

If Yugoslavia can be depended upon to guard its neutrality and prevent the use of its airspace as the avenue of a surprise attack upon American airbases and naval units in the Mediterranean area, that single item will remove a very formidable threat to the United States forces in the Mediterranean and to our allies whom we are committed to assist in the event they are attacked.

The issue in this case is not the question of our regard for Marshal Tito and the form of government which he maintains in Yugoslavia today. The issue is whether we wish to uphold the hand of the President in his efforts to make peace more secure and to save this Nation and its people if war is forced upon us.

The people of the United States have expressed their overwhelming confidence in the judgment and the good intentions of their President. Those who founded this Nation wisely imposed upon the Chief Executive the heavy burdens and responsibilities of the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. They wisely decreed that this Nation should speak in foreign affairs with a single voice. We are fortunate that they did so. This Nation could never have continued its existence had it been necessary to obtain agreement of a majority of the 96 Senators and 435 Congressmen before we could decide upon a course of action.

President Eisenhower has explained that he wishes to consult with various heads of state, some of whom are not popular in America. The President has told us that he believes he can persuade some of these people to accord us a greater degree of cooperation if he is able to meet with them face to face. The President's motive is worthy, and his logic in this respect makes good sense. Completely aside from the matter of international politics, I regard it as morally right that a national leader should undertake to persuade other national leaders who differ with him of his honorable motives and his peaceful intentions. He should exert his best efforts to persuade them to cooperate and collaborate in our effort to preserve mankind from extermination in an atomic holocaust.

Some of those who are most concerned for fear that Marshal Tito may gain greater international respectability by visiting this country are particularly concerned because of the lack of religious freedom, as we know it, under the Tito regime. I would hope that our President would use his best efforts to persuade Marshal Tito to the American view of religious freedom and tolerance.

I have never posed as a teacher of religion. Nevertheless, I have tried to acquaint myself with certain Christian teachings. It seems to me that the Master would have wanted us to be tolerant of the other man's point of view. He would have wanted us to attempt to persuade our enemies in the path of peace and freedom, rather than engage them in mortal combat or to insult and offend them. When the life of our Saviour was taken by a maddened multitude, He prayed for those who knew not the sin they were committing.

A few days ago the junior Senator from Wisconsin told us that if it required discourtesy to Tito to assure that he

would not visit this country, the junior Senator from Wisconsin was prepared to exhaust his wits in ways to be discourteous and insulting. I disagree with that course of action.

The President should know whether it might advance America's position in the world to invite Marshal Tito to visit him in Washington in order that the chief executives of the United States and Yugoslavia could discuss matters that concern both countries. This is not the kind of decision that a highly placed White House adviser will determine for the President. The problems the President might feel in need of discussing involve a subject matter in which President Eisenhower made his reputation as a world statesman and military planner.

I do not propose to tell President Eisenhower that he should invite Marshal Tito to visit him; nor that he should not do so. I would very much prefer that the President use his own good judgment in this matter. If the President should decide to invite Marshal Tito to visit him, then I am certain it will not help matters for any of us to be insulting or offensive to the President of Yugoslavia. Mr. President, you do not accomplish much just going around being mad at people and insulting folks.

Marshal Tito cannot expect to receive from me or many other Americans the warm and enthusiastic reception that has been accorded other world leaders who have called upon our President, but I shall certainly do nothing for the purpose of making Marshal Tito dislike our country or reduce the esteem in which we are held in Yugoslavia and other nations.

President Eisenhower is barred by the Constitution from seeking another term as President. Under these circumstances, we can be certain that he will place his decision in this matter above and beyond politics. I would like to assure him that he can depend on my cooperation.

I have discussed this matter with a number of my distinguished colleagues, especially some of those who are member of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees. I am confident that the views which I hold on this subject are consistent with those held by the majority of the Members of the Senate.

#### PROPOSED NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senators from Washington [Mr. JACKSON and Mr. MAGNUSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1176) to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of the areas within this System by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill which the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] just introduced, the national wilderness preservation bill, of which I am proud to be one of the cosponsors, remain at the desk until Thursday, for other possible sponsors.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the bill would establish on public lands of the United States a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of areas within this system by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a national wilderness preservation council, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, this 85th Congress has a remarkable opportunity to establish sound and enduring policies that will assure Americans a continuing enjoyment of the outdoor recreation that has always meant so much to us.

A few days ago we welcomed the introduction by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] of a bill to provide for a careful and thorough study of all our outdoor recreation needs and resources and to establish for this purpose a national outdoor recreation resources review commission. I commend the Senator and his cosponsors, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senators from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER and Mr. MORSE], the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. CARROLL], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for their leadership in advancing this legislation, and I offer them hearty and eager support.

I note with special interest that four Senators are cosponsors of both this recreation bill and the wilderness bill.

I agree with Senator ANDERSON's comment that the proposed outdoor recreation resources review will be "instrumental in helping to preserve a fine, long-standing American tradition—the healthful and alluring appeal of the

great outdoors." It is as a contribution to this objective that I now urge further the establishment of our National Wilderness Preservation System, as provided in this Wilderness Bill, a measure that deals with areas that already have been dedicated in one way or another to protection through programs that are thoroughly consistent with their preservation as wilderness.

These areas of wildness will play an important role in the total outdoor recreation program which I hope to see developed as a result of the proposed outdoor recreation resources review. But while we are conducting the inventory which that review requires and developing the recommendations on which the program it envisions can be based, I am sure we should not delay in establishing firmly our policies for preserving our remaining areas of wilderness. I therefore urge this Wilderness Bill as another essential measure in what I hope will be the successful legislative program of this Congress for establishing a sound and effective national policy for outdoor recreation and conservation.

Those of us in the Congress who are vitally interested in conservation are worried, and I think with good cause. We see the pressure that is coming, and as elected representatives it is our clear duty to do something before the horse is out of the barn. There seems to be a crisis every day in the world in which we live, and the only way we are going to change this is by looking ahead and taking timely action.

That is what in this Wilderness Bill I propose we do. Instead of waiting until the crisis has engulfed us, I propose that we make secure the preservation of those areas that do now in fact constitute our national wilderness system—the areas that are now in fact being handled as wilderness, even though they serve other and consistent purposes also. Doing that now means providing security for what we already have, perpetuating the multiple purpose programs we now have on these areas, and making sure that multiple purpose on these lands always includes wilderness preservation.

Mr. President, here is a measure designed to make sure that some parts of America may always remain unspoiled and beautiful in their own natural way, untrammled by man and unmarred by machinery. It is a measure that gives expression to a policy which has long been a reality in the minds and hearts of the American people but has never yet been embodied in legislation.

#### THE NEED FOR WILDERNESS

Nearly 2 years ago, on June 1, 1955, it was my privilege to receive unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address on the Need for Wilderness which had been delivered at the National Citizens Planning Conference on Parks and Open Spaces for the American People here in Washington, D. C., on May 24, 1955. In this address, as I then pointed out, the executive secretary of The Wilderness Society, Mr. Howard Zahniser, had not only discussed our various needs for areas of wilderness and the underlying philosophy for their appreciation. He also had proposed a practical program for preserving a system of

such areas without sacrificing any other program or enterprise—and doing this as a part of existing Federal land-management programs, through the existing agencies.

When this address and my remarks regarding it were reprinted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and distributed to interested groups there was a remarkable response from all parts of the country. There was apparent a great inspired hope that, with a minimum of administrative time and expense and with only slight modification of our present land-management policies, we could see affirmed a national policy to preserve for all time some areas of our pristine American wilderness.

Conscious of the special interest which this prospect held for many Members of Congress, I spoke of these developments in the Senate almost a year ago now—on February 29, 1956—and presented a compilation of excerpts from the many letters which had been received.

At the same time I had urged the interested conservation leaders to cooperate with me in the development of this proposal in bill form. As a result, through the cooperation of a number of conservation leaders and organizations, I was able to introduce this Wilderness Bill in the Senate last June 7 (1956) with the cosponsorship of nine of my esteemed colleagues of both parties, from Maine to California.

On the occasion of this introduction I also presented statements in support of the proposal from the interested conservation organizations and leaders and a number of editorials and newspaper columns commenting on it. These are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 7, 1956.

In an effort to obtain the widest possible consideration of this proposal and to benefit from every possible suggestion, reprints of my own explanatory remarks in introducing the bill and comments by my colleagues, the Senators from Oregon, were widely distributed during the past summer, including the full text of the bill and the statements regarding it to which I have referred. The response once again was most encouraging, and the various suggestions received have led to improvements, corrections, and clarifications in the bill.

When the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, introduced a companion bill in the House of Representatives and spoke with great force and eloquence in that Chamber on July 12, 1956, reprints of his remarks also were obtained and distributed, including likewise the full text of the bill. Many letters in support of this measure have been received from all parts of the country, and Representative SAYLOR has had excerpts from them prepared in a compilation which he has kindly made available to me on this occasion. I thank him for this. With Mr. SAYLOR's approval, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that collected excerpts from these letters may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

#### TWO ASSUMPTIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this bill is based on the assumption that we still can preserve in America an adequate system of wilderness areas without sacrificing any other program. It is based also on a parallel assumption that there will not long be any such areas unless we do deliberately preserve them as wilderness.

In accordance with these assumptions I consider this program both readily feasible and also urgent. It appears to me to be as easy to accomplish as it is important.

#### PART OF AN OVERALL PROGRAM

I should like to emphasize that the preservation of wilderness which we here propose will be part of an over-all land-management program that encompasses also our other needs. There need be no essential conflict. No area now devoted to any economic purpose, or to any other development program, is withdrawn from its use by this legislation. The proposed legislation rather is based on the understanding that we in America still have the opportunity for preserving wilderness while at the same time meeting, outside our wilderness reserves, all our needs for commodities and for developed recreation areas.

Instead of being in conflict with other aspects of our over-all program, our wilderness preservation is actually dependent upon them. Upon their success depend our hopes for wilderness.

Our program is based on this cooperative understanding.

I wish to make clear, for example, that this bill is in no sense, in conflict with, or in competition with, forestry for timber and other economic products. On the contrary foresters are among those upon whom our wilderness program is in reality dependent for its success. If ever the American people come to the borders of our wilderness areas with a need for timber that cannot be met elsewhere, then, I say to you, our wilderness areas will be doomed.

Thus it is to the foresters of America, and to their effective programs for sustained yield cutting, on their production forests, that we must look for success in wilderness preservation.

We recognize this, and we face our program in a spirit of cooperation and with a feeling of dependence on the intelligent foresters of America for support.

Similarly we contemplate cooperation and integration with other enterprises that may likewise be inconsistent within a wilderness and yet thoroughly consistent with the preservation of wilderness as part of an overall program.

After long controversy we recently, for example, found it possible to establish an Upper Colorado River Project that includes a gigantic program for the construction of huge impoundments and magnificent reservoirs and at the same time provides for the protection of national parks and monuments.

There should be no unavoidable conflict between other projects for the wise development and use of our water or other resources and this wilderness preservation program. Wherever there are

perplexities I can assure you, Mr. President, that the proponents of this legislation will face them cooperatively and constructively.

#### A MULTIPLE-USE PROGRAM

Not only in a general or over-all sense, but also specifically, with regard to each area involved, this proposal is one that respects the importance of other programs.

It is a multiple-purpose wilderness program.

Every area included in this System is now serving some other purpose, or purposes, consistent with the continued protection of the area as wilderness. Under this legislation these areas will continue to serve these purposes, and they will be administered by the same agencies that now handle them.

With regard to the 36 wilderness, wild, and roadless areas immediately included and the 44 primitive areas to be added later, the bill has been prepared in accordance with the wilderness policies, programs, and practices of the United States Forest Service and, I may add, in admiration for them. The national forest areas that will be included are those that have been designated by the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, primitive, or roadless, and they will be administered under regulations drawn up in the Forest Service.

This bill will not interfere with, but will perpetuate, the present multiple-purpose administration of these national forest areas.

The central concept of this measure, I repeat, is that our present areas of wilderness can be preserved within the existing land-management pattern if the preservation purpose is made a matter of fundamental policy.

Rather than upsetting the multiple-purpose program of the Forest Service, for example, this legislation will help prevent the upset that will result if the wilderness areas are not protected from the uses that would destroy them as wilderness.

As to the 48 national parks and monuments included, the bill gives added protection as wilderness for the portions not needed for roads and accommodations, and yet sets no limitation on the portions that may be designated for such use as needed. Park areas will continue to serve park purposes, just as forest areas will continue to serve the forest purposes.

The 20 national wildlife refuges and ranges included—20 out of our total of 264—will continue to serve their wildlife purposes. Some wilderness is essential for the preservation of our native species of wilderness wildlife. This measure accordingly will help insure our having a few areas devoted primarily to the preservation of wildlife through the protection of their wilderness environment.

As with parks, as with forests, as with refuges, so with every area included in this system, its wilderness preservation will be an aspect of its management for some other concurrent purpose.

May I emphasize this also in the negative by pointing out that the bill does not establish any special-use privilege nor provide for any special users.

Rather than being concerned with any special use or user, this bill relates instead to the character of the areas involved. Hunting, for example, although it is not mentioned in the bill, will continue to be a major recreation within many national-forest units of the system and will be prohibited in national parks. Wherever there is hunting, it will be wilderness hunting. That is the force of this measure.

Uses of all the various kinds of lands involved will continue to vary. The common concern is that wilderness conditions will persist, whatever the uses.

#### THE EFFECT ON EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. President, I emphasize and reiterate some of these explanations because of misunderstandings, or misinterpretations, that have been brought to my attention. Among these have also been claims that this legislation would put in the hands of Congress the administration of the areas involved, including a charge that the legislation would (and I quote) "cede to Congress final and permanent authority." Intrigued by this charge and interested to know what the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress might comment on these points, I addressed an inquiry to that service. In response to this request, Mr. John P. Earner, of the American Law Division, prepared a report in which he expressed the opinion:

The legislation gives sanction to the policies and programs developed by the Forest Service, the National Park Service, and other Federal conservation agencies under whose administration the existing resource of wilderness has so far been preserved.

