

tions and their suggestions for amendment.

Field hearings were also held in Bend, Oreg., in San Francisco, in Salt Lake City, in Albuquerque, on November 7, 10, 12, and 14. These hearings resulted in a better public understanding of the measure and demonstrated further the broad public support that the wilderness bill has aroused.

NEWSPAPER AND MAGAZINE INTEREST

During the past 3 years, since I first introduced the preliminary draft of the wilderness bill, newspapers and magazines have shown a growing interest in the proposal. At the conclusion of my remarks I shall ask unanimous consent to have the actual text of a sample of such writings included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of all Senators.

PERFECTED PROPOSAL NOW READY FOR ACTION

The significant fact here and now is that we have come to these opening days of the 86th Congress with a proposal that has been formulated after some years of study; subjected to a series of hearings, including two in Washington, D.C., and four in the West; clarified and otherwise revised to meet objections and criticisms; and endorsed by a deeply interested, informed, and aroused public opinion.

A proposal that in its very beginnings sought to avoid any disruption of established programs or enterprises, a bill that sought rather to respect the status quo in Government and business alike, a bill that deals only with Federal lands that are already part of our national forests, parks, and refuges, a bill that damages no other interest or program—this bill has been carefully improved through a series of revisions to meet objections and to take advantage of suggestions.

We now have a measure, Mr. President, that demands and deserves our immediate attention.

WILDERNESS BILL REINTRODUCED

Mr. President, once again it is my privilege to present the wilderness bill to the Senate. On behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and Senators ROBERT BYRD of West Virginia, JOSEPH S. CLARK, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, WILLIAM LANGER, FRANK J. LAUSCHE, KARL MUNDT, MIKE MANSFIELD, THOMAS MARTIN, WAYNE MORSE, JAMES E. MURRAY, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, ALEXANDER WILEY, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., and HUGH SCOTT, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes.

COMMERCIAL INTERESTS NOT DAMAGED

I feel, Mr. President, that I can indeed assure the Senate that commercial interests will suffer no damage whatever by this program.

None of us here in the Senate need fear that after the enactment of this measure the commercial interests, whom we all respect and value, will come to us and complain that they have been hurt. None of them will suffer damage.

This bill, for example, does not give wilderness status to a single acre of forest land now available for timber production.

No lumber company could at present log any of the areas of wilderness protected by this measure without first encountering such a public protest against invading a protected area that the controversy over this bill would seem mild.

For the wilderness bill relates to Federal lands in parks, refuges, or in some other special status in which they already are removed from commercial availability.

LIVESTOCK INTERESTS PROTECTED

The opposition of livestock interests is similarly without basis in the provisions of this bill.

A special provision safeguards the continuation of the grazing that is now established on national forest land to be included in the wilderness system.

The provisions of the bill protect existing private rights and also provide safeguards against damage to the established projects of oil, gas, and mineral interests. Furthermore, the bill takes care to provide for the opening in the future of any national forest areas where and when the need for minerals is greater than that for wilderness. Needed reservoir projects are similarly provided for, and water rights are protected.

HOW MUCH TIMBER LAND IS AT STAKE?

Whatever commercial interests there may legitimately be in these areas of wilderness will thus be carefully safeguarded in this proposed program.

Of course, this is of great importance to those people who are directly affected, and to all of us whom they serve. Yet I cannot refrain from pointing out that the hue and cry raised by the representatives of commercial interests over this proposed wilderness bill sound way out of proportion to the area of land involved and to the value of these lands in the potential production of commercial resources.

In the first place, all the wilderness lands involved make up less than 2½ percent of all our lands.

If we consider our Federal holdings of land and the portion to be thus devoted to wilderness preservation, we see again the reasonableness of this program.

All of the Federal areas involved in the proposed Wilderness System make up less than 5.2 percent of our total Federal holdings. More than two-thirds of this is already in parks, monuments, or refuges and thus already removed from commercial use.

The wilderness bill carefully provides a due process for any additions or enlargements. It is a process that requires 90 days' public notice of any such proposal, by the agency involved, whenever the agency is ready to act or consider action. This notice must be followed by a hearing if there is a demand for the hearing. And finally, after the proposal is adopted, if it is, there are 120 days for congressional review.

These safeguards of due process apply to all areas of Federal land that might be involved, including Alaska, I might emphasize.

AVOIDING DAMAGE IS A PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Thus it seems to me plain that the policy and program to be established by this bill, however we look at it, will not be injurious to any commercial interests.

The wilderness bill has indeed been designed and perfected with the deliberate purpose of thus avoiding damage to other interests.

Furthermore, this bill carefully takes into consideration the various uses that can be made of the actual areas of wilderness which it seeks to protect.

It is not a single-purpose measure but rather seeks to establish a wilderness preservation program that recognizes the multiple uses that can be made of the wilderness areas.

NO CHANGES IN JURISDICTION

This important feature of the wilderness bill is immediately apparent in the fact that no areas will be removed by it from their present classifications or from the custody of their present administrators.

National forest lands continue to be within the national forests and under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service. National park system areas continue as such and under the National Park Service. The refuges and ranges similarly continue as at present under the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Furthermore, each area to be included in the wilderness system will continue to serve its present purpose. Its wilderness preservation will be an aspect of its management for some other concurrent purpose.

A MULTIPLE-PURPOSE WILDERNESS PROGRAM

This is a multiple-purpose wilderness program. The areas within the National park system will continue to be administered for the use and enjoyment of the people. The refuge areas included will continue to be administered, not for recreation as in parks, but for the wildlife. The national forest areas will continue to be administered on the multiple-use principle of the Forest Service, as wilderness but also serving other, consistent purposes.

A great deal has been said about multiple use in the discussions of the wilderness bill.

As a result of the earlier discussions a declaration of the multiple-use policy has been incorporated in the bill itself, in section 1(d), largely in the phraseology of the U.S. Forest Service.

This makes explicit what proponents of the bill had from the start considered to be implicit in the whole program.

It does not, of course, permit anything in a wilderness that would destroy it as such. But it does make clear that an area being preserved as wilderness can serve other purposes also.

WHAT "MULTIPLE USE" MEANS

Despite the fact that so much has been said about multiple use—maybe because so much has been said—multiple use does not seem to be well understood.

Some people seem to think that multiple use means only timber cutting plus a multiplicity of other things, but this is not so.

The Forest Service itself in explaining that national forests are multiple-use areas says that this means that each area yields the combination of uses best suited to public needs.

That is what the wilderness bill means when it directs that the national forests are to be administered—and I quote—“on a multiple-use basis so that all the resources thereof, including the recreational and wildlife habitat resources, will be used and developed to produce a sustained yield of products and services, including the establishment and maintenance of wilderness areas, for the benefit of all the people of this and future generations.”

**THE WILDERNESS BILL GIVES SANCTION TO
MULTIPLE USE**

Far from violating the multiple-use principle, this bill actually gives legal sanction to this principle.

What it means specifically is plain. It means a combination of uses that includes watershed protection, recreation, scientific research, and any others that are consistent with wilderness preservation.

THE NEED AND OPPORTUNITY FOR ACTION NOW

We are indeed fortunate that we still have these remnants of wilderness to preserve. We are fortunate that we have developed a program for their protection and preservation while there is yet a good opportunity to see it adopted without disruption of other interests.

Critics and even friends may chide us for our eagerness and anxiety and say there is no real or pressing need for such legislation now. Yet we can see all about us the mounting pressures.

We can recognize that all our lands are destined to be put to some human use, that no areas of wilderness can be expected to remain as such accidentally, that our only lasting hope for preservation is in the deliberate designation of areas to be preserved.

“DO SOMETHING BEFORE THE HOUSE IS OUT”

As I pointed out 2 years ago, those of us in 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 if we continue to manage our resources on the basis of continuing crises, our entire future will degenerate into a chronic confusion of crises.

The only way we are going to change this is by looking ahead and taking timely action.

That is what this wilderness bill proposes to do.

Instead of waiting until the crisis has engulfed us, we can now, by enacting this measure, 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 purposes also.

It is much better to take such steps now in our present circumstances than to wait for the kind of pressing need for

protective measures that must be accompanied by emergency action, the bitterness of urgent controversy, and the high cost of poor planning.

THE TEST AHEAD OF US

We do well to view thus in the relative calmness of our present opportunity our responsibility for preserving some of our wilderness.

The noted professor of economics at Harvard, John Kenneth Galbraith, in his current best selling book on “The Affluent Society,” underscores the importance of such concerns as we have in wilderness preservation.

The test ahead of us, he concludes, “will be less the effectiveness of our material investment than the effectiveness of our investment in men.”

Dr. Galbraith suggests that the problem ahead of us may be that of “a burgeoning population and of space in which to live with peace and grace.”

It may be “the depletion of the materials which nature has stocked in the earth’s crust and which have been drawn upon more heavily in this century than in all previous time together.”

It may be that of “occupying minds no longer committed to the stockpiling of goods.”

Whatever the problem, says Professor Galbraith, “the basic demand on America will be on its resources of ability, intelligence, and education.”

To have failed to solve the problem of producing goods would have been to continue man in his oldest and most grievous misfortune—

Writes Dr. Galbraith in the closing paragraph of his book.

But to fail to see that we have solved it and to fail to proceed thence to the next task, would be fully as tragic.

We are rightfully proud of our material success, but we have more than material needs. Our young people especially need the experience that comes in unspoiled areas of wilderness. Certainly we should do our best to preserve the areas that are still wilderness, still in our Federal custody, still available for all of us today and for our successors also if we ourselves act responsibly.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that this bill lie over on the desk through the end of this week for the names of additional cosponsors.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent that a detailed explanation of this bill be inserted at this point in the RECORD—exhibit A—along with the full text of the bill itself—exhibit B—and a supplementary memorandum—exhibit C—comprising a selection of letters and statements regarding the wilderness bill plus magazine and newspaper articles, editorials and reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation, bill, and supplementary memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1123) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes, intro-

duced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The explanation, bill, and supplementary memorandum submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follows:

EXHIBIT A

A DESCRIPTION OF THE NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION BILL

In the preparation of this analysis and description I have been greatly aided by a summary of the earlier bill prepared by William Zimmerman, Jr., Washington Representative of Trustees for Conservation, and also by an analysis and series of comments written by Charles Callison, Conservation Director of the National Wildlife Federation.

I wish to express my appreciation to these conservation leaders and to acknowledge my use of their excellent interpretations.

A WILDERNESS POLICY

Section 1 lays down the broad policies for the formation of a national wilderness system.

It is made clear that the preservation of wilderness areas is in the public interest, to serve the public by providing opportunity for recreation, scenic enjoyment, scientific and historical study, and conservation of the primeval environment in such a manner as to preserve the wilderness unimpaired for future use and enjoyment.

Preservation of such areas is declared to be a desirable policy for the health, welfare, knowledge, and happiness of present and future generations.

These wilderness areas will not be locked up for the benefit of a few.

They will be preserved for the Nation, and will be available to any and all persons who want to see and visit and enjoy them.

It is made clear in the very first section that this bill relates to lands now in Federal ownership or control, either by congressional action, as in the national parks, or by administrative action, as in the national forests.

Wilderness areas under various designations are presently reserved and are not open to commercial exploitation.

The wilderness bill would set up standards and procedures for the guidance of the agencies which have been and will continue to be responsible for administration.

All of the areas which will be established as wilderness under this bill will continue to be managed by the bureaus which are now responsible.

In the Department of Agriculture, this is the Forest Service. In the Department of the Interior, these are the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and perhaps the Bureau of Land Management.

No new bureau or administrative agency will be needed. The two departments, acting through the bureaus, will have authority and machinery to carry out the purposes of this act.

They will have the added strength which will come from congressional affirmation of a national policy, clothed in a statute.

Multiple use

One other point in section 1 needs to be considered.

While it is required that the areas in the Wilderness System be so administered as to

preserve their wilderness character, the Congress would for the first time give statutory recognition to the policy of multiple use, particularly as carried out in the national forests.

Of course, this does not mean that every foot of a national forest is susceptible to half a dozen uses.

It does mean that half a dozen uses may be possible within the forest.

And specifically, in this connection, it means an investigation and a finding that certain parts of the forests have their highest and best use as wilderness.

A revision in this section removes the declaration that wilderness shall be paramount and instead substitutes the direct requirement that the wilderness character of the areas involved must be preserved.

The substitute is equally satisfactory for wilderness protection purposes but avoids offending Western water interests especially, who for well understandable reasons, do not want anything considered paramount to watershed protection.

The "policy" section

Section 1 is thus the "policy" section, setting forth principles and purpose.

SUBSECTION 1(A)

Subsection (a) of the opening section in addition to establishing a National Wilderness Preservation System points out the public purposes: "Recreational, scenic, educational, conservation, and historical use and enjoyment."

SUBSECTIONS 1(B) AND 1(C)

Subsection (b) gives additional reasons why wilderness areas must be protected, and subsection (c) declares wilderness preservation for public use to be a policy of Congress.

Areas that qualify, having retained the principal attributes of their primeval character are to be protected in national parks, national forests, national wildlife refuges, or other public lands.

Certain areas are to become part of the System with passage of this bill. Others may be added in accordance with procedures specified later in the bill.

All such areas are to be so administered as to "preserve their wilderness character."

This means the areas are not exclusively for wilderness but that the wilderness values shall be considered of greater importance to the people than, say, logging, or farming, or anything that would destroy these special areas as wilderness.

It does not prevent their use for purposes that will not threaten them as wilderness.

SUBSECTIONS 1(D) AND 1(E)

Subsection (d) approves the policies of "multiple use" and "sustained yield" management that have been developed by the U.S. Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture for the national forests.

A directive that wilderness areas, like other national forest lands, "shall be so managed as to protect and preserve the watersheds, the soil, the beneficial forest and timber growth, and all beneficial vegetative cover," is especially important. This provides for fire control and measures, such as hunting, to keep big game herds in control.

Subsection (e) defines "wilderness," a term that holds different meanings for different people: a place where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. This subsection makes plain that for the practical purposes of this act the term means the areas that are designated in section 2.

THE WILDERNESS SYSTEM

Section 2 states that the wilderness system shall comprise (subject to existing private rights, if any) the federally owned or controlled areas of land and water provided for in this section. The section has six sub-headings:

SUBSECTION 2(A). NATIONAL FOREST WILDERNESS

(a) National forest areas: Areas within the national forests, classified as of June 1, 1958, as wilderness, wild, primitive, or roadless, are included, with the proviso that the Secretary of Agriculture must within 20 years make such boundary modifications of the primitive areas as to exclude any portions not predominantly of wilderness value or add adjacent national forest lands which he determines to be predominantly of wilderness value.

The Secretary by former versions of the bill would have had only 10 years within which to make such modifications, but in order to make sure that there is adequate time for the important investigations involved, the proposed time allowance has been doubled.

If the Secretary desires to include additional areas in the wilderness system he must give at least 90 days public notice and must also hold a hearing if there is demand for one.

A further check on the Secretary is provided in subsection (f), which permits congressional review of changes in wilderness areas, as explained later.

The Forest Service, acting without specific direction by Congress, has already set aside portions of national forests for wilderness preservation.

When first marked out for protection and study, such an area has been called primitive. Next the Service studies the area, revises the boundaries if necessary, and puts it into the wilderness area classification if it contains more than 100,000 acres. Tracts smaller than 100,000 acres are called wild areas.

There are three special areas in the wilderness canoe country of Minnesota that have been given the special designation of roadless areas, and are now grouped as the boundary waters canoe area.

There are now 44 primitive areas in the national forests, with a total of 8,355,983 acres.

An even dozen have been reclassified as wilderness areas and, combined, total 4,725,077 acres.

Twenty-one wild areas have 726,168 acres.

The Minnesota canoe area comprises 1,038,743 acres.

Altogether the primitive, wilderness, wild, and roadless areas total 14,395,971 acres. This is only 8 percent of the 181 million acres in the national forests.

Most of these areas are in high or steep mountain country where logging, grazing, and mining would be restricted anyway to protect the watersheds.

SUBSECTION 2(B). NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM AREAS

(b) National park system areas: The procedures for the national parks are similar to those for national forest areas, but they differ technically, because already, by statute, the parks are dedicated to a related preservation purpose.

An entire park is included in the wilderness system, but the Secretary of the Interior will be permitted to determine what portion of a park or monument may be required for roads, motor trails, and necessary buildings for visitors and administration.

The remainder of each park or monument embracing a block of 5,000 acres or more without roads will then be part of the wilderness system.

This section also includes language which will safeguard the high standards of the National Park Service, in accordance with the National Parks Act of 1916, and subsequent supplementary acts.

In a statement prepared for the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the National Park Service has estimated that there probably are 46 areas in the national

park system (out of a total of 181 units in the system) that would be designated as wilderness.

The Secretary of the Interior would be given 10 years to designate such units and decide what part of each unit should be used for roads, buildings, and other facilities needed to accommodate park visitors. If the Secretary (National Park Service) has not completed the mapping job within 10 years, any national park or monument containing 5,000 acres or more of roadless country would become a part of the wilderness system.

Wilderness preservation has been an established policy that the National Park Service also has developed under acts of Congress creating the national park system.

SUBSECTION 2(C). REFUGES

(c) National wildlife refuges and ranges: Recognizing that not all wildlife refuges and ranges are properly wilderness areas, even though they protect wildlife, the bill provides in this subsection that the Secretary of the Interior include such refuges and ranges, or portions thereof, as he determines proper.

The Secretary will have 5 years within which to make a survey of the refuges and ranges, before he makes this determination.

Only the larger areas would qualify, and even if they were large enough, any areas where water levels and vegetation are artificially controlled or manipulated to produce food and cover for wildlife would not qualify as wilderness.

These are good refuges but not necessarily wilderness.

Only about 20 of the 275 national wildlife refuges and ranges would be in the wilderness system.

SUBSECTION 2(D). THE INDIANS' WILDERNESS

A way is provided in subsection (d) for establishment of wilderness areas on Indian reservations if the Indians so wish.

Such lands really belong to the Indians, not to the public, and are only held in trust by the Government. Wilderness bill sponsors recognize this, and the bill makes it clear that wilderness areas can be established on reservations only if the Indians give their consent.

There is a significant revision here of S. 4028. The revision restores to the wilderness bill its earlier requirement that anything done with the Indians' wilderness must be with their consent.

In S. 4028 last summer the wilderness bill, in response to earlier criticisms, was changed to give authority to the Secretary of the Interior to establish wilderness areas on Indian reservations after "consultation" with the Indians. This was severely criticized—and rightly so, in my opinion.

As before, however, the wilderness bill now requires Indian consent. And it carefully safeguards all Indian rights and privileges.

On some reservations the best and highest use for some portions would be wilderness preservation.

Economically, too, such use would be desirable, for it would bring in more visitors and more cash than would be derived from any other kind of exploitation.

Finally, some of these Indian areas are contiguous to similar areas in national forests or national parks. If these Indian areas are not properly managed, the results could be disastrous for watershed protection and for scenic and other values.

SUBSECTION 2(E). OTHER UNITS

It is conceivable that some other Federal agency, such as the Defense Department, might own or control an area suitable for inclusion in the Wilderness Preservation System. There are a few areas of true wilderness owned by private individuals. It is conceivable that some of these areas might in the future be given or transferred to the

Federal Government for wilderness preservation. Subsection (e) makes it possible to accept such areas.

SUBSECTION 2 (F). ADDITIONS OR OTHER CHANGES

(f) Additions, modifications, and eliminations: This paragraph provides that the responsible officials who have authority to make changes in the wilderness system shall do so only after public notice and shall report the changes to Congress.

The changes become effective at the end of a 120-day period, during which Congress may pass a concurrent resolution opposing the changes.

If the Congress does not act, the changes stand effective.

This paragraph also authorizes the acquisition of private lands within the boundaries of any wilderness unit.

Subsection (f) should be studied carefully. It provides specifically how existing wilderness areas may be changed, or how areas may be added to or eliminated from the System.

Public notice must be given for 90 days. A hearing will be held if there is public demand for it.

Then the change, addition, or elimination can be made only if Congress does not disapprove within 120 days.

In other words, such changes would normally be carried out by the administrative agencies, in accordance with these rules, but Congress would have 120 days in which to take action if necessary.

The public would always be informed. The wilderness bill would not blanket in new areas not now designated as wilderness or primitive in the national forests or not already included within national parks or wildlife refuges.

Additions could be made only through a prolonged, public procedure, and Congress, representing all the people, would have the final say.

The bill would not "freeze" or "lock up" such material resources as timber and minerals for all time.

Congress can abolish or change any wilderness area at any time by passing a bill. The President can open any area for mining if needed in the national interest under section 3(c)(2).

The bill itself provides an orderly procedure for changing wilderness areas. For every lock there is a key.

