

Barry
Bates
Becker
Beckworth
Bell
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton,
Frances P.
Bolton,
Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Clausen,
Don H.
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Glaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.

Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harrison
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Henderson
Herlong
Hoffman
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Ichord
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Johnson, Wis.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kelth
Kelly
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McLoskey
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski

NAYS—131

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Andrews, Ala.
Ashbrook
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Battin
Beermann
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Bray
Brock
Brotzman
Broyhill, N.C.
Burlison
Burton, Utah

Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del.
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Everett
Flindley

Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill
Osmer
Ostertag
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riethman
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Schwengel
Scott
Senner
Sheppard
Shipley
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Westland
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wright
Wyder
Wyman
Young
Zablocki

Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Kyl
Langen
Latta
Lennon
McClory
MacGregor
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Meador
Mills
Minshall
Mosher
Natcher
Neisen
Perkins
Pickle
Pillion

Alger
Arends
Ashmore
Avery
Baring
Bass
Bennett, Mich.
Bolling
Brademas
Bromwell
Bruce
Buckley
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Duncan
Evins
Forrester
Frelinghuysen

So the resolution was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Wallhauser.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Bruce.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Bass with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Hollifield with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Lankford.
Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Passman.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Staebler.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Pilcher.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MURRAY, MORRISON, and CORBETT.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to consider the bill (H.R. 9070) to establish a National Wil-

derness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members speaking in general debate may have the privilege of including charts, tables, and other pertinent matter with their statements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H.R. 9070, with Mr. GARY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 14 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is with a deep sense of satisfaction and with great pleasure that I advise the House that H.R. 9070, the wilderness bill as amended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is a compromise measure that I feel can be supported by everyone.

In bringing the bill to the floor today I take this opportunity to acknowledge the cooperation of those who have made it possible for this compromise to have been reached. I want the record to be clear that the Kennedy and Johnson administrations cooperated very closely with the chairman of your Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now speaking.

President Kennedy was personally interested in the success of the movement for a compromise wilderness bill, which was assured just a few days before the tragedy of November 22, 1963.

So many others contributed to the development of the compromise that I could not possibly name and thank them all. I would be remiss, however, if I did not mention the cooperative spirit of the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], long one of the leading advocates of wilderness preservation; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] who, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, conducted the hearings on this legislation; and finally, those private citizens representing organizations interested in the use of national forests and other federally owned lands, ranging from those who desire preservation of large areas in their natural state through those who seek recreation in these areas and to those whose livelihood depends on the availability of these public land areas.

There is no statutory authority at the present time to set aside and retain areas of federally owned lands in their natural state. However, since 1924 the Chief of the Forest Service and the Secretary of Agriculture have in one way or another set aside areas within the national forests for wilderness preservation. For the past

several years we have had a national discussion concerning the need for Congress to set forth legislative guidelines to govern wilderness preservation and also to assure a proper balance in the designation of such areas; that is, control the amount of land set aside for this limited use by making sure on one hand that not too much is so earmarked while making sure on the other hand that some future administrator did not arbitrarily do away with all of these areas.

The interest that Members have in wilderness preservation is demonstrated by the fact that we had before our committee in this Congress 23 bills introduced by 16 Members of the House on this subject.

The majority of those to whom I have talked, the majority of those who appeared at hearings before our committee, and the majority of the members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have felt, and continue to feel, that preservation of areas for their wilderness values is a legitimate and worthwhile objective in the management of public lands and the majority are likewise of the opinion that these designations should have congressional sanction and statutory protection. Many of us have felt—and I feel rather strongly—that Congress does not fulfill its responsibility under the Constitution to make rules and regulations respecting the property of the United States unless the Congress establishes the procedures under which wilderness areas are to be preserved.

The dialog that has continued through the past several years has, accordingly, been directed primarily at the terms and conditions rather than the underlying principle. In H.R. 9070, as amended, we bring you a bill in which, with one exception, controversy has been virtually eliminated. I will return in a moment to the controversial feature which involves the proposal to establish commercial skiing facilities on Mount San Gorgonio in an area administratively classified as the San Gorgonio Wild Area; but first let me discuss the features on which we have successfully compromised.

As set forth in the committee report that I filed on H.R. 9070 (H. Rept. No. 1538), the committee agreed upon the following underlying principles as the basis for legislation establishing a national wilderness preservation system:

1. Areas to be designated as "wilderness" for inclusion in the wilderness system should be so designated by affirmative act of Congress.

(a) Those areas currently designated as "wilderness," "wild," and "canoe" have been defined with precision and could be given statutory designation immediately, if all other criteria are satisfied.

(b) Areas currently designated as "primitive" have not been defined with precision and should not be considered for inclusion in the wilderness system until completion of a thorough review during which all interested parties have an opportunity to be heard.

(c) Areas within units of the national park system and the national wildlife system that might qualify for inclusion in the wilderness system should not be considered for inclusion in the wilderness system until comple-

tion of a thorough review during which all interested parties have an opportunity to be heard.

2. Uses not incompatible with wilderness preservation should be permitted in areas included within the wilderness system.

3. Currently authorized uses that are incompatible with wilderness preservation should be phased out over a reasonable period of time.

In taking affirmative action relative to the statutory designation of wilderness areas that have previously been classified administratively as wilderness and wild, the committee, in effect, was reviewing each of these areas individually. Of all the areas so classified, the only objection that was brought to the attention of the committee, other than general objections to the legislation, concerned the restrictions on use in the San Gorgonio Wild Area.

The Forest Service classified the peak of the San Gorgonio mountain in the San Bernardino National Forest, Calif., as the San Gorgonio Primitive Area in 1938 and, reclassified it as a wild area in 1956 on 33,898 acres of national forest land.

The history of two proposals to permit development of commercial ski facilities is detailed in the committee hearings and outlined in the committee report on H.R. 9070. Suffice to take note here that:

First. The community was and remains divided, there being many who favor the skiing development but also there being many who favor retention of the San Gorgonio area in its natural state; and

Second. On October 16, 1963, the Chief of the Forest Service rejected an application to permit the installation of ski lifts and associated facilities. The decision has been appealed to the Secretary of Agriculture and the appeal is pending before the Secretary.

Our Subcommittee on Public Lands in its hearings at Las Vegas on January 13 and 14 this year heard numerous witnesses and received many statements on both sides of the San Gorgonio matter. Subsequently, when we announced the hearings to be held here in Washington the week of April 27, 1964, on this legislation, we took cognizance of the special position that San Gorgonio occupied in the consideration of wilderness legislation and included the following statement in our press release:

In this connection the committee announcement referred specifically to testimony received by the subcommittee at Las Vegas concerning proposals to permit a ski development within the San Gorgonio Wild Area. Inasmuch as all sides of the question had been aired thoroughly at Las Vegas, no further testimony will be taken during the Washington hearings on the San Gorgonio Wild Area ski development alone, except from persons or groups headquartered at or near Washington. In accordance with the general procedure, however, the committee will be pleased to receive any additional written statements that have new views to set forth concerning a proposed ski development in the San Gorgonio area.

Thereafter the committee received two additional statements directed specifically at the San Gorgonio ski develop-

ment problem: one from a director of the San Gorgonio Ski Lifts, the organization desiring skiing development, and one on behalf of the Defenders of San Gorgonio Wilderness who are opposed to commercial skiing development.

The committee position, as expressed by majority vote and as stated in the committee report, is that the public interest will best be served by devoting a portion of Mount San Gorgonio to development with facilities to permit recreational skiing use by the general public. In order to permit use by the general public the installation of ski lifts is required.

H.R. 9070, as amended is, as I have quite frankly said, a compromise bill. As such I recommend it for approval by Members of the House and I urge you to vote for it. In urging your support of this measure I will take just another minute or two to outline more fully its background along with some of the details of the bill.

The first Federal land specifically earmarked for wilderness preservation was an area in the Gila National Forest, N. Mex., which was set aside by the Chief of the Forest Service in 1924. In 1926 roadless areas were designated and given protection in the Superior National Forest in Minnesota leading eventually to the complex of several areas now designated as the Boundary Waters Canoe Area.

The Secretary of Agriculture in 1929 established specific procedures for the designation of primitive areas in national forests when he promulgated regulation L-20 authorizing the Chief of the Forest Service to set aside areas for their primitive values. Regulation L-20 was rescinded in 1939 by regulations then identified as U-1 and U-2 which have since been codified in 36 CFR 251.20 and 251.21 creating new categories to be known as "wilderness" and "wild" areas. Lands designated as either "wilderness" or "wild" have been and are managed under the same procedures and principles—the difference has been that wilderness areas are those in excess of 100,000 acres and may be designated only by the Secretary of Agriculture while wild areas are comprised of between 5,000 and 100,000 acres of land and may be so designated by the Chief of the Forest Service.

Between 1929 and 1939, 73 primitive areas had been established within the national forests. In accordance with administrative policy adopted by the Department of Agriculture, the Forest Service has, since 1939, been reviewing these primitive areas to determine which ones should be designated in whole or in part as either wilderness or wild areas. Since 1930 the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief of the Forest Service have, by administrative action, set aside within the national forests 88 wilderness-type areas designated as either "wilderness," "wild," "primitive" or "canoe" comprised in the aggregate of 14,617,461 acres of land.

In this connection I also call to the attention of the committee that, of the millions of acres of land in the national forests classified by the Department of Agriculture and the Forest Service as

having wilderness values, only 26,455 acres are in the eastern States of North Carolina and New Hampshire, the boundary waters canoe area with 886,673 acres is in the State of Minnesota, and the remaining areas, aggregating 13.7 million acres, are in national forests carved out of the public domain in the 11 Western States.

Of the total of 14,617,461 acres, 5,477,740 acres are in 34 primitive areas and 9,139,721 acres are designated as "wilderness," "wild," and "canoe." Parenthetically, I note for the record that 2 years ago when our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was considering wilderness legislation there were only 6,822,400 acres of land designated as "wilderness," "wild," and "canoe" and that the increase of 2,317,321 acres that has taken place since then has been accomplished by the Department of Agriculture after coordination with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I am pleased to take this opportunity to once again thank Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and Chief of the Forest Serv-

ice Edward Cliff for their cooperation in bringing to our attention the proposed reclassification of primitive areas and proposed enlargements of wilderness and wild areas.

As a matter of fact, there have been many changes in these areas during consideration of the wilderness legislation by the committee, with the latest one taking place on Tuesday of this week when the Chief of the Forest Service modified the boundaries of the Mount Zirkel-Dome Peak Wild Area and changed its name to the Mount Zirkel Wild Area on 72,180 acres of land in the Routt National Forest, Colo., resulting in an increase of this wild area by 18,780 acres.