The effect of this bill—

as interpreted by Mr. Earner—

will be to bring into a single system, for the purpose of insuring their continued preservation as wilderness, the various federally owned areas designated as wilderness by the departmental heads or by Executive order. In no instance will the jurisdiction of a single area be transferred from one agency to another. Areas controlled, for example, by the Forest Service will continue to be managed by that agency. Furthermore, it will be the Forest Service under the Secretary of Agriculture that determines the precise area of the unit of its wilderness land to be included in the Wilderness Preservation System. And it will be solely the responsibility of the Forest Service under law to preserve the wilderness character of that area. No wilderness area of the Forest Service thus made a part of the Wilderness Preservation System may be modified or removed from the system except by action of the Secretary of Agriculture which has not been disapproved by Congress. In a similar manner lands under the jurisdiction of other executive agencies may be affected by this legislation.

Mr. Earner stated categorically:

The notion that enactment of this legislation would take from the executive branch of the Government and give to Congress a power to dictate all matters concerning wilderness areas is simply not true.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report by Mr. John P. Earner, of the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, on "A bill to authorize a National Wilderness Preserva-

tion System," dated December 4, 1956, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

#### REPORT ON S. 4013, 84TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, A BILL TO AUTHORIZE A NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

(Prepared at the request of the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, by John P. Earner, American Law Division, December 4, 1956.)

It is the purpose of the National Wilderness Preservation Bill to establish by act of Congress a clear-cut national policy for preserving for both the present and the future, some of what remains of our resource of wilderness. No act of Congress does this at present.

The legislation gives sanction to the policies and programs developed by the Forest Service, the National Park Service and other Federal conservation agencies under whose administration the existing resource of wilderness has so far been preserved.

The effect of this bill will be to bring into a single system, for the purpose of insuring their continued preservation as wilderness, the various federally owned areas designated as wilderness by the departmental heads or by Executive order. In no instance will the jurisdiction of a single area be transferred from one agency to another. Areas controlled, for example, by the Forest Service will continue to be managed by that agency. Furthermore, it will be the Forest Service under the Secretary of Agriculture that determines the precise area of the unit of its wilderness land to be included in the Wilderness Preservation System. And it will be solely the responsibility of the Forest Service under law to preserve the wilderness character of that area. No wilderness area of the Forest Service thus made a part of the Wilderness Preservation System may be modified or removed from the System except by action of the Secretary of Agriculture which has not been disapproved by Congress. In a similar manner lands under the jurisdiction of other executive agencies may be affected by this legislation.

The notion that enactment of this legislation would take from the executive branch of the Government and give to Congress a power to dictate all matters concerning wilderness areas is simply not true. This legislation would give to Congress nothing Congress has not had since the Constitution was adopted:

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting \* \* \* property belonging to the United States" (Constitution, art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2).

This has never been a power of the Executive. Any exercise of the power by departmental heads has been by virtue of authority delegated by the Congress.

By the act of 1897, as amended (33 Stat. 628), Congress granted to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to manage and regulate the national forests. There has never been any question raised about the ownership and control of the Federal timber, of the protection of vegetation within the national forests. They are functions inherent in the act of 1897.

Court decisions resulting from national forest grazing regulation violations have affirmed the constitutionality of this congressional delegation of administrative power (*U. S. v. Grimaud* (220 U. S. 506); *Light v. U. S.* (220 U. S. 523)).

There is no explicit congressional recognition of recreation and wilderness reservations as a major purpose of Forest Service administration. Timber, water, and forage are uniformly accepted as national forest resources by law, court decisions, executive office directives, and regulations. Recrea-

tion, however, has only been proclaimed a fourth major forest use by Forest Service administrative regulations with occasional approval by the Secretary of Agriculture.

There has been infrequent legislative acknowledgment that recreation is a legitimate forest use, but only for isolated areas or special situations. No broad provision for national forest recreation, of which wilderness reservations are a part, has been made by Congress.

Congress authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to rent or lease national forest areas near mineral springs for erection of sanitariums or hotels open for public health or pleasure (act of February 28, 1899, 30 Stat. 908; U. S. C. 16:495).

Congress authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to secure and protect for all time the big trees known as Sequoia Washingtoniana in the Calaveras Bigtree National Forest (act of February 18, 1909, 35 Stat. 626; U. S. C. 16:494).

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to grant permits for the construction of homes, resorts, and stores in the national forests needed for recreation and public convenience (act of March 4, 1915, 38 Stat. 1101; U. S. C. 16:497).

Congress authorized the President to designate certain national forest lands as refuges for the protection of game, birds, or fish (acts of August 11, 1916, 39 Stat. 476, amended June 25, 1948, 62 Stat. 860; U. S. C. 16:683; and March 10, 1934, 48 Stat. 400; U. S. C. 16:694).

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to set aside 5,000 acres within the Angeles National Forest of California for camping purposes, and such lands shall not be subject to mining laws (act of February 24, 1925, 43 Stat. 969).

Certain national forest lands in northern Minnesota were withdrawn from entry or appropriation under the public land laws for the express purpose of conserving the natural beauty of lake and stream shorelines for recreational use. Limitations are placed on logging near the shorelines, and water levels and adjacent features in this region were to be preserved in an unmodified state of nature (Shipstead-Nolan Act, July 10, 1930, 46 Stat. 1020; U. S. C. 16:577, 577 (a), (b)).

The Thye-Blatnik Act gave congressional recognition to the unique qualities and natural features of the remaining wilderness canoe country on national forest lands in Minnesota, and gave authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire private lands where such might impair wilderness values (act of June 22, 1948, 62 Stat. 568; U. S. C. 16:577 (c)).

In view of the varied delegations of congressional power to deal with public lands, there can be no legal question of the right of Congress to enact legislation which promises the preservation of large areas in undeveloped condition on any Federal lands.

#### THE BILL DESCRIBED SECTION BY SECTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like finally to describe the bill section by section and to urge upon all interested the fact that the bill speaks plainly its own purposes and intentions. Many of the questions that have so far been raised with regard to it have been settled, I have noted, when the questioners have read the proposed measure.

The bill comprises five sections which may be described as follows:

The opening section defines the term "wilderness" both in the abstract and as used specifically in this bill and, recognizing the hazards to wilderness in the midst of our civilization, declares it to be a desirable policy for our health, welfare, and happiness to preserve wilderness as an enduring resource for the

benefit of present and future generations. Accordingly, the continued preservation of federally owned areas of wilderness is given congressional sanction, and a National Wilderness Preservation System is established to "serve the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation by the people."

Section 2 names the areas that will constitute this System, and makes provisions regarding additions, modifications, or eliminations. It takes cognizance of, and historical use and enjoyment also of the fact that within certain of the units of this System there are needs for designating portions of the areas to be used for roads and certain other installations that are exceptions within wilderness. Section 2 comprises 6 subsections.

#### NATIONAL FOREST WILDERNESS

Subsection (a) designates 36 areas within the national forests to become units of the National Wilderness Preservation System. These are not entire national forests; they are special areas inside the forests. The Forest Service has found them to have highest value as wilderness and has already designated them as wilderness, wild, or roadless areas. In addition, there are 44 areas now classified as "primitive" that are earmarked to be included in this System when the Forest Service has carried out its plans to: reclassify them as either "wilderness" or "wild" areas. A 10-year period is provided for this reclassification program. Including all these primitive areas which are to be added eventually, this System will have included special areas within some 80 of the 149 national forests. Out of the 181 million acres in our national forests some 14 million acres will be in this System. As at present, the administration of the national forest areas will be in accordance with regulations by the Secretary of Agriculture. This bill, either in section 2 or in section 3, makes provisions that in effect give sanction to and continue the present regulations that have been so ably developed by the Forest Service for the sound administration and protection of wilderness. An additional safeguard against an undesirable elimination of any wilderness is provided in that, after completing the process for such action as now provided by Department regulations, such proposed action will have to be reported to Congress, where for 120 days it is subject to disapproval. Additional areas may be designated by the Secretary of Agriculture, and such additions must also be reported to Congress, and for 120 days be subject to disapproval by either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

#### WILDERNESS IN THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

Subsection (b) of section 2 designates 48 out of the 181 areas in the National Park System as units of the National Wilderness Preservation System, 26 of which are national parks, 20 are monuments, 1 is a recreational area, and 1 is a memorial park. Our national parks and many of our national monuments include within them our superbly beautiful pristine areas of wilderness. The chief threats to their preservation are

such, under existing legislation, come from prospects for the extension of roads and the intrusion of recreation developments, perfectly good in themselves, that nevertheless are out of place in wilderness.

Unless provision is made to protect the primeval within the parks, eventually the developments may take over.

This process may be gradual, but, nevertheless, it is a prospect against which we can now set guards with no sacrifice. There are other places for the development of our recreation facilities that require roads and other conveniences. Our parks are reservoirs of wilderness.

It is true, however, that certain portions of the parks must be used for the roads and accommodations that make them accessible and hospitable. Accordingly this bill provides for the designation of such portions for this purpose. A 10-year period is provided for the several designations, and the provisions of this law will not take effect for any park or monument until the designations have been made.

The National Park Service, under its so-called Mission 66, is undertaking to provide systematically during the next 10 years for the proper and economical development of the roads and accommodations within the parks and monuments.

The designations of the areas provided for in this bill can thus be made, park by park, as the plans for Mission 66 materialize.

Provision will in this way be made for the proper handling of developed areas but also for the protection, without development, of our wilderness in the back country.

If ever additional areas are needed for developments, they can be designated, but only after a public notice that will give all concerned an opportunity to weigh the importance of diminishing the area of wilderness.

In any case, wilderness preservation becomes a congressional policy in the specified national parks and monuments. The primeval back country receives an added protection. At the same time, this bill takes care to point out that within the areas designated for developments the present protection afforded by the National Park Act of 1916 is not affected.

Additions of national parks and national monuments to the wilderness System could be made by the Congress or the President. Only Congress could remove a park or monument from the System.

#### WILDLIFE REFUGES

Subsection (c) of section 2 designates 13 national wildlife refuges and 7 ranges as parts of this System.

As with National Park System areas, provision is here made for designation by the Secretary of the Interior of areas that are required for roads and installations inconsistent with wilderness. In this instance these are required for administration of the refuge or range for wildlife.

Refuges or ranges could be added to the System by the Secretary of the Interior, subject to congressional disapproval within 120 days. Only Congress

could remove a refuge or range from the System.

#### THE INDIANS' WILDERNESS

Subsection (d) of section 2 designates 12 roadless areas and 3 wild areas within Indian reservations as possible units in the National Wilderness Preservation System, but no such area will actually become a part of the System unless its inclusion is approved by the Indians. The consent of the Indians is also required for the regulations by the Secretary of the Interior that are to govern the administration, addition, modification, or elimination of areas.

This subsection is so drawn as to give the Indians the privilege of having included in this System their areas that have been classified as roadless or wild, but the principle of doing nothing with regard to Indian lands without Indian consent has been observed. Care is taken also to say that no Indian treaty is abrogated nor any hunting or fishing rights affected.

Subsection (e) of section 2 recognizes that Congress may designate additional areas within the wilderness System and also provides for the designation of such areas within any federally owned or controlled areas by appropriate officials.

Subsection (f) of section 2 provides for reports to Congress of certain additions, modifications, or eliminations, and it also authorizes the acquisition of any privately owned lands within units of this System.

Throughout section 2 provisions are made for reports to be made to the National Wilderness Preservation Council that will be established by section 4 and will be the repository for files pertaining to this System.

#### USE OF THE WILDERNESS

Section 3 specifies the proper uses of areas within the System and the practices that are to be excluded. It includes special provisions with regard to existing "nonconforming" uses of areas of wilderness included in the System.

At the outset this section says that nothing shall be interpreted as interfering with the purpose for which any of the lands involved were set aside, except that the "wilderness character" of the area is to be preserved.

Each administering agency is to administer the areas in the wilderness System for such other purposes as are appropriate but do this in such a way as to preserve the wilderness.

The System will be devoted to public purposes that are summarized as recreational, educational, scenic, scientific, conservational, and historical. All use will be in harmony with the wilderness environment and its preservation.

This section provides that the administration of the areas in the wilderness System shall be in accordance with regulations to be adopted by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, as the case may be, or by such other official or officials responsible for the lands and waters involved. This section also states categorically that the Wilderness Preservation Council provided for in section 4 "shall have no administrative jurisdiction over any unit

in the System nor over any agency that does have such jurisdiction."

Special provision is made for the protection of existing rights and privileges of any areas involved. Grazing within the national forest areas is provided for as at present, and existing uses authorized or provided for in refuges are also permitted. The termination of nonconforming uses is provided for whenever this is agreeable to those making the uses.

With one main exception, this bill thus proposes, not reform, but such security for what we have so far preserved as we can achieve without disrupting our present administrative and other practices.

The exception to which I refer has to do with mining. It relates primarily to the areas within the national forests.

Spokesmen for the United States Forest Service, as well as other conservationists, have long and insistently warned that a prime threat to the preservation of wilderness within the national forests comes from the prospect of mining. After careful thought it seems unwise to propose wilderness legislation that does not deal with this threat in these national forest areas.

Accordingly, this bill provides that there shall be no mining—although, of course, existing private rights are protected in this case as in all others.

#### A WILDERNESS PRESERVATION COUNCIL

Section 4 would create a National Wilderness Preservation Council to serve as a focus for the various interests in wilderness represented in the System, to provide an information clearinghouse and a headquarters for the records relating to the System as such, and to provide a medium through which information regarding wilderness and its use and preservation may be gathered and made available.

The Council will have no administrative jurisdiction over the areas of wilderness within the System, nor over any of the agencies that will continue to have such jurisdiction. The Council will not even have any coordinating responsibilities with regard to the administration of these areas. It will comprise administrators and citizens, will represent our special and distinctive interest in our wilderness resource as *wilderness*, and will make annual reports to Congress regarding the System.

