall in their first attempt to meet service requirements. It will aim to correct physical deficiencies in 6 months, thus qualifying many thousands of volunteers who otherwise would be turned down each year. According to the President's message, a pilot plan will involve about 10,000 men in 1965, and will establish "how many of these young men can be upgraded so as to qualify for service."

I hope that this program, after hitting several snags last year, will be given a full and fair trial. It is a sensible alternative to continuing to turn down men who want to be, and who can be, good soldiers, while arbitrarily interrupting the lives of thousands of others who view their time in the armed services as nothing more than a piece of bad luck.

This is only one method by which our military-manpower needs can be met in a more rational fashion. There are others which remain to be explored. An article by the Wall Street Journal's Pentagon reporter, William Beecher, published in the National Guardsman magazine for January 1965, concludes with the statement that the study will probably do away with the present draft system.

The only obstacle—

He writes—

is the added cost of raising pay and incentives enough to attract a volunteer force.

"The peacetime draft appears headed for an early retirement," begins Mr. Beecher's article; and his discussion of the alternatives is one of the most informative yet published. He points out that the special training enlistment program—STEP—is regarded by many in the Defense Department as an opportunity for not only saving considerable money over the long run, but also improving the morale of our Armed Forces.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Beecher's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the National Guardsman, January 1965]

IS THE DRAFT DOOMED?

(By William Beecher)

(NOTE.—William Beecher, Massachusetts born (Harvard 1955, M.S., Columbia 1956), served a 1956 active duty hitch as an ROTC produced second lieutenant, now is a captain in the U.S. Army Reserve. A newsmen on the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, 1956-59, and with Fairchild Publications in Washington, 1959-60, he has been with the Wall Street Journal since 1960, covering the Defense Department beat.)

The peacetime draft appears headed for an early retirement. Although forced conscription into the Armed Forces of the United States dates back to the Civil War, it was not until the nonwar, nonpeace cold war period following the Korean conflict that the wartime draft was pressed into peacetime duty full time.

The draft, historically, never has been very popular. Army units had to be diverted from the battlefield in the Civil War to put down draft riots in New York City. In recent years, critics of the draft have been legion, and their strength seems to be growing. Their ranks include inductees plucked out of good jobs while buddies continue in civilian life, educators and businessmen upset about the unsettling effect on young men waiting for the ax to fall sometime between their 18th and 26th birthdays, mothers, sweethearts, and even venerable lawmakers in Washington.

The whole question managed to get caught up in the recent presidential campaign—with Republicans and Democrats eagerly straining to outdo each other in denouncing the draft.

The GOP candidate, Senator Barry Goldwater, charged the Johnson administration "uses the outmoded and unfair military draft system for social schemes as well as military objectives. Republicans will end this draft altogether, and as soon as possible, that I promise you."

The Defense Department immediately retorted that the draft is used only for "direct military needs" and added: "We are glad to know the Republican candidate agrees with the administration that the draft should be ended as soon as possible. The fact is that more than 4 months ago President Johnson directed a study to reach this result. The study will be completed in April."

President Johnson, of course, is not committed to ending the draft. He could, between the time he receives the Pentagon's recommendations and the expiration of the draft law, decide to keep things pretty much as they are, or reform them somewhat. No one in Washington, however, would be surprised if he kills the draft outright (or puts it into cold storage) after the law expires in June, 1967. The largest single obstacle: the immense cost anticipated for maintaining a wholly volunteer Defense Establishment of current proportions, reckoned by some to run several extra billions each year.

Just how many billions is to be determined. Since last spring a 30-man Pentagon task force working under William Gorham, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, and assisted by personnel from the Census Bureau, Selective Service Headquarters, the National Guard and the Reserves, and the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, has been laboring to come up with a series of options—together with price tags for each—that would allow the President to maintain a large standing Army backed by sizable Reserve forces over the next 10 years either without the draft, or with a substantially rejiggered conscription policy.

The group has reviewed all known literature on the question, has studied the experiences of Canada and Great Britain which no longer use conscription, and has conducted special surveys of thousands of men, in service and out, to determine their attitudes

toward military service, why they joined, why they stayed in or left, what benefits would sufficiently sweeten active duty or Reserve service to attract and hold more men. (Meantime, it's been reported that Australia, which has let its Regular Forces dwindle to the vanishing point, is considering revival of the draft in light of Indonesian-Malaysian quarrels and the Red threat elsewhere in southeast Asia, which is uncomfortably close to home.—EDITOR.)

GIVEN TOP PRIORITY

The effort is a rather awesome one and has received top priority from the administration. For, since it's clear that America will have to keep a mammoth force under arms for the foreseeable future, many officials feel it's time that this force cease its heavy reliance on the increasingly criticized draft system.