In order to bring the record up to date, Mr. Chairman, under leave previously granted. I include revised tabulations setting forth a summary of national forest areas administratively designated as having wilderness characteristics, one tabulation setting forth a summary by type of designation and the other tabulation setting forth a summary by States:

Summary of existing national forest wilderness-type areas

1. BY TYPE OF AREA

	Acres
Wilderness areas (18).....	6,898,014
Wild areas (35).....	1,355,034
Canoe areas (1).....	886,673
Subtotal (54 areas).....	9,139,721
Primitive areas (34).....	5,477,740
Total wilderness-type areas (88).....	14,617,461

2. BY STATES

State	Wilderness	Acres (net)		Canoe	Net
		Wild	Primitive		
Arizona.....	329,140	93,850	250,936		673,926
California.....	934,796	322,088	563,152		1,820,036
Colorado.....		274,859	554,283		829,142
Idaho.....	987,910		1,642,388		2,630,298
Minnesota.....				886,673	886,673
Montana.....	1,359,733	122,834	417,140		1,899,707
Nevada.....		64,667			64,667
New Hampshire.....		5,400			5,400
New Mexico.....	603,360	75,301	335,424		1,014,085
North Carolina.....		21,055			21,055
Oregon.....	412,958	249,839	86,700		749,547
Utah.....			240,717		240,717
Washington.....	458,105	125,091	801,000		1,384,196
Wyoming.....	1,812,012		586,000		2,398,012
Total.....	6,898,014	1,355,034	5,477,740	886,673	14,617,461
Total number of areas.....	18	35	34	1	88

H.R. 9070, as amended, gives statutory designation as wilderness to all but one of the areas classified by the Department of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service 60 days before the effective date of the act as "wilderness," "wild" and "canoe" and provides for their inclusion in a national wilderness preservation system. The one exception, as I indicated earlier, is the San Gorgonio wild area in connection with which provision is made for future inclusion in the system of so much of the 33,898-acre tract as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be feasible for preservation after utilizing 3,500 acres for development with commercial skiing facilities.

Excluding, for the time being, the entire San Gorgonio area, this means that

we will by approving H.R. 9070 as reported to the House, authorize the start of a wilderness system comprised of 9,105,823 acres of land.

Under the bill, the 5,477,740 acres of primitive areas will be reviewed over a 10-year period as will all units of the national park system and the national wildlife refuge system. After review by the executive branch, reports will be made to Congress; but none of these added areas can be classified as wilderness and incorporated into the wilderness system except by act of Congress.

The bill as reported by the committee provides that, unless otherwise specifically authorized, no commercial enterprise and no permanent roads are to be allowed in the wilderness areas desig-

nated therein. Provision is, however, made for commercial services necessary "for activities which are proper for realizing the recreational or other wilderness purposes" of the areas involved.

Hunting and fishing will be permitted, and the jurisdiction of the States over hunting and fishing is specifically preserved.

In order to permit evaluation of the mineral potential in the wilderness areas designated by H.R. 9070, the committee has made these specific provisions:

First. Prospecting will be allowed at all times if conducted so as to be compatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment.

Second. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to develop a program for recurring surveys by the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines to determine whether there are any mineral values present.

Third. New mining activity, including all forms of prospecting and staking of claims, will be permitted for a 25-year period ending December 31, 1989, after which the lands involved will be withdrawn from appropriation under the mining laws. During the same 25-year period the lands will be open to mineral leasing.

In making these provisions for mineral exploration and development we have provided the necessary caution for the protection of the wilderness values in the areas. The bill provides that claims located during the 25-year period will entitle the claimant to only such use of the surface as is reasonably required in connection with mining operations, restoration of the surface would be required to the extent practicable after prospecting, location, and discovery work, and in those cases where claims go to patent, the Government would grant title only to the mineral deposits. I also point out that in order to make these provisions meaningful to the mining industry we have provided that the Secretary of Agriculture, while controlling ingress and egress must, where essential, permit the use of mechanized ground or air equipment.

I submit that we have established a reasonable balance in this bill, assured the long-range preservation of wilderness areas while at the same time permitting the continuance of essential uses and an inventorying of the mineral resources that may be present.

It is with confidence that the Members of the House will give this measure their overwhelming support that I submit it for favorable consideration and urge adoption of H.R. 9070, as amended.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for bringing out this bill. It has been a long, hard struggle. He has received much publicity, and while I think some of it has probably been unfavorable, I do not think that the gentleman was deserving of any unfavorable publicity. He has worked hard and long on

this legislation. I think this is legislation that this Nation needs.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman from Colorado has maintained the position of the House whereby we have not delegated to bureaucracy, so to speak, the prerogatives of the House. Before any additional lands can be put into this wilderness area, each session of Congress will have an opportunity to look over this situation and see whether it is justified or not. Therefore, I think the gentleman has done a very, very fine job in maintaining the responsibilities that the Congress should assume in this legislation.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank my colleague, and may I return the compliment to all of the members of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, because I wanted to join other members of the committee in expressing to the great chairman of this committee the appreciation which I think all of us feel is in order for the chairman for his able leadership in connection with this legislation. I think other Members of the House would have to have sat in on some of the lengthy hearings in connection with this bill and would have to have been witness to the very difficult period of markup in connection with this bill in order to appreciate the Spartan-like qualities which the chairman of the committee exhibited in connection with this measure. I think he not only had a major role in coming out with a piece of legislation that accomplishes a great and constructive purpose but also in seeing that vital industries of the country, such as our mining industry and timber industry, are safeguarded in their legitimate desires to continue to prosper in areas of the country where they play such a major role in our economy.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his commendatory remarks and I thank him for his constructive help which he has rendered not only on this legislation but all matters which come before our committee.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the wilderness bill as amended in the House Interior Committee and presented to the House of Representatives today, and I am unalterably opposed to further amendments to this legislation.

I never thought the bill was necessary in the first place, but since the wilderness issue developed into a controversial one I recognized the need for a thorough investigation of the subject.

As chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, I held extensive hearings and heard the views of over 600 witnesses, both in the field—Colorado, State of

Washington, and Nevada—as well as here in Washington, D.C.

The Interior Committee reviewed all of this testimony and put a bill together which we think is a fair bill, fair to all factions concerned.

I am, personally, strictly for multiple use of the public lands but do realize the need for the preservation of some primitive areas; however, not at the cost of the local economy, such as the cattle business, lumber, and mining industries.

Therefore, I feel this wilderness bill before us today, which in the first place covers into the wilderness system initially a much smaller area than the legislation passed by the other body, and, secondly, does take into consideration the mining interests for a stated period of time, as well as grazing subject to reasonable regulations, as deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture, is a good bill.

I sincerely urge passage of H.R. 9070, the wilderness bill, without further amendments.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9070, popularly referred to as the wilderness bill. I wish to take this opportunity to commend the efforts of the able chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] in behalf of this legislation. I wish also to commend the fair and careful way in which the hearings on this measure were conducted by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

This measure has been before the committees of the House and the other body for a period of some 8 years. To the best of my ability to calculate there have been a total of 18 hearings; the first in the House was before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in 1957. In addition thereto, field hearings were held in Phoenix, Ariz.; Sacramento, Calif.; San Francisco, Calif.; Denver, Colo.; Montrose, Colo.; McCall, Idaho; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Las Vegas, Nev.; Bend, Oreg.; Olympia, Wash.; Seattle, Wash.; and Salt Lake City, Utah.

From this citation of the long deliberation on this legislation, it may seem odd to begin my comments by stating what the measure before you does not do prior to urging your support for the important positive proposals that are now contained in the wilderness bill. Despite the long period of concern and study the Congress has given to the proposed wilderness legislation, I am surprised to find that there are still misunderstandings not only about what the measure purports to do but the imagined disasters that some feel will result if the bill is enacted. I think it might best serve the convenience of the Members if I can put to rest some of these misunderstandings.

First. The measure contains no authorization for appropriations to acquire any land and waters that are not now owned by the Federal Government.

Second. The measure establishes no new bureau, committee, and/or council.

Third. The bill does not disturb the jurisdiction of the various bureaus of

Government such as the Forest Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and the Fish and Wildlife Service. They will continue to have the same responsibility of administration under this proposal as they have at the present time.

Fourth. The bill does not lock up 1 billion acres, 776 million acres, and all of the national forests. While such allegations may be absurd to some, a number of people have from time to time mentioned each of these items as being a consequence of the present legislation.

The present legislation starts from the fundamental premise that there is a need to preserve some wilderness in the United States and that this should not disappear from our culture, as would seem to be inexorable without specific and special provisions for its maintenance. There is the general feeling that all land must be designated to some purpose or use. Supporters of wilderness legislation have never denied this but on the contrary have sought to emphasize that the enjoyment of wilderness areas is an important and significant use in our culture.

The country is endowed with the good fortune of having, now in Federal ownership, areas that meet the criteria for wilderness. In addition, we are genuinely indebted to the Forest Service for the special designation of wilderness areas and the careful manner in which administrative procedures have been worked out to protect these areas. It is only natural, therefore, that the measure before you starts at this point.

The question of course has been raised that if the Forest Service has been able to designate and maintain wilderness areas, what purpose can be achieved by this legislation? The immediate answer is that such areas now enjoy only the protection of the executive or more specifically the Secretary of Agriculture, who at some future time could by the stroke of the pen remove all or part of such areas from wilderness, if it should be so desired.

Wilderness is not only fragile but also perishable. The United States continues to be a fast growing Nation. The centers of population appear to be moving; development of every conceivable type possible, both public and private, races forward at breakneck speed. Therefore, it appears logical to presume that in the near future the administrators, whom ever they may be or of whatever political persuasion, will find themselves beleaguered indeed to continue the same type of protection that they have historically been able to give. Once the stroke of the pen is made to change a wilderness area to one of development the act has a finality that enables few comparisons. This is not a construction mistake that can be changed after consultation with architect and engineer. This is not a case of wasting money on a private or public venture that did not result in the planned-for event. This is an act that once done is done forever. No amount of exhortation, soul searching, self-criticism, or scientific application can turn the area back to wilderness. Therefore, it is deemed advisable

that these remaining areas be given the statutory protection that can only be afforded by the act of law.

There are those who contend that this constitutes locking up resources for time immemorial, which might well operate to a serious disadvantage for the entire country. The Members of this body know full well that this is not possible under our form of government. If an emergency arises based on a need that seems greater than that specified in this bill, then of course the procedure for enacting subsequent legislation is always the prerogative and responsibility of the Congress. If this legislation is passed into law, there can be no secret covenants that might result in wilderness losses. There must be instead a public record and a full debate of the merits of acceding to the wishes of those who would urge us to use wilderness for other purposes and those who might insist upon the maintenance of the wilderness. Upon such issues the Congress will work its will. This procedure seems more than fitting in this instance because the abuses of wilderness have the finality of which I referred to previously and the change in its character must give the Congress, as representatives of the American people, the full opportunity to consider carefully any changes.

I would not be truthful with my colleagues if I said that H.R. 9070 is all that I would hope a wilderness bill to be. I hasten to add, however, that the debates upon the details of this measure have not been primarily over whether legislation should be enacted but more often than not it has been centered on the procedure of achieving wilderness protection and in what manner uses generally not compatible with wilderness can be handled. By and large, it is my firm conviction that the measure reported out by the committee will mean a significant step forward in protecting wilderness areas.

It is important to indicate precisely what is meant by wilderness areas. At the present time the national forests have four classifications in which the term wilderness is usually applied—wilderness areas as such, the wild areas, the boundary waters canoe areas, and the primitive areas. Wilderness areas involve areas of 100,000 acres or over. Wild areas are considered exactly the same with the exception that the total area would be less than 100,000 acres. The boundary waters canoe area is unique because of its specific location and which in part was arrived at by cooperation with the Canadian Government. The primitive areas are now administered exactly as the other areas to which I have just referred. The distinction between the primitive areas and the other three is that primitive areas have not been carefully studied as to specific boundary and complete identification.

With the enactment of this legislation the wilderness, wild, and canoe areas would be immediately protected by the force of this act from any changes except by an act of Congress. The primitive areas would not come under the protection of this legislation until a recommendation from the President for designation as wilderness shall be presented

to the Congress and the Congress acts affirmatively. The measure specifies that the classification of areas now in primitive status will be classified within 10 years after the enactment of this act. Primitive areas shall continue to be administered under the present rules and regulations until Congress has determined otherwise, with the exception that the Secretary of Agriculture, with the approval of the President, can declassify or increase in size primitive areas. The increase is further modified in that it is limited to areas of less than 5,000 acres.