The Council will include the heads of the bureaus that administer areas within the System—Forest Service, National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Indian Affairs Bureau—and also the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. Six citizen members will complete the eleven-member Council.

The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution will be the secretary of the Council, and will maintain its files and provide its headquarters. This arrangement will help make clear that the Council is not responsible for any area or agency administration. Involved with no land areas within the System, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution will not be concerned with any inter-agency administrative problems regarding such areas. Selection of this official as secretary of the Council fur-

ther emphasizes the function of the Council as an information focus and a repository of records. It likewise will serve to bring to attention the scientific interest in wilderness preservation and the values of wilderness areas as living museums.

Section 4 provides that the members of the Council shall serve in this capacity without compensation, but receive transportation expenses and a per diem for attendance at meetings of the Council. Provision is made for the expenses of the Council.

Section 5 specifies a name: "National Wilderness Preservation Act."

#### CONCLUSION

Mr. President, our civilization moves fast. Our population pressures are growing. The time when we still have the opportunity to provide for the preservation of wilderness without having to interfere with other programs will not be with us long. I urge prompt and sympathetic consideration of this bill. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks to be followed by an article entitled "Conservation Wilds" which appeared in the New York Times on February 3, 1957.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1176) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, in order to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness, there is hereby established a National Wilderness Preservation System. As hereinafter provided this System shall be composed of areas of public land in the United States and its Territories and possessions retaining their natural primeval environment and influence and being managed for purposes consistent with their continued preservation as wilderness, which areas shall serve the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservational, and historical use and enjoyment by the people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness.

(b) The Congress recognizes that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, is destined to occupy and modify all areas within the United States, its Territories, and possessions except those that are set apart for preservation and protection in their natural condition. Such preservation of areas of wilderness is recognized as a desirable policy of the Government of the United States of America for the health, welfare, and happiness of its citizens of present and future generations.

It is accordingly declared to be the policy of Congress (1) to secure the dedication of an adequate system of areas of wilderness to serve the recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, and conservational needs of the people and (2) to provide for the protection of these areas in perpetuity and for the gathering and dissemination of information regarding their use and enjoyment as wilderness. Pursuant to this policy the Congress gives sanction to the continued preservation as wilderness of those areas federally owned or controlled that are within national parks, national forests, national wildlife refuges, or other public lands, and that have so far retained under their Federal administration their primeval character. It is pursuant to this policy and sanction that the National Wilderness Preservation System is established. Within the units of this System designated for inclusion by this act, and

in those that may later be designated in accordance with its provisions, the preservation of wilderness shall be paramount.

(c) A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a member of the natural community, a wanderer who visits but does not remain and whose travels leave only trails.

For the purposes of this act the term "wilderness" shall include:

(1) The wilderness, wild, roadless, and primitive areas as presently designated by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service within the national forests;

(2) Those units within the National Park System herein or hereafter designated as units of the National Wilderness Preservation System, except those portions set aside hereunder for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, and administrative installations;

(3) The national wildlife refuges and ranges or areas therein, herein or hereafter designated as units of the National Wilderness Preservation System, except those portions set aside hereunder for roads and buildings and other installations for administration and protection of the refuge or range for wildlife;

(4) The areas within Indian reservations classified as roadless or wild and included in the National Wilderness Preservation System with the consent of the tribal council or other duly constituted authority; and

(5) Such other areas as shall be designated for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System in accordance with the provisions of this act.

#### NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

SEC. 2. The National Wilderness Preservation System (hereafter referred to in this section as the System) shall comprise (subject to preexisting private rights, if any) the federally owned or controlled areas of land and water provided for in this section and the related air-space reservations.

#### NATIONAL FOREST AREAS

(a) The System shall include the following roadless, wild, and wilderness areas within the national forests: Caribou, Little Indian Sioux, and Superior Roadless Areas, Superior National Forest, Minn.; Chiricahua Wild Area, Coronado National Forest, Ariz.; Galiuro Wild Area, Crook National Forest, Ariz.; Sierra Ancha Wild Area, Tonto National Forest, Ariz.; Cucamonga Wild Area, San Bernardino National Forest, Calif.; Hoover Wild Area, Toiyabe and Inyo National Forests, Calif.; San Geronimo Wild Area, San Bernardino National Forest, Calif.; Thousand Lakes Wild Area, Lassen National Forest, Calif.; Yolla Bolly-Middle Eel Wilderness Area, Mendocino and Trinity National Forests, Calif.; Maroon Bells-Snowmass Wild Area, White River National Forest, Colo.; Mount Zirkel-Dome Peak Wild Area, Routt National Forest, Colo.; Gates of the Mountains Wild Area, Helena National Forest, Mont.; San Pedro Parks Wild Area, Santa Fe National Forest, N. Mex.; Linville Gorge Wild Area, Pisgah National Forest, N. C.; Diamond Peak Wild Area, Willamette National Forest, Oreg.; Gearhart Mountain Wild Area, Fremont National Forest, Oreg.; Kalmiopsis Wild Area, Siskiyou National Forest, Oreg.; Mount Hood Wild Area, Mount Hood National Forest, Oreg.; Mount Washington Wild Area, Willamette National Forest, Oreg.; Mountain Lakes Wild Area, Rogue River National Forest, Oreg.; Strawberry Mountain Wild Area, Malheur National Forest, Oreg.; Three Sisters Wilderness Area, Deschutes and Willamette Area, in portions of Gifford Pinchot and Sno-National Forests, Oreg.; Goat Rocks Wild qualmie National Forests, Wash.; Mount

Adams Wild Area, Gifford Pinchot National Forest, Wash.; Mazatzal Wilderness Area, Tonto National Forest, Ariz.; Superstition Wilderness Area, in portions of the Crook and Tonto National Forests, Ariz.; Marble Mountain Wilderness Area, Klamath National Forest, Calif.; Bob Marshall Wilderness Area, in portions of the Flathead and Lewis and Clark National Forests, Mont.; Gila Wilderness Area, Gila National Forest, N. Mex.; Pecos Wilderness Area, in portions of the Santa Fe and Carson National Forests, N. Mex.; Eagle Cap Wilderness Area, in portions of Wallowa and Whitman National Forests, Oreg.; North Absaroka Wilderness Area and South Absaroka Wilderness Area, both in the Shoshone National Forest, Wyo.; Teton Wilderness Area, Teton National Forest, Wyo.

Additional wilderness and wild areas may be designated for inclusion in this System by the Secretary of Agriculture. Such designations shall be reported, with maps and descriptions, to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council established hereunder. These designations by January 1, 1966, shall include, but shall not necessarily be limited to, the following areas within the national forests classified as primitive by the Department of Agriculture on January 1, 1956, with such modifications in boundaries as may be made upon reclassification as wilderness or wild:

#### AREAS CLASSIFIED PRIMITIVE

Blue Range Primitive Area, Apache and Crook National Forests, Ariz. and N. Mex.; Mount Baldy Primitive Area, Apache National Forest, Ariz.; Pine Mountain Primitive Area, Prescott and Tonto National Forests, Ariz.; Sycamore Canyon Primitive Area, Coconino, Kaibab, and Prescott National Forests, Ariz.; Agua Tibia Primitive Area, Cleveland National Forest, Calif.; Caribou Peak Primitive Area, Lassen National Forest, Calif.; Desolation Valley Primitive Area, Eldorado National Forest, Calif.; Devil Canyon-Bear Canyon Primitive Area, Angeles National Forest, Calif.; Emigrant Basin Primitive Area, Stanislaus National Forest, Calif.; High Sierra Primitive Area, Inyo, Sierra, and Sequoia National Forests, Calif.; Mount Dana-Minarets Primitive Area, Inyo and Sierra National Forests, Calif.; Salmon Trinity Alps Primitive Area, Klamath, Shasta, and Trinity National Forests, Calif.; San Jacinto Primitive Area, San Bernardino National Forest, Calif.; San Rafael Primitive Area, Los Padres National Forest, Calif.; South Warner Primitive Area, Modoc National Forest, Calif.; Ventana Primitive Area, Los Padres National Forest, Calif.; Flat Tops Primitive Area, White River National Forest, Colo.; Gore Range-Eagle Nest Primitive Area, Arapaho and White River National Forests, Colo.; La Garita-Sheep Mountain Primitive Area, Gunnison, Rio Grande, and San Isabel National Forests, Colo.; Rawah Primitive Area, Roosevelt National Forest, Colo.; San Juan Primitive Area, San Juan National Forest, Colo.; Uncompahgre Primitive Area, Uncompahgre National Forest, Colo.; Upper Rio Grande Primitive Area, Rio Grande National Forest, Colo.; West Elk Primitive Area, Gunnison National Forest, Colo.; Wilson Mountains Primitive Area, San Juan National Forest, Colo.; Idaho Primitive Area, Challis, Salmon, and Payette National Forests, Idaho; Sawtooth Primitive Area, Boise, Challis, and Sawtooth National Forests, Idaho; Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area, Clearwater, Nezperce, Lolo, and Bitterroot National Forests, Idaho and Mont.; Absaroka Primitive Area, Gallatin National Forest, Mont.; Anaconda-Pintlar Primitive Area, Beaverhead, Bitterroot, and Deerlodge National Forests, Mont.; Beartooth Primitive Area, Gallatin and Custer National Forests, Mont.; Cabinet Mountains Primitive Area, Cabinet and Kootenai National Forests, Mont.; Mission Mountains Primitive Area, Flathead National Forest, Mont.; Spanish Peaks Primitive Area, Gallatin National Forest, Mont.; Black Range Primitive Area, Gila National Forest, N. Mex.; White Mountain Primitive Area, Lincoln National Forest, N. Mex.; Mount Jefferson Primitive Area, Deschutes, Mount Hood, and Willamette National Forests, Oreg.; High Uintas Primitive Area, Ashley and Wasatch National Forests, Utah; North Cascade Primitive Area, Chelan and Mount Baker National Forests, Washington; Bridger Primitive Area, Bridger National Forest, Wyo.; Cloud Peak Primitive Area, Bighorn National Forest, Wyo.; Glacier Primitive Area, Shoshone National Forest, Wyo.; Popo Agie Primitive Area, Shoshone National Forest, Wyo.; Stratified Primitive Area, Shoshone National Forest, Wyo.

tin National Forest, Mont.; Black Range Primitive Area, Gila National Forest, N. Mex.; White Mountain Primitive Area, Lincoln National Forest, N. Mex.; Mount Jefferson Primitive Area, Deschutes, Mount Hood, and Willamette National Forests, Oreg.; High Uintas Primitive Area, Ashley and Wasatch National Forests, Utah; North Cascade Primitive Area, Chelan and Mount Baker National Forests, Washington; Bridger Primitive Area, Bridger National Forest, Wyo.; Cloud Peak Primitive Area, Bighorn National Forest, Wyo.; Glacier Primitive Area, Shoshone National Forest, Wyo.; Popo Agie Primitive Area, Shoshone National Forest, Wyo.; Stratified Primitive Area, Shoshone National Forest, Wyo.

Addition to or modification or elimination of wilderness, wild, or roadless areas shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish in conformity with the purposes of this act. Copies of such regulations and any subsequent amendments shall be forwarded to and filed by the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council established hereunder.

Any addition, modification, or elimination of any national forest area or part thereof to, in, or from the System shall be made only after not less than 90 days' public notice in accordance with section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 238, U. S. C. 5:1003), and the holding of a public hearing, if requested, and shall be reported with map and description to the secretary of the said National Wilderness Preservation Council and shall take effect as provided in subsection (f) below.

#### NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM AREAS

(b) The System shall include, at the times and in the manner hereinafter provided for, the following units of the National Park System: Acadia National Park, Maine; Arches National Monument, Utah; Badlands National Monument, S. Dak.; Big Bend National Park, Tex.; Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument, Colo.; Bryce Canyon National Park, Utah; Capitol Reef National Monument, Utah; Carlsbad Caverns National Park, N. Mex.; Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, N. C.; Channel Islands National Monument, Calif.; Chiricahua National Monument, Ariz.; Colorado National Monument, Colo.; Crater Lake National Park, Oreg.; Craters of the Moon National Monument, Idaho; Death Valley National Monument, Calif. and Nev.; Devils Postpile National Monument, Calif.; Dinosaur National Monument, Colo. and Utah; Everglades National Park, Fla.; Glacier National Park, Mont.; Glacier Bay National Monument, Alaska; Grand Canyon National Park and Grand Canyon National Monument, Ariz.; Grand Teton National Park, Wyo.; Great Smoky Mountains National Park, N. C. and Tenn.; Hawaii National Park, T. H.; Isle Royale National Park, Mich.; Joshua Tree National Monument, Calif.; Katmai National Monument, Alaska; Kings Canyon National Park, California; Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif.; Lava Beds National Monument, Calif.; Mammoth Cave National Park, Ky.; Mesa Verde National Park, Colo.; Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska; Mount Rainier National Park, Wash.; Olympic National Park, Wash.; Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, Ariz.; Petrified Forest National Monument, Ariz.; Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo.; Saguaro National Monument, Ariz.; Sequoia National Park, Calif.; Shenandoah National Park, Va.; Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, N. Dak.; White Sands National Monument, N. Mex.; Wind Cave National Park, S. Dak.; Yellowstone National Park, Idaho, Mont., and Wyo.; Yosemite National Park, Calif.; and Zion National Park, Utah.

Additional units of the National Park System may be designated for inclusion in the

System by act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President. No unit of the National Park System shall be removed from the System except by act of Congress.