Wilderness use

Section 3 on "use of the wilderness" is important, for it makes clear that wilderness is for use by the public. This section also, in subsection 3(a), makes plain that the preservation of wilderness is not inconsistent with the purposes for which national parks, national forests, and other units have been established.

These units will be so administered for such other purposes as also to preserve their wilderness character.

SUBSECTION 3 (B). PROTECTION AGAINST WRONG USES

Subsection 3(b) prescribes certain general requirements for the maintenance of wilderness.

No permanent roads, no use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, motorboats or aircraft, and no other mechanical transport or delivery of persons or things, and no structures or installations, including temporary roads, in excess of the minimum required for administration.

SUBSECTION 3 (C). SPECIAL PROVISIONS

However, this section also makes certain exceptions or special provisions, giving recognition to prior established uses in national forests, such as grazing and the use of motorboats.

By the inclusion of one of the Department of Agriculture (Forest Service) recommenda-

tions made at the July 23, 1958, hearings, another special provision authorizes such measures within national forest areas as may be necessary in the control of insects and diseases, subject to conditions deemed desirable by the Secretary of Agriculture.

This subsection in paragraph 3(c)(2) authorizes the President to open specific areas in the national forests for prospecting, mining, or construction of reservoirs and water-conservation works if he finds that such uses will best serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof.

The third paragraph in this subsection relates to the roadless areas in the Superior National Forest which have been the subject of prior special legislation and administrative orders.

Paragraph 4 of these special provisions deals with existing uses on wildlife refuges and ranges. It clearly authorizes the continuation of such uses as are authorized in the Executive order or the legislation establishing such unit.

Paragraph 5, the last in this section, contains language vital to colleagues from the West.

When the first wilderness bill was being discussed, some people felt that its enactment would change existing water laws and would deprive local communities of water, both domestic and irrigation. Although this was certainly not the intention of the sponsors, a short sentence was inserted to remove any doubts. The sentence says:

"Nothing in this act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws."

More lenient than some have thought

This section 3 which spells out the permitted uses of the wilderness areas, is more lenient than many have been led to believe.

It does say, in subsection (b), that use of roads, motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or motorboats, the landing of aircraft or other mechanical transport or delivery of persons or supplies, shall be held to the minimum required for administration of the areas in accordance with the purposes spelled out in the act.

The bill would not, however, close any area to hunting or fishing where these forms of recreation are now permitted.

National parks, of course, have always been closed to hunting, by law, although fishing is permitted. Certain wildlife refuges also are closed to hunting under law. The national forests are open to public hunting and fishing, under State law, except where special sanctuaries are set apart by State action.

Special provisions reiterated

To avoid any possible misunderstandings, it may be well to reiterate and review the special provisions spelled out in section 3 under subsection (c):

1. Grazing and the use of aircraft or motorboats may be continued on any national forest area where now permitted. These uses would be subject to such restrictions as the Chief of the Forest Service deems desirable, but this would not be adding anything new here, because the Forest Service now has the authority to make such restrictions.

The Secretary of Agriculture may permit such measures as he deems necessary for the control of forest insects and disease.

2. The President of the United States could open any national forest wilderness area to prospecting and mining, or permit reservoir construction, in the national interest, including the essential road construction involved.

3. The laws and regulations now in force for the roadless areas in Minnesota are reaffirmed. Where motorboats are now permitted, their use may be continued.

4. Where mineral leasing or other commercial developments are now permitted under the Executive order or law establishing

any national wildlife refuge, such uses may continue.

5. No claim is made to exemption from State water laws on wilderness areas.

SECTION 4

The Wilderness Council

Section 4 establishes the National Wilderness Preservation Council.

The Council is not an administrative agency, and it has no authority over any of the agencies which do have jurisdiction.

It is composed of the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, all three of whom serve ex officio, and three citizen members, to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The citizen members, after the initial terms which are staggered, serve for 6 years. They receive no pay, but are allowed per diem and transportation costs when actually serving.

The Council is intended to bring to a focus our various wilderness interests and to be an information center. It is to be the repository for maps, official papers, and data about the Wilderness System, and it is authorized to coordinate and disseminate information.

The Council is required to present an annual report to the Congress, on its own operations and about the status of the Wilderness System.

The authorization for Council expenses is limited to \$100,000 a year, and disbursements of funds would be made through the Smithsonian Institution, so that no new fiscal machinery need be established.

Section 4(b), which refers to sending the Council copies of regulations for the proper use of wilderness, was formerly a paragraph of section 3(a). It has been transferred in order to have in one section everything that concerns the Council, and especially to make sure that readers interested in the Council, pro or con, will not miss the clear-cut provision that the Council shall have no administrative jurisdiction over any unit of the Wilderness System nor over any agency that does have such jurisdiction.

Another revision, one suggested by the Forest Service spokesman at the July 23, 1958, hearings, provides that each of the Cabinet members on the Council may designate an alternate to serve for him.

Still another change provides that the Council may make surveys—instead of shall make—and may encourage the coordination of such surveys, instead of being required to coordinate.

Some people contend that the Council would be a superagency interfering with the administrative agencies, such as the Forest Service and Park Service, that have responsibility for managing the areas.

The Council would have absolutely no administrative jurisdiction over any area of land. It could issue no orders to, nor countermand any orders of, any agency of government.

Its duties would be factfinding, informational, and advisory only.

Nor would its advice be required. No administrative agency would have to consult this Council before taking any action it wished to take.

The Council would provide a central place where any citizen or any Congressman could go to find out about wilderness areas and wilderness policy, without having to wade through the redtape of 4 or 5 separate bureaus in 2 or more executive departments.

SECTION 5

Section 5 simply provides that this act shall be known as the National Wilderness Preservation Act. It is an act for which the American people will long be thankful, and of which we who here work for its enactment will long be proud.

In the overall view, the wilderness bill does the following important things to protect the public interest in preserving some wilderness areas for public use:

1. It establishes wilderness preservation as a policy of Congress and applies this policy to areas of land, such as parks, national forest, and refuges, where wilderness preservation fits in with other programs.

2. It makes it impossible for a bureau chief or Cabinet officer to abolish a wilderness area, reduce it in size, or add to it, merely by affixing his signature to an Executive order.

3. It gives the general public—the people who own the public lands—a voice in saying what shall be done with the wilderness areas. This voice would be exercised in two ways—at public hearings, and through elected representatives in Congress.

These three things are reasons why the wilderness bill has been proposed, and why it should be enacted.

EXHIBIT B

S. 1123

A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a), 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 federally owned or controlled areas in the United States and its Territories and possessions, retaining their 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, conservation, 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 designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition. The preservation of such designated areas of wilderness is recognized as a desirable policy of the Government of the United States of America for the health, welfare, knowledge, and happiness of its citizens of present and future generations, particularly for those uses of such areas that facilitate recreation and the preservation or restoration of health.

(c) 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, conservation, and historical needs of the people, and (2) to provide for the protection of these areas 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 the principal attributes of their primeval character. It is pursuant to this policy and sanction that the National Wilderness Preservation System is established. The units of this System designated for inclusion by this Act, and those that may later be designated in accordance with its provisions, shall be so protected and ad-

ministered as to preserve their wilderness character.

(d) In establishing thus a National Wilderness Preservation System to include units within the national forests it is further declared to be the policy of Congress to administer the national forests with the general objectives of multiple use and sustained yield, and in order to carry out this policy the Secretary of Agriculture is accordingly directed to administer the national forests on a multiple-use basis so that all the resources thereof, including the recreational and wildlife-habitat resources, will be used and developed to produce a sustained yield of products and services, including the establishment and maintenance of wilderness areas, for the benefit of all the people of this and future generations. Such areas of wilderness, like all other national forest land, shall be so managed as to protect and preserve the watersheds, the soil, the beneficial forest and timber growth, and all beneficial vegetative cover. The purposes of this act are further declared to be within and supplemental to but not in interference with the purposes for which national forests are established as set forth in the act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 34, 35; U.S.C. 475, 551).

(e) 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 untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. For the purposes of this act the term "wilderness" shall include the areas provided for in section 2 of this act and 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 Act as the Wilderness System) shall comprise (subject to existing private rights, if any) the federally owned or controlled areas of land and water provided for in this section and the related airspace reservations.

NATIONAL FOREST AREAS

(a) The Wilderness System shall include as wilderness areas the areas within the national forests classified on June 1, 1958, by the Department of Agriculture or the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, primitive, or roadless.

Provided, That the Wilderness System shall not include any primitive area which the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine to be not predominantly of wilderness value, and each primitive area included in the Wilderness System shall be subject to such boundary modification as the Secretary shall determine to be needed to exclude any portions not predominantly of wilderness value or to add any adjacent national forest lands that are predominantly of wilderness value. Determinations regarding national forest areas classified as primitive shall be made within twenty years after the date of this Act, and any such area regarding which such determinations have not been made shall then, with the exception of any roads, motor trails, structures, or other installations then existing, become a part of the Wilderness System without further regard to this proviso.

Additional areas for inclusion in the Wilderness System may be designated within national forests by the Secretary of Agriculture, after not less than ninety days' public notice and the holding of a public hearing, if there is a demand for such a hearing, and such designations shall take effect as provided in subsection (f) below. The publication of a proposal to add any national forest area or part thereof to the Wilderness System shall segregate the public lands involved from any or all appropriations under the

public-land laws to the extent deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture.

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM AREAS

(b) At the times, in the manner, and with the exceptions hereinafter provided for, the Wilderness System shall include each park and monument in the National Park System on June 1, 1958, embracing a continuous area of five thousand acres or more without roads, and such additional units of the National Park System as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe.

Not later than ten years after the date of this Act, or within two years after the unit has been prescribed for addition to the Wilderness System, whichever is later, and ninety days after giving public notice in accordance with section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 238; 5 U.S.C. 1003), the Secretary of the Interior shall designate within each unit of the National Park System to be included in the Wilderness System such area or areas as he shall determine to be required for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, and administrative installations. Each such unit, with the exception of the particular area or areas determined to be required for the aforesaid purposes, shall become a part of the Wilderness System when the designation of such area or areas has been made. Should the Secretary fail to make such a designation within the time limits specified, each such unit shall then become a part of the Wilderness System, with the exception of roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, and administrative installations then in existence.

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; 16 U.S.C. 1 and the following). 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 historical objects and flora and fauna of the park or monument in its natural condition. Further, the inclusion of any National Park System area within the Wilderness System pursuant to this Act shall in no manner lower the standards evolved for the use and preservation of such National Park System areas in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535, as amended; 16 U.S.C., 1952 edition, sec. 1 and the following), the statutory authority under which the area was created, or any other Act of Congress which might pertain to or affect such National Park System area, including but not limited to, the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225; 16 U.S.C., 1952 edition, sec. 432 and the following), the provisions of title 16, United States Code, 1952 edition, section 796; and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C., 1952 edition, sec. 461 and the following).

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGES AND RANGES

(c) The Wilderness System shall include such wildlife refuges and game ranges, or portions thereof, as the Secretary of the Interior shall designate. Within five years after the date of this Act the Secretary shall survey the refuges and ranges under his jurisdiction on June 1, 1958, and designate for inclusion in the Wilderness System those refuges and ranges, or portions thereof, that he determines to be appropriate. Further, the Secretary shall survey any refuges or ranges added to his jurisdiction after June 1, 1958, to determine if they are, or contain areas that are, suitable for inclusion in the Wilderness System, and shall make such determination and so designate the appropriate refuge, range, or portion thereof, within

two years after the refuge or range is added to his jurisdiction.

Within two years after the designation of any refuge or range in its entirety, and ninety days after giving public notice in accordance with section 4, Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 238; 5 U.S.C. 1003), the Secretary of the Interior shall designate within such refuge or range such area or areas as he shall determine to be required for roads and buildings and other installations for administration and protection of the wildlife, which area or areas shall be excluded from the Wilderness System. Should the Secretary fail to make such designation within the time limit specified, the refuge or range shall then become a part of the Wilderness System, with the exception of any road, building, or other installation for administration and protection then existing.

THE INDIANS' WILDERNESS

(d) The Wilderness System shall include such areas of tribal land on Indian reservations as the Secretary of the Interior may designate as appropriate for inclusion upon the recommendation of or with the consent of the tribes, bands, or groups concerned, acting through their tribal councils or other duly constituted authorities. Such designation shall not change title to the land or any beneficial interest therein, and shall not modify or otherwise affect the Indians' rights to the land.

The Secretary of the Interior shall make any addition, modification, or elimination recommended by any tribal council or other duly constituted authority of any tribe, band, or group with regard to any area of its tribal land.

Nothing in this Act shall in any respect abrogate any treaty with any tribe, band, or group of Indians, or in any way modify or otherwise affect the Indians' hunting and fishing rights or privileges.

OTHER UNITS

(e) The Wilderness System shall also include such units as may be designated within any federally owned or controlled area of land and/or water by the official or officials authorized to determine the use of the lands and waters involved, including any area or areas acquired by gift or bequest by any agency of the Federal Government for preservation as wilderness. The designation of, 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, including, but not limited to, provisions for segregating any public lands involved from any or all forms of appropriation under the public-land laws pending addition of such units to the Wilderness System, and shall take effect as provided in subsection (f) below. Such regulations with regard to any privately owned area given or bequeathed to a Federal agency for preservation as wilderness shall be in accordance with such agreements as shall be made at the time of such gift or bequest.

ADDITIONS, MODIFICATIONS, AND ELIMINATIONS

(f) Any proposed addition to, modification of, or elimination from any area of wilderness established in accordance with this act, and any proposed addition or elimination of any unit to or from the Wilderness System, shall be made only after not less than ninety days' public notice and the holding of a public hearing, if there is a demand for such a hearing, and shall be reported with map and description to Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, or other official or officials having jurisdiction over the lands involved and shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of one hundred and twenty cal-

endar 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 Congress a concurrent resolution opposing such proposed addition, modification, or elimination: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall restrict or affect the authority of officials of the United States, acting pursuant to other law, to establish in the manner prescribed by such law, areas of the National Park System, or to make additions, modifications, or eliminations from any area of such National Park System pursuant to such authority. Within any unit of the Wilderness System the acquisition of any privately owned lands is hereby authorized, and such sums as the Congress may approve for such acquisition are hereby authorized to be appropriated 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 purposes 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 Wilderness System shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area and shall so administer such area for such other purposes as also to preserve its wilderness character. The Wilderness System shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use. All such use shall be in harmony, both in kind and degree, with the wilderness environment and with its preservation.

(b) Except as specially provided in this section, and subject to existing private rights (if any), no portion of any area constituting a unit of the Wilderness System shall be used for any form of commercial enterprise not contemplated in 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 permanent road; nor shall there be any use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or motorboats, or landing of aircraft, nor any other mechanical transport or delivery of persons or supplies, nor any temporary road, 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) Within national forest areas included in the Wilderness System grazing of 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 Secretary of Agriculture deems desirable. Within national forest areas included in the Wilderness System such measures may be taken as may be necessary in the control of insects and diseases, subject to such conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture deems desirable.

(2) Within national forest areas included in the Wilderness System the President may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize prospecting, mining, or the establishment or maintenance of reservoirs and water-conservation works, including the road construction found essential to such mining and reservoir construction, upon his determination that such use in the specific area will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial.

(3) Other provisions of this Act to the contrary notwithstanding, the management of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, formerly designated as the Superior, Little Indian

Sioux, and Caribou roadless areas in the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, shall be in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the general purpose of maintaining, without unnecessary restrictions on other uses, including that of timber, the primitive character of the area, particularly in the vicinity of lakes, streams, and portages: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall preclude the continuance within the area of any already established use of motorboats. Nothing in this act shall modify the restrictions and provisions of the Shipstead-Nolan Act, Public Law 539, Seventy-first Congress, second session, July 10, 1930, and the Humphrey-Thye-Blatnik-Andresen Act, Public Law 607, Eighty-fourth Congress, second session, June 22, 1956, as applying to the Superior National Forest or the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Modifications of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area within the Superior National Forest shall be accomplished in the same manner as provided in section 2 (a) and (f).

(4) Any existing use or form of appropriation authorized or provided for in the Executive order or legislation establishing any national wildlife refuge or range existing on the date of approval of this Act may be continued under such authorization or provision.

(5) Nothing in this Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION COUNCIL

SEC. 4. (a) The National Wilderness Preservation Council is hereby created, to consist ex officio of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and also three citizen members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution may each designate an official of his department or institution to serve as his alternate in the Council. The citizen members shall be persons known to be informed regarding, and interested in the preservation of, wilderness; one of them shall be appointed initially for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 4 years, and one for a term of 6 years. After the expiration of these initial terms, each citizen member shall be appointed for a 6-year term. The President shall designate from among the citizen members a chairman, who shall serve for a 2-year term. The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution shall be ex officio the secretary of the Council and, subject to the Council, shall maintain its headquarters.

(b) Copies of regulations established or issued in connection with the administration of any unit or units of the Wilderness System, copies of any subsequent amendments thereto, and copies of any reports with map and description submitted to Congress regarding additions, modifications, or eliminations in accordance with section 2(f) of this act, shall be forwarded to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council by such official or officials as shall establish or issue them. The Council shall maintain a public file of such copies, but shall have no administrative jurisdiction over any unit in the Wilderness System nor over any agency that does have such jurisdiction.

(c) The Council shall serve as the repository for, and shall maintain available for public inspection, such maps and official papers regarding the Wilderness System as may be filed with it. The Council shall serve as a nonexclusive clearinghouse for exchange of information among the agencies administering areas within the Wilderness System and may make, sponsor, and encourage the coordination of 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 Wilderness System, including information and maps regarding State and other non-Federal areas. The Council is directed to consult with, advise, and invoke the aid of 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 the President for submission to the Congress not later than the tenth day of January, a report on the operations of the Council during the preceding fiscal year and on the status of the Wilderness System at the close of that fiscal year, including an annotated list of the areas included showing their size, location, and administering agency, and shall make such recommendations to Congress as the Council shall deem advisable.

(d) 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 \$50 a day, as reimbursement for expenditures in connection with attending any meeting of the Council. A sum sufficient to pay the necessary expenses of the Council, including printing and binding and rent, not to exceed an annual expenditure of \$100,000, is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Disbursements from such appropriations shall be made by the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution in behalf of 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 as the "National Wilderness Preservation Act."

EXHIBIT C

SUPPLEMENTARY MEMORANDUM—A SELECTION OF REPORTS AND COMMENTS ON THE WILDERNESS BILL

Many individuals, organizations, and publications have endorsed the wilderness bill and have urged its enactment.

An understanding of the widespread interest in and support for this measure would require attention to the many letters and other comments referring to the bill in the 85th Congress. Essentially the same bill is now being reintroduced, in the 86th Congress.

CORRESPONDENCE

Those who have already written their comments to Senators and Representatives in Congress may naturally assume that their endorsements are on record. They may not realize that it will be helpful for them to reiterate their opinions for the benefit of a new Congress.

Accordingly it is well for us to note that such letters were received in great numbers, and selections have appeared in the published transcript of the Senate hearings held in Washington in June of 1957 and July of 1958 and in the West in November of 1958. Such correspondence has also been represented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, particularly February 29, 1956, June 7, 1956, and February 11, 1957.

NEWSPAPER AND MAGAZINE COMMENT

Magazine articles and newspaper editorials reporting favorably on the wilderness bill were also impressively numerous during the 85th Congress and were represented in the printed transcripts of the hearings and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

These included Washington Post editorials on February 2, 1958, and July 6, 1958, entitled "Saving the Wild" and "Land Forever Wild"; a New York Times editorial on July 20, 1958, on "The Wilderness Bill," which "ought certainly to be passed"; a July 11, 1957, editorial in the Minneapolis Star entitled "The Wilderness Bill"; a column in the Denver Post of May 25, 1958, by Cal Queal called "New Kind of Tonic"; an editorial in the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin on "The Wilderness Bill," saying it "deserves support"; an editorial in the January 29, 1958, Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard on "Wilderness in Our National Parks"; a St. Louis Post-Dispatch favorable editorial on March 6, 1958, called "To Preserve Our Heritage"; a Christian Science Monitor editorial of June 14, 1958, entitled "Wilderness Must Be There"; and an editorial in the San Francisco Chronicle of April 14, 1957, entitled "The Wilderness and the Future," saying that the bill offers "truly sound wilderness protection."

ORGANIZATION SUPPORT

Endorsements from conservation and other civic and educational organizations likewise were greatly encouraging during the 85th Congress. It can be assumed with confidence that such support for a bill that is essentially the same as its predecessor will be reiterated.