This act also seeks to preserve and designate those areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Interior which meet the criteria for wilderness. Such areas would include roadless portions of the national park system and appropriate areas of fish and game refuges. These areas will not become a part of the wilderness system until they are so designated by the Secretary of Interior with the approval of the President and Congress acts affirmatively thereon. The bill provides such a determination be made within 10 years of the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. The gentleman is making a very profound statement and is very well posted in this field. This is something that should be heard by all members of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 196]		
Alger	Hanna	Pilcher
Arends	Harris	Powell
Ashley	Harrison	Rains
Ashmore	Hays	Reid, N.Y.
Auchincloss	Healey	Ryan, Mich.
Avery	Hébert	St Germain
Baring	Hull	Sheppard
Barrett	Jones, Mo.	Sibal
Barry	Kee	Skubitz
Bass	Kilburn	Slack
Bennett, Mich.	Kilgore	Smith, Calif.
Bolling	Kluczynski	Springer
Brademas	Landrum	Steed
Bromwell	Lankford	Taft
Buckley	Leggett	Teague, Calif.
Carey	Lesinski	Teague, Tex.
Celler	Lloyd	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Tenn.	McIntire	Toll
Dawson	Macdonald	Tollefson
Diggs	Malliard	Tupper
Duncan	Miller, N.Y.	Van Pelt
Everett	Morrison	Wallhauser
Evens	Nix	Willis
Goodell	Norblad	
Halleck	Passman	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROOSEVELT) having assumed the chair, Mr. GARY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 9070, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 354 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I include specific tables indicating the location, areas, and classifications immediately following my remarks relevant to both the areas in the national forests and to the approximate areas as reported by the Secretary of the Interior.

ALASKA		Gross acreages (see previous explanation)
Mount McKinley National Park	1,939,493	
Glacier Bay National Monument	2,274,595	
Katmai National Monument	2,697,590	
Aleutian Islands National Wildlife Refuge	2,720,235	
Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge	1,815,000	
Nunivak National Wildlife Refuge	1,109,384	
Arctic National Wildlife Range	8,900,000	
Clarence Rhode National Wildlife Range	1,890,000	
Izembek National Wildlife Range	415,000	
Kenai National Moose Range	2,057,197	
Total	25,818,494	
ARIZONA		
Grand Canyon National Park	673,575	
Grand Canyon National Monument	198,280	
Canyon de Chelly National Monument	83,840	
Chiricahua National Monument	10,645	
Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument	330,874	
Petrified Forest National Monument	94,161	
Saguaro National Monument	78,644	
Wupatki National Monument	35,545	
Cabeza Prieta Game Range	860,000	
Kofa Game Range	660,000	
Total	3,025,564	
CALIFORNIA		
Kings Canyon National Park	454,650	
Lassen Volcanic National Park	108,934	
Sequoia National Park	386,550	
Yosemite National Park	760,951	
Death Valley National Monument	1,907,760	
Joshua Tree National Monument	557,992	
Lava Beds National Monument	46,238	
Pinacles National Monument	14,497	
Total	4,235,572	
COLORADO		
Mesa Verde National Park	51,333	
Rocky Mountain National Park	260,018	
Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument	13,547	
Colorado National Monument	17,692	
Dinosaur National Monument	205,136	
Great Sand Dunes National Monument	36,740	
Total	584,466	
FLORIDA		
Everglades National Park	1,400,533	
GEORGIA		
Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge	330,973	
HAWAII		
Hawaii Volcanoes National Park	220,345	
Haleakala National Park	26,403	
Total	246,748	
* 1,792,520 acres are in California; 115,240 acres are in Nevada.		
* 152,159 acres are in Colorado; 52,977 acres are in Utah.		

IDAHO		NEW MEXICO		UTAH ¹	
<i>Gross acreages (see previous explanation)</i>		<i>Gross acreages (see previous explanation)</i>		<i>Gross acreages (see previous explanation)</i>	
Craters of the Moon National Monument.....	48, 183	Carlsbad Caverns National Park.....	49, 448	Bryce Canyon National Park.....	36, 010
		Bandelier National Monument.....	30, 703	Zion National Park.....	147, 034
		White Sands National Monument.....	146, 535	Arches National Monument.....	34, 010
				Capital Reef National Monument.....	39, 172
MICHIGAN		Total.....		Total.....	
Isle Royale National Park.....	539, 338		226, 686		256, 226
		NORTH CAROLINA AND TENNESSEE		WASHINGTON	
		Great Smoky Mountains National Park.....	4 511, 715	Mount Rainier National Park.....	241, 782
				Olympic National Park.....	896, 599
		OREGON		Total.....	
Total.....	1, 963, 956	Crater Lake National Park.....	160, 290		1, 138, 381
		SOUTH DAKOTA		WYOMING	
		Wind Cave National Park.....	28, 059	Grand Teton National Park.....	310, 350
		Badlands National Monument.....	111, 530	Yellowstone National Park.....	* 2, 221, 773
				Total.....	2, 532, 123
		Total.....	139, 589	Total gross acreage.....	
				46, 599, 563	
		TEXAS		² Dinosaur National Monument is partially in Utah. See acreages under Colorado.	
		Big Bend National Park.....	708, 221	³ 2,039,217 acres are in Wyoming; 151,068 acres are in Montana; 31,488 acres are in Idaho.	
		⁴ 275,332 acres are in North Carolina; 236,383 acres are in Tennessee.			

Wilderness areas

State, name, and date established as primitive area	Date established	National forest	Net area (acres)	State, name, and date established as primitive area	Date established	National forest	Net area (acres)
Arizona:				New Mexico:			
Mazatzal (1932).....	1940	Tonto.....	205, 000	Gila (1933).....	1953	Gila.....	438, 360
Superstition (1939).....	1940	do.....	124, 140	Pecos (1933).....	1955	Santa Fe.....	165, 000
Total.....			329, 140			Carson.....	
California:				Total.....			603, 360
John Muir (1931).....	1964	Inyo.....	502, 978	Oregon:			
Marble Mountain (1931).....	1953	Sierra.....	213, 283	Eagle Cap (1930).....	1940	Wallowa.....	216, 250
Minarets (1931).....	1963	Sequoia.....	109, 484	Three Sisters (1937).....	1957	Whitman.....	196, 708
Yolla Bolly-Middle Eel (1931).....	1956	Klamath.....	109, 051			Deschutes.....	
Total.....		Sierra.....				Willamette.....	
		Shasta-Trinity.....	934, 796	Total.....			412, 958
Idaho: Selway-Bitterroot ¹ (1936).....	1963	Mendocino.....	987, 910	Washington: Glacier Peak.....	1960	Wenatchee.....	458, 105
						Mount Baker.....	
Total.....			987, 910	Total.....			458, 105
Montana:				Wyoming:			
Anaconda-Pintlar (1937).....	1962	Beaverhead.....	157, 803	Bridger (1931).....	1960	Bridger.....	383, 300
Bob Marshall (1931-33).....	1940	Bitterroot.....	960, 000	North Absaroka (1932).....	1951	Shoshone.....	359, 700
Selway-Bitterroot ² (1936).....	1963	Deerlodge.....	251, 930	South Absaroka (1932).....	1951	do.....	505, 552
Total.....		Flathead.....		Teton (1934).....	1955	Teton.....	563, 460
		Lewis and Clark.....		Total.....			1, 812, 012
		Bitterroot.....		Wilderness total.....			6, 898, 014
		Lolo.....					
		Total.....	1, 359, 733				

¹ Also shown in Montana.
² Area also shown in Idaho.

Wild areas

State, name, and date established as primitive area	Date established	National forest	Net area (acres)	State, name, and date established as primitive area	Date established	National forest	Net area (acres)
Arizona:				Colorado:			
Chiricahua (1933).....	1940	Coronado.....	18, 000	La Garita (1932).....	1961	Gunnison.....	49, 000
Galiuro (1932).....	1940	do.....	55, 000	Maroon Bells, Snowmass (1933).....	1956	Rio Grande.....	66, 100
Sierra Ancha (1933).....	1951	Tonto.....	20, 850	Mount Zirkel-Dome Peak (1931).....	1949	White River.....	53, 400
Total.....			93, 850	Rawah (1932).....	1953	Routt.....	25, 579
California:				West Elk (1932).....	1957	Roosevelt.....	62, 000
Caribou (1931).....	1961	Lassen.....	19, 080	Total.....			256, 079
Cucamonga (1931).....	1956	San Bernardino.....	9, 022	Montana: Gates of the Mountains.....	1948	Helena.....	28, 562
Domeland (1931).....	1963	Sequoia.....	62, 121	Total.....			28, 562
Hoover (1931).....	1957	Toiyabe.....	42, 800	Nevada: Jarbidge.....	1958	Humboldt.....	64, 667
Mokelumne.....	1963	Inyo.....	50, 400	Total.....			64, 667
San Geronio (1931).....	1956	Eldorado.....	33, 898	New Hampshire: Great Gulf.....	1959	White Mountain.....	5, 400
San Jacinto (1931).....	1960	Stanislaus.....	20, 565	Total.....			5, 400
Thousand Lakes (1931).....	1955	San Bernardino.....	15, 695				
Total.....		Lassen.....					
		Total.....	253, 581				

Wild areas—Continued

State, name, and date established as primitive area	Date established	National forest	Net area (acres)	State, name, and date established as primitive area	Date established	National forest	Net area (acres)
New Mexico:				Oregon—Continued			
San Pedro Parks (1931).....	1940	Santa Fe.....	41, 132	Mount Hood (1931).....	1940	Mount Hood.....	14, 160
Wheeler Peak.....	1960	Carson.....	6, 051	Mount Washington.....	1957	Deschutes.....	46, 655
White Mountain (1933).....	1957	Lincoln.....	28, 118	Mountain Lake (1930).....	1940	Willamette.....	23, 071
Total			75, 301	Strawberry Mountain.....	1942	Malheur.....	33, 004
North Carolina:				Total			249, 889
Linville Gorge.....	1951	Pisgh.....	7, 655	Washington:			
Shining Rock.....	1964	do.....	13, 400	Goat Rocks (1931).....	1940	Snoqualmie.....	82, 680
Total			21, 055	Mount Adams.....	1942	Gifford Pinchot.....	42, 411
Oregon:				Total			125, 091
Diamond Peak.....	1957	Deschutes.....	35, 440	Wild total			1, 173, 475
Gearhart Mountain.....	1943	Willamette.....	18, 709				
Kalmiopsis.....	1946	Fremont.....	78, 850				
		Siskiyou.....					