Ninety days after giving public notice in accordance with section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 238, U. S. C. 5: 1003) the Secretary of the Interior shall designate within each unit of the National Park System named for inclusion in the System such area or areas as he shall determine to be required for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, and administrative installations. A notice of each such designation, together with a map and description of the affected area or areas, shall be forwarded to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council established hereunder. Each such unit of the National Park System, exclusive of such area designated as required for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, and administrative installations, shall become part of the National Wilderness Preservation System when this designation has been made. Designations shall be made not later than January 1, 1966, or within 2 years after the unit has been added to the System, whichever is later. Should the Secretary fail to make such a designation for any such unit of the National Park System within the time limit specified, that unit shall in its entirety automatically then become a part of the System.

No designation of an area for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, or administrative installations shall modify or affect the application to that area of the provisions of the act approved August 25, 1916, entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes." (39 Stat. 535, as amended; U. S. C. 16: 1 et seq.) The accommodations and installations in such designated areas shall be incident to the conservation and use and enjoyment of the scenery and the natural and historic objects and flora and fauna of the park or monument in its natural condition.

#### NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGES AND RANGES

(c) The System shall include, at the times and in the manner hereinafter provided for, the following national wildlife refuges and ranges: Aleutian Islands National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska; Aransas National Wildlife Refuge, Tex.; Bogoslof National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska; Cabeza Prieta Game Range, Ariz.; Cape Romain National Wildlife Refuge, S. C.; Charles Sheldon Antelope Range, Nev.; Delta National Wildlife Refuge, La.; Desert Game Range, Nev.; Fort Peck Game Range, Mont.; Kenai National Moose Range, Alaska; Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska; Kofa Game Range, Ariz.; Moccasin National Wildlife Refuge, Maine; Montana National Bison Range, Mont.; Nuniyak National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska; Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, Ga.; Red Rock Lakes Migratory Waterfowl Refuge, Mont.; Seney National Wildlife Refuge, Mich.; Sheldon National Antelope Refuge, Nev.; Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, Okla.

Additional national wildlife refuges and ranges or areas therein may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior for inclusion in the System. Such designations shall be reported, with maps and descriptions, to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council established hereunder. No wildlife refuge or range shall be removed from the System except by act of Congress.

Ninety days after giving public notice in accordance with section 4, Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 238, U. S. C. 5: 1003) the Secretary of the Interior shall designate within each national wildlife refuge and range or area therein named for inclusion in the System such area or areas as he

shall determine to be required for roads and buildings and other installations for administration and protection of the refuge or range for wildlife. A notice of each such designation together with a map and description of the affected area or areas shall be forwarded to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council established hereunder. Each national wildlife refuge and range or area therein named for inclusion in the System, exclusive of such area designated as required for roads and buildings and other installations for administration and protection of the refuge or range for wildlife, shall become part of the National Wilderness Preservation System when this designation has been so made for that national wildlife refuge or range or area therein. Designations shall be made not later than January 1, 1966, or within 2 years after a refuge or range or area therein has been added to the System, whichever is later. Should the Secretary fail to make such a designation for any such national wildlife refuge or range or area therein within the time limits specified, that refuge or range or area therein shall in its entirety automatically then become a part of the System.

#### THE INDIANS' WILDERNESS

(d) The System shall include the following roadless areas and wild areas within Indian reservations and such additional roadless and wild areas on Indian reservations as the Secretary of the Interior may designate, but no such area shall be included until the tribe or band within whose reservation it lies, through its tribal council or other duly constituted authority, shall have given its consent to the inclusion of the area within the System: Black Mesa Roadless Area, Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.; Black River Roadless Area, Fort Apache and San Carlos Indian Reservations, Ariz.; Columbia-San Poil Divide Roadless Area, Colville Indian Reservation, Wash.; Fort Charlotte Wild Area, Grand Portage Indian Reservation, Minn.; Goat Rocks Roadless Area, Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash.; Grand Canyon Roadless Area, Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz.; Grand Portage Wild Area, Grand Portage Indian Reservation, Minn.; Mesa Verde Roadless Area, Consolidated Ute Indian Reservation, Colo.; Mount Adams Wild Area, Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash.; Mount Jefferson Roadless Area, Warm Springs Indian Reservation, Oreg.; Mount Thomas Roadless Area, Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz.; Mission Range Roadless Area, Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.; Painted Desert Roadless Area, Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.; Rainbow Bridge Roadless Area, Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.; Wind River Mountains Roadless Area, Shoshone Indian Reservation, Wyo.

Any proposed addition, modification, or elimination of roadless and wild areas within Indian reservations shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior shall establish in conformity with the purposes of this act subject to the consent of the several tribes or bands, through their tribal councils or other duly constituted authorities, each with regard to the area or areas within its jurisdiction. Any addition, modification, or elimination shall be reported with map and description, to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council. Nothing in this act shall in any respect abrogate any treaty with any band or tribe of Indians, or in any way modify or otherwise affect existing hunting and fishing rights or privileges.

#### OTHER UNITS

(e) The System shall also include such units as may be designated within any federally owned or controlled land and/or water by the official or officials authorized to determine the use of the lands and waters in-

involved. Addition to or modification or elimination of such units shall be in accordance with regulations that shall be established in conformity with the purposes of this act by the official or officials authorized to determine the use of the lands and waters involved, and said official or officials shall forward a notice of such addition, modification, or elimination to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council.

#### ADDITIONS, MODIFICATIONS, AND ELIMINATIONS

(f) Any proposed addition to, modification of, or elimination from the National Wilderness Preservation System otherwise than by act of Congress, except on Indian reservations, shall upon receipt of notice be reported to Congress within 10 days by the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council and shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of 120 calendar days, of continuous session of Congress, following the date on which the report is received by Congress; but only if during this period there has not been passed by either House of Congress a resolution opposing such proposed addition, modification, or elimination. Within any federally owned unit within the National Wilderness Preservation System the acquisition of any privately owned lands is hereby authorized and such sums as the Congress may decide are hereby authorized to be appropriated for such acquisition out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

#### USE OF THE WILDERNESS

Sec. 3. (a) Nothing in this act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purpose stated in the establishment of any national park or monument, national forest, national wildlife refuge, Indian reservation, or other Federal land area involved, except that any agency administering any area within the National Wilderness Preservation System shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area and shall so administer such area for such other purpose or purposes as to preserve also its wilderness character. The National Wilderness Preservation System shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, educational, scenic, scientific, conservation, and historical uses. All such use shall be in harmony, both in kind and degree, with the wilderness environment and with its preservation.

The administration of wilderness, wild, and roadless areas in the national forests as units of the System shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish in conformity with the purposes of this act. The administration of the included national parks, national monuments, and wildlife refuges and ranges as units of the System shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior shall establish in conformity with the purposes of this act subject to the consent of the several tribes or bands, through their tribal councils or other duly constituted authorities, each with regard to the area or areas within its jurisdiction. The administration of any other area added to the System and not otherwise provided for in this section shall be in accordance with such regulations as shall be established by the official or officials authorized to determine the use of the lands and waters involved. Copies of the regulations established for such administration of any unit or units of the System and copies of any subsequent amendments thereto shall be forwarded, by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, or such other official or officials as shall establish such regulations, to the secretary of the

National Wilderness Preservation Council. The Council shall maintain a public file of such regulations but shall have no administrative jurisdiction over any unit in the System nor over any agency that does have such jurisdiction.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in this section, and subject to existing private rights (if any), no portion of any area constituting a unit of the National Wilderness Preservation System shall be devoted to commodity production, to lumbering, prospecting, mining or the removal of mineral deposits (including oil and gas), grazing by domestic livestock (other than by animals in connection with the administration or recreational, educational, or scientific use of the wilderness), water management practices involving diversion, impoundment, storage, or the manipulation of plant cover (except as required on national wildlife refuges and ranges for the management of habitat in maintaining wildlife populations), or to any form of commercial enterprise except as contemplated by the purposes of this act. Within such areas, except as otherwise provided in this section and in section 2 of this act, there shall be no road, nor any use of motor vehicles, or motorboats, or landing of aircraft, nor any other mechanical transport or delivery of persons or supplies, nor any structure or installation in excess of the minimum required for the administration of the area for the purposes of this act.

#### SPECIAL PROVISIONS

(c) The following special provisions are hereby made:

(1) Roads over national forest lands included in the System reserved for the public domain and necessary for ingress and egress to or from privately owned property shall be, and roads over national forest lands otherwise acquired may be, allowed under appropriate conditions determined by the forest supervisor.

(2) Within national forest areas included in the System grazing of domestic livestock and the use of aircraft or motorboats where these practices have already become well established may be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions as the Chief of the Forest Service deems desirable. Such practices shall be recognized as nonconforming use of the area of wilderness involved and shall be terminated whenever this can be effected with equity to, or in agreement with, those making such use.

(3) Nothing in this act shall modify the restrictions and provisions of the Shipstead-Nolan Act, Public Law 539, 71st Congress, 2d session, July 10, 1930, and the Humphrey-Thye-Blatnik-Andresen Act, Public Law 607, 84th Congress, 2d session, June 22, 1956, as applying to the Superior National Forest or the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) Any existing use authorized or provided for in the Executive order or legislation establishing any national wildlife refuge or range may be continued in accordance with permit granted under such authorization or provision, but any nonconforming use of the areas of wilderness involved shall be terminated whenever this can be effected with equity to, or in agreement with, those making such use.

#### NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION COUNCIL

SEC. 4. (a) A National Wilderness Preservation Council is hereby created to consist ex-officio of the persons at the time designated as the chief of the United States Forest Service, the director of the National Park Service, the director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and also six citizen members known to be informed regarding, and interested in the preservation of, wilderness, two of whom

shall be named initially for terms of 2 years, 2 for terms of 4 years, and 2 for terms of 6 years, by the President. After the expiration of these initial terms, each citizen member shall be appointed for a 6-year term. When initial or subsequent appointments are to be made to this Council any established national organization interested in wilderness preservation may make recommendations to the President regarding candidates any of whom would be deemed suitable for appointment to the Council. The President shall designate from among its members a chairman, who shall serve for a 2-year term. The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution shall be the secretary of the Council and, subject to the Council, shall maintain its headquarters.

(b) The Council shall serve as the repository for, and shall maintain available for public inspection, such maps and official papers regarding the National Wilderness Preservation System as may be filed with it. Upon receipt of a report of a proposed addition, modification, or elimination of an area as required under section 2 of this act, the secretary of the Council shall report within 10 days such proposed action to the Senate and to the House of Representatives. The Council shall serve as a nonexclusive clearinghouse for exchange of information among the agencies administering areas within the System. The Council shall make, sponsor, and coordinate surveys of wilderness needs and conditions and gather and disseminate information, including maps, for the information of the public regarding use and preservation of the areas of wilderness within the System, including information and maps regarding State and other non-Federal areas which the Council shall consider important to wilderness preservation. The Council is directed to consult with, advise, and invoke the aid of the President, the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture, and other appropriate officers of the United States Government and to assist in obtaining cooperation in wilderness preservation and use among Federal and State agencies and private agencies and organizations concerned therewith. The Council, through its chairman, shall annually present to Congress, not later than the first Monday in December, a report on the operations of the Council during the preceding fiscal year and on the status of the National Wilderness Preservation System at the close of that fiscal year, including an annotated list of the areas in the System showing their size, location, and administering agency, and shall make such recommendations to Congress as the Council shall deem advisable.

(c) The Council shall meet annually and at such times between annual meetings as the Council shall determine, or upon call of the chairman or any three members. Members of the Council shall serve as such without compensation but shall receive transportation expenses and in addition a per diem payment to be fixed by the Council, not to exceed \$25 a day, as reimbursement for expenditures in connection with attending any meeting of the Council. A sum sufficient to pay the necessary clerical and administrative expenses of the Council and its members, not to exceed an annual expenditure of \$50,000, and such additional sums as the Congress may decide for carrying out the purposes of the Council, including printing, are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. The Council is authorized to accept private gifts and benefactions to be used to further the purposes of this act, and such gifts and benefactions shall be deductible from income for Federal tax purposes and shall be exempt from Federal estate tax.

SEC. 5. This act shall be known by the short title "National Wilderness Preservation Act."

[From the New York Times of February 3, 1957]

CONSERVATION: WILDS—A BILL IN CONGRESS AND A CONFERENCE SEEK TO SAVE WILDERNESS AREAS

(By John B. Oakes)

Of all the conservation problems facing the new Congress, none is more important—or likely to cause more controversy—than the bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System. This measure was introduced last session by two of Congress' leading conservationists, Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota. It has already been reintroduced this session by Mr. SAYLOR and at least five other Members of Congress.

The basic purpose of the bill, which was discussed in this column for May 13, 1956, is to establish existing Federal wilderness preserves on a firm legislative foundation. Of the 2¼ billion acres in the United States, some 58 million—a mere 2.5 percent of the total—are protected wilderness areas, almost all of which are on federally owned or controlled land. The bulk of these unspoiled and as yet uninvaded tracts of mountain or forest country have been designated as wilderness merely by administrative action, and they can be wiped out by administrative action as well. The proposed bill would make it a matter of national policy to preserve forever intact these last remnants of primeval America against the increasing pressures of exploiters and developers.

#### SIERRA CLUB MEETING

A conference on the necessity of erecting more adequate defenses around America's vanishing wilderness will be held next month in San Francisco under auspices of the Sierra Club, one of the Nation's leading conservation organizations. Special attention at this gathering—known as the Fifth Biennial Wilderness Conference—will be paid to the extent to which dedicated primitive areas, believed safely set aside, are coming under the threat of commercial exploitation and to what desirable areas may still be added to the Nation's scenic resources.

In this connection, the Sierra Club itself has proposed a National Scenic Resources Review, a full-scale inquiry by a commission appointed by the President "to find what scenic resources are still left, to make an estimate of the future's need for them, and to devise ways of protecting them in time." As David R. Brower, the Sierra Club's dynamic executive director, points out, commodity producers—those who use up the Nation's natural resources—are planning their requirements many years ahead. But what about the conservationists, who want to preserve some of those resources—particularly the scenic resources—for permanent, nonmaterial, nonexploitative enjoyment? We do know what lands have been set aside in parks and preserves; but we simply do not know how much usage those lands can sustain and we do not yet know what other areas could and should be preserved against all inroads, for the benefit of future generations.