The fire of critics has been directed for the most part at allegedly unfair draft deferment policies. Some claim the rich are favored because they can afford to stay in college and graduate schools beyond the maximum draft age of 26. Others assert the poor are favored because they tend to marry early and married men were added to the already large deferred list a couple of years ago by the late President Kennedy.

Actually, because of dwindling draft needs at the very time when the postwar baby boom is reaching age and industry is having trouble absorbing all the youngsters ready to join the job market, only roughly 10 percent of draft age young men are being inducted into the Army—the only service which today relies on conscription for part of its needs.

Many men join up (1) to choose the service of their liking, and (2) to determine the timing of their military duty. And this leads to still another reason for criticism of the draft: the 5-year period of uncertainty between registration at age 18 and average induction at 23 has a jarring effect on thousands of young men and their civilian career plans. (Statistics do not yet bear out the alarm, expressed at the time deferment was conferred on married men, that droves of youngsters would rush to the marriage bureau, perhaps prematurely, to avoid military service. In his own characteristically dry, Hoosier way, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, with more than two score years of draft experience behind his observation, had philosophized to a gathering of guardsmen: "Anybody that gets married to get out of service, it's probably just as well that you found out ahead of time.")

Already one step has been taken to relieve the uncertainty for some, at least. In the past, men registered for the draft at 18 but were not examined until they were called, often years later. Now all will be examined at registration time and told whether they qualify or not.

TASK FORCE SEEKS ANSWERS

But, in itself, that falls a great deal short of what is wanted and needed. In search of some answers to the many problems posed by the draft, the Pentagon task force has, in effect, been asked these basic questions: (1) Can the United States drop the draft? Under what circumstances? When? (2) If that cannot be done, what changes in the present draft system can be made to reduce inequities and decrease reliance on the draft by making military careers more desirable?

To compound the problem—as if it weren't difficult enough already—the task force was asked to project its thinking 10 years hence, whereas the Defense Department scarcely ventures beyond 5 years into the future in force level planning and weapons development programing. Thus the task force will come up with different programs for approximately the same total force level as at present—about 2,700,000 men on active duty and another million or so in the National

Guard and Reserves. It will come up with alternative programs based on appreciably smaller—and larger—force mixes.

For one thing, an attempt will be made to further substitute civilian help for non-combat military assignments—such as for civilians in military kitchens, doing everything from cooking to KP.

One interesting phase of the study is an attempt to determine what would happen to the number of volunteers if the draft were dropped and military benefits—pay, housing, etc.—were left unchanged. The first-blush reaction is that the number of volunteers would decline markedly. Without the fear of the draft and without any special inducements beyond those now offered, men would be expected to stay away in droves.

Thus, there's almost universal agreement that many incentives would have to be added to make active and reserve duty more attractive.

Money is one obvious avenue being explored. Salaries can be boosted up and down the line to correspond more favorably with what's available in civilian life. There's even some thought to paying certain specialists more in military service than they could get outside, the thinking being that once the Government has invested tens of thousands of dollars into giving a man very special training—say in nuclear propulsion engineering—it would be cheaper to pay him enough to keep him rather than have to repeat this large training expenditure on a replacement.

Thought also is being given to substantial cash bonuses, both for enlistment and reenlistment.

The draft chief, himself, appears highly skeptical that more money would stimulate enlistments. Last fall, General Hershey told the National Guard Association of the United States that the Regular Forces hadn't been able to enlist as many men in any single month since the October 1963 pay raise, as they had in August before the raise.

But a lot of nonmonetary inducements are also being scrutinized. Thought is being given to a substantial expansion of the Army's so-called guaranteed training program for all the services. If a man scores high enough in preliminary tests he would be "guaranteed" to receive military training in one of three specialties, depending on the service's existing needs.

There is also a possibility of military-paid vocational training in top civilian trade schools, either before or during service. Thus, if a man wanted to learn a difficult trade—as an electrician or plumber or aircraft mechanic—he could get the best education available, plus a lot of excellent on-the-job experience, by signing up with his local recruiter for such a program.

This could well be linked with a reserve program, so that if a man decided not to make a career of the service, he could pursue the same field in civilian life and fulfill his military obligation in a local National Guard or Reserve unit.

Another thought: a new version of the GI bill might be employed to attract men desirous of earning a full education after completing service.

More likely, however, would be a vast expansion of the so-called Holloway plan now used by the Navy for many of its commissioned officers. A carefully selected number of applicants are picked each year and given a 4-year education at a fine university of their choice; they thereafter are committed to serve 4 years of active service.

This approach, if broadened to cover all the services, would meet officer requirements unfilled by the service academies, it's generally thought. But either the GI bill or the 4-and-4 plan would be terribly naive. The latter would have the benefit of attempting to keep men after their service, under the GI bill approach, lots of men would hardly be able to wait to get out so they could start their college educations.



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org