Boundary waters canoe area

State, name, and date established as primitive area	Date established	National forest	Net area (acres)
Minnesota:			
Caribou Division.....	1948	Superior.....	36, 059
Little Indian Sioux Division.....	1939	do.....	64, 117
Superior.....	1936	do.....	786, 497
Total			886, 673
Boundary total			886, 673

Primitive areas

State, name, and date established as primitive area	Date established	National forest	Net area (acres)	State, name, and date established as primitive area	Date established	National forest	Net area (acres)
Arizona:				Montana:			
Blue Range ¹	1933	Apache.....	180, 139	Absaroka.....	1932	Gallatin.....	64, 000
Mount Baldy.....	1932	do.....	7, 400	Beartooth.....	1932	Custer.....	230, 000
Pine Mountain.....	1933	Prescott.....	17, 445	Cabinet Mountains.....	1935	Gallatin.....	89, 900
Sycamore Canyon.....	1935	Tonto.....	45, 952	Mission Mountains.....	1931	Kaniksu.....	73, 340
Total			250, 936	Spanish Peaks.....	1932	Kootenai.....	49, 800
California:				Total			507, 040
Agua Tibia.....	1931	Cleveland.....	25, 995	New Mexico:			
Desolation Valley.....	1931	Eldorado.....	41, 343	Black Range.....	1933	Gila.....	169, 196
Devil Canyon-Bear Canyon.....	1932	Angeles.....	35, 267	Blue Range ²	1933	Apache.....	36, 598
Emigrant Basin.....	1931	Stanislaus.....	97, 020	Gila.....	1933	Gila.....	129, 630
High Sierra.....	1931	Sierra.....	13, 000	Total			335, 424
Salmon Trinity Alps.....	1932	Sequoia.....	223, 300	Oregon: Mount Jefferson	1933	Deschutes.....	86, 700
San Rafael.....	1932	Shasta-Trinity.....	74, 458	Mount Hood.....		Mount Hood.....	
South Warner.....	1931	Klamath.....	68, 870	Willamette.....		Willamette.....	
Ventana.....	1931	Los Padres.....	52, 769	Total			86, 700
Total			632, 022	Utah: High Uintas	1931	Ashley.....	240, 717
Colorado:				Wasatch.....		Wasatch.....	
Flat Tops.....	1932	White River.....	117, 800	Total			240, 717
Gore Range-Eagle Nest.....	1933	do.....	61, 204	Washington: North Cascade	1935	Mount Baker.....	801, 000
San Juan.....	1932	Arapaho.....	238, 080	Okanogan.....		Okanogan.....	
Uncompahgre.....	1932	San Juan.....	53, 252	Total			801, 000
Upper Rio Grande.....	1932	Uncompahgre.....	56, 600	Wyoming:			
Wilson Mountains.....	1932	Rio Grande.....	27, 347	Cloud Peak.....	1932	Bighorn.....	137, 000
Total			554, 283	Glacier.....	1937	Shoshone.....	177, 000
Idaho:				Popo Agie.....	1937	do.....	70, 000
Idaho.....	1931	Boise.....	1, 224, 576	Stratified.....	1932	do.....	202, 000
Salmon River Breaks.....	1936	Challis.....	216, 870	Total			586, 000
Sawtooth.....	1937	Salmon.....	200, 942	Primitive total			5, 639, 510
Total			1, 642, 388				

¹ Area also in New Mexico.
² Area also in Arizona.

Mr. Chairman, I will in the course of the consideration of this legislation seek two amendments to which I now urge my colleagues' attention and I shall discuss them at the appropriate time. The first is to exclude the authorization of a ski area in the San Gorgonio wild area, and secondly, I shall ask the deletion of the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to declassify primitive areas. The latter instance would simply leave the primitive areas in their present state until Congress has made a final determination as to their suitability for wilderness classification.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and the leader of the minority in the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], for the work they have done in making possible this action by the House today. We now are drawing to a conclusion the careful study that the committee and the House have given the wilderness bill through a period of 8 years, both here in Washington and in the many field hearings throughout the West.

We now have the opportunity to pass a wilderness bill that will represent a highly reasonable approach to the objective of preserving certain parts of this Nation as wilderness. The measure before us embodies provisions that have come out of study and evaluation of our objectives in terms of the needs that have been defined by conservation groups as well as the commodity users of resources who have been critical of certain of the provisions of earlier wilderness measures.

Mr. Chairman, I am encouraged by the efforts of this committee and its leaders in bringing our deliberations to a productive conclusion by reporting a bill that I feel will satisfy our need for effective wilderness protective legislation. The people in Michigan whom I represent have urged me to work for House passage of a sound wilderness bill. I am pleased today to give every possible assistance in our effort to secure passage of this vitally important conservation legislation and to support the adoption of amendments that will strengthen it in serving the important goals that it sets forth.

It was my privilege last November to introduce a revised version of the wilderness bill, H.R. 9162, which embraced amendments that were then suggested as a means of resolving the major differences that had grown out of discussions between sponsors of earlier wilderness bills and those who had opposed their passage. I was pleased to have had this part in the cooperative effort which cleared the way for hearings and the favorable action by the committee that brings us to this point today. At the time I introduced my revised bill I made clear that I wished to consider later possible amendments to this measure that might prove, in my judgment, to be desirable. I subsequently presented

these to the committee during its hearings and I am pleased that the measure before us incorporates part of these strengthening features.

I shall not take time to emphasize the vital importance of this legislation which many of us regard, and President Kennedy described so aptly, as one of the most significant conservation landmarks of recent years. This measure has solid support from the present administration and our wilderness agencies and all of our major conservation organizations. People from over the entire Nation are urging its enactment. No single item of conservation legislation has received broader support or wider advocacy by our publicity and educational media including the press, radio, and television. The time has now come for us to reach agreement, to complete the resolution of our differences, and to pass a bill that will serve our country well in preserving our wilderness heritage.

This bill calls for inclusion of only the national forest wilderness and wild areas and the one canoe area in the National Wilderness Preservation System to be established upon its enactment. Other areas of Federal wilderness land—the national forest primitive areas, and areas of wilderness within the jurisdictions of the National Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service—would be added to the wilderness system only after careful reviews that call for field studies and hearings, and upon the recommendation of the President to the Congress. The Congress would then have to take affirmative and positive action in designating those wilderness units for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

I was pleased to see that the bill before us—H.R. 9070—contains language to provide needed protection for the primitive areas while the administrative review of these areas is in progress and until Congress has acted to approve or reject the President's recommendation to Congress for each such unit. I very much regret, however, that the measure contains language that would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to declassify any one of the remaining 30-odd primitive areas. While such action calls for approval of the President and 60 days notice to Congress, it seems wholly inconsistent with the requirements of the bill for congressional action in providing for any additions or withdrawals from the wilderness system. I, therefore, strongly support the amendments to eliminate this authority of the Secretary of Agriculture and thus leave to Congress the final decision as to the disposition that will be made of the 5 million acres of wilderness in the national forest primitive areas.

I wish to give my support to the amendment which will be offered today to eliminate the language in the bill that calls for the exclusion of the San Gorgonio wild area from the National Wilderness Preservation System in order to permit commercial ski development. To include this type of precedent-setting authorization in basic and far-reaching legislation of this importance, would be a tragic mistake. I certainly wish to add

my voice to those who support the amendment to strike the language of the bill that would authorize commercialization of this irreplaceable unit of wilderness.

The Forest Service, the agency in whose jurisdiction the San Gorgonio wild area falls, has recently denied the scheme of the ski developers. Their plan calls for a 5,000-car parking lot, roads, hotels, trams, and other facilities in the heart of this unit where development would spell the end of a unique wilderness resource. The Forest Service has recommended alternative sites for the ski development that could better meet the needs of those who enjoy skiing without sacrificing an area which since 1931 has been protected as part of the national forest wilderness.

Skiers, of course, are welcome—as they always have been—to use the San Gorgonio wild area in its unspoiled, natural condition. They enjoy it now along with the tens of thousands of boys and girls who every summer tramp its expanses of unsurpassed alpine country. These young people, with conservationists throughout the Nation, do not want this area to be sacrificed to one recreational use—commercial skiing—at the expense of the year-round enjoyment by the thousands who visit the San Gorgonio each year.

I would express the hope also, Mr. Chairman, that mining provisions of this measure could be modified to reduce the period in which mineral development would be permitted in the national forest wilderness. Mining destroys wilderness and I would urge that the phaseout period for this use be reduced considerably from the 25-year period which is provided for in this bill before us.

As a reasonable compromise, my bill H.R. 9162, provided for 10 years of mineral exploration and development in wilderness of the national forests. I would prefer to see mining eliminated entirely in these areas, but the 25-year extension goes far beyond what I regard as a reasonable limitation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this legislation will stand out through the years as one of the most far reaching and significant conservation measures enacted by the Congress in this century. It has been a pleasure to participate in its development and to play a part in this action of the House today which marks the culmination of long effort by the Congress and conservationists throughout our land.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN].

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of the purposes of this legislation. The establishment of a National Wilderness Preservation System is, to my mind, highly essential to the preservation of that segment of our background which is so rapidly disappearing. We have made advances in this program from the original establishment of primitive areas in our national forests in 1929. The advancement of the idea through such designations as "wilderness" areas, "wild" areas, and "canoe" areas through the years have

been helpful, but the legislation presently being considered is, to my mind, a very essential culminating step.

The wildlife, the forests, the lakes, the valleys, and the glades of our country have been repeatedly mentioned in song, prose, and poetry. All of us have favorite sections of this country where we can still enjoy primitive America. Unfortunately, however, the encroachments of civilization have tended to materially decrease our wildlife and to eliminate these natural wonders. What was once a forest may now be just a few sparse trees, and what was once a scenic wonder may now be a housing development, and many of the species of our once-pleetiful wildlife can now only be found in zoological gardens.

Fortunately, however, it is not too late to save some of primitive America, principally within the confines of our national forests, and I feel that it is high time we do everything in our power to preserve what we still have left. The forests and the woodlands are needed for the preservation of our wildlife, and the purposes of this legislation is to keep intact what we still have of these wonders which were originally given us with such a lavish hand.

I, therefore, feel that H.R. 9070 is a real step forward in trying to save these things for the future enjoyment of those who come after us, as they were enjoyed in their entirety by our forebears, and, to a lesser degree, are enjoyed by ourselves.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, in the time that I have been a Member of Congress, many issues have been debated in this Chamber but to my mind there have been few of such vital concern to the American heritage as the issue before us today, the permanent preservation of remnants of our American wilderness.

Wilderness is part of our heritage and a continuing influence upon our thoughts and our desires, both as individuals and as a people.

We owe a great deal to the great American wilderness, economically and spiritually. It is therefore fitting that we as a people wholeheartedly support the proposition that some representative areas of this great country be preserved as a wilderness not for us alone but for those generations of Americans to come. Critics of wilderness preservation may say that such estheticism has no place in a 20th-century world. However, this may be said of everything and anything that an individual or a people set above price or commercial advantage.

I believe that it is time for this country to act to preserve the suitable remaining wilderness areas in our federally owned lands on a permanent basis by an act of Congress for all times.

Some of my colleagues may be wondering and skeptical of the wilderness preservation interest expressed by those of us who live in the heavily settled areas on the northeastern seaboard. The vast, eastern wilderness areas were lost some time ago. Lost perhaps because then there was always more wilderness to be

had over the ridge to the west. Somehow, in the process, we ran out of space—there was not another ridge to cross and the wilderness was overrun and thereby destroyed forever. The scarcity of wilderness throughout the East and in other areas of our country are mute testimony to the urgency for acting as conclusively as possible to preserve the natural areas still in existence.

It is for these reasons that I urge the enactment of H.R. 9070. It is a bill which was sponsored by the distinguished ranking minority member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is a bill which also follows the recommendations of the Eisenhower-appointed Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission which called for enactment of legislation "providing for the establishment and management of certain primitive areas as wilderness areas."

In conclusion, I would like to call to the attention of this body the widespread opinion throughout the country that Congress should take action to assure the permanent reservation of these areas. It is important that we, as a people, act to place our remaining wilderness areas above price, above commercialism, above exploitation for individual or special group advantage. We cannot afford the continuous destruction of this valuable resource that, once despoiled, can never be recovered.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, for some 8 years now I have been hoping that the House would have an opportunity to consider a wilderness bill. At long last, today, this wish is fulfilled and with the passage of this legislation an important step in the interest of conservation will have finally been achieved.