#### SPIRITUAL NEEDS, TOO

In his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower specifically noted that the conservation and development of "our soil, water, mineral, forest, fish and wildlife resources \* \* \* are vital to the present and future strength of the Nation." The President surely could not have meant to allude only to material strength. Conscious as he evidently is of the spiritual needs of the people, he doubtless meant also to draw attention to the intangible but very real values of America's incomparable scenic resources as well. A major effort such as the

Sierra Club suggests, to determine through a Presidential commission just what are these resources, what are the conflicting demands, and what are the highest uses, ought to have a strong appeal to the President.

The Sierra Club's proposal is spelled out by Mr. Brower in an article entitled "Scenic Resources for the Future," in last December's Sierra Club Bulletin, which, in that issue at least, is no bulletin but a handsomely illustrated magazine containing material of interest to conservationists not only on the west coast but all over the country.

Particularly relevant to the problem of wilderness preservation is an article by Grant McConnell, professor of political science at the University of California, on the Cascades Wilderness, a little-known area of northwest Washington that is at present only partially protected against incursion and yet is described as scenically "among the superlative areas of the continent." This region, according to Professor McConnell, is under rapidly growing pressure for exploitation of its undoubted timber and possible mineral resources. It is relevant to ask whether areas of such completely primitive quality and remarkable beauty should not be maintained for a much higher purpose than transitory but destructive commercial development. Such areas, as Professor McConnell remarks, could well be considered not only as the playgrounds of the Nation, but rather its sanctuaries.

#### EXHIBIT 1

##### COMPILATION OF EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS TO THE HONORABLE JOHN P. SAYLOR REGARDING THE WILDERNESS BILL FROM EDUCATORS AND SCIENTISTS

James Munro, associate professor at the University of Oregon School of Law, Eugene, Oreg., writes:

"The general purpose of this bill is most constructive and helpful. For years we have needed legislation which would give greater protection to wilderness country. This bill would accomplish this purpose and, in addition, would provide an orderly procedure for the expansion of wilderness. In my opinion this Nation will need in the future not less, but more of these areas, where, in the words of the bill . . . 'the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a member of the natural community who visits but does not remain and whose travels leave only trails.'"

Robert E. Gregg, of the department of biology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., writes:

"Wilderness areas and all natural features are so delicately balanced that the least interference by man inevitably modifies them and in many instances destroys them beyond recovery."

Dr. Gregg emphasizes that the spiral of rapidly rising populations is creating pressures which can be harmful to the integrity of wilderness, and he writes that this is of great concern to biologists and ecologists as well as to other persons. In speaking of the pressures upon the national parks, Dr. Gregg feels that a national wilderness preservation system would "unquestionably . . . strengthen the hands of the administrative personnel whose job of guarding the values of the parks now all but overwhelms them." He continues:

"If we are going to save wilderness, and really mean it, then we have got to save wilderness with decidedly firm policies, for the fundamental and undeniable reason that wilderness will not tolerate any halfway measures and compromises. And the people who administer must be dedicated to the work for its sake, resistant to any additional opening of the wilderness which is now reduced to minimum levels that will permit self-perpetuation. . . . The best managed wild area is the one receiving the least so-

called management, for it is not wilderness that needs managing but rather man who needs to be managed!"

"It is becoming even more apparent that wild areas and their contained animals and plants constitute a limitless reserve of genetic or hereditary materials, the potentiality of which can be glimpsed by considering the achievements of plant and animal breeding. Such breeding has been chiefly among already domesticated species, but consider the possibilities when perpetually maintained wild populations are investigated. This is a resource of the first magnitude, and it must not be lost. It is one that can be most easily destroyed, but fortunately one which can reproduce itself interminably if so permitted.

"Aside from the foregoing, there are many other reasons, scientific and cultural, to support the passage of a wilderness preservation act . . ."

From other scientists and educators have come such expressions as these—

Armin K. Lobeck, professor emeritus of geology, Columbia University: "There is no time to be lost in alerting this Nation to the need of preserving wilderness areas and of establishing new ones while it is still possible to do so."

Tom McKnight, assistant professor, department of geography, University of California, Los Angeles: "I firmly believe that this legislation, if passed, will prove to be one of the 2 or 3 most significant conservation measures in the history of the United States. For my grandchildren and their grandchildren, I thank you."

Lawrence S. Hamilton, associate professor of forestry, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.: "I am certainly very interested in the subject of wilderness preservation and \* \* \* support this measure, and your remarks on the subject."

L. G. Hines, professor of economics, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.: "It is hard for me to express how strongly I agree with you on this matter."

Lloyd C. Hulbert, assistant professor, department of botany and plant pathology, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans.: "Perhaps the most important provision, at the present time, is the one that will allow control of mining claims, which certainly is a major threat to many areas at present. Also important is the part of the bill which strengthens the agencies such as the Forest Service in maintaining the wilderness and wild areas which they have set aside."

Sherman P. Lawton, President, Oklahoma Anthropological Society, University of Oklahoma, Norman: "The bill represents an action which the Oklahoma Anthropological Society hopes can be approved by the next (85th) Congress."

Harry L. Buckalew, principal, Jefferson School, Fresno, Calif.: "I can conceive of no higher form of patriotism than the preservation of parts of our wonderful national heritage of unmatched natural beauty for ourselves and for generations yet unborn. The time is late and the urgency immediate."

In addition to the above expressions of approval have come from the following educators and scientists: S. C. Dellinger, head, department of zoology, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Henry I. Kohn, M. D., radiological laboratory, University of California, San Francisco; John H. Cover, director, College of Business and Public Administration, University of Maryland, College Park; Leroy B. Nydegger, associate professor of biology, Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa; George C. Wheeler, department of biology, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks; William F. Kimes, assistant superintendent in charge of business, Orange Coast College, Costa Mesa, Calif.; Lloyd A. Rider, conservation chairman, New York Association of Biology Teachers.

#### FROM CONSERVATION ADMINISTRATORS

Unsolicited letters of approval have been received from the following State conservation administrators: Paul D. Dalke, Leader, Idaho Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit; Henry H. Brown, New Mexico Game and Fish Commission; I. T. Quinn, Executive Director, Virginia Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries; C. Eric Reppun, President, Board of Agriculture and Forestry, Territory of Hawaii.

Seth Gordon, Director of the California Department of Fish and Game writes: "We have read your proposed Wilderness Bill and feel it is a real step forward in the conservation of the wild lands remaining in the Nation. Rest assured that we are heartily behind your program."

Dave Gaskill, geologist, writes:

"Establishment of a National Wilderness Preservation System is an almost desperately needed measure if we are to preserve the remnants of our country's pristine beauty from man's inexorable campaign to subvert every wild spot on earth. . . ."

"Most of us are quite aware of the never-ending, ever increasing commercial efforts to render unto themselves that which might be gained from any source, even God's purest temples, and we are all more or less a party in this race to 'feed ourselves and our Nation's economic appetite.'"

"I know from my own experiences that wilderness values cannot be measured in monetary terms, for they stem from the very well-spring of life. My own most treasured moments have been lived among innumerable frost-shattered, ice-scalloped peaks and passes, tundra gardens, untrampled forests, wilderness fords, and canyon lands of the Colorado Plateau. Nor can we experience these values from the highways and beaten paths, for each wilderness jewel lies beyond the outposts of civilization, and none survive for long the trampling and 'improvement' of man.

"This bill defines a need, and offers basic legislation, with legal responsibility for preserving these values. I agree that the chief threats to wilderness in our parks is from road extensions and so-called recreational developments; the latter of which is rapidly bringing our national parks into competition with amusement parks everywhere while offering the possibility of nobler Coney Islands with scenic backdrops."

#### FROM SPIRITUAL LEADERS

Reverend Arthur W. Brandt, St. Catherine's Rectory, Quarryville, Pa., writes: "I hope it [the measure] will go far toward saving America's wilderness. I know you realize the magnitude of your undertaking."

Robert McConnell Hatch, Suffragan Bishop of Connecticut: "I am familiar with the provisions of the bill, and I feel that they have been worked out with an acute awareness of all the needs that are involved in this matter. I feel that it is a wonderfully good bill, and I greatly hope that it will be enacted. The cause of wilderness preservation is very dear to my heart."

Mrs. James M. Evans, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America: "It is a bill important to the future of our country and to future generations."

Professor Otto A. Piper, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.: "A rather extended trip through our country, during the summer months, has convinced me both of the wonderful treasures we possess in our wilderness, and the serious threat that advancing civilization and military demands make on those areas.

"All who think in terms of coming generations, and not only of the actual, or imaginary, needs of the present day, do hope sincerely that the new Congress will enact your bill."

## FROM PHYSICIANS AND PSYCHIATRISTS

Robert C. Murphy, Jr., M. D., Waverly, Pa.: "I think the preservation of islands of beauty in our scarred and plundered planet is as important as life itself."

William C. Menninger, M. D., Topeka, Kans.: "I'm deeply interested and concerned about the preservation of our wilderness system and all that implies in our forests, national parks, wildlife refuges and ranges, and our Indian reservation areas. I just wish there were many more of them."

Sidney F. Thomas, M. D., Palo Alto Medical Clinic, Palo Alto, Calif.: "The need for this is apparent, especially here on the west coast where intrusions by roads and industry are diminishing the effect of many of the wilderness areas."

In addition, commendatory letters have come from Harold E. Crowe, M. D., Los Angeles, Calif.; Karl Menninger, M. D., Topeka, Kans.; James C. White, M. D., Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston; Eugene R. Grether, M. D., Alexandria, Va.

## FROM CONSERVATION LEADERS

Fairfield Osborn, president of the New York Zoological Society, writes: "Please allow me to express our warm approval of the Wilderness Bill."

Mrs. Neil Haig, trustee and conservation chairman, Seattle Audubon Society, Seattle, Wash.: "We heartily endorse the efforts of the nonpartisan sponsorship in this matter. We favor this legislation and trust that it will receive the approval of the new Congress as much as it is meeting the approval of the public."

Mrs. C. Reed Cary, chairman of conservation reports, Conservation Council of Eastern Pennsylvania:

"After careful reading of your excellent preamble and the proposed bill itself, I think you have avoided every possible objection the AFA [American Forestry Association] could have and I sincerely hope they will join with all lovers of wilderness areas in writing this magnificent bill into law."

Letters of support have also been received from Mrs. LeRoy Clark, chairman, national parks committee, the Garden Club of America; Mrs. Arthur A. Dugdale, conservation chairman, the Garden Club of Virginia; Harold Kruse, president, Citizens Natural Resources Association of Wisconsin; Clifton R. Merritt, chairman, wilderness and refuge committee, Flathead Wildlife, Inc., Kalispell, Mont.; Joel H. Hildebrand, past president, Sierra Club, Berkeley, Calif.; Gerald R. Hunter, vice president, region III, Georgia Conservation League; Maurice Broun, board of directors, Hawk Mountain Sanctuary Association; Allston Jenkins, president, Philadelphia Conservationists, Inc.; and many others.

Philip Hyde, a distinguished photographer and wilderness traveler, writes:

"One of the things that concerns me a great deal is the continuing threat to wilderness areas from mining. I note that you are a member of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, so you may have some ideas on this. I do not deny the great need for strategic materials, and the great good that the mining industry has sometimes done for the country—but I have too often been made painfully aware of the great damage that mining can do. A few miles from my home are acres and acres of fine silt piles, tailings from a now defunct copper mine. In many parts of the county in which I reside are the unsightly traces of mining debris, and so often the story is one in which a mining group came in, on Federal land, that is, yours and my land, did whatever they pleased in the way of destroying timber, wrecking streams, tearing up topsoil, and otherwise creating havoc with the natural scene that they found. More often than not, they never found what they were looking for, or found it in such minute quantities

that they abandoned the mess, and left for other parts, to repeat the process, leaving nature to repair the damage their wantonness caused.

"If this were a thing of the past, I should be saddened at the evidence of such frontier negligence, but go my way, secure in the belief that it could not happen in these enlightened days. But, it is certainly not a thing of the past. It goes on apace today, and this is where my concern mounts: It happens far too frequently in dedicated wilderness areas. This summer, I was privileged to visit an area of the Washington Cascades that contains some of the Nation's most superlative mountain scenery. This is an area now up for reclassification by the Forest Service, and about which you may have heard: the Glacier Peak Limited Area. Here, in the heart of this fine area, which has a tremendous value as wilderness because of its close proximity to the population centers of the Puget Sound region, mining operations are busily tearing up a large area on a ridge, from which one of the finest views of Glacier Peak is obtained. In an area of some square miles, timber has been wantonly cut, trash and debris scattered, mining tailings abound, and the scene generally resembles more the scene of a battle than the scene of a benevolent industry about its daily work. Some of this land is patented, from old mining claims, some of the debris is undoubtedly from older operations. But the new operation seems to be doing its best to maintain the standards of former years.

"It is my understanding that it was still not decided whether there was enough ore here, of a high enough grade to make it economical to take out. We can only hope there isn't. In any event, it is evidently a marginal operation. The big question is, can we afford to have a marginal mining operation in the heart of a superb wilderness area, whose recreational value should easily exceed whatever mineral value that is present?"

"In the same area, a little farther along the trail, we camped beside a beautiful lake whose morning-still surface shimmeringly mirrors the glacier-clad slopes of Glacier Peak which rises across the deep Siatlulle River canyon from the lake. That night we encountered a prospector, just coming over the ridge above the lake, who told us of his asbestos claim on a ridge far into the hinterlands to the north. He opined that his claim wouldn't be much good if he had to carry the stuff out on burros, as he was prospecting. But he was confident that the Government would build him an access road up this "inaccessible" canyon, and make it easy for him. How much asbestos he might get out is anybody's guess. Would it be worth the cost of the road? Quite probably not. Would it be worth the irreparable loss of the large segment of the wilderness that the road would cut and destroy? How much asbestos for several dozens of square miles of wilderness? How critical a mineral is asbestos? How short is it in supply?—as short in supply as wilderness? I think not. But his chances of getting his road may be better than the chances of over a million people in the Seattle area seeing this area without a road, in its pristine natural state."