On pages 120 and 121 of the printed transcript of the July 23, 1958, hearings by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs entitled "National Wilderness Preservation Act," there are listed 80 organizations who have expressed support of the bill. In two categories—national organizations and State, regional, and local organizations—they are as follows:

TWENTY-TWO NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING THE WILDERNESS BILL

AFL-CIO.
American Nature Association.
American Planning and Civil Association.
American Society of Mammalogists.
American White Water Affiliation.
Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.
Council of Conservationists.
Defenders of Furbearers.
Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs.
Garden Club of America.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.
Izaak Walton League of America.
National Audubon Society.
National Council of State Garden Clubs.
National Grange.
National Parks Association.
National Wildlife Federation.
Nature Conservancy.
Sierra Club.
Trustees for Conservation.
The Wilderness Society.
Wildlife Management Institute.

FIFTY-EIGHT STATE, REGIONAL, AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING THE WILDERNESS BILL

Adirondack Mountain Club.
Albuquerque Game Protective Association.
American Bowhunters Association.
American Youth Hostels.
Appalachian Mountain Club.
Beaver County Sportsmen's League.
Billings Rod and Gun Club.
Bird Club of Westfield, N.J.
California Alpine Club.
Cascadians of Yakima.
Citizens Natural Resources Association of Wisconsin.
Conservation Council of Eastern Pennsylvania.

Conservation Forum of New York State.
Desert Protective Council.
Dude Ranchers Association.
East Orange Garden Club.
Federation of Garden Clubs of Virginia, Piedmont District.
Flathead Wildlife, Inc.
Friends of the Forest Preserve.
Friends of the Three Sisters Wilderness.
Friends of the Wilderness.
Garden Club of Virginia.
Georgia Conservation League, Region 3.
Green Mountain Club.
Hawk Mountain Sanctuary Association.
Idaho Wildlife Federation, District 2.
Illinois Audubon Society.
Independent Timbermen's Committee.
IWLA, Wisconsin Division.
MAZAMAS.
Montana Wilderness Association.
Montana Wildlife Federation.
Montclair Bird Club.
The Mountaineers.
The Natural History Society of Eugene.
Natural Resources Council of Illinois.
New York-New Jersey Trail Conference.
New York State Conservation Council.
North Cascade Conservation Council.
North Rocky Mountain Sportsmen's Association.
Obsidians.
Obsidian Princesses.
Oklahoma Garden Club.
Oklahoma Outdoor Council.
Otero County Wildlife Association.
Olympic Park Associates, Inc.
Philadelphia Conservationists, Inc.
Peoria Rod and Gun Club.
President's Quetico-Superior Committee.
Quetico-Superior Council.
Ravalli County Fish and Wildlife Association.
Roamer Hiking Club.
Rock Tavern Rod and Gun Club.
St. Petersburg Audubon Society.
Seattle Audubon Society.
The Tralländers.
Trowel Garden Club.
Washington State Sportsmen's Council.

RECENT COMMENT

Since the adjournment of the 85th Congress, particularly in connection with and as a result of the field hearings held in November, interest in the wilderness bill has increased. Comments from sources previously not heard from have been widely circulated.

Notable among these was an Associated Press feature article by Bem Price dispatched from the Washington, D.C., headquarters but used by many member papers of the Associated Press throughout the country.

The Des Moines (Iowa) Sunday Register for December 21, 1958, ran this article on its front page. It appeared to be the paper's No. 2 item. First was a report on the Atlas satellite with an 8-column banner heading across the page, "Message to Space and Back." Next was a 7-column heading for Bem Price's dispatch entitled "The Great Debate: Are Wilds Doomed?"

The article is as follows:

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register,
Dec. 21, 1958]

"THE GREAT DEBATE: ARE WILDS DOOMED?—
SHARP CLASH OVER USE OF LAST FORESTS—
PRESERVATION SOUGHT IN LEGISLATION

(By Bem Price)

"WASHINGTON, D.C.—For many people the prospect of America exhausting its wild forests where a civilization-battered man can find peace for his soul is almost inconceivable.

"With our exploding population, however, the loss is possible, and therein lie the seeds of a dispute which will affect countless future citizens.

"There are those who would set aside, as this generation's gift to the future, between

50 and 55 million acres of wilderness in 11 Western States and Alaska which remain as the Indians found them thousands of years ago.

"Opponents hold that setting aside these lands would mean locking up potentially valuable assets, with a subsequent loss in taxes and wages from private exploitation. "This is not a new dispute. It has been going on since the late 1860's when a national park was first proposed. Such a park did come into being in 1872. Arguments over such use of public land haven't changed much since.

"Preservation bill

"In each of the last two sessions of Congress efforts were made to pass a national wilderness preservation bill. Another effort probably will be made early in the coming 86th Congress.

"Fifty to 55 million acres appear to be a lot of land until you consider that the United States and Alaska contain 2,309,683,680 acres.

"Of this total the Federal Government owns or controls 477 million acres, including 181 million acres of forest land. About 58 million acres of true, roadless wilderness lands remain in the Nation.

"At present nearly all of the 50 to 55 million acres in the proposed law is restricted by Federal administrative decree to recreational use only. People can move into them by pack train, canoe, or on foot to hunt and fish.

"So what is the fuss about?

"The chief fear of opponents seems to be that once the wilderness preservation principle is established by law, more and more land will be brought under its protection.

"While the opponents generally agree that wilderness preservation is desirable, they object to preservation by an act of Congress—which is much tougher to change than administrative fiat.

"Remote areas

"These forests are administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Forestry Service and the National Park Service.

"Forests which would be protected lie, for the most part, in the high and remote areas of the West where timber cutting, oil exploration, mining, and cattle grazing probably would be arduous and expensive. At least that is what the advocates of the proposal claim.

"An opposition point of view was given by Warwick M. Downing, of Denver, chairman of the oil industry public lands committee.

"Downing said:

"The U.S. Geological Survey recently reported that the public lands have earned \$127,400,000 during the past year. This proposed bill would set aside at least 50 million acres now and probably soon another 50 million acres from which there would be no land revenue.

"The Department of the Interior and the public land States are committed to the doctrine of multiple use. For instance, land can be prospected for oil or for potash, or prospected for mining and used for grazing, or used both for grazing and timber operations.

"There is ample land in the national parks and in a few isolated areas for all wilderness purposes without directly setting aside tremendous areas for limited use."

"Public land revenues

"Downing referred to public land revenues. None of the land which would be set aside as wilderness now produces revenue.

"More than 160,500,000 acres of public lands are now open to grazing, and 77,369,000 are open to mineral, gas, and oil exploitation. These figures represent acres actually under lease.

"Another opposition point of view came from G. R. (Jack) Milburn, of Grassrange,

Mont., president of the American National Cattlemen's Association.

"Milburn recently told a cattlemen's meeting that 'the loss of grazing and other resource harvesting will have a great economic impact on our communities.'

"He argued that the wilderness preservation proposal would mean loss of revenue by the Government from grazing fees and would lower the value of ranches in the area.

"Not adequate consideration

"Milburn, like Downing, warned that the proposal would establish procedures for pulling additional public and private lands into this system of playgrounds for the few.

"W. D. Hagenstein, executive vice president of the Industrial Forestry Association of Portland, Oreg., said the wilderness bill would set aside millions of acres of Federal lands for recreation purposes without adequate consideration of the effect on local economies.

"Why the urge to place these forest lands in escrow by law?

"Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of The Wilderness Society, a nationwide group of conservationists with headquarters here, said in a report to his members:

"Those who have been studying wilderness preservation needs have come to the conclusion that all our land is destined to be put to some human use. The pressures of civilization are such that none of the land can be expected to escape.

"That recognition has led to the further understanding that none of our land can be expected to endure as wilderness accidentally."

"Commercial interests generally have opposed the proposed law. The bill is supported by 22 national organizations, including the AFL-CIO, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Garden Club of America, the National Wildlife Federation, and the American Planning and Civic Association.

"Local support

"There are 58 State, regional, and local organizations also lending support to enactment of the measure.

"In the last Congress the wilderness bill was sponsored by 12 Senators—HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota; RICHARD NEUBERGER, Democrat, Oregon; H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Republican, Maine; KARL MUNDT, Republican, South Dakota; WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, Oregon; PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, Illinois; JAMES MURRAY, Democrat, Montana; ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin; JOSEPH CLARK, Democrat, Pennsylvania; FRANK LAUSCHE, Democrat, Ohio; HENRY JACKSON, Democrat, Washington; and WARREN MAGNUSON, Democrat, Washington. The proposed bill contained this paragraph:

"The Congress recognizes that an increasing population * * * is destined to occupy and modify all areas within the United States * * * except those designated for preservation. * * * The preservation of such areas is recognized as a desirable policy of government * * * for the health, welfare, knowledge, and happiness of its citizens of present and future generations."

"There is no doubt the U.S. population is booming. By the time a baby born January 1, 1959, reaches his 21st birthday, the United States will have between 230,800,000 and 272,600,000 people. Present population is 175 million. At 41, the baby of 1959 will be hemmed in by an estimated 320 million people and all their landscape-cluttering works.

"What would the proposed law do?

"Safeguards cited

"Senator NEUBERGER has said safeguards would be included in the bill to protect the communities which are wholly reliant on national forest timber and other resources for a livelihood.

"The proposal permits grazing in the wilderness lands where such already is the established custom.

"Where recreation facilities exist, they will continue.

"The proposal creates no new bureaucracy save an unpaid advisory council. Those agencies that already administer the lands will continue to do so.

"A number of provisions have been written into the proposal since 1957 to meet objections by western commercial interests.

"Zahniser said, 'Our objective is to design a program that will avoid controversy.'

"Resources group

"Congress created a committee known as the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission.

"This commission is to study the Nation's recreation needs and report 2 years from now. Opponents of the wilderness bill hold that no action should be taken until this commission completes its study.

"Proponents hold that to wait 2 years is just another stalling action; that any report by the commission merely would complement the wilderness preservation bill."

OUTDOOR LIFE

The January 1959 issue of the magazine Outdoor Life has the entire monthly department "Reports from the Field" by Arthur Grahame devoted to an article entitled "Legislation to Watch" and devoted entirely to the wilderness bill. It is as follows:

"LEGISLATION TO WATCH

"(By Arthur Grahame)

"Introduction of legislation which, if enacted into law, will have good or bad effects on hunting and fishing will be a feature of the 1st session of the 86th Congress which convenes this month.

"Early in the session, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (Minnesota) will reintroduce his wilderness bill.

"For the past decade The Wilderness Society has been urging preservation of our remaining sizable areas of wilderness, most of which are federally owned. In 1955 a speech made by Howard Zahniser, the Society's executive secretary, interested Senator HUMPHREY in the project. The following year he introduced his first National Wilderness preservation system bill, but no action was taken on it. He reintroduced it in the 85th Congress. After the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held public hearings on it, he substituted a revised bill designed to meet objections to it.

"Today there are 50 million acres in 163 areas—classified and administered as roadless, wild, wilderness, or primitive—in our national forests, national parks, Federal wildlife refuges and game ranges, and Indian reservations in 28 States and Hawaii. Three quarters of these are in the West, but several in the eastern half of the country are of importance to sportsmen—among them the Moosehorn Wildlife Refuge in Maine, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area in North Carolina, Okefenokee Wildlife Refuge in Georgia, and Delta Wildlife Refuge in Louisiana.

"HUMPHREY's bill doesn't seek removal of these areas from jurisdiction of agencies now administering them to that of some new setup, but seeks to insure that they will remain real wildernesses. The bill would make Federal-owned wilderness areas units in a nationwide wilderness preservation system. Each unit would continue to be managed by the Federal agency that now administers it, and that agency would be responsible to Congress for preserving the area's true wilderness character.

"The law would not make the wilderness system perpetually inviolate by freezing any unit in unchangeable wilderness status.

Areas could be added to the system, modified, or eliminated from it after public hearings and with the consent of Congress. Agencies involved would be given ample time to decide whether or not certain areas now classified as wildernesses should be included permanently in the system, and only areas of predominantly wilderness value would be included. The law would not forbid multiple use of areas, provided such use would not detract from their wilderness character. Grazing, for example, could be continued where it now is permitted. Prospecting and mining would be barred unless the President ruled that they are in the national interest.

"The bill requires that, so far as practicable, machines be kept out of the areas—that road building and the use of motor vehicles, motorboats (including outboards), and aircraft be held to the minimum necessary for protection and efficient management of the areas. But it makes the exception that airplanes and motorboats may continue to be used where they now are established means of transportation.

"Hunting and fishing aren't mentioned in the bill, but its provisions guarantee continuance of hunting in all wilderness areas where it now is permitted, and of fishing in all wilderness areas that have fishable waters. Hunting would be prohibited, as it is now, in national park wilderness areas.

"Some sportsmen are lukewarm in their support of the bill because they think that the ruggedness, and often the cost, of travel and living in wilderness areas limits their use to a few hunters and fishermen. Supporters agree that this, fortunately, is the case, and point out that if such areas were used by many persons they would soon lose their wilderness character. But they insist that areas offering real wilderness hunting and fishing will be an indispensable part of the well-rounded system of recreational facilities, including easily accessible public hunting grounds and fishing waters, that we must develop to get maximum payoff from public lands.

"The revised bill has been approved by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior. But the former has recommended elimination of the provision for a National Wilderness Preservation Council—with an appropriation of up to \$100,000 a year—which would have no administrative authority. Hence, it couldn't be much more than a glorified information center. Some supporters of the bill consider this provision its only weak spot.

"The bill is supported by 22 national and 55 regional, State, and local organizations interested in conservation. Among them are the Izaak Walton League, the Wildlife Management Institute, and the National Wildlife Federation. HUMPHREY says he has received letters endorsing it from every State.

"The bill is opposed by the American Pulpwood Association, American Forestry Association, Industrial Forestry Association, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, and American National Cattlemen's Association. In the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs it has been opposed by Senators Frank A. Barrett, Wyoming, and Arthur V. Watkins and Wallace F. Bennett, both of Utah. Both Barrett and Watkins, incidentally, were defeated in the November elections. It was these Senators' last-minute insistence that additional public hearings be held in the West in November that kept the bill from being voted on before adjournment.

"Senator HUMPHREY expects that his toughest fight will be to get the bill cleared by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He's sure of more than enough bipartisan support to assure its enactment once it gets past the committee.

FIELD & STREAM

The "Conservation" department which Harold Titus edits in the magazine *Field & Stream* included in its January 1959 issue a section entitled "Wilderness Bill." It is as follows:

[From *Field and Stream*, January 1959]

"CONSERVATION

"(Harold Titus)

"Wilderness Bill

"Lawmakers are assembling in Washington for the organization of a new Congress. Before this body will come the usual number of proposals for legislation affecting the Nation's natural resources. At the present time one measure that will be of prime importance to conservationists stands out. This is known as the wilderness bill, designed to establish a wilderness-preservation policy backed up by enabling legislation. It will mark the third appearance of this bill in as many consecutive sessions.

"Four well-attended hearings held in the West 6 weeks ago by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee served to sharpen the lines of those forces which will debate the issue in coming months. The draft of the bill now before Congress appears to be satisfactory to all the public land agencies that are likely to be affected, but evidently it has served only to stimulate the opposition of those commercial interests which dislike the basic idea. Certain timber, grazing and mining groups registered their disapproval at the hearings and gave the other side an idea of what to expect when the actual debate in Congress begins.

"New Members of Congress should be approached and informed of the attitude of conservationists on this measure. In general, the positions of the older legislators is known, but it is possible that newcomers may hold the balance of power when the voting takes place. Conservationists may well ask one another if they are on record with their Senators and Representatives."

THE OREGONIAN

The issues posed before the American public in the field hearings on the wilderness bill were discussed in the (Portland) *Oregonian* on November 13, 1958, by Jalmar Johnson, the paper's associate editor, in an article entitled "Who Shall Have the Say on Wilderness?" It is as follows:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) *Oregonian*,
Nov. 13, 1958]

"WHO SHALL HAVE THE SAY ON WILDERNESS?"

"(By Jalmar Johnson)

"A great many Americans believe that parts of the national forests, as well as the national parks and other Government-owned lands, should be set aside in their natural state. Present and future generations need such areas of true wilderness, unprofaned by the workaday man and his works, in which to commune with nature for the good of both soul and body. Scientists need them as natural laboratories in which to study the interplay of flora and fauna as it exists free from human influence.

"The present bitter dispute over establishment of a national wilderness preservation system is not so much over the need for wilderness preservation, although there is no unanimity even on that, as over the methods of control. The latest national wilderness preservation bill would change the methods of control substantially.

"It would declare wilderness preservation to be a policy of Congress and, in areas included in the system, such preservation would be made paramount to other uses. The wilderness system would include all areas within the national forests classified now by the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless. Within 10

years the Secretary of Agriculture would be permitted to determine which primitive areas are predominantly of wilderness value and to modify boundaries accordingly. (Primitive, wilderness, wild, and roadless areas in the national forests now total 14,395,971 acres, or 8 percent of the total national forest area).

"Congress would have the veto power over any addition to, modification of, or elimination from any wilderness area established. Ninety days' public notice would have to be given of any proposed change and a hearing held if demanded. Congress, however, would have 120 days while in continuous session to pass a concurrent resolution opposing the change.

"In addition, a National Wilderness Preservation Council, consisting of the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and the Smithsonian Institution and three citizens appointed by the President with consent of the Senate, would be created. The Council would be the clearinghouse for the system but would have no administrative jurisdiction over any area.

"The proposed legislation would involve the national parks, national wildlife refuges and ranges and some other lands, as well as the national forests. Indian lands, since they technically belong to the Indians and not to the Government, will be eliminated. It is the proposed law, as it would apply to the national forests, which is of paramount concern to commercial interests in the West, however, since these are the lands which provide valuable natural resources for timbermen, livestock growers, miners, irrigators, etc.

"Hundreds of thousands of words of argument, pro and con, on wilderness preservation currently are being made part of the record of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, cosponsor of S. 4028 (wilderness bill) in the last session of Congress, conducted hearings last Friday at Bend and this Monday in San Francisco. Senator JAMES E. MURRAY and Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON are conducting similar sessions this week at Salt Lake City and Albuquerque.

"At the risk of oversimplification, one might say that the arguments boil down to this:

"Most conservationists want Congress officially to recognize wilderness areas by legislative act and to have the final say in any changes in their borders. They want to make it more difficult for timber operators and others to whittle away at the edges of the wilderness areas. They want all the people of the United States, as represented by Congress and the proposed Wilderness Council, to have a voice in determining which lands should be kept in their wild state and which should yield their timber, grass, water, and minerals to the country's economy. Administrators of the lands, who now make such decisions, are too subject to pressure from those who would use the resources for profit, the bill's proponents argue.

"Commercial interests are for the status quo. They are bitterly opposed to any watering down of the multiple-use principle under which the national forests were established. They don't want Congress, the majority of whose Members come from States where wilderness, timber cutting, grazing, mining, irrigation, etc., are of minor importance, deciding what shall be done with the West's natural resources and every bit of Federal land not yet exploited. They don't want a National Wilderness Council, whose three citizen members might become tubthumpers for inclusion of vast areas of the West in a perpetual forest primeval, telling Congress what it should do. And they point out that only a very small portion of the American public is able to enjoy the wilderness where automobiles may not penetrate.

"Reference was made at the Bend hearing to the famous Three Sisters case of a couple of years ago in which a primitive area was reduced by 53,000 acres by the Forest Service in converting it into a more permanent wilderness area. The reduction was made to provide greater timber resources for mills in the Eugene area. Conservationists fought the proposal strenuously, although 197,000 acres remained in the wilderness area.

"This newspaper at that time expressed the view that the boundary change was in keeping with the forest management philosophy of Gifford Pinchot, patron saint of conservation, who sought the greatest good for the greatest number in the long run. One cannot but wonder whether this wise compromise between conflicting interests would have resulted if a Wilderness Council had then existed to stir up a veto-empowered Congress.

"How different the national and local view may be was demonstrated by two Izaak Walton League statements submitted to Senator NEUBERGER at Bend. A resolution from the national Walton League endorsed the wilderness preservation bill. A statement from the Oregon division of the league said directors did not approve the bill, although they were in substantial agreement with most of the objectives.

"The Oregon division recommended that such legislation should be held in abeyance until the Outdoor Recreational Resources Review Commission, which was set up by the 85th Congress, has made its report, which is due in 1961. That is not a bad idea, though one would be optimistic, indeed, if one seriously believed such a report would settle the controversy."

In its news column the Oregonian had earlier, on November 8, 1958, reported the hearing held in Bend, Oreg., on November 7, 1958, in a special dispatch by its staff correspondent, Phil F. Brogan, as follows:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, Nov. 8, 1958]

"OUTDOOR GROUPS, INDUSTRY SPLIT ON WILDERNESS BILL

"(By Phil F. Brogan, staff correspondent, the Oregonian)

"BEND.—Strongly conflicting views relative to the wilderness bill were expressed by delegations and individuals from the Pacific Northwest at a U.S. Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs hearing here Friday, November 7, 1958.

"Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, presided at the all-day session assisted by Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Republican, of Idaho. The Bend hearing is one of four to be held in the Western States relative to the controversial bill, original version of which was revised.

"Outdoor groups in favor

"Strong views in favor of the bill were voiced by recreationists, outdoor groups, sportsmen clubs, alpine groups, and others. These included the powerful Sierra Club of California with some 10,000 members in the United States, 250 of them in the Northwest.

"A phenomenal population growth in the United States is causing the encroachment of residential, industrial, agricultural, logging, and mining activities on the formerly vast areas of undeveloped wilderness, particularly in the West, Sanford S. Tepfer, Eugene, spokesman for the group, declared.

"From opponents of the measure which concerns a proposal that would give congressional recognition to wilderness preservation as a public land-management concept came condemnation. This opposition came from lumber interests, stockmen, and, among others, the Associated Oregon Industries. Hans Millus, Bend, spokesman for the ACI, declared that 'Legislation of this type is neither desirable nor necessary.' How-

ever, Millus said ACI would not object to legislation which would 'merely give congressional recognition to wilderness use.'

"Churchmen, represented by the Rev. R. Riley Johnson, Episcopal minister from Cheilan, Wash., also entered a strong protest against the bill in behalf of the Protestant Episcopal Missionary District of Spokane, Wash.

"Action can be revoked

"But from other Washington groups came statements from garden clubs, outdoor groups, nature lovers, campers, sportsmen, and others in favor of the bill. Charles D. Hessey, Jr., representing the Cascadians of Yakima, Wash., declared: 'The wilderness bill is not irrevocable. The decision to destroy wilderness is a final choice. Any legal protection we can give to wilderness now Congress can revoke if the national welfare ever demands it.'

"The entire Tribal Council of the Warm Springs Confederated Tribes was present. Tribesmen learned that Indian lands may be withdrawn from the final version of the bill.

"Representatives of the western forest industry declared the wilderness system has created a serious problem for Oregon. He said he had been told wilderness and wild areas in Oregon are greater than the State of Rhode Island.

"Friends of the Three Sisters area, represented by Karl W. Onthank, Eugene, submitted strong support for the bill.

"Several compromise plans were suggested.

"Farm Bureau opposed

"But there was no compromise on the part of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, represented by R. E. Kerr, Eugene. He declared the bill diminishes rather than increases the recreation potential of the country, militates against conservation, and is not necessary and is untimely.

"The Oregon Cattlemen's Association and the Oregon Wool Growers also entered statements in protest of the bill as did the Washington Wool Growers. In support of the bill, Paul Gerhardt, Portland, representing the Trails Club of Oregon, said, 'The strongest case for this bill lies in the aura of the national forests which were initially instituted not for recreation but for timber and water management.'

"The Izaak Walton League of Oregon backed the bill as did Dr. James Kezer of the University of Oregon, who represented the Oregon Academy of Sciences.

"Scores of statements, newspaper editorials, clippings, and telegrams were entered in the record."

SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER

The November 10, 1958, hearing held in San Francisco was reported in the San Francisco Examiner on November 11 in two news items in successive editions with the headings, "Wilderness Area Plan Aired Here" and "Battle of the Wilderness a Standoff." They are as follows:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Nov. 11, 1958]

"WILDERNESS AREA PLAN AIRED HERE

"A seemingly endless procession of witnesses strode up to a wooden armchair in the health building auditorium here yesterday to tell a U.S. Senate hearing how they feel about the so-called wilderness bill.

"The subject matter—a bill on wilderness areas that lost in the last Congress but will be reintroduced next year—generated an almost equal division of opinion from the more than 50 witnesses.

"And among the phrases tossed into the hearing transcript from the opposing sides were: juvenile delinquency, States rights, the camping boom, automation, increased leisure,

America's economic future, grizzly bears, and selfish interests.

"Accuse each other

"By far the most popular of these was selfish interests.

"Each side was prone to accuse the other side of misrepresenting them.

"Those favoring the bill were mainly conservationists and scientists; those opposed represented such resource industries as mining, oil and timber.

"Because 70 men and women had asked to appear at the 1-day hearing, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Oregon Democrat who conducted the long session, imposed a 5-minute limit on all witnesses at the outset.

"Interests conflict

"The bill, of which Senator NEUBERGER was a cosponsor, would designate certain federally owned uninhabited regions as wilderness areas and establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council that would aid in their administration.

"Witnesses representing the resource industries, as well as spokesmen for the State and San Francisco Chambers of Commerce feel that the bill would seriously deter the natural resource development of the West.

"They claim that the benefactors of the bill would be a group of conservationists and hikers representing less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the U.S. population.

"Natural beauty

"The conservationists, on the other hand, argued that to designate wilderness areas for multiple uses—that is, to permit development of natural resources—would be to permit despoliation of natural beauty.

"Among the witnesses were a pretty Mills College sophomore, Fran Leonard, who urged passage of the bill; and Wendell Robie, chairman of the California State Board of Forestry, who opposed the bill as too inflexible.

"Robie and the others said there was no need to change the present machinery for establishing wilderness areas."

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Nov. 11, 1958]

"BATTLE OF THE WILDERNESS A STANDOFF—66 CONSERVATIONISTS, SCIENTISTS HURL WORDS

"Sixty-six citizens—most of them from the Bay area—hurled an assortment of bouquets and brickbats yesterday at a U.S. Senate bill on the future of Federal wilderness areas.

"The occasion was a 1-day hearing at the health center building here on the controversial wilderness bill that would confine certain Federal wilderness to recreational use.

"The hearing—which saw a seemingly endless procession of witnesses give their ideas on the bill—ended up with opinions about equally divided.

"Speaking limited

"Those favoring the bill were mainly conservationists and scientists; those opposed represented such resource industries as mining, oil and timber.

"Because of the large number of men and women asked to appear, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Oregon Democrat, who conducted the long session, imposed a 5-minute limit on all witnesses.

"The bill, of which Senator NEUBERGER was a cosponsor, would designate certain federally owned, uninhabited regions as wilderness areas. It would also establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council that would serve, in effect, as an advisory commission.

"The bill lost in the last Congress, but it is to be reintroduced next year, perhaps in slightly modified form.

"Varied opinions"

"Here are some of the opinions expressed: "David R. Brower, executive director of the Sierra Club:

"Unbridled commercialism born of self-interest is the greatest threat there is to the beauty of America. The wilderness bill provides the bare minimum of restraint which should be imposed upon such commercialism."

"Robert T. Patton, chairman of the public lands committee of the Western Oil and Gas Association, opposing the bill:

"We feel that preservation of wilderness areas for the recreational benefit of our Nation * * * should not be done on a wholesale basis, but should provide for proper utilization of the essential natural resources and other economic values."

"Serious loss"

"Charlotte E. Mauk, a technical editor at the University of California Radiation Laboratory, speaking as an individual:

"A few thousand acres of timberland here or so many square miles of reservoir site there cannot add much to the gross national product * * * but subtracting them from our dwindling wilderness resources amounts to a serious loss.

"We must respect our scenic savings account, lest we become a Nation of poverty in everything but dollars."

"Dr. Russell H. Varian, scientist, inventor, and industrialist, of Palo Alto:

"The significance of wilderness to people lies, along with concepts of beauty and religion, in the category of human values. The wilderness is one of these intangible values of great worth which is in danger of shrinking to the vanishing point."

SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE

The San Francisco Chronicle in a report by David Perlman described the November 10 hearing in a heading which read, "Hot Debate Here on Wilderness Bill." It is as follows:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Nov. 11, 1958]

"HOT DEBATE HERE ON WILDERNESS BILL"

(By David Perlman)

"A bill to preserve wilderness areas in Federal lands, and to protect them against commercial development, generated a lengthy and highly partisan quarrel here yesterday.

"The Federal measure, introduced in the Senate more than 2 years ago, is scheduled to come up again in the new Congress. Washington experts predict it will pass in amended form.

"The Senate's Interior and Insular Affairs Committee held one in a series of field hearings on the bill here yesterday, and 66 witnesses showed up to testify—all with strong and uncompromising points of view.

"Presiding was Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, committee chairman, also attended.

"Ranged against each other at the hearing before an audience of 200 in the Health Department Building, 101 Grove Street, were conservationists from all over the West on one side, and spokesmen for such major industries as oil, timber, mining, and livestock on the other.

"There wasn't much middle ground.

"To the conservationists the proposed bill was essential as a means of stemming the exploitation of America's last remaining wilderness areas—about 2 percent of the country's land area where roads still don't exist and the scenery is unspoiled.

"The conservationists argued that wilderness areas have high scientific value as natural laboratories; that they help protect

watershed resources; that they should be preserved for future generations.

"To the industry spokesmen the bill was an anathema—a piece of special interest legislation designed to lock up critically needed natural resources.

"The measure itself would continue existing machinery for administering the areas already classified as wilderness, but it would also provide that only Congress could remove a tract of land from the wilderness system. It would create an advisory Wilderness Preservation Council to help decide on what lands should be kept intact and what should be opened to development."

SAN FRANCISCO NEWS EDITORIAL

The San Francisco newspapers later commented editorially on the wilderness bill and the hearings it had called forth. The San Francisco News, under the heading "Ah, Wilderness," commented as follows:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) News, Nov. 13, 1958]

"AH, WILDERNESS"

"There are about 50 million acres of wilderness—planned and maintained by nature—left in the United States. They constitute 2 percent of the country. Most of it is in the West.

"This week a U.S. Senate committee held hearings in San Francisco on a bill to preserve the beauty and natural utility of these untouched lands.

"It is said to have an excellent chance of passing and we hope it does.

"The bill adds no new restrictions on mining, logging, and grazing; it simply confirms those that exist and requires congressional approval before an area can be removed from the wilderness category.

"Even the city lover who has no intention of trudging off into the wilds is comforted to know that such unscarred majesty remains.

"Future generations will not be thankful if this generation permits all of the 'original America' to be swallowed by ravenous progress."

CHRONICLE EDITORIAL

The San Francisco Chronicle on November 12, 1958, entitled its editorial on the wilderness bill "One Hundred Million Arguments." It was as follows:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Nov. 12, 1958]

"ONE HUNDRED MILLION ARGUMENTS"

"The best argument for the wilderness-preservation bill which a Senate Interior subcommittee had under hearing in San Francisco this week is found in the latest word from the Census Bureau. It predicts that in the next 21 years this country may grow by almost 100 million in population.

"A prospect like that should wake up the public at large to the fight which conservationist groups are making for a truly effective wilderness reserve. They urge the enactment of a National Wilderness Preservation Act to protect that 2 percent of the Nation's land area, some 50 million acres, where roads still don't exist and the environment is unchanged by man.

"If Congress does not legislate wisely and soon to bar the gates against exploiters of these regions, many of them are certain to be overrun as the population swells to the estimated figure of 272 million by 1980. Once lost, a wilderness is lost forever.

"The key idea of the wilderness bill, S. 4028, is to take the power of opening or closing wilderness lands out of the hands of Federal agencies. Experience has shown that the pressures on them become almost irresistible. So the bill gives Congress alone the power to open up wilderness areas for private exploitation. There is, of course, a great deal of resistance to this idea. The

sparsely populated Western States having the greatest expanses of federally owned land tend to be the most resistant; those with teeming populations the most favorable. Oil, mineral, livestock grazing and timber interests continue to oppose the bill, despite the fact that specific objections they made to its first draft have been accommodated.

"There may be legitimate further accommodations. But there should be no retreat from the main principle of keeping the vanishing American wilderness intact. Unless that decision is made by Congress, we'll find some day that there is no wilderness left, and that the Nation as a whole is relatively strapped for adequate park and recreation land as our cities are now."

PALO ALTO TIMES EDITORIAL

On November 14, 1958, the Daily Palo Alto (Calif.) Times warned editorially "When it's gone it's gone forever." The editorial is as follows:

[From the Daily Palo Alto (Calif.) Times, Nov. 14, 1958]

"WHEN IT'S GONE IT'S GONE FOREVER"

"Let us suppose the conservationists win the fight for Federal legislation setting aside wilderness areas: If at some time in the future the natural resources of those areas are urgently needed for our economy, or for our defense, they will still be available.

"Let us suppose, on the other hand, the multiple use policy is adopted instead. The resources are utilized, recreation facilities are maintained, efficient use is made of the land—but there is no more wilderness. The quality that is gone can never be regained.

"Opponents of the bill which was debated heatedly in San Francisco Monday say they favor preserving the wilderness all right, but that they want it done by more flexible administrative means and in a way that will permit 'proper utilization of the essential natural resources and other economic values'.

"We do not believe this irreplaceable inheritance can be trusted to the decisions of administrators, who are subject to varying pressures. We do not believe that utilizing land is wilderness in the real meaning of the word.

"The bill itself defines wilderness as 'an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain.' It recognizes the multipurpose programs already under way on Federal lands, but undertakes to make sure that one of the multiple uses shall be wilderness preservation.

"Well-regulated exploitation and development can create beautiful recreation areas, but nothing takes the place of virgin mountains, streams, and forests among which man ventures reverently, knowing this is the very America his forefathers loved and that his children's children will rest their eyes on the same beauty.

"It will be a sorry day for the United States when its people must sacrifice this part of their natural heritage."

SALT LAKE TRIBUNE

In Salt Lake City, Utah, the Salt Lake Tribune reported of the November 12 hearing that "in number of speakers at least, it was the opposition that had the edge." This report by Jerry Voros, Tribune staff writer, is as follows:

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune, Nov. 13, 1958]

"OPPOSITIONS RIP WILDERNESS FOREST PROJECT—SUPPORTERS SAY BILL VITAL, 67 EXPLAIN VIEWS IN SALT LAKE"

(By Jerry Voros)

"Supporters of proposed Federal legislation to create wilderness areas which would be maintained with only access allowed by foot

or horse were branded dreamers and wishful thinkers Wednesday by cattle and sheep men, foresters, mining men and water officials.

"During 7 hours of verbal battling before the Senate Insular and Interior Committee, which held a hearing in the Salt Lake City Federal Building, lines were clearly drawn.

"Opponents, among the 67 witnesses which were heard, told the committee that the bill would be class legislation providing land use for only 1 percent of the Nation's population.

"They also claimed the bill ignored the multiple-use concept of present Federal forest management, would create another agency duplicating work now handled by other bureaus, would threaten economies of various areas and would allow for negative legislation.

"Backers of the bill, mostly fish and game officials and organized sports groups, argued action must be taken now to save portions of the Nation's wilderness or it would be too late forever.

"Senator JAMES E. MURRAY (Democrat, Montana) presided at the morning session and at a portion of the afternoon hearing.

"Then Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK (Republican, Idaho) took over.

"Also attending were two newly elected Democratic Senators, FRANK E. (TED) MOSS of Utah, and GALE MCGEE, of Wyoming.

"The district courtroom in which the hearing was held was jammed and scores of persons stood in corridors. A committee clerk estimated 150 persons attended the sessions.

"Utah officials, headed by Gov. George D. Clyde, marched with opponents of the measure.

"Governor Clyde said people in the West are concerned by the bill because of the impact it would have on the future economy and on job opportunities for their children.

"He said the opposition to the bill does not imply opposition to wilderness preservation as a legitimate part of the multiple-use concept. He said the multiple-use concept cannot be too strongly emphasized.

"The resource of first importance, in my book, is water," the Governor said.

"Other Utah officials to state opposition to the bill were Frank J. Allen, director of the Utah State Land Board; Jay R. Bingham, executive director of the Utah Water and Power Board, and C. J. Olsen, director of the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission.

"Supporters included the National Wildlife Federation, the Colorado Department of Fish and Game, The Dude Ranchers' Association, the Wind River (Wyo.) Outfitters' Association, the Utah Wildlife Federation, the Montana State Department of Fish and Game, the Montana Wildlife Federation, a host of local fish and game clubs in Wyoming and Montana and a United Mine Workers local from Rock Springs, Wyo.

"But in number of speakers at least, it was the opposition that had the edge.

"Other opponents of the bill included Rocky Mountain Oil & Gas Association, Vernal Chamber of Commerce, National Wool Growers, Utah Farm Bureau, Utah Wool Growers, North Dakota Oil & Gas Association, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Montana Stockgrowers Association, Utah Cattlemen's Association, Colorado Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

"Others opposed were the Idaho Wool Growers, National Wool Growers Association, Colorado Farm Bureau, the Utah Association of County Officials, the Colorado State Chamber of Commerce, Utah Farmers Union, the Wyoming Natural Resource Board and the Utah Water Users Association."

In the Salt Lake Tribune's Public Forum on November 13, 1958, a letter writer, W. S. Bolton, of Milford, Utah, undertook to correct some misinformation. His letter given the title Save Wilderness, is as follows:

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune, Nov. 13, 1958]

"THE PUBLIC FORUM: SAVE WILDERNESS

"EDITOR, TRIBUNE:

"Contrary to what some special interests will tell you, the wilderness bill is not designed to take away any of the privileges which are already established on the public lands. It does however protect certain public lands from further encroachment by selfish private interests that are concerned only in the pursuit of another dollar, regardless of its source.

"We have many forests and other public lands at the present that are a network of roads and show the scars of so-called progress wherever you turn. It is about time that we protected what we have left so that the generations to follow will not be cheated of their heritage, the untrammelled primitive areas of this great West.

"Regardless of what the various chambers of commerce and other drumbeaters broadcast, it is not progress just because it rings a cash register. When you cut a road across the side of a mountain covered with virgin timber so someone can take a picture from the front seat of a Cadillac, it strikes a decidedly sour note with millions of people.

"If the present trend continues and this bill in some form is not passed, your grandchildren will never know the thrill or satisfaction of penetrating into an area only occasionally visited by man and then without the use of a mechanical vehicle. They will be denied the soul-stirring drama of sitting by a campfire far in the hills without the background of billboards detailing the advantages of twice over television sets for those who wish to watch two old movies at the same time. They will never be able to spend 1 hour, much less an entire day, without the soul-jarring sight of an automobile accident unfolding before their eyes.

"W. S. BOLTON.

"MILFORD, UTAH."

ALBUQUERQUE JOURNAL

The hearings in Albuquerque on November 15 were reported in the Albuquerque Journal of that date by Wayne S. Scott in an article that was entitled "Wilderness Bill Is Called Threat and Advantage." It is as follows:

[From the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal, Nov. 15, 1958]

"WILDERNESS BILL IS CALLED THREAT AND ADVANTAGE—WITNESSES HEARD IN SESSION HERE THROUGHOUT DAY

"(By Wayne S. Scott)

"The bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System was depicted here Friday both as a threat to economy of the West and as a means of providing a retreat from civilization and from the ravages of atomic warfare.

"The conflicting statements were made at a hearing conducted by U.S. Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, a member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has the bill under consideration. Several hundred persons attended the hearing, forcing it to be moved from the Federal courtroom of Judge Waldo Rogers to the larger courtroom on the sixth floor of the Federal Building.

"Forty-two are heard

"Forty-two persons presented testimony during the day. Backers of the bill dipped into the Bible and into poetry to support their contention man needs areas away from

civilization in which to retreat and find spiritual strength. Opponents declared it would hurt the livestock industry, hinder or halt continued development of oil and mining industries, and be in conflict with the multiple use principle of Federal lands.

"Indians offered the additional objection their lands could be declared wilderness, under present wording of the bill, without their consent. ANDERSON assured them this would be changed either to require their consent or to omit Indian lands from the proposed wilderness system.

"The bill, as presently worded, would declare a policy of preserving certain lands as wilderness areas, to include portions of national forests, national parks, wildlife refuges, Indian lands and other lands owned or controlled by the Federal Government. The Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior would have 2 to 10 years to designate Federal lands to be excluded and could later add other lands to the system on 90-day notice. With certain exceptions, roads, motor vehicles and landing fields would be excluded from the wilderness areas.

"The hearing was marked by one flareup between witnesses. This followed endorsement of the bill by Russell L. Hankins of the New Mexico Mountain Club.

"Attacks club

"Otto Hake, of Frank Bond and Son, Inc., which operates a large ranch in northern Sandoval County, asked Hankins' testimony be disregarded. Hake said hiking club members several years ago climbed Redondo Peak, on the Bond ranch, and charged, 'They left gates open and the cattle mixed, and it cost us hundreds of dollars to unmix them. * * * An appeal from an organization that destroys property and makes it hard for us to produce cattle should not be permitted.'

"Hankins angrily denied the charge and challenged Hake to prove gates were left open, property was destroyed and members of the New Mexico Mountain Club were responsible.