May I say that on one hand, I am especially gratified that this bill retains the power to extend wilderness areas in the legislative branch. This provision, I know, is not supported by many conservationists. But under our U.S. Constitution such power is assigned to the Congress and as with many constitutional responsibilities I have been opposed to delegating our authority and responsibility to the executive branch. So in all conscience I support Congress retaining its constitutional power.

On the contrary, however, in this measure the Secretary of Agriculture is delegated authority to declassify primitive areas. This would place undue power in the executive branch to open major areas to commercialization and, as I say, is contrary to my belief that this discretionary authority should not be so delegated. So if an appropriate amendment is offered as I understand it will be, I shall support retaining control over primitive areas in the Congress rather than giving the right to the Secretary of Agriculture to open up major primitive areas to commercialization. Congress should be the watchdog over the unique scenic wilderness for future generations.

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the desirability of adopting certain needed amendments such as this one, I think the

bill is a good one and I am sure the American people have every reason to be indebted to its sponsors.

I support the bill and congratulate the committee for a job well done.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, for all who love the great open spaces, and wish to preserve for succeeding generations of Americans the precious heritage of the wilderness, this is an historic day of legislative accomplishment. At long last I, with my colleagues, will have the opportunity of voting for a measure that will establish a national wilderness preservation system and protect our forests from the destruction that inevitably would descend upon them unless action in time were taken.

For me, Mr. Chairman, it is a day of happiness and I am sure my vote for the national wilderness preservation bill will please my constituents in the great Second District of Illinois. I do not believe there is a district in the United States that is more deeply interested in conserving our riches of nature. My mail has been large, very large, and responding to the wishes of my constituents and the impulses of my own nature, I have introduced legislation in the nature of that now under consideration at every session of the Congress of which I have been a Member. Two of the twenty-two bills considered by the committee and which were combined in the present H.R. 9070 were H.R. 2530 and H.R. 9164, which I had the honor and privilege of introducing and sponsoring.

As has been said, this is a compromise bill and it is a good bill. It does not do everything that I would wish, and it does more than some others would wish. But it does bring together on a bill all can support practically the entire membership of this body. I doubt that there will be few, if any, who cast negative votes.

Mr. Chairman, too much credit cannot be given the membership of the great Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is one of the hardest working committees of the House, and while it is natural and desirable that there should be differences of opinion on details, this remarkable committee always can be depended upon to work out its differences and come up with programs everybody can accept and live with. My warmest congratulations to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TAYLOR], and to all their teammates.

As a Member of the freshman class of the 81st Congress, I feel a reflected glory in the high accomplishments of the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], who is the first Member of that class to attain the power and the prestige and the glory of the chairmanship of a major committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. I can assure the gentleman from Colorado that the words of high praise of him voiced on both sides of the aisle today have been sweet

music in the ears of his fellow freshmen of the 81st Congress.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 9070. As I understand it will be in order upon its passage to substitute S. 4. There is in S. 4 section 6(c) (8) as follows:

(8) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent, within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, any activity, including prospecting, for the purpose of gathering information about mineral or water resources or to prevent the completely subsurface use of such areas, if such activity or subsurface use is carried on, in a manner which is not incompatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment.

H.R. 9070 on page 26, section 4(d) (2) has a provision which covers most of the section that I read save and except that it does not take into consideration the subsurface use of the wilderness system.

What I would like to know is this. If this goes to conference will the chairman of this committee and his conferees take into consideration the possible subsurface use in these wilderness areas?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, somehow, I think it was inadvertent, we left out of our bill this phrase. We feel that the language in the bill properly protects what my colleague has in mind. I can assure my colleague from Colorado's First District that if the intent is not there, as it was in the Senate bill in this particular, I, for one, will be very glad in conference to see to it that the remedy is made. I feel sure, and I have been advised, that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] feels the same way I do about it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I appreciate the information and I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN].

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to thank personally the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Of course, in the part of the country that I have the privilege to represent here in Congress we have a great interest in what happens to public land for we have a considerable amount of such property in our State.

When I was first elected to Congress and came here in 1961, I could see that there was an almost impossible division and it appeared as far as wilderness legislation was concerned, between the different thoughts and philosophies, that no legislation could pass the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I did not think I would be here today speaking on behalf of this bill because I did not think it was possible to weld all of these factions to-

gether and produce a piece of legislation that is acceptable, not only to the people who promote wilderness, but also to those who promote a multipurpose use of the systems of the great Federal lands in this country.

I represent a very large cattle-producing area which depends to a great extent upon grass from federally owned land for which they pay a lease or a rental fee. They find no objection to this bill, because it retains in Congress congressional control. The people who are involved with mining and oil exploration find this a good bill. It does justice to them and at the same time protects the needs of those who are primarily interested in wilderness and preserves these areas in the United States for the many people who love the great outdoors.

So, I would say to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and to the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], you are both to be congratulated because you could not have produced this bill without a great deal of understanding, without a great deal of work and without a great deal of perseverance.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] compliment the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and his comment on the excessive and unfair criticism that had been leveled at the chairman by editorial writers and magazine writers throughout the country. It was unfair and I think the gentleman has proved its unfairness by the fact that the bill is here today being supported by the very groups that at one time or another were taking potshots at the chairman.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. BATTIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. SHORT. May I join with the gentleman in commending the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and the ranking Republican member the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for doing such a remarkably good job in bringing out a bill that involved a lot of emotional feelings on the part of people on both sides of the issue with reference to the establishment of wilderness areas.

Mr. Chairman, the only additional thing that I want to inject here is the fact that the livestock industry across the country has now accepted this bill, without any reservation.

The chairman of the committee and the task force of the committee met with the livestock people over the country and with other people and apparently any fears that they may have had have now been clarified.

Mr. Chairman, the president of the American National Cattlemen's Association happens to be a next-door neighbor of mine from North Dakota and I know that the livestock people have no reservations about this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is rather important to inject into the RECORD the fact that this group which is perhaps as

largely interested in the use of public lands as any, has no reservations about this wilderness bill now pending.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, I say in conclusion that certainly by throwing the bouquets to the chairman and the ranking member that by no means do we fail to recognize the efforts and hard work of the other members of the committee who have had to fight this battle and come up with a very workable and understandable bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the job they have done has been one almost impossible of solution. Gentlemen, the Members of the House and the people throughout the country thank you.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, although I did not introduce a wilderness bill in this Congress, I have in the past been one of the sponsors of this important and farseeing conservation legislation. Therefore I am delighted to have this opportunity to add my voice in its support, and I intend to cast my vote for its passage. I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Interior Committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and all his colleagues, for their long and patient work in resolving the many problems that had to be met in devising a workable plan for saving our precious remnants of natural grandeur, while at the same time protecting the interests of all users of the public lands.

Our national park system and our national forests, Mr. Chairman, have been held up justly as conservation models for the world. The national park concept was born on this continent and it grew, as I believe this legislation has grown, out of the special feeling—a kind of inspiration to freedom, which our people have always drawn from the beauty with which the Creator endowed our land.

Much has been said and written of the recreation to be enjoyed in our wilderness areas. The hunting and fishing, the camping and pack trips, the hiking and canoeing, that can be done in areas where "man is only a visitor and does not remain"—all these experiences do have a special quality in big, wild, unspoiled country of the kind this bill is designed to protect.

But there are additional benefits to science and conservation in the preservation of wilderness. Here ecologists can study and measure the processes of nature as a check against man's artificial manipulation of his environment in other places. Sometimes man not only manipulates, he pollutes and contaminates. Sometimes the consequences are not always what man has calculated they should be. Many kinds of scientific research are impossible except in areas where nature's processes are kept as undisturbed as possible.

This bill will also yield important benefits in wildlife conservation. The grizzly bear and the mountain lion, both magnificent creatures of the wilderness, are unlikely to survive unless some siz-

able areas are saved for them. The California condor, one of the largest and rarest birds in the world, is utterly dependent upon wilderness that has been saved for it in the Los Padres National Forest in California. The bald eagle, our national emblem, the golden eagle, the much admired but rare sport fish known as the grayling, and many other species depend upon wilderness habitat.

Mr. Chairman, I support the bill. I would have preferred a less permissive section pertaining to mining, as I question that the national interest requires the operation of the mining law in these parts of the national forests for another 25 years. I am afraid that in the process, some of our best wilderness will be turned into nonwilderness.

I also think that a commercial ski center or development, as this bill would permit in one area, is inconsistent with the purposes of the legislation. While it affects only one area, I suggest this is a precedent that may return to haunt us.

But despite the reservations which I have just expressed, I believe this bill will go down in history as a milestone in conservation progress. It is a credit to all its sponsors. It proves that Americans can rise above and look beyond selfish ends and materials purposes. This is putting aside commercial considerations and saving some of the finest and most beautiful pieces of primitive America for the future.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, if this Congress keeps up the way we are going I think we are going to be known as the "conservation Congress." In 2 weeks, when this bill passes today, and I am going to delay its passage for only 2 minutes, we will have enacted, two real landmark pieces of conservation legislation: the wilderness bill and the land and water conservation fund bill.

In my judgment every legislative body which has committees ought to have a chairman like the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. Of every thousand bills that are introduced in the House, more than 600 of them end up in his committee. He runs a fair committee, he runs a businesslike committee, he runs a committee that processes important legislation. It is a tribute to the national view he has taken of conservation problems that we have been able in this Congress to resolve some of these important issues. I want also to pay tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has so ably and for so many years led the fight for wilderness preservation.

This wilderness bill is a compromise bill, but it is a good bill. It is a bill which we can take pride in telling our grandchildren about. One of the most significant things about our country is its dramatic population growth. In the year 2000 instead of the 190 million people we now have, we are going to have 340 million people the experts tell us. We are running out of land. What this bill will do is to set aside some of the

choice, scenic areas of America to preserve them for generations to come.

It is a good bill, and I urge its support.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN].

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this important legislation establishing a national policy for wilderness preservation.

This bill has been described as one of the most vital conservation measures ever to come before Congress. I am pleased to say also that it does not call for the outlay of more Government money.

It merely sets up a system by which existing Federal agencies will preserve wilderness values in the specified areas already under their jurisdiction.

This legislation will also set up orderly procedure for additions, deletions, or changes in the wilderness preservation system. There will be provisions for due notice and public hearings.

One of the fine provisions sets aside about 9 million acres of the national forest wilderness, wild and canoe areas for the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Also, about 5.6 million acres of primitive areas of the national forests and wilderness lands of park and wildlife refuge areas will be added during a 10-year review period. The review, appropriately, will be carried out by Congress periodically.

In earlier forms, this bill had been subject to some criticism. I am pleased to say, however, that now it will not, for example, conflict with established uses of parks, monuments, forests, or wildlife refuges.

Neither will it interfere with established practices, such as grazing.

And, it will not endanger existing private rights. On the contrary, it specifically safeguards them.

This bill, I am happy to say, will preserve for present and future generations, land in its original state to be used and enjoyed by all who are interested in outdoor life and conservation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in the commendations that have been made with reference to the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], for the initiative they have taken to bring this bill to the floor.

The purpose of this bill and the objective of those who have introduced wilderness bills in past sessions of Congress has been to establish by legislative action a firm reservation of these great remaining natural, scenic areas, so that they will remain inviolate in their present form for future generations to enjoy as we can enjoy them today.