"How much longer can we afford to give the mining industry carte blanche in our public lands and wilderness, to do as they please with it, wreck, destroy, and leave virtually permanent debris, whether or not there is mineral to justify it, and whether or not the area has a higher potential value used for something else than a graveyard for mining stocks?"

## FROM OUTDOOR GROUPS

Al Jenkins, president, Billings Rod and Gun Club, Billings, Mont., writes:

"We have gone on record endorsing your bill and will help in every way possible to make it become a reality. Our club is made

up of 1,500 spirited people who are interested in conservation of natural resources, hunting, fishing, and outdoor recreation. Many members are intensely interested in wilderness preservation for its invaluable primitive aspects and for preserving diminishing species of fish and wildlife that are making their last stand against the advance of civilization and man.

"Educational, scientific, and spiritual value must not be overlooked when evaluating wilderness. When roads, mechanical vehicles, or exploitation takes place, these God-made wonders lose most of their value. The United States covers such vast and varied areas that we believe the few million acres set aside as wilderness would not affect the economy of our Nation or its people where esthetic values are an issue. The President of our country and all the thinking people of today are concerned with our young people and what the future might hold for them. Is it possible to have a strong nation or good government without healthy, strong, and spirited people to guide its destinies and to protect our heritage and culture so dear to all of us? Clear thinking and great energy have made our Nation the envy of the world. Wilderness played a part in the beginning and is more essential than ever today for the part it will play in the future of our country. What we have today was preserved for us by men of great vision, always keeping in mind the needs of our people."

Tom Deckert, vice president, Montana Wildlife Federation:

"The people of the State of Montana, where well over half of its population might be classified as outdoor people, are tremendously interested in assisting in every way possible to make this excellent bill become a reality. We are very sincere in our belief that wilderness is a valuable natural resource that belongs to the people, and that its preservation for educational, scientific, and recreational use, along with restoration and propagation of fish and wildlife, is part of a balanced conservation program essential in the survival of a healthy, strong, spirited people so necessary if our civilized culture is to survive and our Nation be kept strong.

"We take special pleasure in the Wilderness Bill because it constitutes a step toward which our organization, together with many other groups and individual conservationists, has been working for so long. The people who value the things that make America beautiful will be ever grateful for what is being done to make wilderness preservation a reality."

Robert K. Koonce, president, Otero County Wildlife Association, Alamogordo, N. Mex.:

"The Wilderness Bill is the only hope for protecting wildernesses from commercial, military, and similar attrition which, at the present rate, is rapidly destroying them.

"Two local situations will illustrate.

"Northeast of here the Sierra Blanca (12,003) is the southernmost alpine, out-of-timberline peak in the United States. Rising from desert, it supports 6 of the 7 world life zones, from Sonoran Desert to Arctic-Alpine. A Forest Service wild area established several years ago should have preserved some of its ecological and recreational value.

"Today the resort town of Ruidoso invades and grows in the area, with roads instead of trails, stables, and nightclubs instead of trees and pure mountain streams. The Forest Service is in retreat, relocating the wild area on the opposite mountain slopes.

"Possibly the most unique natural attraction of all, the snowy gypsum dunes of White Sands National Monument originate in Lake Lucero to the west. Theoretically a written agreement between the Secretaries of War and Interior protects the monument from intrusions. Nevertheless, roads, powerlines, and installations have been built in the Lake Lucero portion, harmful in themselves but

also inviting such depredation as pillaging of the spectacular crystal beds. In addition, a general military campaign of harassment is obviously aimed at taking over the entire monument when opportune. Anyone doubting this has only to remember the military attempt to make a private hunting preserve of newly acquired land here, a case with which you are doubtless familiar.

"Multiply these examples across the land and it is obvious that present administrative practices are unequal to the task of conserving our wildernesses intact, and that congressional action is the only reasonable long-range hope.

"Once we have lost the few lands remaining in their virgin, natural condition we will have lost values forever irreplaceable; and we will then have people walking around who are spiritually and therefore mentally and physically sick, wondering what is wrong with themselves and the world."

Robert J. Redinger, secretary, North Rocky Mountain Sportsmen's Association:

"By order of the membership of this organization, I am writing you concerning your Wilderness Bill.

"Our membership, at the regular meeting of November 20, 1956, has voted unanimously to go on record in support of this bill. You are to be congratulated for your sponsorship of this legislation. We feel that this bill is the best thus far, toward the assurance that we will always have a system of wilderness areas in this country."

Letters of approval from other outdoor groups include: J. A. Canade, secretary, Rock Tavern Rod and Gun Club, Maybrook, N. Y.; Don Maxwell, field director, Bird Club of Westfield, N. J.; R. O. Doolittle, public relations secretary, Peoria Rod and Gun Club, Peoria, Ariz.; A. W. Black, secretary, Albuquerque Game Protective Association, Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Marion Alman, chairman, National Conservation Committee, American Bowhunters Association, Louisville, Ky.; Oscar Hawksley, national conservation chairman, American White Water Affiliation, Warrensburg, Mo.; Walter S. Atwood, Green Mountain Club, Palsades Park, N. J.

#### FROM MEN OF LAW

United States Circuit Judge Albert Branson Maris states his personal feeling as follows: "I have read with a great deal of interest your speech delivered in the House on July 12 last in support of the bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System. Your speech is unanswerable and I am enthusiastically in accord with it. I have also read the text of the bill with some care and it seems to me to be well designed to carry out the objective of preserving the wilderness areas now owned by the Federal Government with the minimum interference with the control of those areas by the various agencies presently having them in charge. I assume that this is as far as we could have hoped to go at the present time. The machinery of the system can, of course, be further developed as experience dictates but the basic thing is to establish as law the principle that these wilderness areas are to be preserved intact and this your bill will certainly do."

Harvey Broome, attorney, Knoxville, Tenn. (and vice president of The Wilderness Society): "It is warming indeed to find such interest and understanding of wilderness needs in Congress. Future generations will always be in debt to Representatives like yourself [Mr. SAYLOR], and Mr. METCALF, of Montana, and to Senators HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, NEUBERGER, and others for your courageous and unstinting work on behalf of basic conservation legislation."

Robert Brown, attorney, St. Joseph, Mo.: "The least I can do is to express my thanks and to tell you that I am very much interested in the proposed legislation; that I think it is well considered and well drawn; and

that I sincerely hope it is enacted into law."

Other attorneys who have written to declare their approval include: Bruce Bowler, Boise, Idaho; K. B. Steinmetz, Knoxville, Tenn.; V. J. Muench, Green Bay, Wis.; Arthur Roberts, Duluth, Minn.

Herbert J. Powell, architect, Los Angeles, Calif., writes:

"I wish to strongly endorse this bill. It has been my practice for many years to take walking trips through our High Sierra country and I know many people who enjoy this activity.

"We know, that once these wilderness areas are developed, it is impossible to ever again recapture that character which made them so attractive to a large body of Americans who enjoy a chance to get away from the pressures of civilization.

"It is my hope that the 85th Congress will adopt this measure and I wish to commend you for your activity in its behalf."

David S. Wood, councilman, city of Sierra Madre, Calif., writes: "I feel strongly that this is a wise and necessary step in national land use planning. I have found from personal experience that visits to wilderness areas from time to time are an invaluable aid in maintaining a balanced perspective toward life in our modern and complex society. Physical separation of one's person from the surroundings of the machine age render it considerably simpler to view that age and society with its complex (and fascinating) problem from an objective and detached point of view. I believe that such a process of standing off and looking at life from a distance, so to speak, is of the utmost value to the individual at appropriate intervals."

#### FROM PUBLISHERS AND WRITERS

George X. Sand, president, Florida Outdoor Writers Association, Deerfield Beach, Fla.:

"Since I happen to be president of the Florida Outdoor Writers Association, a statewide group of some 180 magazine, newspaper, radio, and TV writers, and programists, I am taking the liberty of recommending your proposed legislation to them for favorable consideration.

"You are to be complimented for making known the startling fact we have no legal assurance from Congress that our wilderness areas cannot be further exploited."

William Hard, roving editor, the Reader's Digest: "Much applause for your splendid contribution to wilderness preservation."

Louis Mecker, literary editor, the Kansas City Star: "I hope nothing will interfere to mitigate your efforts in this splendid cause."

William B. Edwards, technical editor, Guns magazine, Skokie, Ill.: "May I commend you on the approach and ideas contained in your plea for wilderness preservation by enactment of Federal legislation 'in perpetuity.' As I sit here looking out on the brick bungalow jungles of Greater Chicago, I remember even more vividly the peace and the sense of freedom which came to me in those infrequent moments when, on trips to national parks and other areas, I had been in 'the wilderness.' . . . In the wilderness man can touch the bedrock of human existence, and regain a point of view from which one can only look upward. This, from our present supposedly high spot on the scale of evolution, is important. It may give the man who is so occupied with material progress a re-evaluation of where we are going, but knowing from what we have come."

Among other writers who have written in to encourage this bill are outdoor columnists John Willard, Helena, Mont., and Ralph A. Fisher, Sr., Phoenix, Ariz.

#### FROM BUSINESSMEN

Mortimer R. Proctor, president, Vermont Marble Co., Proctor, Vt.:

"I only wish to say that that is a subject very close to my heart and has been for many years. It almost seems like a sacrilege

to see the way civilization is intruding on our wilderness areas.

"For many years I have hunted and fished and it is a sad aspect of changing times to see this most valuable asset for the happiness, wealth, and welfare of our people gradually destroyed."

Walter A. Schmidt, president, Western Precipitation Corp., Los Angeles, Calif., writes in approval, as do John R. Elliott, R. S. Elliott Arms Co., Kansas City, Mo.; C. F. Erwin, Erwin's Drugstore, Harbor Springs, Mich.; Oscar Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.

Michael Frome, Department of Public Relations, American Automobile Association, writes: "This is a matter that merits definite interest and study."

#### THE FAMILY INTEREST

R. P. MacIntosh, Alameda, Calif.: "I and my family pack into one of these areas in the High Sierra each summer. We know the values of these areas and we are in full support of your excellent work. Please continue for the benefit of all those Americans who enjoy the out-of-doors."

Mr. and Mrs. S. F. Nicol and Louise, Jim, Rob, and Lori, Stratford, Conn.: "It is difficult to express my feelings on this subject. I thank God there are men of foresight and courage to go ahead with this bill. I cannot believe that it will not pass. It is too important—too vital—to our generation—to future generations."

Mrs. Cornelius James Cannon, Cambridge, Mass.: "How people 100 years from now will bless you when they can leave their crowded cities to go to the wilderness you have preserved for them. I feel personally grateful as well as grateful for my children and grandchildren."

John Taylor, New York, N. Y.: "My wife and I deeply appreciate receiving information of such hope toward preserving those wonderful areas which mean so much to us and to some of our friends. Each year we go on a trip into a great peaceful area because as you have said there is a 'deep need for areas of solitude and quiet, for areas of wilderness where life has not yet given way to machinery.' Each trip helps us to adjust ourselves out of our pressures by impressing on us something much, much greater than we."

Henry S. Chafee, Providence, R. I.: "We who live in the East know that most of the national parks are in the West, and since we have lost so much of our own wilder areas, we are particularly interested in the preservation of such extensive tracts of land. Mrs. Chafee and I have visited a great many of the national parks and wilderness areas. We do not want them encroached upon so that our children and grandchildren may similarly enjoy them and obtain the peace of mind which comes from visits to them."

Warren E. Fisher, Glendale, Mo.:

"I am deeply interested in seeing to it that areas of wilderness are set aside and protected so that our children and all that come after us may have a place where they can become enraptured with Mother Nature and her creatures.

"We need it, too, as a place where we can meditate in peaceful quiet away from the tensions of our hectic everyday life that the spiritual man may be unfolded.

"I had the pleasure in 1954 of making a 10-day canoe trip through the Quetico Superior National Forest under auspices of the forestry association. It will never be forgotten; the call of the loons, the angelic song of the hermit thrush and the sad, sweet song of the white throated sparrow can still be heard when I sit quietly alone."

Mr. and Mrs. Allan B. Ross, Haddonfield, N. J.:

"We have been particularly concerned over the uranium mining activities of which we had first hand opportunity to observe re-

cently in some of the Western States. It is our sincere hope that the National Wilderness Preservation Bill will bring better control over this vicious exploitation.

"Another of our hopes has been that much of the road-building programs within all our public lands will be cut to a bare minimum for reasons well known to every true conservationist."

Kathe B. Leidke, West Englewood, N. J.: "Our family has read (your bill) with interest and we are proud and happy that you and others in our legislative branch of Government have taken up the matter with vigor and skill. We hope that a good law, to preserve the beauty and wilderness in parts of our country, will be passed in the 85th Congress."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Finally, Mr. President, I join in the request of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that the bill be held at the desk until the close of Senate business on Thursday to allow for additional cosponsorship if desired.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, few Members of the Senate in our time have demonstrated so keen an interest in the preservation of natural resources as has the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

I am pleased again to be associated with him in the introduction and sponsorship of this bill which seeks to protect the relatively few outdoor solitudes left within the borders of our country. I think I can speak with some experience when I say that these upland fastnesses are the heritage of future generations of Americans quite as much as any other part of our legacy. It has been the privilege of my wife and me to camp and hike in some of these wilderness areas. There are a number in my State—some of the finest, in fact. Had some earlier generation permitted such fastnesses to be looted and wiped away, we would never have experienced this marvelous adventure. Surely we owe to the people who will come after us quite as much as our own predecessors have been obligated to us.