"Anderson stepped in at this point to advise club members to talk to Gordon Bond, head of the Bond firm, in an attempt to clear up the difficulty.

"State opposed

"The State of New Mexico was placed on record as opposing the wilderness preservation bill by S. E. Reynolds, State engineer, who said 'it could have serious consequences adversely affecting the economic development' of the State and its citizens. He mentioned several reservoir and irrigation projects present and proposed, in or so near the wilderness areas they would be handicapped if motor vehicles could not be used to reach them.

"The State is anxious to prevent the despoliation of her wilderness areas by commercial activity and to preserve these areas for the enjoyment of all of the people of the United States,' Reynolds declared. But he believed the bill under consideration was not the proper step. He advised actor should wait for the report of the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, which is due in 1961.

"Opposition of the New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau was expressed by John Augustine, secretary. He said that under the bill, a large amount of federally owned land could be set aside as wilderness areas, which he said would in fact be used only by a small portion of the people.

"Asks delay

"He also declared the measure would 'obstruct the special use programs' of national parks, national monuments and wild life refuges and would result in a 'locking up of natural resources in wilderness areas.' He, and almost all other witnesses who opposed

the bill, asked action be delayed until the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has reported.

"Recommendation for 'passage of legislation setting up a wilderness system as one of the multiple uses of the national forests,' was made by the New Mexico Wildlife and Conservation Association. It recommended some changes in the present wording.

"The bill, fortunately, does not interfere with established uses, such as grazing of livestock,' the association said in a statement read by Elliott Barker, former director of the State game department. 'The bill does not impair, but rather enhances, watershed values of the areas. Watershed is, after all, the highest single use to which practically all existing wilderness, wild and primitive areas can be devoted.'

"A wilderness trip of any kind afoot or horseback is inspiring and educational,' Barker said in an individual statement. 'Who would deprive his children and their children after them of enjoying such a wonderful experience? Passage of the Wilderness Preservation Act will preserve that privilege for them.'

"Cattlemen's stand

"W. I. Driggers, president of the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association, declared it considers 'the multiple use of forest and public lands in New Mexico to be of paramount importance to the economic growth and progress of our State.' He said the State's livestock industry had an income of \$126 millions last year, and expects \$150 millions this year. He said the industry has not opposed the million acres now in wilderness, wild and primitive areas in New Mexico, but believes present law gives the Forest Service adequate authority to maintain them and establish new ones if needed.

"In New Mexico, 98 percent of the land area is adaptable only to grazing,' Driggers declared. 'The economy of our State is dependent upon livestock and farming; mining and oil development and all of these industries are dependent upon our public lands. Is it any wonder then that we look upon any move to disrupt the use and productivity of these lands with alarm?'

"Locals 1689 and 794 of the International Association of Machinists and the New Mexico AFL-CIO endorsed the bill in statements read by James Weber.

"We believe people, the general public, as opposed to individuals or groups with special interest, have first priority as to our natural resources,' read the machinists' statement.

"Clyde Ely, publisher of the Silver City Daily Press—in a city near the State's largest wilderness area—endorsed a wilderness bill but called for changes in the present draft.

"Two views

"There appear to be two camps, one unalterably opposed to the ideas of the other,' said Ely. 'It seems to me necessary changes can be made in the bill, and it ought to be passed then. As it stands now, it depends upon the whims of an administrator. We can have a wilderness today, and tomorrow the Secretary of Agriculture may wipe it out.'

"H. Ray Macht, rancher of Pagosa Springs, Colo., said he does not believe a wilderness area should do any harm to the livestock industry, but he called for some assurance grazing privileges will be continued.

"Testimony has been all for or all against the bill,' he said. 'I think we should open our ears and our eyes and our minds and realize there are several sides to this. I think it is necessary for us to compromise.'

THE DENVER POST

The columnist Cal Queal of the Denver Post reported on the hearings in his "Outdoor Empire" column for November 13, 1958, en-

titled "Final Hearing Held." This column by Cal Queal with a significant summary comment on the wilderness bill is as follows:

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Nov. 13, 1958]

"OUTDOOR EMPIRE

"(By Cal Queal)

"Final hearing held

"The last of a series of hearings in the West on the so-called wilderness bill is now under way in Albuquerque, N. Mex. The hearings are an opportunity for a last-ditch effort from opponents of the measure, who were opposed to such hearings until they saw the bill gaining enough support for possible enactment in the last Congress.

"As a delaying move for the bill's opponents, the tactic sort of backfired. Conservation interests have marshaled their forces to testify at the hearings and are making their opinions felt.

"Colorado conservationists are well represented in Albuquerque. Leading a four-man delegation from the State is Dr. Raymond R. Lanier, of Littleton, who is chairman of State parks and wilderness for the Colorado Izaak Waltonians. Also attending are three Denver men: Dr. Ernest Brunquist as a representative of the Colorado Mountain Club; Ed Hilliard, representing the Wildlife Federation, and George Kelly, representing the State's garden clubs.

"Dr. Lanier will present a three-point testimony favoring the bill, which, briefly described, would set aside areas of the Nation where wilderness recreation values would take preference over other uses, such as commercial development.

"Dr. Lanier's three points are these:

"1. The bill for the first time recognizes wilderness areas in the overall theory of land management.

"2. It protects such areas from adverse management decisions (decisions to change a wilderness designation would be given public notice for 90 days, with a hearing if the demand existed, and Congress would be given 120 days to act on the measure). The signature of a bureau chief or Cabinet officer would no longer be enough.

"3. The bill wouldn't impair multiple-use principles of the Forest Service, national parks, etc. It doesn't preclude grazing, mining, and other interests, but would at the same time have wilderness preservation as its major goal. The President can open any area for mining if needed in the national interest.

"Many points in the revised bill are misunderstood, sometimes willfully, by those interests who are fighting it. A few of these points of controversy we will make clear.

"The bill does not set a policy of special privilege or selfish interest. Groups that have made this charge are those who want to use the public lands for commercial purposes and private gain.

"The charge has been made that unreasonably large blocks of land will be pulled out of circulation for special interests, meaning recreationists. Altogether, the primitive, wilderness, wild and roadless areas that may come under the bill account for only 8 percent of the 181 million acres in the national forests. Most of these acres are in high or steep mountain country where logging, grazing, and mining are already restricted to protect the watersheds.

"The wilderness bill would not blanket in new areas not now designated as wilderness or primitive in the national forests, or areas already included within national parks or wildlife refuges. Additions could be made only through a prolonged public procedure, and Congress would have the final say.

"Private rights are protected under the bill. Grazing would be continued on any national forest area where it is now permitted. Reservoir construction or mining development could be permitted as the President deems necessary in the national interest.

"The wilderness preservation council provided for in the measure would have absolutely no administrative jurisdiction over any area of land. Its duties would be fact-finding, informational and advisory only. The council would be composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and three citizens appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

"Charges that the council would be a built-in lobby are unfounded. If it were such, so would be the case for the grazing advisory boards set up for public lands under the Taylor Grazing Act, the State and local committees created by law to run the farm conservation programs, and the advisory board on national parks and historic sites.

"The original bill provided for a council that could conceivably have been called packed for recreation interests, but the revised bill certainly could not.

"The Forest Service had objections to the original bill—valid ones. They were concerned that the original bill would take away authority they must have to manage wilderness areas. This major objection and others have been removed.

"The bill will make wilderness preservation a firm national policy, whereas up to now it has never been recognized as even a legitimate one.

"With the pace of life in America increasing daily, the assurance that there will be a haven from living pressures in the future becomes more important than ever. The wilderness bill will insure that haven."

A week after the last hearing was held in the West, Cal Queal reported in his "Outdoor Empire" column in the Denver Post for November 20, 1958, that the oft-repeated and vague charges of the opponents of the wilderness bill are wearing thin. Cal Queal's November 20 article is as follows:

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Nov. 20, 1958]

"OUTDOOR EMPIRE

"(By Cal Queal)

"It was obvious from the news out of Albuquerque, N. Mex., last week concerning the congressional hearings on the wilderness bill that opponents of the measure were there in force.

"But their oft-repeated and vague charges of 'conservation purism' and 'wildlife radicals' are wearing thin.

"By contrast, the viewpoints presented by supporters of the bill, including several Coloradans, were clear and well taken. The comments of two Colorado men were especially noteworthy.

"One of them was Ed Hilliard, a partner in Denver's Redfield Gunsight Co., who spoke as a member of the hunting industry—sporting goods dealers and manufacturers, motel and dude ranch operators, etc. He's also an outdoorsman, and much of what he said was guided by a close understanding of the problem of land for wildlife. Some of his comments:

"The game management people are being asked to produce more and more with less and less plant. The not-too-distant results of these trends could be the complete unavailability of the types of game that require relatively large tracts of terrain free of human influence."

"Hilliard said he was referring particularly to elk, which in Colorado range through

wilderness and adjoining areas. He points out that timber and livestock industries have alternatives to the wilderness in pursuit of their livelihood, but that there is no alternative for elk.

"The manufacturer said he was not saying that large numbers of hunters use the wilderness.

"I do contend, however," he said, "that the wilderness areas serve as the magnet which attracts hunters and other users to a general area where the wilderness lies. The value or use of the wilderness, therefore, goes far beyond its use with respect to people actually setting foot in it."

"To people who say the wilderness bill goes too far, and that such legislation isn't needed right now, Hilliard had this answer:

"The creation of national parks and national forests occurred far ahead of their time at the beginning of this century. Yet here we are only 60 years later running out, so to speak, of these irreplaceable assets."

"Another interesting viewpoint was presented by H. Ray Macht, of Pagosa Springs, president of the Colorado Wildlife Federation. His remarks were particularly interesting because Macht also is a prominent Colorado stockman. Grazing interests have marveled their top talent to speak against the bill, and it was refreshing to see someone like Macht supporting it.

"Macht runs cattle on land which his grandparents and father ranched before him, and he has a grazing permit on forest land. Here are a few of the things he said:

"My father and I have seen this good country hurt and civilized, but more recently have seen a good gain back to nature and beauty through conservation. * * * This part of the National Forest (a portion near Macht's ranch) is becoming littered, rutted, and very civilized. A few miles from the ranch is a wilderness area—it has remained natural and beautiful.

"No stockman wants to see vital watersheds wasted in any way—whether by overgrazing, by fire, or by erosion caused by wheel tracks and jeep roads. I believe protection by the wilderness legislation is a good answer to these problems.

"They (federation members) have assured me that their primary aim is to have something left in a wild form for their children and grandchildren to enjoy, as they enjoy it."

"That's a stockman speaking. We can't help but think there are many more like Macht, who have feelings on the matter entirely different from those of most livestock representatives who appeared at the hearings.

"Here are some charges opponents of the bill have used, along with the answers that take the starch out of them:

"There is the charge that grazing, and therefore the livestock economy of the West would suffer. In fact, there will be no change in the administration of wilderness areas regarding grazing privileges. Where grazing is now permitted, it will continue to be permitted, and under the jurisdiction of the forest service as in the past.

"The logging interests have objected. In fact, logging has never been carried out in wilderness areas, and there would be no change in this policy under the wilderness bill.

"Prospecting, mining and construction of water impoundments could be authorized in the areas when they were deemed to be in the national interest.

"Finally, the bill would create no new wilderness areas, but would add the protection of Congress to a land management system in effect since the early 1930's.

"The various opponents of the bill know these things, but have set up a smoke screen around the arguments for another reason. They know that when they want to move in on a wilderness area in the future, it's going to be a little bit tougher than it used to be.

"Considering that the lands concerned comprise only 2 percent of the Nation's acreage, and only 8 percent of national forest acreage, it should be tough—real tough—to take them over for private gain."

NATURE MAGAZINE EDITORIAL

Editorials in Nature magazine and in The Living Wilderness have commented significantly on the public interest in the wilderness bill, particularly with a bearing on the field hearings held in the West. The Nature magazine editorial in its November 1958, issue entitled "Speaking of Wilderness," is as follows:

[From Nature magazine, November 1958]

"SPEAKING OF WILDERNESS"

"When Chairman JAMES E. MURRAY of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, announced recently a series of field hearings on the wilderness bill in the West, he issued conservationists a challenge that they should be prompt in accepting and meeting.

"The hearings have been scheduled for Bend, Oreg., November 7, San Francisco, November 10, Salt Lake City, November 12, and Albuquerque, November 14. Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER will conduct the Bend and San Francisco hearings, Senator MURRAY himself the hearings in Salt Lake City, and Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON the final one in Albuquerque.

"We can be sure that those opposed to making wilderness preservation a firm national policy will do their best at the hearings to attack this measure, which conservation forces have been developing for more than a decade. It is a proposal that has been designed to fit into existing programs and to avoid conflict with other interests, but so far the representatives of the other interests involved have seemed slow to recognize this. If they still are unconvinced by November we can expect to see them at the field hearings in November—stockmen, lumbermen, mining interests, and others—objecting vociferously to this sound proposal to save some of our national lands for wilderness.

"Conservationists must accordingly be sure to be at these hearings in force, ready to demonstrate that Americans really are interested in wilderness, ready to point out that this is indeed a reasonable program that does not harm lumbermen or other interests, and prepared to urge that it be enacted as promptly as possible while our wilderness preservation opportunity is still here.

"Senator MURRAY, himself a friend and co-sponsor of the wilderness bill, has acted with commendable promptness and decision in taking opponents of the bill at their word and scheduling this series of hearings in their own western regional centers.

"When proponents of the wilderness bill, a year earlier, sought to have field hearings arranged, Senators opposing the measure objected. Apparently they did not want to have the bill publicized and given the advantage of such hearings.

"When, however, widespread public interest in the legislation was apparent and its opponents faced the possibility of enactment in the 85th Congress, the prospect of hearings that could not be held until after Congress' adjournment seemed very enticing indeed.

"Insistence upon hearings in the West," as Conservation Director Charles Callison, of the National Wildlife Federation puts it, "was a final maneuver by opponents to prevent action on this important legislation in the 85th Congress."

"But even as American Forests, a perennially imaginative fault-finder as far as the wilderness bill is concerned, admits, the proponents of the bill withdrew from the 85th Congress 'in good order with their hand visibly strengthened for a renewed assault next session.' Enactment in the 86th Con-

gress was predicted by many, and the field hearings to be held during the congressional recess were recognized as a live transition to the 86th Congress.

"It is indeed time to see this wilderness policy and program finally enacted. More than 7 years ago it was, on our June-July 1951 editorial page, that we first enlisted in its support. 'The time has come,' we said then, 'to move positively and translate the wilderness thinking into specific terms of legislation.' We saw this then as an opportunity and a challenge to shift from the defensive to the offensive, and we have since continued to urge it along as an outstandingly important constructive program.

"The bill is needed because without its congressional sanctions the administrative programs so far successful cannot be counted on to endure in the face of pressures that obviously are increasing. It is urgent because the opportunity now to establish a wilderness policy and program without conflict cannot be expected to last.

"These are understandings that conservationists have had for some time. It is time now that they express them forcefully. These hearings offer each of us who resides within the Western States an excellent personal opportunity to do so.

"As Senator MURRAY has suggested, everyone interested in testifying should notify him at once—Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington 25, D.C.—and tell him where the statement should be made—Bend, Oreg., November 7; San Francisco, Calif., November 10; Salt Lake City, Utah, November 12; or Albuquerque, N. Mex., November 14.

"Those unable to attend hearings are invited to send statements to Chairman MURRAY and indicate at which hearing they should be entered in the record.

"Thus by written statement, or better still by testimony, every conservationist in these Western States is given a personal opportunity to stand up and be heard in support of preserving some of our American wilderness wild and unspoiled."

It is interesting to note that, perhaps somewhat facetiously, the editor of Nature magazine, Richard W. Westwood, commented in his "Contents Noted by the Editor" department in his February 1959 magazine that political good fortune seemed to have been coincidental with sponsorship of the wilderness bill. Mr. Westwood's good-natured comment is as follows:

[From Nature magazine, February 1959]

"CONTENTS NOTED BY THE EDITOR"

"Conservation's gains or losses in the 86th Congress are not yet completely assessable. No doubt there are Members of the new Congress not well informed on conservation issues, as well as others who have a good background in our field of interest. It is, no doubt, coincidence, but it is interesting to note that none of the many sponsors of the wilderness bill, whether Senator or Representative, Republican or Democrat, male or female, failed to return to the 86th Congress. On the other hand, some of the most active opponents of this legislation fell by the wayside in the last November election.

"R. W. W."

THE LIVING WILDERNESS

The Living Wilderness, published by The Wilderness Society, saw the field hearings as a challenge and an opportunity. The editorial in the magazine's Summer-Fall, 1958, issue was accordingly entitled "Challenge and Opportunity."

It was followed in the magazine by a detailed report entitled "Wilderness Bill Hearings" which included a summary of the testimony both against and for the measure at the July 23, 1958, hearings in Washington, D.C. These hearings have since been

printed by the committee and, thus available, make it unnecessary to present here the hearing report in *The Living Wilderness*, but it may be noted that this report, followed by the full text of the bill, did appear in the magazine's Summer-Fall 1958 issue on pages 34 to 45 inclusive and is there for reference.

The editorial in that issue is as follows:

[From the *Living Wilderness*, summer-fall 1958]

"CHALLENGE AND OPPORTUNITY"

"Conservationists who want wilderness preservation to become a basic national policy in the United States are facing one of the most striking challenges they have yet known.

"They are facing the challenge—and opportunity—of a series of four public hearings to determine what public opinion on wilderness preservation really is.

"These hearings will be held by the chairman and two other key members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

"They will be held in regional centers of the West—in Bend, Oreg., San Francisco, Salt Lake City, and Albuquerque, on November 7, 10, 12, and 14.

"Subject of the hearings will be the revised wilderness bill—S. 4028—a measure to establish a national wilderness policy and program.

"At stake will be prospects for enacting this measure in the 86th Congress.

"As reported in the 'News Item Feature' beginning on page 34 of this magazine, the revised wilderness bill was the subject of Washington, D.C., hearings held on July 23, 1958, especially for the agencies and organizations who had opposed the bill before its revision. These hearings revealed favorable changes on the part of Federal agencies and some organizations. Others reiterated opposition, although in some cases commending the revisions.

"Immediate outcome was the decision to hold field hearings, insisted upon by opposing Senators. This ended progress toward enactment in the 85th Congress, but, far from defeat, provided a vital transition to the 86th Congress.

"Responding to this challenge, realizing the opportunity, will require participation in these hearings by all who can and will represent the public interest in wilderness preservation.

"The organizations and individuals concerned should write at once to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Washington 25, D.C., and arrange to appear at one or another of the hearings.

"Two things that wilderness bill supporters will want to know in preparation for these hearings—what are the objections and what is proposed—are presented in the 'News Item Feature' in this magazine.

"The detailed reports of testimony at the July 23, 1958, hearings provide an insight into the opposition.

"As to what is proposed and why, the bill itself is the best answer. In the words of its chief sponsor in the Senate, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, 'the bill speaks plainly its own purposes and intentions.' Its complete text is on the concluding four pages of this magazine and well merits careful reading in full by all who are concerned with wilderness.

"Aware of the nature of their opposition, familiar with the proposal they support, conservationists who want wilderness preservation to become a basic national policy can well be expected to make the November 1958 field hearings on the wilderness bill a significant series indeed."

In its Autumn 1958 issue, published after the November field hearings had been held,

The Living Wilderness in its News Items of Interest department carried a report of the hearings released by the National Wildlife Federation in its *Conservation News* for December 1, 1958, "Wilderness Bill Hearings," as follows:

[From the *Living Wilderness*, autumn 1958]

"WILDERNESS BILL FIELD HEARINGS"

"Surprising public support for the wilderness bill was disclosed in the field hearings held in four western cities in November, the National Wildlife Federation's *Conservation News* reported on December 1, 1958. While uncovering little new about the lineup of organized support and organized opposition, the *News* said 'the hearings did reveal an amount of public interest and a volume of support from the general public that surprised both the sponsors and the organized opposition.'

"The hearings were held on the revised Senate bill 4028 by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, in Bend, Oreg., November 7; San Francisco, November 10; Salt Lake City, November 12, and Albuquerque, November 14, 1958.

"The text of the *News* report follows:

"Public hearings held on the wilderness bill in four western cities last month disclosed little new about the lineup of organized support and organized opposition.

"Conservation groups unanimously urged passage of legislation, although some did not endorse all details of S. 4028, the latest version of the bill and the draft upon which the hearings were conducted.

"Trade association spokesmen representing the timber, oil, mining, and livestock industries—commercial users of the public lands—generally were opposed. As in the past many of their statements bore little relationship to the actual language and purpose of the pending legislation.