The pressure in this country through the growth of population is becoming so tremendous upon these areas that unless firm legislative action is taken by this Congress there is inevitably going to be a

continued reduction in this type of area, a reduction by roads, a reduction by improvements, a reduction by lumbering in areas that should not have lumbering in them, and in other ways through commercial resorts, that will reduce these areas so that we will reach a time when there will be no more wilderness areas of this type. Once that time is reached, it will be impossible to restore areas because once an area is destroyed in its natural beauty by a road that cuts down the side of a mountain, or if a beautiful forest that should be preserved is cut, you cannot restore that area in its natural form even within one generation.

Those of us who enjoy going out on hikes in areas where we cannot find a television set, where no telephone can reach us, would like to see the next generation and the generations to follow find such places. I can assure you that no matter how badly we feel we may need these areas, the generations to follow are going to need them even more desperately. In my own State of California, which now has 18 million people, within 20 or 30 years the population will double. Under the bill, according to my understanding, California will have the largest total acreage of wilderness area in the United States. But if we do not take action to preserve these wilderness areas, the pressure of 36 million people will cause many of those wilderness areas to be destroyed, cut into, and resorts put there, which would make it impossible for those in future generations to find the solitude, the peace and the quiet they may need so desperately when they want to get away from the pressures of civilization.

So this is the reason why those of us who have been interested in this subject, why the national conservation organizations have been working year after year to establish this wilderness system. Inevitably the pressure on a single man at an administrative desk who would have the right to declassify one of these areas might become too great in the future, and a legislative body of this type would be better adapted to resist this pressure. This primarily is the reason why this wilderness bill is brought out on the floor. I hope the House and Senate will pass the bill and the conferees will resolve the differences with rapidity, so that this bill can be signed and become law as soon as possible.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman congratulations are certainly due the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for bringing this legislation to the House for favorable action. Personally, I feel this legislation has been long needed. I first introduced legislation on the subject in 1959 and have had revised legislation pending in each succeeding Congress. With the passage of this legislation I believe this session of

Congress can properly claim credit for making the greatest advances of any recent Congress in the field of conservation for future generations.

I wish to thank particularly the committee chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and his counterpart on the committee for the minority side, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], for their successful effort in bringing this important legislation to the floor of the House for our consideration today. I strongly support its enactment and I would urge adoption of the amendments that are being offered to strengthen its wilderness-protective features.

Through its establishment of a National Wilderness Preservation System, the excellent definition of wilderness that it gives, and the clearcut procedures it sets up for adding wilderness of the primitive areas, park units, and wildlife refuge areas to the wilderness system, this measure promises to be recognized as one of the major conservation landmarks of recent decades. Through its passage, we here today are making conservation history.

The purpose of this measure is to afford protection for our priceless wilderness heritage, a heritage that once destroyed can never be replaced. It is impossible to restore wilderness once it is gone. And in joining those who seek refinements in this bill to meet the wilderness preservation objectives it sets forth, I would hope that its provisions for safeguarding this heritage might be tightened.

I object strenuously to the language in this bill that would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to declassify our national forest primitive areas and thus remove them from their present status in which their irreplaceable wilderness features have been preserved for us and the generations that follow. I wish to support the amendment that would strike this provision from the bill. In this way, only Congress would be vested with the authority of declassification that would permit removal of these units from protected status. Just as the measure places securely in Congress' hands the responsibility for adding areas to the wilderness system, I want only the Congress to hold the authority to declassify these areas. There is no sound reason for us to relinquish to the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to declassify these units. Let these primitive areas remain in their present status and be protected as wilderness until Congress considers and acts upon them.

I also wish to support the amendment to eliminate language in the bill that calls for a skiing development in the San Geronio Wild Area. The intrusion of such commercial enterprise in a unit of the national forest wilderness, which has been protected since 1931, establishes a dangerous precedent. There can be little justification of such an action.

I would express my hope that the section of this measure that calls for mining in the national forest wilderness can be improved by shortening the period in which such activity would be allowed. Mining is incompatible with the wilderness preservation purposes of the meas-

ure. It is my hope that this feature of the bill can be modified to provide better protection from mining encroachments for our wild areas.

Again I wish to commend the leadership of the committee and the sponsors of this legislation for their achievement in bringing this vitally important measure before us in this its final stage of consideration before enactment. This day will long be remembered in the conservation annals of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND].

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk just a little bit about this legislation. I think first of all we could say that the period of gestation of this bill has been about 5 years at least. I have talked to several of my colleagues, several on our side, who were on this Interior and Insular Affairs Committee as long as 5 or 6 years ago. They have told me how they remembered the beginning of wilderness legislation. This child, or this legislation, did not have a very easy birth. But it finally arrived with the consent of the parents. As a matter of fact, this is a bill that passed the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs unanimously and, yet, only as short a time as 2 years ago this bill was probably one of the most controversial pieces of legislation that the House of Representatives had considered. A lot of bitter words were exchanged. Views were completely different on what the legislation should contain. Yet through debate and through real honest consideration, a little give here and a little give there, this committee came out with a bill that satisfies, I believe, everyone. When I say everyone, I mean people in the lumber industry. I mean people in the cattle industry and in the mining industry and in the recreation field and in the wilderness field. Even the ultra wilderness people have taken this bill as good legislation. And if this was not the best work I have ever seen in committee, then I will say I have never seen good work.

I, too, want to pay my eulogies to the chairman of the committee and to the ranking Republican member. But there is another fellow who I think deserves a great deal of credit for this bill being here on the floor under these conditions, and that is the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING], who had some very strong views on this legislation but who in the interest of getting this bill before us gave a little bit and now feels that this legislation is acceptable.

Just this last winter a subcommittee went out to the Western States and held hearings where I think something over 500 or 600 witnesses appeared before the subcommittee of which I was a member to give their views. All the views were taken into consideration in the writing of this bill.

The district I represent contains all of the things that this bill is about. In my district I have a 900,000-acre national park. I have a 450,000-acre wilderness area. I have an 800,000-acre primitive area and I have three national forests or

parts of two of them and one that is entirely included in my district. So I believe I am qualified to talk about this kind of legislation. I think I know whereof I speak. As a youngster one of my first jobs was as a whistle punk at a logging camp when I was 16 years of age. I worked in the woods for many years to get enough money to provide an education for myself. I know what people in the lumber industry want. I know what fishermen and gunners want. I know what the people want who like to put a pack on their back and just plain go hiking.

Obviously it was not very easy to make these somewhat incompatible people all get together and support one piece of legislation, but it has been done.

This bill varies considerably from the bill which came to us from the Senate, known as S. 4. I hope that when it goes to conference this will be the bill which will finally go to the President. If I am a conferee on this measure I certainly shall remain steadfast with this legislation, because we have gone through too much trouble and too much effort to do anything else than what is encompassed by this bill.

Again I compliment the chairman, the ranking minority member, and all the members of the committee. This is fine legislation, and I am pleased to be able to support it.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate and thank the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], the ranking and dedicated minority member from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], and their many able colleagues for bringing this measure before us today.

This is a bill which can and should be improved, and at the appropriate time I will support amendments which I believe will strengthen it. But more important, this bill will realize a long-sought-after, a long-desired, and a long-deserved goal—the preservation of a sound and enduring system of wilderness—and I rise in its support.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress is in a position to do more for our all-too-rapidly diminishing wealth of natural resources than any other of our time. Last week this House passed the farsighted Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. Today we are presented with the opportunity of preserving the vast scientific, recreational, and educational benefits of unspoiled wilderness for generations of Americans yet to come.

As this bill, which I have joined in sponsoring since coming to Congress, makes clear in its title, our rapidly expanding population, accompanied by increasing mobility and growing amounts of leisure time, is destined to occupy and modify all areas within our country not specifically designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition. Without affirmative action, and action at this time, our few remain-

ing natural areas will not long be able to withstand this onslaught.

Yet this bill is clearly a modest and reasonable call to action. For there remains in the United States today 50 to 65 million acres of land which could conceivably become part of a national wilderness system. All of this land is already in national forests, parks, monuments, wildlife refuges, and game ranges.

This bill would set aside only about 9 million acres of this land at this time, with provision, after a 10-year review period, for inclusion of primitive areas of the national forests, and the wilderness areas of park and wildlife refuges.

This bill would not conflict with established uses of the parks, monuments, forests, or wildlife refuges.

It would not interfere with established practices, such as grazing.

It would not endanger existing private rights.

And, it does not call for money.

Rather, it would give statutory protection to existing wilderness areas. It would set up orderly procedures for additions, deletions, or changes, with provisions for public hearings and review by Congress.

For it must be remembered, that most of our wilderness areas today have been established by administrative action. And any of these areas could, therefore, be abolished or altered, without approval of the Congress or the public.

Mr. Chairman, we who have been striving for wilderness preservation have often been told that at best we are engaged in a rearguard, delaying action—that we cannot hope to see areas of wilderness last forever—that the best we can hope for is to slow down the relentless process of development and encroachment.

But today we can see a brighter future. Today, with this bill, we have the tools to preserve an irreplaceable resource. For wilderness once trampled cannot be freed. Once lost it cannot be regained.

This bill can preserve the wilderness character of lands that will serve a vast range of consistent purposes, safeguarding these areas for the permanent good of the whole people.

It is an instrument of foresight, planning, and protection. It is an investment in the future of America. But we must act now, we must pass this bill today, or it will be too little and too late.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, it is with a feeling of real satisfaction that I can participate in the discussion of the wilderness bill here today. As a sponsor of the legislation, I thank the committee chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and our distinguished minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], for the work they have done to bring to a culmination this long effort in behalf of one of the most important items of conservation legislation ever considered by the Congress.

We have a special interest in this in Minnesota because of the boundary canoe areas in the northern part of the State. I have been in this area and have participated in the activities, partially, in which one can participate. I know of the utilization that comes in this area.

I have a close interest in this, also, because of the activities of the past 3 weeks. When the Congress recessed, getting ready for the Republican political convention, I took my family to the western part of the United States, to Wyoming and Montana, and we traveled over some of these areas. We went up to the mountains; we went sliding down glaciers; we caught some fish; and generally we saw how heavy is the utilization.

When I was out in that area, in the Grand Tetons, notice came that the 1 millionth visitor had traveled in the Grand Tetons this year.

One can see the tremendous increase in the use of wilderness areas and the out of doors by the American people.

We worked on this legislation for a long time.

I understand that the hearings before this committee this last April were the 18th that were conducted on wilderness bills since 1956. There have been thousands of pages of testimony put together and millions of words have been used by those who have commented upon this legislation. I believe never before in the history of our country has a measure affecting natural resources elicited such widespread interest and support as has this legislation. It has become a household word in the major newspapers, networks, and magazines, and we are now advocating this be passed. In the enactment today the House will have passed one of the most important conservation milestones. I think it will be comparable to the work that Teddy Roosevelt did some time ago. It will have the effect of protecting our wild areas within the federally owned forests, the wild river refuges, ranges, and national parks and monuments. Through the establishment of the national wilderness preservation system and the delineation of a national policy for wilderness preservation, with its definition of "wilderness," this bill gives a firm basis for the protection of our wild lands within Federal jurisdiction. The procedures which it established for adding areas to the system provide for careful review and participation by the interested public and the Congress. In this measure we have a basic piece of legislation that will well serve the American people by preserving for future generations this irreplaceable resource that has had such an important part in molding our culture and our Nation.

I might point out the work people who came before us did to set aside the Rock Creek Park running through the District of Columbia and the advantage to which it is utilized by this crowded city at this time.

I want to point out in my comments here there are some parts of the bill that I think are disappointing. I think the part which permits mining to be carried on in wilderness areas and forests for 25 years is too long a period of time. I

hope we can reduce this period, and as far as I am concerned, there ought to be a complete elimination of mining in the wilderness areas, in my judgment, unless this is required in the national interest.