Mr. President, the urgent need for some form of congressional action to safeguard these scenic realms has just been indicated by a decision of the Department of Agriculture to remove from the Three Sisters Wilderness Area of Oregon some 53,000 acres of majestic forest canyons and ridges, as well as of supremely important botanical content. I ask that two telegrams which I have just received from Oregon conservationists appear at this point in the RECORD, for they highlight the importance of providing some congressional protection for our career foresters from the pressure and leverage of their political superiors, regardless of which party those superiors may represent.

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

PORTLAND, OREG., February 11, 1957.  
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

We understand Wilderness Bill is to be reintroduced soon with your cosponsorship. Recent decision regarding the Three Sisters shows how imperative is need for firmer pro-

tection of our wild lands. Our full support is with you.

AL SCHMITZ.

EUGENE, OREG., February 11, 1957.  
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Pleased to learn that Senator HUMPHREY reintroducing Wilderness Preservation Bill Monday with your support. You can cite Three Sisters Wilderness decision as evidence such legislation urgently needed. Eugene Register-Guard has strong editorial today saying Wilderness boundaries now much too easily changed by administrative fiat alone and that Humphrey bill providing Wilderness System and requiring congressional sanction for boundary change should be reintroduced. Appreciate your good work.

KARL ONTHANK,  
President, Federation Western  
Outdoor Clubs.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let me state by way of explanation that these cogent messages are from Dr. Karl W. Onthank, of Eugene, Oreg., president of the Western Federation of Outdoor Clubs, and from Al Schmitz, of Portland, Oreg., one of the leaders in the famous Sierra Club.

I am not assailing, or attacking, or criticizing anyone in the Forest Service or in the Department of Agriculture for the Three Sisters decision. What I am saying is this: Such a decision is virtually for eternity. Once those 53,000 virgin acres have been logged—even under selective-cutting conditions which are supervised so carefully by the Forest Service—they never, through all the epochs of time can duplicate their original primeval state. So final a verdict, Mr. President, ought to be reviewed by the Congress of the United States and it should not be merely within the fiat of an executive agency. The Congress, after all, is the supreme policymaking agency of the American people, to whom these national forest solitudes actually belong.

That is what the bill offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and some of the rest of us is all about. That is why its introduction today is so pertinent and timely, because it was only 4 days ago that the determination of the executive arm of Government to eliminate 53,000 virgin acres from the Three Sisters Wilderness Area was announced. And let me explain that the addition of some less unique and extraordinary acreage elsewhere in the Cascade Range does not constitute adequate atonement or compensatory action.

Mr. President, some sincere and conscientious outdoor enthusiasts have had a few reservations about the bill being introduced. I would be less than candid if I did not confess such a fact. Many of these enthusiasts have had highly favorable relations with the staffs of the Forest Service and the Park Service over the years, and they would naturally hesitate to see any of the authority of these splendid career officials reduced.

One person to express such doubts has been a close personal friend of mine and a brilliant individual, Mrs. Martha Ann Platt, of the Mazamas, which is Oregon's great mountain-climbing club. Mrs. Platt, on December 20, 1956, addressed such a letter to me. I, in turn, submitted her communication to Mr. Howard Zahn-

iser, executive secretary of The Wilderness Society, which has played a pioneer role in helping to draft and revise the legislation being submitted to the Senate today.

I believe that further background and information about this bill will be provided for Senators if the letter from Mrs. Platt, as well as Mr. Zahniser's very complete and thorough reply, dated January 30, 1957, are made a part of the RECORD at this point. I ask unanimous consent that this be done.

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

MAZAMAS ROOF STUDIOS,  
Portland, Oreg., December 20, 1956.  
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,  
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR: I did regret, at such a delightful teaparty at your house, making a discordant note concerning the Wilderness Bill because I am heartily in favor of its principle that we need such congressional protection for our wilderness areas. But this bill is controversial and will be strongly opposed by mining, grazing, and water-power interests. However, the opposition I am concerned about is that from the agencies themselves, and we might be in the peculiar and uncomfortable position of opposing those whom we are trying to help. Since some of their objections may be sound, I think we should take a long, hard look at what the bill encompasses.

I'll begin first with the Indian lands. Has there been a thorough check to determine their classification under the old treaties and the probable attitude of the tribal councils for this new status? I know some lands in reservations have been set aside for wilderness purposes, so there is not only awareness but appropriate action for this need. However, I am wondering if elimination of grazing and timber-cutting would be compatible with the Indian economy; more than that, I am wondering if we are not tampering with a people's prior rights and way of life. I hope I am wrong, but I understood that neither the Bureau of Indian Affairs, nor representatives of the tribal council, had been consulted about this bill. If so, this could be a serious oversight, as I think we must be truly and honestly considerate of Indian rights and feelings. There must be no cause for misinterpreting our motives by the opponents of this bill, nor in our attempts to provide an improved status for Indian lands.

Concerning refuge lands, there is that no-grazing stipulation again. In some wildlife refuges such as the Malheur and Red Rocks, controlled grazing greatly improves the feeding and nesting areas for waterfowl. Impoundment of water in dams and reservoirs is part of the management program and probably could be continued under existing authority, but I would want assurance of this. Certainly, I can't see the compatibility of oil drilling and mining with wildlife protection and think prohibitive legislation for these practices is urgently needed.

Both the Park Service and Forest Service would be expected to protest and I think their objections should be learned and studied carefully. I have high regard for the program of the Park Service and the philosophy that has guided it, and I have confidence in its personnel, and am grateful for the degree of congressional protection it enjoys. This bill would not increase its protection but rather be a check on the administrative freedom now exercised. I think the Service has real concern that a Wilderness Bill with less protection might be passed which would weaken the strong position the Park Service now has. However, the bill would prevent a Director or Secretary of the

Interior from unusual or unfortunate courses of action, if such should ever arise.

The Forest Service would benefit from freedom from mining and power dams in the wilderness areas. However, there will be opposition from these interests, and also from the Service itself when serious curtailment of staff is involved and loss of administrative flexibility.

I heartily agree with Mr. Lyle Watts that there should be a conference between the department heads and the sponsors of this Wilderness Bill to determine areas of disagreement and any defects in the bill itself. If objections continue, we should know about them so that we may make our proper defense. This bill will have to have support beyond the ranks of the conservationists. The average citizen will expect or understand minor differences between Congress and bureaus, but he will be suspicious and negative if they are fundamental or important.

A lot of the strength of the conservationists has been their selfless interest—no economic benefits accruing to them as the result of their support. This bill may bring cries of "special legislation to lock up the wilderness for a few users." Certainly, wilderness can never be justified on the basis of use, but rather must be defined as the creation of a special kind of permanent, unspoiled, natural treasure for all to own, to see, or to enjoy vicariously. Few of us would ever be privileged to visit all the national parks, or refuges or wilderness areas, but we glory in our ownership and delight in the experiences we do achieve. And it is a good feeling to know that others in different parts of our country are sharing our excitement and pleasure in our natural treasures, and that we can work together to make their heritage more permanent.

Very best wishes for a wonderful year.  
Sincerely,

MARTHA ANN PLATT.

THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY,  
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1957.  
The Honorable RICHARD NEUBERGER,  
United States Senate,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DICK: I am glad to comment on the questions that Mrs. Martha Ann Platt has raised regarding the Wilderness Bill, as you request, and would enjoy discussing them with you further if you should so desire. These are excellent and important questions, representing a keen interest in wilderness preservation, and they lead to an expectation of excellent cooperation from Mrs. Platt. I trust that these comments are helpful to this end.

For your convenience I am enclosing a copy of the bill as reintroduced in the House this year, with changes made during the summer and fall as a result of comments received. I am using for this purpose Mr. METCALF'S H. R. 1960 and am making my references to it.

#### INDIAN LANDS

Mrs. Platt begins "first with the Indian lands," asking as to the consideration given Indian rights and feelings in the preparation of the bill.

The answer, in brief, is that the bill has been prepared in accordance with a deep interest in the rights of the Indians and in their right of consent. We trust that the Indians recognize that this bill when enacted into law will give them the privilege of having their areas (roadless and wild) included in the System if they so wish—but not unless they do so indicate.

The bill in section 2 (d), lines 5 to 8 on page 15, provides that no area shall be included "until the tribe or band within whose reservation it lies, through its tribal council or other duly constituted authority, shall have given its consent to the inclusion of the area within the System."

In this same subsection, lines 6 to 13 on page 16, it is provided that additions, modifications, and eliminations shall similarly be subject to the Indians' consent.

Section 3 (a) provides that any Indian areas included in the System will be administered in accordance with regulations adopted subject to the Indians' consent.

Section 2 (d) in lines 15 to 18 on page 16 provides further that "nothing in this act shall in any respect abrogate any treaty with any band or tribe of Indians, or in any way modify or otherwise affect existing hunting and fishing rights or privileges."

The bill as regards Indian lands was drafted in cooperation with the Washington representative (and attorneys) of the Association on American Indian Affairs. It provides for inclusion of the Indian lands if the Indians so desire. The bill recognizes the wild and roadless areas that have already been designated but gives legal recognition to the Indians' right of consent with regard to them.

#### WILDLIFE AREAS

As regards the wildlife refuges and ranges and the controlled grazing to which Mrs. Platt refers, the bill provides in section 3 (c) (4), lines 13 to 19 on page 21, that "any existing use authorized or provided for in the Executive order or legislation establishing any national wildlife refuge or range may be continued in accordance with permit granted." This provision was drafted after informal consultation with, and with help from, the Fish and Wildlife Service. It covers the grazing on Red Rock Lakes to which Mrs. Platt refers specifically. The other refuge to which she specifically refers, Malheur, is not included in the bill. In fact, Malheur (which I admire greatly and have enjoyed visiting and writing about) can represent those excellent refuges which are such because of the way in which men have "developed" them as refuges—valuable but not primeval.

Only 20 of the 264 refuges and ranges are included in the wilderness system—only those in which wilderness preservation as a management policy is appropriate. The areas so managed now, and proper for inclusion, were determined in informal consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

#### NATIONAL PARKS AND MONUMENTS

As to the national parks and monuments the bill gives added protection as wilderness for the portion not needed for roads, accommodations, etc., and yet sets no limitation on the portion that may be designated for such use. Other than requiring that such a designation be made deliberately and that the primeval back country be recognized as wilderness the bill includes no "check on the administrative freedom now exercised." In connection with Mission 66 every park is being studied for development needs. The designations called for in the Wilderness Bill can be made at the same time.

The national park system areas were included in accordance with an overwhelming consensus of conservation leaders concerned with wilderness and in accordance with a modus operandi suggested some years ago at a Sierra Club wilderness conference by a park superintendent.

An early draft of the bill was taken to the National Park Service and changes were made to meet criticisms made. As Mrs. Platt suggests, intensive efforts have been made to ascertain any National Park Service objections. As understood these have been carefully studied, but we have not yet obtained the concurrence and cooperation of the National Park Service leadership, and we are still working on this.

A special statement recently prepared on the subject of National Park Service areas in the Wilderness System is as follows:

"The national parks and monuments containing areas of wilderness should be included in the proposed National Wilderness

Preservation System both for the sake of making the System complete and for the sake of making more secure the preservation of the wilderness back country of the park system itself.

"Existing legislation does not insure the preservation of areas within the parks and monuments as wilderness. Under the existing legislation all the roads and buildings now in the parks and monuments have been constructed, and more and more could be built. There is nothing in our legislation now to protect future administrators from mounting pressures to use more and more of the back country for developments that would destroy them as wilderness.

"The proposed Wilderness Bill would provide protection by making wilderness preservation a paramount congressional purpose.

"Yet the bill deals realistically with the needs for accommodations. It gives authority to designate for this purpose whatever areas are needed. It places no limit on the size of such areas. It includes nothing that would prevent designation or additional areas if determined to be needed. And it provides for the application of the new law over a period of time which makes it possible for the administrators to designate the development areas at the same time that they make the plans for Mission 66.

"Including the National Park System makes complete a wilderness system that is seen as an effective means of preserving our various kinds of primeval areas and doing this in a feasible way at this late date in our land management history.

"The essence of this proposal is the certain continuation of wilderness preservation, where appropriate, along with the objectives in managing lands for other purposes, also, and doing this without interfering with the status quo, without changing jurisdiction over the areas, and without creating any new land-management agency.

"Parks continue to be for the use and enjoyment of the people, wildlife refuges for the protection and increase of wildlife, forests for the multiple purpose administration that includes watershed protection and various other uses on various areas—each and all of these in consistency (as they now are) with preserving the areas as wilderness.

"Including the superb wilderness of the National Park System is essential to the completeness of any such program.

"To bring these varying interests to focus and to provide a central repository for files and records and a source of information—but not to supervise in any way or to coordinate in any way the administration of any areas or any agencies—there is proposed a National Wilderness Preservation Council. The Director of the National Park Service and the heads of the other land-management agencies administering areas in the Wilderness System would be members of this Council along with citizens appointed by the President. The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution would be a member also and would be the Council's secretary. This emphasizes the character and purpose of the Council and places the Council's headquarters outside those of any agency concerned with land administration.

"This proposed legislation provides a new and further opportunity for extending the influence of the national park principle and for developing further the cooperation and leadership of the National Park Service in helping to preserve our heritage of wilderness."

#### NATIONAL FOREST AREAS

As regards the wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless areas within the national forests this bill has been prepared after many consultations with the Forest Service. It has been prepared in accordance with the wilderness policies, programs, and practices

of the Forest Service and is designed to strengthen the forest administrators' hands in carrying out these policies and programs.

There is no "curtailment of staff" involved and no loss of administrative flexibility.

The areas included are those that have been designated as wilderness by the Forest Service, and the bill provides that these areas shall be administered under regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, which means Forest Service as at present.

The bill does provide for elimination of mining in the areas included in the System. This is something that Forest Service spokesmen have been emphasizing. The bill in this respect was strengthened in the way suggested by Lyle Watts when he reviewed a draft of the bill during the Northwest Wilderness Conference in Portland last April.