"The hearings did reveal an amount of public interest and a volume of support from the general public that surprised both the sponsors and the organized opposition. The following interesting sidelight, for example, was reported by F. Ross Brown, vice president of the National Wildlife Federation, who attended the hearing at Bend, Oreg.:

"A young lady representing the Junior High School of LaPine, Oreg., made a fervent appeal for enactment of the bill as a means of preserving these (wilderness) areas for her generation. She was followed by the president of the Junior Izaak Walton League club of Blue River on the Mackenzie. His statement also indicated the young people of this area feel they have an interest in the preservation of some of America's remnants of true wilderness."

"Letters 50 to 1 in favor of bill"

"Unattached witnesses supporting the bill, speaking only as interested citizens, showed up also at the other hearings. But the one-sided aspect of general public sentiment was demonstrated most clearly in the large volume of written statements and telegrams sent to the hearings for inclusion in the printed record. These came from people who didn't have travel expenses paid by an organization and who could not personally afford the time and cost of attending in person.

"Benton J. Stong, the official of the Senate Interior Committee who managed arrangements and details of the hearings, said more than 350 written statements and telegrams were received for the record at Bend. Similar communications numbered 315 at San Francisco, 299 at Salt Lake City, and 185 at Albuquerque.

"The communications, totaling well over 1,100, ran in the proportion of 50 to 1 in favor of the wilderness bill.

"It was difficult to classify all of the witnesses definitely as either pro or con because

some declared they were in favor of wilderness legislation but opposed to features of the pending bill. However, observers attending the Bend hearing estimated that of the 69 witnesses heard that day, a majority were in favor of S. 4028. Proponents had a definite edge among the 66 who testified at San Francisco, November 10. On the other hand, opponents who clearly outnumbered the advocates at Salt Lake City were cattlemen, irrigation groups, Chamber of Commerce officials, and Utah politicians who ganged up to denounce the measures. Opponents may have had a slight edge in numbers among the 42 witnesses at Albuquerque, November 14.

"Stockmen praise forest service"

"Opposing arguments echoed and re-echoed phrases like 'locking up natural resources,' 'class legislation,' and 'threat to development of the West,' according to William L. Reavley, of Salt Lake City, who attended all the hearings except the one at Bend.

"While such phrases were common, the idea also was expressed by the opposition that the present wilderness administration is quite all right and for the most part entirely adequate," Reavley reported. "The Forest Service received a great deal of praise at each hearing, particularly from the livestock groups. This is an entirely new refrain for the stockmen who in the past have denounced the Service as despotic and who have sponsored legislation to handcuff the Federal agency or take the grazing lands away from it."

"The stockmen said the bill proposes to eliminate grazing from the public lands, which it would not do. S. 4028 contains specific language protecting all existing grazing privileges, even on national forests wilderness areas.

"The loggers said it would 'create' or 'blanket in' huge new wilderness areas, which it would not do. Only areas already classified as 'wilderness,' 'wild,' or 'primitive' in the national forests and where logging is presently excluded, plus parts of certain national parks and wildlife refuges, would be affected. Additional wilderness areas could be established only through a long process involving public hearings and consideration by Congress.

"One Utah witness, representing county government, even testified the measure would remove lands from local taxation, something that could not happen because the bill applies only to lands already in public ownership.

"ORRR Commission used as opposition tool"

"A favorite argument, repeated by innumerable opposition witnesses, was that wilderness legislation should be delayed until the new Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, created by the last Congress, completes its study 3 years hence. It is now clear that some of the leading congressional opponents of wilderness preservation actively supported the ORRR Act as a means of blocking the wilderness bill. This has been confirmed by the actions of Senators ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, and FRANK A. BARRETT, of Wyoming, who passed up the hearings in order to attend a meeting of the ORRR Commission in Washington, D.C., November 11 and 12. Both worked for the ORRR bill and subsequently were appointed as Senate members of the Commission. At the November meeting, they tried to get the new Commission to go on record opposing early enactment of the wilderness bill. They failed. Both Watkins and Barrett have been outspoken opponents of wilderness legislation. Both were defeated for reelection and therefore must relinquish their posts on the ORRR Commission when their terms expire December 31.

"Objectors ignore changes in bill

"The fact that sponsors of the bill have modified the original version to remove objections and to protect existing private rights seems to have little effect on the opposition," Reavley reported. "The trend of the testimony indicates that many commercial organizations in the West are going to fight any bill recognizing wilderness. Their arguments went beyond the bill in many cases and discussed the entire philosophy of public lands.

"Some presented arrays of figures to show how much of the West is under the rigid hand of Uncle Sam and how much this retards progress. It was stated that government closer to home will produce better management of the resources. Another thought expressed was that each State should have the resources of the land within its boundaries developed exclusively for local use and not in any pattern of national need.

"Although much testimony appeared to miss the mark entirely, there were many witnesses who showed they had studied the bill carefully. Several suggested amendments they thought would make it more palatable. Some said S. 4028 doesn't go far enough and recommended strengthening amendments. Presiding Senators gave Indian representatives assurance that a section of the bill affecting their reservations would be changed, either by taking it entirely out of the bill or modifying it to require consent by the Indians rather than mere consultation.

"After the smoke cleared away the testimony of proponents could be boiled down something like this: They contend that wilderness recreation and enjoyment is one of the several multiple uses of the public lands and that wilderness values will be destroyed unless protected for that purpose. They contend this principle of multiple use, including wilderness, should be recognized by Congress rather than depend on mere administrative policy established and subject to change by a Secretary of Agriculture or other executive official. In essence, they believe this is about all S. 4028 does."

"Hearings endorsed as democratic way

In his summary NWF Vice President Brown said the Bend hearing was "a practical demonstration of a democratic way of handling questions concerning our wilderness areas, national parks, and wildlife refuges."

"The new bill to be enacted in Congress should, therefore, provide that after the national policy is established and boundaries for these areas set up, they should be changed only by legislative action that includes public hearings," Brown wrote.

"It is apparent that the extremists on the wilderness question have reconciled themselves to a more multiple-use policy and have shown a fine attitude of compromise. Other conservation organizations, who perhaps have been thinking too liberally, now seem generally agreed that the last version (S. 4028) is a very good one.

"The opposition, while admitting the desirability of wilderness preservation, seem to oppose any national legislation for fear it will restrict their sphere of influence and make it more difficult for selfish interests to invade these areas.

"Finally, such hearings as this one at Bend certainly should be beneficial in educating the general public and should definitely increase the support for a wilderness bill."

"Veteran Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, presided himself at the Salt Lake City hearing. Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, conducted the Bend and San Francisco hearings, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, presided at Albuquerque. Senator

HENRY DWORSHAK attended the Bend and Salt Lake City hearings. Two newly elected U.S. Senators attended the Salt Lake session. They were FRANK E. MOSS, of Utah, and GALE W. MCGEE, of Wyoming.

"The wilderness bill, probably somewhat revised as a result of the recent hearings, will be reintroduced shortly after the 86th Congress convenes in January. It will then have a number different from the present S. 4028."

In its Autumn 1958 issue *The Living Wilderness* also noted the opposition to the wilderness bill expressed at the field hearings and subsequently by "those who have a commercial interest in making use of these wilderness lands," and commented as follows in an editorial entitled "If We Have To."

[From the *Living Wilderness*, autumn 1958]

"IF WE HAVE TO

"Advocates of the proposed National Wilderness Preservation Act have earnestly endeavored to avoid controversy and to see a national policy established through constructive cooperative efforts on the part of all concerned. They have espoused a bill that does not interfere with current uses of the areas involved but rather fits wilderness preservation into an overall program that includes other interests, too.

"Nevertheless responsible foresters, livestockmen, and others with commercial concerns seem determined to fight the proposal. As one long-experienced Federal official remarked with regard to the evidence of the field hearings in the West in November (reported on p. 30 of this magazine), those who have a commercial interest in making use of these wilderness lands, either now or in a future that they anticipate, are opposed to the bill, while all the rest of the interested public seems overwhelmingly in favor of it.

"Advocates of the measure, however, have shown no disposition to abandon the reasonableness of their proposal or attitude. On the contrary, they have maintained their confidence that responsible legislators and executives who are called on to resolve controversy into legislation can be expected to recognize the reasonableness and identify the opposition for what it is.

"But those urging action can hardly continue longer to spend valuable time meeting objections outlined by opponents only to find that when the objections have been met the opposition continues. Reluctant as they may be to do so, the advocates of the bill must now recognize that some controversy is inevitable, and they must press on earnestly in the public interest as they see it.

"There is, of course, considerable satisfaction in having made every effort to be cooperative and constructive—in having, as it were, proved the inevitability of opposition and controversy.

"There is also great encouragement in having evoked from the resulting public discussions such testimony as Martha Ann Platt's at Bend, Oreg., when representing the Mazamas she commended the wilderness bill's 'nobility of concept' and commented that 'in this age of intense commercialization and fierce competition it is refreshing and stimulating to have a practical yet idealistic concept presented that insures permanent wilderness treasures for everyone.'

"If the process of making idealism practical must itself share the age's fierce competition, the conservationists who long ago learned to fight for the freedom of the wilderness can certainly be expected to meet the challenge."

SIERRA CLUB BULLETIN

A final example of public comment on the wilderness bill, particularly on the western field hearings, that will be of interest and help to Members of the Senate and

others interested is found in the *Sierra Club Bulletin* in a feature entitled "Wilderness Hearings—Report and Reply," on pages 11 and 12 of its January 1959 issue. This publication, issued by the Sierra Club from its San Francisco headquarters, first reprints a New York Times dispatch from Salt Lake City by Jack Goodman and follows this by a reply: Wilderness needs an automatic stay of invasion, first written as a letter to the New York Times by David R. Brower, executive director of the Sierra Club. This feature, comprising the New York Times dispatch and Mr. Brower's letter, is as follows:

[From *Sierra Club Bulletin*, January 1959]

"SENATE SCOUTS EXPLORE WESTERN WILDS

"(Late in November the New York Times published a report on the Senate field hearings on S. 4028 that troubled many people. The days passed by and no replies were published. Finally an official of the Times suggested that the club's executive director reply, which he did. Unfortunately the New York newspaper strike arrived at the same time. Seeing that the interim between report and reply would be too long, the Times has given the Sierra Club permission to reprint the report. David Brower's reply follows the report.—EDITOR.)

"By JACK GOODMAN

"SALT LAKE CITY.—Members of the Insular and Interior Committee of the U.S. Senate have been riding circuit this month—holding public hearings to determine whether there is a need for the establishment of a national wilderness preservation system to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness. If such a system were to be established it would be administered by a specially created council or agency.

"In hearings conducted in California, Utah, and New Mexico in the last few weeks, supporters of the wilderness bill have thus far found themselves out-talked by water users who say the measure would seriously limit future power and agricultural developments; by foresters who say the bill would trim the timber potential; mining men who state natural resources would be locked up forever; and by sheep and cattle men who view the proposed Senate bill, S. 4028, as a threat to their livelihood.

"The touring Senators gave ear to a variety of groups, including representatives of the Dude Ranchers' Association who rode in from the range (aboard commercial airliners) to plead for more wilderness. Official representatives of such sportsmen's groups as the Utah Wildlife Federation and the Jackson Hole Chapter of Izaak Walton League as well as a wilderness-minded, semi-bearded poet all turned up at Salt Lake City hearings to argue for the preservation of the type of countryside that is getting to be in short supply.

"In response to appeals of this kind, however, Montana Rancher J. S. Brenner referred to wishful thinking and daydreaming, and added: 'Most of us share delusions of being pathfinders and feel we were born 100 years too late. We picture ourselves leading great explorations, trapping and hunting expeditions and Indian battles. But we can't bring back those cherished days by legislation and it seems rather pathetically useless to try.'

"Better hunting

"The Wind River Outfitters' Association, represented at the Salt Lake City hearings by Rancher Leslie E. Shoemaker, advocated the perpetuation of big game herds in our area in the interest of better hunting, and therefore favored enactment of the wilderness bill without reservations. But bemused Senators, at the jam-packed session in Salt Lake's Federal Building, moments later

heard another rangeland expert maintain that too much wilderness of the positive sort can and does lead to concentrations of elk that destroy feed and eventually destroy themselves through starvation.

"State land board and forestry officials, declaring that too much wild West was too much of a good thing, said that the wilderness envisioned by don't-destroy-the-scenery advocates would itself be destructive of scenic areas. And C. T. Olsen, former U.S. Forest Service supervisor who is currently Utah State Park and Recreation Commission director, warned that control of insect invasions and fire is extremely difficult in roadless wilderness of the type under discussion.

"Discussing a proposed airspace limitation which would bar flights over primitive areas, Utah's Gov. George D. Clyde called the notion ridiculous and said other provisions of the proposed measure violate the rights of Utah's Indians. He cited studies indicating that few recreation seekers now penetrate existing wilderness preserves, and asserted that the proposed wilderness preservation, superimposed on existing and adequate administering agencies, would be a single-interest council, serving no useful purpose, but adding to the burden of expense.'

"The Governor, along with both opponents and proponents of the wilderness bill, drew attention to the fact that wilderness areas, primitive areas, wild areas, and roadless areas already exist under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service, along with wilderness areas within the national parks. It was made plain that fewer than 2 percent of all recreation seekers seem aware of the existence of such areas—a matter that irks many westerners.

"One Montana stockman, discussing the fortunate few who have time and money to hire professional packers and outfitters, asked: How about the average citizen? The easterner or westerner with a short vacation can only drive by these sacrosanct areas at a respectful distance and try to imagine the scenery, the hunting and fishing delights of roadless country. That can by no stretch of the imagination be called democracy, nor can it be honestly claimed to be preserved for all the people.'

"Chiefly under scrutiny at the Senate committee hearings are the 78 wildlands areas, comprising 14 million acres, administered by the U.S. Forest Service. Except for a relatively few areas heavily used by the public, the flora and fauna and historical values of the national parks in the West are already preserved in perpetuity, with grazing, lumbering and mining to all intents and purposes prohibited.

"Better conservation

"The situation regarding the 181 million acres of U.S. Forest Service lands—except for the present wilderness areas—is very different, because of multiple-use provisions applying to most Forest Service lands. Under the multiple-use philosophy, national forests are open to selective timbering, with efforts made to preserve scenic values while insuring a monetary return from the publicly owned forests.

"Advocates of this policy say cutting mature timber and planting and protection of new growth is "better conservation" than the wilderness philosophy practiced in national parks under which fallen timber may be left to rot, spread disease or cause fire hazards.

"Under the multiple-use concept controlled grazing is permitted, mining operations can be carried out, ski runs cleared and forest roads cut to picnic areas or lakes—situations that cannot prevail in the 78 wilderness, wild, primitive or roadless areas under Forest Service jurisdiction.

"From the vacationist standpoint, the existing wilderness areas deserve thoughtful consideration in both short-range and long-range terms. Of immediate concern, this off season gives opportunity to weigh the prospects for 1959 summertime visits to such typical wilderness regions as Utah's backcountry Uinta primitive area of 243,957 acres; to the Anaconda-Pintlar, Spanish Peaks or Absarokee primitive areas in Montana; Wyoming's Wind River range; or the 11 wilderness areas comprising 800,000 acres in Colorado.

"Some wilderness purists prefer to hoof it into such regions. Others arrange pack trips from dude ranches. In most cases, the "Wild West" being what it is today, sizable towns are situated near the end of pavement close to the preserves, and it is possible to park the family station wagon, rent a few horses, with or without guide, and enter the back country with comparative ease.

"National forest wilderness areas are governed under protective regulations (which will continue whether or not the wilderness bill passes) providing that 'there shall be no roads or other provision for motorized transportation, no commercial timber cutting, and no occupancy for hotels, stores, resorts, summer homes, organization camps, hunting or fishing lodges * * * so any shelter must be of the visitor's own providing.

"Under the vagaries of past legislation, 'wild' and 'wilderness' areas are virtually alike except that the latter are larger; 'primitive' areas differ from 'wild' and 'wilderness' preserves only in that they were established earlier in the Nation's conservation history; while 'roadless' areas are not necessarily wholly without roads, since traffic arteries and livestock routes sometimes lead to private enclaves within preserves—ranches, mines, and suchlike which preceded establishment of the wildland tracts.

"The High Uintas primitive area in Utah, fairly typical of the regions which have been the focus of the preservationist uproar, was established as long ago as 1931. It contains 13,498-foot Kings Peak, highest in Utah; encircles fully 1,000 mountain lakes including an estimated 100 which have never been fished; encompasses grassy parks first visited by Robideaux, Bridger, and other mountain men; and protects a goodly supply of elk, bear, lynx, Bighorn sheep, and spectacular scenery.

"The Bridger wilderness area in Wyoming, just north of Pinedale in the Wind River country, contains 13,785-foot-high Gannett Peak, highest in that State, and scenery comparable to the more accessible Jackson Hole region. In Colorado, the 62,600-acre Maroon-Snowmass wild area is barely a brisk walk, for seasoned hikers, from Aspen. In contrast, the San Juan wilderness area in the Durango region is far enough from civilization to shelter most of the State's remaining grizzly bears.

"At the hearings they have been holding across the West, Senators have been meeting not a few citizens who have enjoyed camp in the Bitter Roots of Idaho, the Uncompahgre wild area of Colorado, and the Spanish Peaks of Montana. These hearty souls have impressed upon the legislators the fact that wilderness country holds a special place in the hearts of a dedicated, well-organized group of citizens.

"Scenic regions closed

"But the Senators have also learned that for every man who hikes into the back country, hundreds are obviously satisfied with what they can see in comfort from paved highways, while an intermediate number of tourists are a bit irked at finding scenic regions closed off to them by lack of passable highways.

"To most nonpartisan observers attending the hearings, it would appear that the multiple-use philosophy of the Forest Service

concerning most lands under its jurisdiction, coupled with the present availability of wilderness lands kept pristine both by the Forest Service and the National Park Service, provide the necessary balance of acreage for those who want their West wild and those who want their western scenic regions accessible.

"Whatever the Senators, in their wisdom, decide to do as the result of the hearings, however, it might be a good idea for more vacationists to visit the fringes of the wildlands to see for themselves what all the shouting is about. (The New York Times, Sunday, Nov. 23, 1958.)"

"REPLY: WILDERNESS NEEDS AN AUTOMATIC STAY OF INVASION

"SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., December 19, 1958.

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

"Mr. Jack Goodman's article (Times, November 23) about the Senate field hearings on the wilderness bill was recently shown me by several people—in Rochester, Boston, New York City, Washington, Chicago, and now in San Francisco—who were disturbed by it and urged that it be answered. In the intervening period I have questioned individuals who attended all four hearings—in Bend, Ore.; San Francisco; Salt Lake City (from which Mr. Goodman fled); and Albuquerque. Their observations correlated with my own at the Bend and San Francisco hearings. The consensus: although Mr. Goodman's piece has an aura of impartiality, there is deep bias running through it and major error as well.

"An important difference exists between objectivity and advocacy, and between either of these and advocacy disguised as objectivity. It is not clear that Mr. Goodman revered this distinction. To avoid the same pitfall, let me say that I strongly favor the proposed National Wilderness Preservation System and believe its creation can be the most important legislative step in conservation since 1916.

"The internal evidence of the article's bias is inescapable:

"(1) The featured quotations from witnesses are all from statements by opponents, which are allowed to stand unanswered.

"(2) The descriptions of opponents are straight reporting, but those of proponents are colored.

"(3) The scant mention of proponents' arguments is immediately answered by an opponent's statement, and at length.

"(4) The proponents are described as 'out-talked' by the opponents, whereas I am afraid they were only outreported by Mr. Goodman. In my own biased view, opponents' arguments sounded like mimeographed versions of an original distortion. In San Francisco the proponents outnumbered the opponents by 39 to 22; the press coverage was equitable, as in Bend, and editorial comment favored the bill.

"With respect to error, Mr. Goodman starts out with a big one in his first paragraph, which says, 'If such a [wilderness] system were to be established it would be administered by a specially created council or agency.'

"This is untrue. There are other evidences that Mr. Goodman's study was cursory at best. If he found time for nothing else, he should have considered carefully the Times editorial of June 23, 1957, before contradicting its carefully considered language with an article seriously short of documentation. That editorial closed with a sentence worth remembering: "The wilderness bill has met with a bureaucratic and a special interest opposition that its moderate and reasonable terms do not deserve.'

"One could hardly listen in on any of the hearings without realizing that the very opposition of the special interests in itself compellingly argues the need for the wilderness

bill. They must know that the present protection of wilderness is conveniently weak—weak enough to allow commercial exploitation of these dedicated areas without too much trouble. The bill's added protection would make that exploitation harder (by providing for congressional review of what the various administrators choose to add to the System or delete from it), and therefore, they think, should be opposed with vigor. For that very reason the bill should be supported with vigor by the public as a whole.