The provisions of this measure which call for the development of commercial skiing in the San Gorgonio Wild Area are also of deep concern to many conservationists in the country. The exclusion of this unique wild area from the wilderness system through the language that is in this basic and far-reaching legislation would set, I believe, a dangerous precedent as we are trying to make this historic step. This San Gorgonio Wild Area is used by thousands of visitors each year now, and these include skiers, who are welcome in the area. We are not concerned about making this a commercial development. There are tens of thousands of children who enjoy the wilderness trek in the San Gorgonio each year. More than two dozen youth and religious camps surround this area. These camps are dependent upon this area as a source of experience in outdoor and wilderness living. There is no other place nearby for the young people of the Los Angeles area to go for this kind of recreational opportunity.

I want also to register my objection to the language in this bill that would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to declassify our national forest primitive areas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. QUIE. This would authorize the Secretary to remove these units from their present protected status in which their wilderness features have been preserved through several decades. I strongly support the amendment that would strike these provisions from the bill. Thus, only Congress would be vested with the authority of declassification, and Congress alone could remove these units from protected status.

This measure places the responsibility for adding areas to the wilderness system securely in Congress hands. I think for that reason and as a matter of consistency, I feel that only Congress should hold the authority to declassify these areas. Such authority should not be relinquished by the Congress to the Secretary of Agriculture. I urge that we hold these primitive areas in their present status and that they be protected as wilderness until Congress considers and acts upon them.

Again I wish to compliment the committee for bringing this bill before us. It gives me great pleasure to support it at this time.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, bringing this bill to the floor of the House ends a 4-year experience for me on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs as a member of the subcommittee and a member of the full committee. I want at this time to say

how much I enjoyed serving on that committee chairmanned by the very fine chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] as chairman of the subcommittee. Also the minority ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], who served both on the subcommittee and on the full committee with us was a very fair and responsible member in putting this bill together.

Coming from an area such as the one that I represent we have much wilderness, wild and primitive areas at the present time. Since the bill was under discussion California has added four new areas, two new wilderness areas and two new wild areas. This bill will establish the start of a wilderness system in the United States. I am very happy to see this done because there has been so much argument as to what was in the wilderness bill that many people had a misconception of the bill itself.

With the start of this wilderness system throughout the United States I am sure there will be many areas added in the very near future. I am certain that in our State of California we will see many new areas added to the wilderness system.

I want to say that the people in the State of California very much support this bill. I want to say that I am in full support of the bill as it comes from the committee. The bill left the committee with a unanimous vote, went to the Rules Committee, and is now before us on the floor for action. I ask your favorable support for the bill as it was reported from the committee.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and associate myself with my colleagues, the gentlemen from California [Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. BALDWIN] in their remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation designed to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System. Further, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues, the gentlemen from California [Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. COHELAN], as we look to the future, the conservation measures we adopt today, in addition to the recently passed land and water conservation fund bill should stand the Members of this 88th Congress in good stead for having met our responsibilities in this important field. Many well-deserved tributes have been directed toward the chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], the ranking Republican, as well as all members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. To mold a consensus of opinion among the committee members in this highly controversial matter certainly is worthy of recognition and the American people owe this fine committee a debt of gratitude. Again, I urge your support of this bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I have had the privilege of hunting and fishing in so-called wilderness areas, areas accessible only on foot or horseback. In the past, a comparatively few enjoyed this privilege. Better means of transportation, longer vacation periods, larger paychecks, and a snowballing interest in outdoor recreation have changed the picture considerably.

We spend millions to build art galleries where valuable works of art may be displayed and preserved for posterity.

Costly libraries house outstanding works of literature where they can be properly protected against the ravages of time.

Our Library of Congress houses priceless irreplaceable papers, manuscripts, and documents of every description where they will be available for unborn generations.

By modern methods, we record voices of our great singers and speakers which will live through the ages.

By an act of Congress the Department of the Interior is authorized to designate certain buildings as national historical landmarks.

Can we, or should we, do less for our irreplaceable heritage? Do we not have an obligation to posterity to pass on to it some natural environment as it existed when the Pilgrims first landed on these shores? Like many other Members who have been interested in adequate legislation to insure that coming generations of Americans will have an opportunity to see and know how parts of this country looked in its earliest day, I am happy to support the objectives of this bill.

Preservation of wilderness is a record of our society, for it was out of the wilderness of this continent and its abundance of timber, soil, water, wildlife, minerals, and other natural resources that this country and this society found the wherewithal to supply the free chosen wishes of its people. And like other treasures I have mentioned, wilderness areas have both a present and future use for our society. We need to preserve areas where people can study, hunt, fish, or merely observe and enjoy lasting examples of the things the development of this country and its society have largely destroyed. Unless we preserve the remnant areas of wilderness which we have in our national forests, parks, and wildlife refuges, the opportunity we have today—the opportunity to add undisturbed, natural land areas for future generations may soon be lost and with it the wilderness we cherish.

My State of Pennsylvania does not have any areas proposed for inclusions in this wilderness system. Pennsylvanians, however, are outdoor minded and appreciate the many values of wilderness areas, particularly in the preservation and production of wildlife. We love and appreciate birds, mammals, and fish.

History teaches us that some species of wildlife, such as the bobwhite quail, ringneck pheasant, deer, and several other species thrive in man's environment. Some species cannot adapt to

man's environment. I am thinking of the whooping crane with a population of approximately 30, the mountain goat, bighorn sheep, and one of the most magnificent of all our North American animals, the grizzly bear. Do we want these species to go the way of the carrier pigeon, the heath hen, the American bison, and others?

Just recently each of you received a sizable list of birds and mammals from the Secretary of Interior which face extinction unless drastic action is taken. Given protection of national forest, national parks, and refuge areas, many species can probably be saved from extinction. The key deer of Florida is an example of what can be done if we are sufficiently interested and have the will to do it.

Development and resources use are essential to the national welfare. Public lands must be administered for maximum returns consistent with sound management practices. Today we are not talking about the millions of acres of public land on which there is multiple resource use. We are talking of the few acres of land on which wilderness preservation should be the dominant use.

Mr. Chairman, it would be tragic after all the years of sincere effort for H.R. 9070 to get this far and fail on final passage. We need to pass it today, refer it to a conference committee, and send it on its way to the White House. We should and dare do no less for posterity.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to stand here in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and to also congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for the work that they have done in this field.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] has long been the champion of wilderness legislation in the House of Representatives. Although he is the author of this bill, I introduced one in support of his bill.

Mr. Chairman, what we are striving to do today is to preserve for future generations the land as we inherited it from those who went before us.

Mr. Chairman, the burgeoning population which has hit this country makes it essential that we now set aside certain of these areas in their pristine form for the enjoyment of those who come after us.

May I say that civilizations have been lost where they have destroyed or allowed the destruction of their natural resources.

There is tradition in Spain that before the occupation of that country by the Moors for some 800 years you could travel from Madrid to Seville without getting out from under the shade of a tree. Today most of this is wasted desert.

We have seen lands denuded, land lost because we have not given it the care we should have. We seek now through this bill to preserve inviolate the beauti-

ful areas of this country for our enjoyment, and the enjoyment of those who come after us. It is a duty that we must face.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure for me to rise in support of this vitally needed legislation.

As one of those who has consistently supported conservation legislation in the past, and one who has introduced a wilderness bill (H.R. 10630) during this session, I feel that this Congress has a unique opportunity to make another outstanding contribution to the national welfare.

The phrase "for the permanent good of the whole people" contained in the precis of the bill is, I am certain, most applicable. According to the mail I have received from countless residents throughout western Massachusetts, there is complete agreement that the legislation is designed for the permanent good of the whole people.

Every segment of the population will reap untold benefits with the enactment of the bill. Both urban and rural residents can find that the areas designated as "wilderness" will be for their personal enjoyment and use. In setting aside federally owned areas and designating these areas as wilderness, the Congress is establishing an important national policy. This policy will make certain that natural resources of the country will be preserved. This is a major responsibility. It is an overdue responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, it is a unique period in the history of our country when we can have the opportunity of establishing not only guiding principles for the preservation of primitive units of America, but to designate such areas as an American heritage.

The opportunity is on a par with the acts which set up our national forests and established our national park system. In another sense, the Wilderness Act would be complementary to these.

The wilderness bill, a bipartisan measure, has been before Congress for almost 9 years. Although this bill has now reached the floor of the House for the first time, it has been debated in committee, heard in the field, discussed by Cabinet officers, recommended by the administration, and modified through compromise, until it is one of the most refined bills ever to come before this body.

The wilderness bill is a carefully thought out, long range, important measure which will provide balance for our human culture and stability for our society. For without wilderness, the source of our strength, we cannot balance our lives against the imbalances we inescapably create with the civilization which we find necessary.

What will the wilderness bill do? It will establish the preservation of wilderness as a national policy through congressional sanction. It relates only to federally owned land, now within national forests, national parks, and certain

national wildlife refuges and ranges. It establishes no new authority or agency—it simply provides that the wilderness character of units within these areas shall be maintained for the public good. It establishes a procedure for maintaining these units. No extra costs are involved, no other land use is interfered with, and other programs are not sacrificed. It does not pose any economic threats.

H.R. 9070 is, and remains, a most important bill. It was a product of patient compromise and good will. It came out of committee with certain amendments, and some of these, I am sure, can be modified or eliminated to restore the original strength of the bill.

The amendment which eliminates the San Geronio wild area in California as a part of the wilderness system should be rejected. The San Geronio area was established in 1931 and classified as a wild area in 1956. To eliminate this already dedicated area because of pressure for a ski development would be unfair special interest legislation—like handing over a national park for a country golf club. Skiing is enjoyed in the San Geronio wild area now—that is, cross-country skiing, without commercial trappings. Ski lifts, access roads, concessions, and all which follows such developments, would destroy the San Geronio wilderness. It would be a dangerous precedent to allow the desecration or elimination of this area. I urge that language to authorize this be stricken from the bill.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Can the gentleman tell me how many acres of wilderness in California are included in this bill as reported?

Mr. CONTE. I do not have the figures. I imagine it is quite great.

Mr. KYL. It is extremely large, as a matter of fact, 1,820,000 acres.

Mr. CONTE. I realize this is a very small segment of that area.

I urge also that all language in the original H.R. 9070 which would protect wilderness units of the national parks and of the national wildlife refuges and ranges, be restored.

I am pleased to note the language in the measure which provides that each primitive area shall continue to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as on the date of the act until Congress has acted on a recommendation of the President regarding the area.

I strongly urge the elimination of language in section 3(b)(1) of the amended bill, on page 20, lines 3 to 17, inclusive, which would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to declassify a primitive area. This provision is in direct contradiction to the principle which the wilderness bill asserts—that the inclusion, addition, or elimination of a primitive area must have the sanction of Congress.

I urge the restoration of language which is in the original H.R. 9070 with respect to mining. The original lan-

guage would permit prospecting within wilderness areas for the purpose of gathering information about mineral or other resources on a planned basis by the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines. It is my belief that the committee amendment which would allow mining to continue for 25 years would be inimical to the wilderness. Mining activity, with its attendant developments, is incompatible with wilderness. The report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission shows that mining within wilderness areas has not been of major economic importance. We would do best to eliminate this provision, and enact this most essential legislation with strengthened provisions.