With the exception of this mining prohibition, the bill includes no reforms, and even here the bill protects any existing private rights. Grazing, for example, is permitted to continue on national forest areas as at present (sec. 3 (c) (2), lines 22, p. 20, and following.)

The Forest Service would file reports with the Council established, but the bill provides explicitly (sec. 3 (a), lines 17 to 19 on p. 19) that the Council shall have no administrative jurisdiction over any area or agency. The head of the Forest Service would be a member of the Council.

This bill would not interfere with but would perpetuate the present multiple-purpose administration of the wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless areas in the national forests. Its central concept is that our present areas of wilderness can be preserved within the existing land-management pattern if this preservation purpose is made a matter of fundamental policy. Thus the effect of the legislation is not to upset the present multiple-use program of the Forest Service but rather to prevent the upset in this program that will result if the wilderness areas are not protected from the uses that would destroy them as wilderness.

#### EFFECT ON EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

At the request of Senator HUMPHREY the Legislative Reference Service made a study of this bill and prepared a report which included comments that seem pertinent in connection with Mrs. Platt's interest in cooperation with the administrative agencies. Said this report:

"The legislation gives sanction to the policies and programs developed by the Forest Service, the National Park Service, and other Federal conservation agencies under whose administration the existing resource of wilderness has so far been preserved.

"The effect of this bill will be to bring into a single system, for the purpose of insuring their continued preservation as wilderness, the various federally owned areas designated as wilderness by the departmental heads or by Executive order. In no instance will the jurisdiction of a single area be transferred from one agency to another. Areas controlled, for example, by the Forest Service will continue to be managed by that agency. Furthermore, it will be the Forest Service under the Secretary of Agriculture that determines the precise area of the unit of its wilderness land to be included in the Wilderness Preservation System. And it will be solely the responsibility of the Forest Service under law to preserve the wilderness character of that area. No wilderness area of the Forest Service thus made a part of the Wilderness Preservation System may be modified or removed from the System except by action of the Secretary of Agriculture which has not been disapproved by Congress. In a similar manner lands under the jurisdiction of other executive agencies may be affected by this legislation."

These observations of the Legislative Reference Service are, of course, what might be expected, for the basic intention of this leg-

islative proposal has been to accomplish wilderness preservation without disrupting any other program and to do this through existing agencies and in the ways developed by these several agencies.

The purpose thus is rather simple; namely, to accomplish wilderness preservation without disturbing the status quo.

It is the status quo that is somewhat complex, thus making the legislation seem complicated until its true purpose and the actual situation are recognized.

#### THE WILDERNESS COUNCIL

Special comment in this connection seems called for with regard to the proposed National Wilderness Preservation Council. This is not a superagency. It has been misinterpreted as such by some opponents of the measure, and in earlier drafts was misunderstood by some supporters of the bill. The Council, however, was not so conceived, and efforts have been made to clarify and make more explicit its true nature and purpose.

The name, for example, has been changed to Council from Commission in order to avoid implying such authority.

A sentence has been added to the bill in section 3 (a)—lines 17 to 19 on page 19—providing explicitly that the Council "shall have no administrative jurisdiction over any unit in the System nor over any agency that does have such jurisdiction."

Section 4—which makes provision for the Council—has been painstakingly examined and clarified to make as certain as possible that the true character of the Council is expressed. Much help in this has come from your office, including the careful study and cooperation of Hans A. Linde.

The Council, as it is conceived in this legislation, is, in fact, a corollary of the basic purpose of preserving a Wilderness System through the independent operations of the various executive agencies, each agency handling its own areas of wilderness in its own way and in keeping with its own other purposes. As a center of information and a nonexclusive clearinghouse, the Council provides an essential focus for such a System, but in doing so is actually a device for making unnecessary any superagency whatever.

#### OPPOSITION TO THE BILL

Mrs. Platt's fear that "this bill is controversial and will be strongly opposed by mining, grazing, and waterpower interests" seems well founded on the basis of some expressions so far, as does also her concern about opposition from the executive agencies involved.

Regarding the latter it has been the purpose of this letter to indicate the degree to which possible opposition of the executive agencies would seem to have been met and obviated by the provisions of the bill. As further comments are received from the agencies, continued effort will be made to clarify and correct the bill.

If the opposition proves to be directed against the establishment by Congress of wilderness preservation, on the land, this bill can hardly be expected to meet it, but my confident expectation is that agreement actually can be reached. I have strong hopes for the cooperation of these agencies, and am working toward it.

We also are hopeful for, and in quest of, cooperation from other interests.

Grazing interests are not damaged by this legislation. No area now available for logging is included. Waterpower interests could possibly be affected only to the extent that there cannot be found any alternative to a project that might be located within a wilderness. Our success in resolving the Echo Park controversy gives hope for an understanding that in general we can accomplish our waterpower purposes within an overall program that can also include wilderness preservation. Even the mining interests can realize that the areas

involved that are now available to them are relatively small.

Our objective is not to fight these other interests but to work out a way of preserving a system of wilderness areas without sacrificing other purposes. We need further educational and cooperative work to this end, but I am sure we need not be dismayed.

The key concept in the program proposed in this bill is that of wilderness preservation as a part of other programs and as an important aspect of our culture, along with and dependent on other interests, including the economic. When this concept is understood and when we have succeeded in perfecting its expression I am confident that opposition will be much less than might now be assumed.

We recognize, for example, that wilderness preservation can be realized only if we have successful forestry outside the wilderness to provide us our needed forest products. It is thus the efficient lumberman who makes possible our enduring opportunity to preserve wilderness. As lumbermen realize that this is our concept and that we are all working together for a total land management that meets all needs, and as this understanding becomes clearer to all, I am confident that we shall reach the agreement necessary to enact the legislation.

We are not trying to urge the bill so hard and fast that it cannot be understood by all who are involved. We wish to encourage careful discussion of it. Hearings we hope will be held this June in Washington and perhaps be followed during the summer with hearings in the field. By the second session of this Congress we should thus have a sound basis for putting the legislation in form for enactment, with the benefit of the comments and suggestions of all who are concerned.

#### THIS IS LEGISLATION FOR ALL—NOT SPECIAL

Mrs. Platt very effectively emphasizes that wilderness is a permanent, unspoiled, natural treasure for all to own, to see or enjoy vicariously. She thus expresses the philosophy of this proposed legislation and provides us with an answer to the cries she mentions of special legislation to lock up the wilderness for a few users. She deals thus with one of the most subtly damaging of the misinterpretations of the bill that have been used against it, but one that is bound to be corrected as the bill is understood.

As indicated repeatedly in this letter, the Wilderness Bill has been designed throughout in recognition of the multiple uses of our areas of wilderness. It does not provide for any special users of the wilderness whatever. Its concern is with preserving the character of the areas as wilderness while they serve various other purposes also.

It may accurately be described as a multiple-use wilderness bill.

Mrs. Platt and the rest of us, I am sure, can continue to defend this purpose with the confidence that in so doing we are motivated by the same selfless interest which she recognizes as the source of a lot of the strength of the conservationists.

The title of this bill labels it as for the permanent good of the whole people.

Section 1 states its purpose as to secure a wilderness resource for the American people and provides that the areas shall serve the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservational, and historical use and enjoyment by the people.

Section 3 (a) specifies clearly, lines 2 to 9, page 18, that nothing in this act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purpose stated in the establishment of any national park or monument, national forest, national wildlife refuge, Indian reservation, or other Federal land area involved, except that any agency administering any area within the National Wilderness Preservation System shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area.

And these specific provisions are explicit statements of a principle and objective that are implicit throughout the bill. Wilderness preservation under this act will be accomplished along with other uses of the areas involved and as part of an overall land-management program and policy.

#### CONCLUSION

I trust that you will excuse the length of this letter and recognize that it is so because of the opportunity that Mrs. Platt's thoughtful and sympathetic comment affords to provide an explanation of problems that are of interest to many others also. I note in Mrs. Platt's letter of January 7 to you that she has also sent copies of her letter to other members of the Oregon delegation in Congress, to Senator HUMPHREY, and to Representative JOHN SAYLOR, who likewise has called the letter to my special attention. In her transmittal note to Representative SAYLOR, Mrs. Platt writes that her letter addressed to you "expresses my approval of the bill but indicates my concern about agency opposition to it." For the benefit of our cooperators and supporters, I have accordingly attempted in this commentary to interpret the bill in the light of the opposition to which Mrs. Platt has referred. I trust that it proves helpful.

Finally, may I say that I share also with Martha Ann Platt the appreciation of you which she expresses so enthusiastically in her letter of January 7. It is a great pleasure to be privileged to work along with you on these problems and a great encouragement to know of your championship of wilderness preservation.

With all good regards,

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD ZAHNISER,  
Executive Secretary and Editor.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In conclusion, Mr. President, let me make three very brief points of my own. They are these:

First. This bill in no way reflects on the wonderful career services which now are in charge of wilderness areas and similar outdoor realms, but it actually seeks to safeguard these splendid men and women from undue political pressure, no matter what the source.

Second. The bill recognizes the ultimate authority of the Congress in matters as important as America's comparatively small remaining supply of wilderness domain.

Third. The bill recognizes that wildlife, waterfowl, migratory fisheries, and similar resources require outdoor fastnesses and solitudes in which to survive, and that these must be safeguarded by some form of legislative shield.

Mr. President, once again I state that it is a pleasure to stand shoulder to shoulder with my warm friend, the Senator from Minnesota, in so worthy and historic a cause. Natural resources come this way but once. When gone, they can never be adequately replaced—whether they be resources of minerals, scenery, or a species of wildlife.

#### AMENDMENT OF LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, RELATING TO METHOD OF DEALING WITH LABOR DISPUTES IN VITAL INDUSTRIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, expiration tomorrow of the 80-day Taft-Hartley injunction in the New York longshoremen dispute indicates again the ineffectiveness and inadequacy of the

emergency disputes provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. I am introducing the legislation governing emergency disputes which I have offered before on similar occasions as a means of furnishing the machinery for dealing with these situations that is so evidently needed.

The bill I introduce is the one that was studied carefully, redrafted in some respects, and recommended for passage by the Senate Labor Committee in 1952.

This morning's press reports a collapse of negotiations between the longshoremen and the New York employers in the face of the employers' rejection of the settlement proposed by Federal mediators. Louis Waldman, general counsel for the International Longshoremen's Association, is quoted today by a New York newspaper as saying "There is no hope whatever of a settlement before 5 p. m. Tuesday. If there is no settlement, there is no alternative to a strike."

The Taft-Hartley injunction which halted the strike was issued last November. This indication that the strike will be resumed illustrates again that the machinery of the Taft-Hartley Act is inflexible and not conducive to collective bargaining. What is urgently needed is a rewriting of the emergency disputes section to provide a more flexible system under which the President and Congress can fulfill their responsibilities, and through which labor and management have an opportunity to work out their differences at the bargaining table.

My proposal was first made in 1950, when I introduced S. 3169 to cope with the crisis in the coal industry. It appeared at that time that seizure by the Government might be used as a last resort. My bill recognized the incapacity of Taft-Hartley to deal effectively with emergency disputes, the industrywide disputes of that kind that endanger the national welfare.

In 1952, I introduced the bill again. It was introduced at the time of the crisis in the steel industry when Taft-Hartley's emergency disputes language again proved inadequate. The bill I am offering today is the product of extensive hearings at that time by the Senate Labor Committee, and several redraftings by the committee. It provides for a continuing procedure under which the President and Congress keep constant surveillance of emergency disputes. Both executive seizure and injunctions are permissible, with a congressional veto of such action. The bill emphasizes keeping the disputing parties guessing to provide real incentives for bargaining now lacking in the law.

I ask that the text of my bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1177) to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to provide a more effective method of dealing with labor disputes in vital industries which affect the national security, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public

Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1177

A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to provide a more effective method of dealing with labor disputes in vital industries which affect the national security

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That sections 206, 207, 208, 209, and 210 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 are amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 206. Whenever the head of an appropriate department or independent agency reports to the President, and the President finds, that a national emergency is threatened or exists because a stoppage of work or operations has resulted or threatens to result from a labor dispute (including the expiration of a collective-bargaining agreement) in a vital industry or plant which seriously affects the security of the United States, and the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service advises the President that all possibilities of mediation and conciliation have been exhausted without success, the President shall issue a proclamation to that effect and call upon the parties to the dispute to refrain from a stoppage of work or operations, or, if such stoppage has occurred, to resume work and operations in the public interest.

#### "PROCEDURE FOLLOWING PROCLAMATION

"Sec. 207. (a) Immediately after issuing a proclamation pursuant to section 206, the President shall submit to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action, a full statement of the case based upon such information as has been made available to him through the appropriate agencies of the Government, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make as to procedures for effecting final settlement of the dispute and, pending settlement, for maintaining operation of the enterprise or enterprises involved.

"(b) The President may include a recommendation that the United States take possession of and operate the business enterprise or enterprises involved in the dispute. The President may make such additional reports and recommendations as he deems advisable. If the President recommends that the United States shall take possession of and operate such enterprise or enterprises, the President shall have authority to take such action forthwith. If the Congress by concurrent resolution within 10 days after the submission of such recommendation to it determines that such action should not have been or should not be taken, any property seized shall be returned to its owners and no future seizure shall take place during that dispute without congressional authorization by concurrent resolution: *Provided*, That during the period in which the United States shall have taken possession, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall continue to encourage the settlement of the dispute by the parties concerned, and the agency or department of the United States designated to operate such enterprise or enterprises shall have no authority to enter into negotiations with the employer or with the labor organization for a collective-bargaining contract or to alter the wages, hours, or the conditions of employment existing in such industry or plant prior to the dispute, except in conformity (in whole or in part) with the recommendations of the emergency board: *Provided further*, That in case an emergency board assumes jurisdiction over any form of union security which requires an employee to join a union as a condition of continued employment, the putting into effect of its union security recommendations, during a period of Government possession shall require the acceptance of the labor organization and the