"A living wilderness, for which the proponents of the bill seek better protection, lives but once. The force of creation, uninterrupted by man's technology, has flowed there since the beginning. For all his intelligence, man has not yet learned how to restore wilderness or to phrase the questions which wilderness alone may be able to answer about the life force. Obliterate that wilderness and, as the physicist, Dr. J. A. Rush, of Texas, has said, man will have cut himself off from the evolutionary force that put him on this planet and in a deeply terrifying sense will be on his own.

"How shortsighted dare we get, or dare our reporting be? Wilderness is not now safe enough if its would-be invaders advocate status quo in its defenses. It needs an automatic stay of invasion from the Congress. For this fragment of living wilderness is all there is, and all that remains for future generations to inherit. It is one of the primal wonders of our land and our children have a right to know it.

"In utilitarian terms, what would the destruction of wilderness gain? That which the resource developers now seem to covet to the last commercial crumb amounts to but 2 percent of the area of the contiguous United States, and it contains the only two places where anyone can get more than 10 miles from a road. Only a little of that 2 percent is of appreciable commercial value and that little has an irreplaceable intangible value as wilderness. The small commercial potential will in itself enable no industry to survive. Wilderness may, however, have scientific and educational values that will enable mankind to survive in a civilized state. Man is bright enough, surely, to make his civilization flow around the few islands of wilderness and not over them.

"The proponents' case is summed up, in another context, by Romain Gary, who, in 'The Roots of Heaven,' has his man Laurent cot saying:

"It's absolutely essential that man should manage to preserve something other than what helps to make soles for shoes or sewing machines, that he should leave a margin, a sanctuary, where some of life's beauty can take refuge and where he himself can feel safe from his own cleverness and folly. Only then will it be possible to begin talking of a civilization. A utilitarian civilization will always go on to its logical conclusion—forced labor camps."

"Sincerely yours,

"DAVID R. BROWER,
"Executive Director, Sierra Club."

NEW USES AND NEW MARKETS FOR FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to find new uses for farm products and new markets, through research and other means, for farm products. I ask that the bill lie on the table until Monday, so that other Senators may join as cosponsors of the bill, if they wish to do so.

A bill similar to this has been introduced by myself and, I think, as many as 40 or 50 other Senators for the last 4 or 5 years. Last year the Senate passed

this type of bill, in substance, by a vote of 82 to 0. The bill did not pass the House.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed as a part of my remarks and that a statement I have prepared be printed also. I ask, further, that the names of the cosponsors be printed, including those who may later wish to be cosponsors of the bill.

I know of nothing which is more important than the solving of the Nation's farm problem. I am one who has believed for many years that the only way in which this problem can be solved is to find new uses and new markets for farm products, because the problem is overproduction. I do not think the problem can be solved by reducing the production of the farmers. I think new markets and new uses must be found. To reduce the production of farm products means a reduction in the general economy of the Nation. I simply do not think that is good economics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 1124) to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. SCHOEPEL, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. MUNDT), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATIONS AND FINDINGS

SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States hereby makes the following declarations and findings concerning the development of new and additional industrial uses for agricultural products:

(a) Current productivity of farms in the United States is substantially in excess of current markets for their products at price levels which provide fair and substantial income to farmers.

(b) National defense and the security interests of the United States require increasing and expanding agricultural productivity to meet possible emergency needs of the United States and its allies, which productivity cannot be achieved or maintained at depressed farm prices resulting from overproduction or with acreage curtailments to avoid overproduction.

(c) It is in the national interest of the United States to increase the level of farm income in order that farmers may continue to share to a greater degree in the general prosperity of the Nation.

(d) No program has been developed, and none can be foreseen, that can successfully shrink farm production for an extended pe-

riod of time; but research programs provide known means potentially to increase substantially the industrial uses of agricultural products and thereby to achieve farm prosperity based on full, rather than curtailed, production.

(e) Research facilities, both private and public, including those of land-grant colleges and universities, can and should be utilized for an all-out attack on the development of increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products to enlarge opportunities for increased production by farmers and to reduce Government costs for the acquisition, storage, and ultimate disposition of agricultural commodities which are now a substantial financial burden to the Government.

(f) The cost to the United States of such a research program may be expected to be more than offset by increased tax revenues resulting from increased earnings of both farmers and those who sell goods, wares, and merchandise to farmers, as well as by savings to the United States in costs of current agricultural assistance programs.

PURPOSES

SEC. 2. The purposes of this Act are to find and develop through research, sponsored and financed by the United States, new industrial uses, and increased use under existing processes, of agricultural products.

ADMINISTRATION CREATED

SEC. 3. There is hereby created in the executive branch of the Government an Industrial Agricultural Products Administration (hereinafter referred to as the Administration), in which is vested the duties, powers, and responsibilities hereafter set out in this Act. Such powers, duties, and responsibilities of the Administration shall be vested in an Administrator, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall serve during the pleasure of the President. The Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of \$22,500 per annum.

DUTIES, POWERS, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 4. The Administration shall conduct research, both scientific and chemical, make field studies, conduct both laboratory and field experiments, test production procedures on a commercial basis, maintain and expand pilot plants whenever necessary, maintain and operate manufacturing facilities where necessary to prove the commercial feasibility of volume production, and otherwise promote the finding, development, and commercial use of new, increased, extended, and perfected processes, techniques, and programs for industrial uses of greater quantities of agricultural products.

POWERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 5. The Administration is authorized to:

(a) Utilize such existing facilities of the United States, and such trained personnel employed by the United States, as the President finds can feasibly be transferred to the Administration for carrying out the purposes of this Act. The President is hereby authorized to (1) transfer any such facility, facilities, or personnel to the Administration, or to (2) make any such facility, facilities, or personnel available to the Administration for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

(b) Build, purchase, or lease plant facilities, or necessary equipment, suitable for research, pilot plant, manufacturing, or other needs of the Administration in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

(c) Employ such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act; and all technical or scientific employees engaged for research by the Administration

shall be exempt from the civil service laws and regulations.

(d) Employ or retain on a contract basis individuals, firms, institutions, and organizations, public and private, including land-grant colleges and universities, to conduct research programs for the Administration pursuant to this Act.

Sec. 6. The Administration is authorized to pay incentive awards to private citizens for suitable and acceptable suggestions to improve the program established by this Act, such payments to be made in accordance with previously published rules stating the amounts of, criteria for determining, and subjects of, such awards.

Sec. 7. The Administrator is authorized to appoint Industry Advisory Committees and to employ consultants without compensation or at rates of compensation not to exceed \$50 per diem.

Sec. 8. The Administration may make grants to accredited schools, colleges, and universities for fellowships and scholarships in research for the purposes of this Act.

INDUSTRIAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AGENCY CREATED

Sec. 9. There is hereby created in the Department of Agriculture an Industrial Agricultural Products Agency (hereinafter referred to as the "Agency"). The duties, obligations, and responsibilities of the Agency shall be carried out by and under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE AGENCY

Sec. 10. Under the delegations, directives, and policy determinations of the Administrator, the Agency shall carry out all of the duties, obligations, and responsibilities imposed upon the Administration by this Act, including the making of research contracts, employment of personnel, contracts for the construction, purchase, lease, or other acquisition of real or personal property, and the maintenance of all records, files, studies and other data undertaken pursuant to this Act. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, the Administrator may delegate any power given him hereunder to the Agency, and he may control, supervise, and direct all Agency action permitted by law under this Act.

Sec. 11. The Administrator shall report semiannually to the Congress progress on research programs undertaken pursuant to this Act to find and develop new and increased industrial uses for agricultural products.

Sec. 12. The Agency may license, at a fair and reasonable royalty, any person, firm, or corporation to use any process developed by the Agency or to make and sell under any patent, or application for patent of the Agency. Such royalties shall be based upon fair compensation to the Government for its investment and shall be nondiscriminatory. Whenever the Administrator finds it in the public interest to do so, he may grant royalty-free licenses for processes developed under this Act, including the right to make and sell under any patent or application for patent of the Agency.

APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 13. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture, for the Industrial Agricultural Products Agency, the sum of \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, and the same amount annually thereafter. There shall be paid out of such appropriations the salary of the Administrator as well as all other expenses of his office. The President is authorized to transfer to the Agency \$1,000,000 out of unexpended Agricultural Department funds to initiate promptly this program following the enactment of this Act for and during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959.

The statement presented by Mr. CAPEHART is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

On behalf of myself and other Senators, I have introduced, for appropriate reference, a bill which, as I have said on the floor of this Senate on numerous occasions heretofore, will provide a far-reaching and permanent solution of the farm problem which has been with us for these many, many years.

It is a bill to provide a \$100 million federally directed program of research and development to discover and perfect new uses for the everyday products of the American farm in industry.

It is identical with bills which I and other Senators introduced in the 84th and 85th Congresses. It is similar to a bill which was passed without opposition by the Senate in the 85th Congress and died in the House of Representatives.

It is a bill which agrees in theory and differs only in detail with the recommendations of the President's Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products created by an act of Congress with the full support of both Houses.

CONGRESS MUST SOLVE FARM PROBLEM

I know of no man who has studied and knows the facts who will disagree with the statement that the patchwork, makeshift farm laws under which we have been operating since the 1930's have been a miserable failure.

To finance that failure has cost the taxpayers of the United States in the neighborhood of \$40 billion.

That figure represents more than 15 percent of the farm income in the same period.

All of us agree that some of the laws under which we have been operating have been good laws to meet an immediate, emergency situation. We have all recognized the need for stopgap measures, price-support provisions.

We have agreed with and supported those provisions under which this Government has financed research to teach the farmer how to produce more and more on a given amount of land. That has been money well spent and I have supported it.

So, even with reduced acreages we have continued to produce more and more and piled it up in costly and price-depressing surpluses.

What we have failed to do at the same time was to provide an equal amount of money to develop for the farmer new markets which would assure him, without any price supports at all, a market at a fair price for every ounce of crops he could produce on every acre of land he had to till.

By failing to do so, Congress and administrations over a long period of years have failed the American taxpayer in general and the American farmer in particular.

Those who admit the failure of our farm programs have included Presidents of the United States, Secretaries of Agriculture, and all of the leading farm organizations. The responsibility for that failure must be shared by everybody who has had anything to do with it. And that includes the Congress perhaps more than anybody else.

CORRECT OUR FAILURE NOW

We can now correct our error, on a long-range basis, through the passage of this bill. We can, thereby, not only correct failures of the past. We can, in addition, assure an era of permanent farm prosperity so important to the overall economy of the Nation.

Yes; we have failed. We must not fail again.

Now, what are some of the results of a failing farm program?

Well, one of the most glaring failures is the accumulation of Government-owned surpluses now estimated to have cost something over \$9 billion.

I wonder if Senators know that it costs us \$1½ million a day just to store that surplus. That's almost \$550 million a year.

I wonder if they know that the interest on the money it took to buy that surplus cost us, in 1958, about \$365 million.

Add it up. That's almost \$1 billion a year, and I predict that if something isn't done to correct the situation the combined storage, interest, and handling charges will, within a year or so, exceed \$1 billion a year. That simply cannot go on and on.

This bill is designed to reverse that situation by creating such a demand for farm products that there simply will be no surplus. It's that simple.

FARM INCOME DOWN

Now, what else has happened under our falling farm program?

For one thing, since World War II, the farmer's income from all sources has been pushed downward approximately 23 percent, while the income of the nonfarm population has moved upward approximately 48 percent.

Farm families of the Nation, on an average, now have only about 50 percent of income parity with other groups. That is inexcusable.

This has happened under farm programs submitted by Secretaries of Agriculture, approved by Congresses, and signed into law by Presidents of the United States at a cost of nearly \$40 billion to the American taxpayer.

What else has happened?

Since the Korean war, the number of our farms has decreased by more than 1 million and farm employment by almost 3 million. Meantime, our total population has increased by about 30 million.

In the past 13 years it is estimated that farms of 50 acres or less dropped from about 4 percent to 2½ percent of total farm acreage, and that farms of 50 to 500 acres dropped from about 45 percent to below 38 percent; whereas farms of more than 500 acres rose from below 51 percent to almost 60 percent. Noncommercial farms and the substandard commercial farms, with sales below \$2,500 per year, accounted for about 12 percent total farm sales in 1949, but are estimated at only 7 percent in 1958.

During the same period, however, family-type farms, with sales ranging from \$2,500 to \$25,000 per year, have seen their sales drop from about 62 percent to about 58 percent. The large to giant size farms, with sales about \$25,000 per year, have expanded from 26 percent of total sales to 35 percent.

THE ANSWER IS NEW MARKETS

Why have our programs failed?

Basically, I am convinced, they have failed because they have been based on the negative theory of paying a farmer to curtail production rather than the sound, business-like theory of providing farmers with ample markets for everything they can grow on every acre of land available to them.

This bill would reverse that situation. It would assure ample markets, encourage production because of increased demand and create an agricultural and industrial prosperity the like of which this country has never seen before.

When you produce, through research, a new product, you create demands for new factories, new transportation facilities, new jobs.

This bill is the first step in that direction. It is my best judgment, based on three years of careful study, that within a relatively few years, the kind of federally sponsored research program I am here proposing would double the demand for farm products. In a minute, I will give you examples.

And, what would it cost? I have suggested that we start with a continuing appropriation of \$1 million a year to get this

program under way on a crash basis. Remember, gentlemen, our surpluses alone cost us almost \$1 billion a year.

FOR \$1 MILLION A YEAR—WHEAT?

What would the American people get for that million-dollar investment?

First, of course, it would mean to the farmer a new life of productivity. It would provide prosperity for him. It would permit him to follow his natural instinct to get everything he can out of his land.

Second, it would create new jobs. Obviously, the demand for farm labor would increase. But its effect on industrial labor generally would be even more phenomenal. Entire new industries with millions of new jobs would come into being—industries to manufacture new products. The demand for new transportation facilities—automobiles, trucks, buses, railroads, airlines, and so forth—would be tremendous. The demand for new farm machinery alone would provide an industrial and labor stimulus almost beyond our comprehension.

Third, the increase in retail business would mount into the billions of dollars. Farmers, laborers, and, I am convinced, just about every other category of business customer in the United States would have more money to spend for just about everything business has to sell.

Fourth, such a program would, in my opinion, mean the end of a tremendous tax burden now imposed to finance our vast agricultural assistance and storage programs of the moment—a burden which we gladly bear as long as it is necessary, but a burden which all of us will agree would be a welcome deletion from our national budgets. If we can bring this about—and I believe we can—it would enable us to reduce taxes substantially and to make it easier to retire the national debt at a faster pace.

We must throw the full white light of technical research and development, experimentation, test facilities, pilot plant operations and American technical know-how into an all-out effort to discover and perfect new industrial uses for just the everyday products of our land.

Now, I don't want to be misunderstood about existing research. The Department of Agriculture has been doing some very worthwhile experimental work. Our fine agricultural and technical schools are working at it constantly. We have some very limited utilization research plants under Government management. Within their limited facilities, all of these agencies have been doing a good job.

But, what I am talking about here is a much more comprehensive effort, a job with top priority under the direction of an administrator or administrative board with ample funds and the authority to knock heads together, if necessary, to get the job done.

It is my best judgment that we would begin to see tangible results of such a program within a reasonably short time. I believe that the Department of Agriculture and our research people have enough technical knowledge right now that, given a real opportunity to carry through, they can find industrial uses for 5 billion additional bushels of grain—corn, wheat, rye, barley, oats, rice, sorghum grains and others—each year.

Remember that we produce only about 6½ billion bushels now and that in some years as much as one-third of that amount has been surplus. It takes about 180 million acres to produce our present output. Add another 5 billion bushels to a real and continuing demand for grains and you begin to see the almost fantastic possibilities of this program we are talking about.

The great chemical and petroleum industries have developed, through research programs, ways to make everything from

rubber to clothing materials from substitutes.

These research programs have developed in substantially the same proportion to the amount of money industries have plowed back into research from their profits. Our most successful industries are those which have devoted and are devoting more and more attention to research.

Industry is currently investing more than \$3 billion a year, or 3 percent of gross sales in research. The result is obvious in a constant flood of new and improved products—fabrics, plastics, building materials, surface coatings, detergents, chemicals, and many others.

By contrast, agriculture spends not over \$375 million on research—about 1 percent of gross sales, and most of this goes to improve and increase production. Federal and State governments spend \$190 million of the total, of which no more than \$18 million goes for utilization research. In other words, about one-twentieth of 1 percent of the gross sales of agriculture has been used on research to find new uses for agricultural products.

Some have said that our 6 million farmers ought to do this for themselves. I wish they could. But I believe there is general agreement among those who have studied the problem that here is a job the farmers simply cannot do for themselves.

Most of us remember not too many years ago when the production power on the farm was restricted to animal power, horses and mules. It has been estimated that this animal power consumed the production equivalent of some 80 million acres of feed grains.

The animal power is obsolete and there has been little or no research to develop new markets for the production of that 80 million acres.

I believe all Senators are familiar with what research did for the citrus industry at a time when it admittedly was in bad shape. The quick freezing process, perfected in part through research conducted by our own Department of Agriculture, reversed that economic trend. Not only was the industry stabilized, but new demands brought vast expansion, and every man, woman, and child in the United States enjoyed a potential benefit because of the greater accessibility of the healthful benefits of fresh citrus fruit juices.

Then, have a look at what once was called the lowly soybean. The earliest records show that a Chinese emperor in 2838 B.C. wrote of the highly valued nutritional qualities of the soybean. Yet it was not until about 1930 that research spearheaded by the late Henry Ford—research for industrial uses of the soybean—that this crop started the upward trend that has made it one of the great money crops of today.

It has long been my hope that we could use alcohol produced from grain as a part of our motor fuel. European countries have blended alcohol into their gasoline up to 25 percent. Were we to blend alcohol into our gasoline to the extent of 10 percent, it would require about 2 billion bushels of grain a year. In other words, that one use alone would go a long way toward solving the grain-surplus problem.

Admittedly, gasoline now can be produced cheaper than alcohol. However, I am thoroughly convinced that a broad program of research will lower the cost of producing alcohol from farm products.

At the present time when we make alcohol out of farm products we have a protein residue that is a very valuable food for animals. However, with improved methods brought about by research and trial commercialization, it is believed that the alcohol can be extracted and the protein residue will be a fine human food. Its value will then be many times greater than its value for

livestock food. The alcohol would then become more or less a byproduct and it can be sold at a price that it will compete with gasoline for a part of this motor-fuel market. Who knows?

Our surpluses are primarily starches. From starch we make alcohol and from alcohol we can make rubber, we can make plastics, we can make a thousand and one things that are now being made from other materials.

These include solvents, surface coatings, plastics, chemicals, fibers, films, explosives, adhesives, lubricants, insecticides, drilling muds, paints, varnishes, and even paving materials.

Let us, for the purposes of this statement, discuss just exactly how this bill would work:

There is created in the executive branch of the Government an Industrial Agricultural Products Administration under the administrative direction of an Administrator, to be appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate.

The Administration shall conduct research, both scientific and chemical, make field studies, conduct both laboratory and field experiments, test production procedures on a commercial basis, maintain and expand pilot plants whenever necessary, maintain and operate manufacturing facilities where necessary to prove the commercial feasibility of volume production, and otherwise promote the finding, development, and commercial use of new, increased, extended, and perfected processes, techniques, and programs for industrial uses of greater quantities of agricultural products.

The Administration would be empowered to utilize existing facilities of the Government to carry out the program. It could build, purchase or lease plant facilities, necessary equipment, pilot plant, manufacturing or other needs to carry out the program.

In addition to this, however, the Commission might employ private industry—individuals, firms, institutions and organizations—and the services of land-grant colleges and universities to conduct research. Incentive awards are provided for. Industry advisory committees would cooperate. Consultants might be employed with only per diem pay. Grants to accredited schools, colleges and universities for fellowships and scholarships in research are authorized. The Administrator would be required to report semiannually to the Congress.

At this point the bill makes additional provisions for the participation of private enterprise. It is provided that the Industrial Agricultural Products Agency of the Department of Agriculture may license, at a fair and reasonable royalty, any person, firm, or corporation to use any process developed by the Agency or to make and sell under any patent, or application for patent of the Agency. Such royalties shall be based upon fair compensation to the Government for its investment and shall be nondiscriminatory. Whenever the Administrator finds it in the public interest to do so, he may grant royalty-free licenses for processes developed under this act, including the right to make and sell under any patent or application for patent of the Agency.

Yes; the possibilities are limitless, the potentiality so great as to require every bit of the imagination which has made America the great Nation it is.

Let me list a few more possibilities:

1. A high protein cattle food that could consume an additional 150 to 160 millions of bushels of wheat a year, the production equivalent of 7½ million acres.
2. Metallurgical oils from grain.
3. Oil, as a grain derivative, for use in the manufacture of paint.
4. Ethyl alcohol, for use in producing synthetic rubber, from grain. One ton of

rubber would consume 350 bushels of grain. Multiply that by the 900,000 tons of synthetic rubber we produce a year and it comes up 315 million bushels of grain, the production equivalent of about 7 million acres.

5. Microba rubber, a natural product, from the gluten in grain.

6. Ethyl alcohol from grain to be blended with gasoline. If just 10 percent of the blend was ethyl alcohol made from grain, it would require more than 2 billions of bushels of grain a year. That alone would absorb the grain surplus.

Now, there are many more potential uses of which we already know. Some say, and correctly so, that the cost of some of these uses would be so great as not to be practicable or competitive. Who knows? Finding ways to reduce the cost, make the uses practicable and the products competitive is just exactly what research programs—programs such as the one we here propose—are for.

I have listed a few of the better known possibilities for new industrial uses which we all know about, but I believe it might be helpful if I should record here, in order, the list of known uses given to me by the Department of Agriculture. The Department has estimated that these 11 uses would consume 2.6 to 2.7 billion bushels a year if fully developed by the program here proposed. They are as follows:

1. High protein food by fermentation, 150 million bushels a year.
2. Paint from vegetable oil, if 5 to 10 percent of the potential market is reached, 15 million to 60 million bushels a year.
3. Synthetic rubber, 365 million bushels a year.
4. Microba rubber, if 10 percent of the potential market is reached, 25 to 30 million bushels a year.
5. Increased use of starch in paper, 40 million to 100 million bushels a year.
6. Industrial exploitation of oxystarch, 10 million bushels a year.
7. Raising disease-free poultry for export, 13 million bushels a year.
8. New drug plants, 4½ million bushels a year.
9. Hardboard, boxboard, and building board from wheat, 20 to 40 million bushels a year.
10. Development of high amylose corn, 10 million bushels a year.
11. Blending 10 percent grain alcohol with gasoline, 2 billion bushels a year.

There are a great many other possible uses which have been called to my attention. These include smokeless powder, plastics, medicinals, toilet preparations, soaps, cleaners, anesthetics, antifreeze, dyes, varnishes, and synthetic fuels.

Who knows whether a program such as this may not some day solve the problem of our paper supply, now almost altogether limited to the pulpwood industry? I can foresee the day that we may raise our entire paper supply right on our farms.

Our publishers sometimes get concerned about the shortage or the threat of a shortage of paper. The task group on new and special crops points out that we can make not only paper but furniture and specialties from bamboo. They further point out that you can produce bamboo in the South from South Carolina to Texas and the coastal and Piedmont areas.

It will grow faster than the pine. This crop could be expanded for industrial purposes so that we could use a million acres of bamboo. This crop alone might solve the surplus problem facing cotton farmers.

We must remember always that what helps any segment of American agriculture helps all of American agriculture, and although I am a Hoosier, I am just as interested in the problems of the Cotton Belt as any other area.

I could go on and on with possibilities. New ones are reported from time to time. But, they are going to remain just possi-

bilities unless we do something about it and do it now.

I am sure that most of you are familiar with and admire as I do the work of Mr. Wheeler McMillen, vice president of the Farm Journal and a recognized authority in this field. Called upon to comment in 1956 on the first bill of which I was the principal author, Mr. McMillen said, in part:

"If the Congress will adopt the principles of this bill and will provide adequate funds through the years, it will have taken the longest and soundest possible step toward making agriculture a permanently prosperous, expanding industry.

"It will add new products for the American standard of living. It will build new factories and create new jobs for years ahead.

"It will provide for American industry unfailing sources of raw materials, materials which will ever be renewable, annually re-productive as long as soil and water are conserved.

"It can in time remove, probably forever, the urgency of agricultural subsidies.

"It will work toward making American agriculture the growth industry that farmers want it to be. It will provide expanding opportunity for the family farm. It will make it possible for our fine farm boys and girls to live and prosper on the land they love.

"This proposal offers, in short, an infallible plan toward a richer rural civilization and, therefore, toward a better America."

In this position, he is joined by very distinguished company, including the heads of our farm organizations, deans of schools of agriculture, farm publication policymakers, newspapers editorial writers, scientists, economists, and many others.

The principle involved here has been supported by the American Farm Bureau, the National Grange, National Council of Farmer Co-ops, National Farmers Union, Reed Research, Inc., National Cotton Council, Corn Industry Research Foundation, National Farm Chemurgic Council, various leaders of organized labor, leading research scientists, experts from agricultural colleges, the Farm Journal, the Chemurgic Digest, the Oil and Gas Journal, the Indiana Farmers Guide, the Washington (D.C.) Star, Chicago Tribune, Cleveland Plain Dealer, Indianapolis News, Indianapolis Times, Indianapolis Star, South Bend Tribune, Hammond Times, Plymouth (Ind.) Pilot-News, Philadelphia Inquirer, Omaha World-Herald, Syracuse (N.Y.) Standard, LaPorte (Ind.) Herald-Argus, Kokomo Tribune, Lafayette Courier-Journal, and other farm magazines and newspapers.

I have the greatest admiration for our great schools of agriculture, one of the finest of which, Purdue University, is in my home State of Indiana. They have been and are doing an outstanding job. They are doing a great job for our agricultural industry.

So are our county agents, our extension schools and our 4-H Clubs. They have helped immeasurably to make ours the best fed Nation in the world. Every cent spent on their activities has been well spent. We should continue their programs and make them ever-expanding. The part they could play in the research program here suggested would be just as immeasurable—just as valuable.

As a businessman and a farmer, I know of only two ways to increase business. One is to sell more goods to existing customers. The other is to find new customers. We are selling all we can of our farm produce to existing customers. So, we must find new uses and new customers if we are going to solve permanently the farm problem.

It is time all of us admitted openly and frankly that our farm programs have failed to produce a permanent solution of one of the most serious problems of our Nation.

It is time to provide that solution by beginning to spend, through such a program as is proposed in this bill, a million dollars a year that will return us billions upon billions in the years to come.

PAVING OF ALASKA HIGHWAY

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appropriations for paving the Alaska Highway in Canada, with the cooperation of the Canadian Government.

I am pleased to be joined in introducing this bill by the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], my senior colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE].

Mr. President, terms of the bill which I present today are similar to those contained in the measure which I submitted to the Senate on July 2, 1958, on behalf of myself and other Senators. Appropriations of \$11 million a year for the 6 fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1961 would be authorized for expenditure on improvement of the Alaska Highway and the Haines Cutoff, on the condition that the Government of Canada participate equally in the program. The bill provides that, in addition to sharing the cost of hard surfacing this section of highway, the Canadian Government agree to maintain it after completion of the project and make it accessible on free and nondiscriminatory terms to U.S. traffic.

Amounts cited in the bill are based on studies made by the Bureau of Public Roads. Total cost of the work is estimated at approximately \$125 million, including about \$15 million for making the 110-mile connection with Haines into an all-weather road.

The Alaska Highway extends from Dawson Creek, British Columbia, to Fairbanks, Alaska. Some 300 miles of this highway in Alaska are paved. The remaining 1,200 miles within the borders of Canada are surfaced only with gravel, except for a 50-mile stretch north of Dawson Creek.

Mr. President, a brief informative memorandum describing the background and status of the Alaska Highway has been prepared for me by Mr. Theo Sneed, technical staff member of the Senate Public Works Committee and a colonel with the United States Army Corps of Engineers detachments which constructed this great project during World War II. I ask unanimous consent that this memorandum be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

MEMORANDUM ON THE ALASKA HIGHWAY

The Alaska Highway was completed under the supervision of the U.S. Army in 1943. A pilot road was pushed through the area by engineer troops from March to November 1942, being widened and relocated where necessary, to provide a two-lane graveled surface, with drainage and bridges, by American and Canadian contractors working under the supervision of the Bureau of Public Roads during the 1942 and 1943 working seasons.

The Alaska Highway as then completed extended from the end of the railroad at Dawson Creek, British Columbia, Canada, to Fairbanks, Alaska, a distance of about 1,550 miles. From Dawson Creek the highway passes through Fort St. John, British Columbia; Fort Nelson, British Columbia; Watson Lake, British Columbia; Whitehorse, Yukon Territory; Northway, Alaska; Tanacross, Alaska; Big Delta, Alaska; and Fairbanks. A cutoff road was constructed from Haines, Alaska, on the coast, to the Alaska Highway, 108 miles north of Whitehorse.

Extensive U.S. Army installations, including airfields, were constructed at Edmonton, Grande Prairie, Dawson Creek, Fort St. John, Fort Nelson, Watson Lake, Whitehorse, Northway, Tanacross, Big Delta, and Fairbanks. A telephone line extends along the Alaska Highway to Alaska, with a relay station about every hundred miles. A gasoline pipeline now extends from Haines, Alaska, on the coast, along the Haines Cutoff and the Alaska Highway to Fairbanks. A major airbase has been completed about 20 miles southeast of Fairbanks (Elson Field), and the Arctic Testing Station of the Air Force is located at Big Delta, 95 miles southeast of Fairbanks.

Good highways extend from various points in the United States to Edmonton. From Glacier National Park, in Montana, through Calgary to Edmonton, 375 miles, and from Grand Forks, N. Dak., through Winnipeg, Manitoba, Regina, and Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, to Edmonton, 1,100 miles.

From Dawson Creek to the Yukon-Alaska border on the Alaska Highway, 1,221 miles, will require improvement of the existing highway with respect to drainage, minor relocations, bridge and culvert replacement, slide removals and corrections, and surfacing.

The Haines Cutoff within Canada consists of 110 miles from the junction with the Alaska Highway to the British Columbia-Alaska border, and would require major reconstruction and relocation, including grading, drainage, structures, removal of slides, and surfacing.

The Alaska Highway is improved and has a bituminous plant mix surface course in Alaska from the Canadian border to Fairbanks. It connects with the Richardson Highway, about 95 miles from Fairbanks. The Richardson Highway extends southward to the coast at Valdez, with the Glenn Highway extending from the Richardson Highway westward to Anchorage. Thus, Anchorage and Fairbanks, the major cities and defense centers in Alaska, are now connected by an improved highway. A cutoff road extends from the Richardson Highway at Gulkana northeastward to the Alaska Highway near Tanacross, about 100 miles east of Big Delta. Improved highways extend from Fairbanks to Circle, on the Yukon River (130 miles), and north to Livengood (95 miles).

The total length of highway proposed for improvement in Canada is 1,331 miles, at an estimated cost of about \$125 million. It is proposed that the Canadian Government contribute 50 percent of the cost of construction and improvement of the high-

way, in addition to furnishing the necessary rights-of-way.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, congressional approval of statehood for Alaska paved the way for political equality for this great northern land through full-fledged membership in the Union. Now it is Congress' responsibility to insure that social and economic equality is achieved through strengthening of the lines of communication between Alaska and the other 48 States.

I believe that the Government of Canada will wish to cooperate with the United States in this endeavor. Certainly, rich rewards in terms of increased trade and tourist travel would accrue to our neighbor to the north. I understand that officials in several Saskatchewan and Alberta cities have petitioned the Prime Minister of Canada to press Canada's participation in the paving of the Alaska Highway.

Recently there was brought to my attention an article published in the January 7, 1959, issue of the Daily Colonist, of Victoria, British Columbia, which reveals the desire of that great province to see such a project initiated soon. I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I refer be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

BUILD ALASKA ROAD, UNITED STATES, CANADA
ASKED

Highways Minister P. A. Gaglardi suggested Tuesday that Canada and the United States should share 50-50 on a new north-south highway route through British Columbia.

"Or they could share 50-50 in bringing the Alaska Highway up to standard and hardsurface it," he said, discussing suggestions by Oregon Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER that the Alaska Highway should be paved in a Canada-United States venture.

Mr. Gaglardi said British Columbia's contribution in his plan would be to take over the highway or highways after the hardsurface is laid, and undertake maintenance costs.

The Minister said British Columbia has already undertaken to maintain the first 50 miles of the Alaska Highway north of Dawson Creek, and Ottawa is thinking of hardsurfacing another 50 miles this year.

The United States, he believed, should be prepared to pay 50 percent of new construction, or reconstruction and surfacing costs, since the highway routes through British Columbia would be of vital interest to Americans and Alaskans.

I am sure the two nations could agree, and establish a high degree of cooperation," Mr. Gaglardi said.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, members of the Eisenhower administration have indicated to me their approval of the aims of my bill. In July 1958, I wrote to the President suggesting that he propose United States-Canadian cooperation in paving the Alaska Highway to the Prime Minister of Canada when the two met at Ottawa. The White House has since informed me that this subject was discussed in that conference. I am hopeful that the discussion will serve as a basis for further talks at a lower level and that a United States-Canadian agreement may be rapidly completed so that actual work may get

underway immediately upon availability of funds.

The need for improving that great highway link across western Canada to Fairbanks, Alaska, is a matter with which I am personally familiar. During World War II I served in the U.S. Army as aide-de-camp to the late Gen. James A. O'Connor, of the Corps of Engineers, who was in charge of the construction of the Alaska Highway.

I have traveled many times from Fairbanks to Dawson Creek, through measureless solitudes of pine forests and majestic mountains, and I know we will never have reliable land contact with Alaska until the 1,500-mile Alaska Highway is paved.

Mr. President, since originally introducing this bill in the closing days of the last Congress, I have received numerous expressions of support from organizations and individuals located in Alaska and the other 48 States. This measure is nonpartisan. It would aid the development, not only of Alaska but of the intervening areas of western Canada, for the benefit of both nations. I believe that this proposal is one which deserves the unanimous support of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1125) to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the Alaska Highway, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks and the thanks of Alaska for the vision and the helpfulness of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] in introducing a bill the purpose of which is to encourage the paving of the Canadian section of the famous Alaska Highway.

The junior Senator from Oregon has on many occasions demonstrated his friendship for Alaskans and his desire to promote the economy of that great area, now the newest of our States.

As he made the statement in the Senate Chamber a while ago in introducing his bill, my mind went back to a November day 16 years ago when he and I stood on the shores of Lake Kluane, as the Alaska Highway, one of the great engineering feats of World War II, was officially dedicated.

Mr. President, most of the Alaska section of that highway, extending over a distance of 202 miles, is now paved. Only 50 miles of the Canadian section is under a contract for paving, out of a total distance in the Canadian section of 1,221 miles.

This highway, from Dawson Creek, the point of origin, to Fairbanks, is a long one, extending for 1,520 miles. But should the Canadian section be paved, as a result of the bill introduced by the junior Senator from Oregon or otherwise, we shall have, I predict, the greatest rush of tourists to Canada and to Alaska in recent history. It is a great land. There is a good highway now, but it is only a gravel highway, and sometimes

travelers do not care to traverse the whole distance. But if the highway is paved, as it well can be by both countries, under the provisions of the bill offered by the junior Senator from Oregon, we are going to have there great tourist travel.

I am especially gratified the bill provides for maintenance on a year-round basis at the so-called Haines Cutoff, which provides the only access to an interior highway which southeastern Alaska has. Regrettably, under present circumstances, this is closed most of the year because of snow. If the bill should become law, then we will have a way to go by car from southeastern Alaska to Canada, and to all of the States, on a year-round basis.

Mr. President, I am mindful it was principally because of the hard work and unremitting efforts of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] that Alaska about 3 years ago was included for the first time within the Federal-aid highway system. We in Alaska owe much to the Senator, and we appreciate his work on our behalf.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I want to join my senior colleague in commending our good friend, the junior Senator from Oregon, for his repeated evidences of interest and support of Alaskan aspirations, and particularly for his reintroduction of the bill to pave the Alaska highway.

For a good many years the United States has shown an interest in the promotion and development of an inter-American highway, and the Congress has appropriated liberally for that purpose. I believe in recent years the United States has advanced something more than \$120 million to assist 5 Central American countries to complete their portions of the inter-American highway. I think it may be fairly stated that no link in that inter-American highway could be deemed more important than a highway to connect the 48 States with the 49th State.

A highway connecting the 48 States with Alaska was constructed as a war measure. It was constructed following the report of a commission authorized by the Congress in 1938, under a bill sponsored by our able colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MACNUSSON], who was then a Representative. It was a commission on which I had the honor to serve.

The route which was selected was not the route recommended by either the American members of our commission or the Canadian members of their commission, but was a route which yielded to war necessity and connected some of the airports which had been built by the Canadian Government the previous year. The United States built that highway. The United States paid for the highway, and operated it as a military measure.

One of the officers who assisted in the construction and operation of the Alaska highway was the same RICHARD NEUBERGER who has been so helpful to Alaska ever since, and is now sponsoring a bill to get the highway paved. He has repeatedly visited Alaska and has become familiar with its problems.

It is clear that unless the highway, which was not paved when it was turned over to the Canadian civil authorities after the close of hostilities, and has not been paved by them since it has become theirs, is not paved, its usefulness will be greatly diminished. Those who have traveled over the highway, as I have, realize the traffic will be greatly increased if it is paved, and it is proper that the highway should be paved. It has been of substantial economic benefit to the regions of Canada through which it passes and to Alaska, but those benefits could be much greater if the highway is hard surfaced. I am hopeful that such action will follow.

I must express some reservations about the financial terms of the bill. It would be my hope that the Canadian Government would see fit to pay the entire cost of the highway, in view of the great prosperity which that country has achieved. We have paved that portion of the highway which lies within Alaska.

In any event, it is important the highway be paved and that there be a first-class artery to connect the 48 States and the 49th State more efficiently. Therefore, I am happy to be a cosponsor of the measure.

I wish to conclude by saying that the people of Alaska will be eternally grateful to the junior Senator from Oregon, not merely for the introduction of this measure but for the repeated efforts he has made on our behalf. As my colleague pointed out, the junior Senator from Oregon was instrumental in finally securing, after 40 years of discrimination against Alaska and exclusion of Alaska from all Federal-aid highway legislation, the partial inclusion of Alaska under the old act. We were not and are not included under the Throughway Act, although we in Alaska are subject to all the taxes added especially to pay for the throughway system, which has enabled the building of highways and throughways in the other 48 States.

I think there is an obligation, in addition to the inherent need for this project, to push the fight to completion and, following that, to enable Alaska to secure a highway system comparable to those in the other 48 States.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me very briefly?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I want to thank both my able colleagues from our newest State, and greatest State in area, for their kind remarks about my efforts regarding highways leading to Alaska and within Alaska.

I agree with the Senators completely that Alaska's problem is not simply to have the Alaska Highway hard surfaced but includes the need to have adequate roads built within this great land where now many of the leading communities are not tied together by any highways whatsoever.

I think we should urge the Senate and the House of Representatives to keep in mind the salient fact that this country, from its Treasury, has provided millions of dollars for the Inter-American Highway in Central America. That is a

very important and worthy project, but it merely leads to neighboring countries. The Alaska Highway leads to the 49th State of the Union, a State of the Union equal to any other.

If we are going to spend vast sums of money building an inter-American highway in Central America, we certainly should try to work out an agreement with Canada to hard-surface the Alaska Highway, which leads to Fairbanks, which I believe is the second largest community in our new State of Alaska. I know our two able Senators from Alaska will work on this project, and will put similar effort to the greater project of securing good roads within Alaska, to tie together the communities of Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Oregon. I agree with what he has said. I am hopeful that before the bill is enacted into law we shall be able to arrive at an understanding with the Canadian authorities as to Canadian participation.

I am happy the Senator brought up the fact that Alaska enters the Union in a unique situation, in which not only a few but the majority of its communities are unconnected to each other by highway. If we had a comparable situation in the United States with respect to land transportation—and I say that because Alaskans are very air minded and our air services are good—we would have one railway system extending from New York to Chicago, perhaps going by way of Cleveland and Detroit or Indianapolis. There would be a highway roughly paralleling that railway but taking a slightly different route, going perhaps through Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and Cincinnati. There might be a branch or two extending from that highway. The capital of the Nation would be unconnected with any other city by highway. There would be a few short stubs of roads going out from it and from a few of the cities. The rest of the country would have to depend on air transportation. That contrast illustrates the situation in Alaska today. Obviously a great area such as Alaska cannot be developed without highways. Our 48 States would never have developed without them. I am hopeful this Congress will see fit to initiate a measure or measures which will enable us to compensate for the many years of exclusion from Federal highway legislation—which will enable us to catch up, and to secure a highway system that is proper, just and necessary for the development of Alaska.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 502 OF GENERAL BRIDGE ACT OF 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 502 of the General Bridge Act of 1946.

This bill is a proposal of the Department of Commerce to establish bridge clearances over navigable waters. It would result in savings of millions of dollars annually, the Department feels. Those savings would inure principally to the Federal-aid, State, and local highway programs, and in some degree to railroads and pipelines.