I also take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the committee for the tremendous work that he and his committee have done on this subject and the work that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] has done in behalf of this bill during the many years it has been before their committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I also want to complicate—compliment my colleagues on the committee and my chairman in particular and the members of the subcommittee. I think perhaps my first word might be taken correctly in that I think that is what some people are trying to do here today. We have heard several people talk about the possibility of amending this bill back to some original form or intent. I might assure my colleagues that this bill would not be before you today if the amendments that are proposed here would have been forced in committee.

My compliments should go beyond just the Members of this body, they should go to the people that appeared before the subcommittee in its field hearings, where an area of compromise was reached with the users, with the wilderness advocates, with the people that are directly connected in the wilderness plans today, whether it be for recreation and conservation or for the limited use of the wilderness for mining, grazing, and other uses.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I have looked forward to speaking in support of the wilderness bill and I urge its passage today. It is essential if future generations are to know the good life America affords today.

This wilderness bill provides that only the Congress can add to or make major modifications to the national wilderness system when it has been established with the effective date of this act.

It also provides that within a 10-year period the existing primitive areas may be added to the wilderness system on recommendation of the Executive, provided that the Congress passes an act in support of each such recommendation.

On the other hand, the bill provides, as an exception to the authority of the

legislative branch, that the executive branch may declassify an existing primitive area.

I see no logic in an act which gives the legislative branch half a loaf.

Let us remove this exception, and leave the primitive areas in protected status until Congress has a chance to pass upon the merits of each recommendation, which must be made within the time schedule provided.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 9070, and I urge my colleagues to give it their approval. I have always supported wilderness legislation and have introduced bills of my own on this subject. I am happy that today we will finally make this principle a part of the multiple-use principle which we have followed in the use of the people's lands. Conservation is always wise use—multiple use. It encompasses consumptive use but it most certainly encompasses nonconsumptive use as well. The passage of this legislation will give complete legal status to the principle of wilderness and nonconsumptive use of the people's public lands.

The bill will protect from destruction millions of acres of scenic wonderland. For my wife, my children, and myself, we know these areas as vast forests, precipitous peaks, great and really spacious blue skies, and shining mountains. That is from personal enjoyment. But we know, too, there are other people who are equally glad about wilderness areas just because they know that they exist and dream that maybe someday they will visit them. These areas that I speak of I know to have the best use that they could possibly have. Just as forest areas that are being harvested for lumber or other lands are being used for mining and have a restricted use, so should those areas that are particularly adapted to wilderness use or nonconsumptive use be restricted and set aside for such exclusive use.

I want to say I would hope that when the leadership on the part of the House goes to conference with the other body that attention will be given to the fact that some of the wilderness areas that have been recently created will not be included in this bill because of a 60-day limitation. I would hope particularly the Cabinet Wild Area in Montana will be given wilderness status under this bill.

Finally, I wish to compliment the leadership most highly for reconciling all of the conflicting forces that have been combating here on this legislation. The gentleman from Colorado, Chairman ASPINALL, has done an admirable accomplishment reconciling the respective interests of lumbering, grazing, and mining. Of course my interest in support of wilderness is not completely satisfied, but this compromise is a truly great accomplishment.

I strongly recommend passage of H.R. 9070.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] may ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, it is with an appreciation of this historic occasion that I rise in support of H.R. 9070, the wilderness bill. Passage of this bill and enactment of legislation for the preservation of federally owned wilderness areas will establish that it is the policy of the United States that the preservation and protection of some lands in their natural condition is desirable and necessary.

I recognize that the Department of Agriculture and the Forest Service in particular have been doing a good job in preserving wilderness areas of the national forests. They are to be commended for their actions and their diligence.

We have, however, Mr. Chairman, a responsibility in the Congress to enact legislation that establishes guidelines for management of federally owned lands in order to assure that future generations will have the opportunity of enjoying the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness. Future administrators could rescind or modify actions taken by other administrators in establishing wilderness areas. In addition, aside from national forests, there is no firm administrative policy for the preservation of wilderness areas despite the fact that many areas of national parks, national monuments, wildlife refuges and game ranges should be immediately and permanently protected.

It is for these reasons that I welcome the assertion of congressional authority and responsibility and the establishment of a National Wilderness Preservation System. As I understand H.R. 9070, as amended, the wilderness system will be initiated with approximately 9 million acres of land which is a good start even if, in relation to the total that should be protected, a modest one.

Under the further provisions of H.R. 9070 during the next 10 years there will be reviews of primitive areas in national forests and also units of the national park system and national wildlife system to determine their suitability for preservation as wilderness and their inclusion in the wilderness system. I know that I express the hope of the majority of the Members when I urge the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to diligently assume the task of reviewing these other areas and reporting to Congress through the President as soon as possible so that we may by the further action of this body grant permanent protection to those wilderness areas that should be protected.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. GILL].

Mr. GILL. Mr. Chairman, many of us are coming to realize that man's right to make his way on this earth does not include a right to spoil the land for future generations. This realization is beginning to appear in efforts to clean and prevent the pollution of our rivers and

our air. We see it in attempts to repair the ravages of strip mining, to replant where the forests have been stripped from the mountains. We learned to our sorrow earlier in this century that to tear open the prairies, without careful plowing and planting of cover crops, can cost us the richness of our land. We are learning today that the right to subdivide a man's land and build thousands of acres of houses and streets should be coupled with a duty to plan properly, to plant, to leave open spaces where the people may breathe.

All of these realizations are becoming more intense with the incredible growth of our population. No longer can we hope that people and open areas will find some balance. The pressures are too great for commercial development, for the exploitation of resources, for the use of a river as a sewerline if you will, unless there is general agreement by all to desist and to protect our natural assets.

This is true of the so-called wilderness of the relatively untouched areas treated by this legislation. Unless we can agree now as to how they should be treated and protected they face inevitable destruction. This bill makes a start. Much of the area concerned has already been used in the sense that it has been prospected or in some cases cut over; much of it is left in present use such as grazing or in existing mining; it is hoped that these uses which are incompatible with wilderness status will be gradually phased out.

If one of the basic principles of this legislation is to protect the wilderness which is now in existence and to phase out incompatible uses, I find difficulty with two parts of the bill. One is the specific allowance of a nonexisting and incompatible use in San Geronio, and the second is the allowance of declassification of any primitive area by the Secretary of Agriculture. If we are trying to set boundaries of the wilderness by legislative action based on existing status and uses why should we make these two exceptions? I would support amendments to remove them.

With these exceptions I submit that our committee has arrived at a workable compromise in the long struggle for a wilderness system. The basic decisions are left with Congress. Improvements can be made over the years. We will have made a good start toward the preservation of our natural heritage.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, it is a rather fine day when difficult legislation like this finds 435 Members of the House of Representatives in agreement. There has been a lot of misunderstanding about wilderness areas in particular. The committee is to be commended for having found middle ground, and I believe firm ground, on which to build such legislation.

If I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, I have made these remarks because I wonder if it is

the intention of the members of the committee having jurisdiction in the name of the House to hold firm in conference when this matter goes to conference.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if my friend from Washington will yield, it has always been my thought that the conferees from the House would hold as firmly as possible on matters under their jurisdiction in the conference.

My friend realizes, however, it will be a conference. Sometimes there is a question of playing back and forth a little bit. I hope my friend has confidence enough in the chairman of the committee having jurisdiction over this bill to know that he will stand as firm as he possibly can.

Mr. HORAN. I wish to say here and now that I have every confidence in the gentleman from Colorado. There have been actions by the other body, though, with which I did not agree, and which I would not like to see come out of conference and be enacted into law. It was in that regard I was wondering about the intention of the gentleman from Colorado when the bill goes to conference.

Mr. ASPINALL. If the gentleman will yield further, I shall stand just as firm as it is humanly possible for a Member of this body to stand on the House position on this legislation and on any other legislation.

I believe my colleague from Washington knows that there have been times when there have not been conference reports because of the position the gentleman from Colorado now speaking took in order to uphold the position of the House.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, that entirely satisfies me. I have memories of how, during the past 2 or 3 years, the gentleman from Colorado has been castigated in the press for his position and his firmness in this matter. I know of his great convictions. For my own part, I feel them also.

I do want the gentleman from Colorado to know that I feel satisfied after this colloquy.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to ask the gentleman from Colorado a question. Do I correctly understand that no land can be acquired in any amount except upon the authorization and approval of the Congress?

Mr. ASPINALL. With the exception that there may be donations or contributions, the gentleman is right in his understanding. So far as taking land, in holdings or otherwise, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Without regard to the size of the tract?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. On page 17 of the bill, near the bottom of the page, the language is as follows: "has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation."

I wonder what "a primitive and unconfined type of recreation" might be.

I trust this has nothing to do with topless bathing suits.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. Of course.

Mr. ASPINALL. I knew in some way or other my genial colleague would get some humor into this debate, and I am glad to add that I do not think this has anything to do with topless bathing suits, or anything like that at all, nor nudist camps, but it just simply means that there will not be any manmade structures about in order to embarrass and handicap the enjoyers of this particular area.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his lucid explanation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I support this proposal.

Mr. Chairman, the wilderness preservation legislation we are debating here today is the end product of unceasing and concentrated effort which began in the 84th Congress.

In the space of time involved, 70 bills have been introduced in the Chambers of Congress. Numerous hearings have been held and from these hearings further refinements have been adopted. Finally, after a decade of debate, we have evolved in H.R. 9070 one of the most significant and farsighted pieces of resource conservation legislation developed in our time.

Thousands of Americans have long urged the Congress to work its will to establish a national policy and program to preserve for posterity a part of our unspoiled wilderness. The American people feel that the time has been too long delayed and that Congress should take positive action to assure the permanent reservation of suitable wilderness areas now.

By the enactment of the bill, we would bring about the establishment of a National Wilderness Preservation System of approximately 9.2 million acres of suitable wilderness lands—wilderness areas that currently are being administered as wilderness in our national forests. This bill would provide legislative authority for permanently maintaining these wilderness areas as wilderness for the benefit and enjoyment of all the American people.

In emphasizing, above all, the importance of preserving the wilderness areas in perpetuity on the public lands of this country, I do not wish to detract from the use of wilderness those recreational pleasures that go with it—of hunting, fishing, hiking, swimming, mountain climbing, camping, nature photography, and the general enjoyment of natural scenery and wildlife habitat.

In 1964, with our fast growing population in excess of 192 million, we, especially in the northeastern areas of the United States, are deeply aware of the disappearance of wilderness and other open space recreation resources. We are deeply aware of the rapidity, with which our land resources are being committed

and developed to commercial uses. Opportunities to set aside and develop our lands for outdoor recreation uses are in many instances in danger of being lost forever. We must move with rapidity while there is yet time. Wilderness preservation is an essential part of an action program designed to secure permanent outlets for our outdoor recreation resource needs.

Wilderness recreation has values not present in any other type of recreation. Doctors have testified as to the therapeutic value of an experience in a natural area. Many witnesses in their pleas for passage of the wilderness bill have confirmed that both the intangible spiritual and therapeutic values and other benefits claimed for wilderness recreation are realities which greatly enrich the lives of those who experience them.

We should recognize that true wilderness is not a renewable resource. If these areas are not set aside and given permanent status and protection as wilderness by Congress, the influences of man are going to rapidly erode and consume all that we have.

Time is of the essence, for by the year 2000 there will be more than 300 million people in the United States competing for a share of our country's outdoor recreation facilities. We must act now to preserve these unique areas of remaining wilderness for the benefit of succeeding generations of Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I have received hundreds of letters from constituents in favor of the National Wilderness Preservation System legislation, and I have pointed out to members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the urgency in getting legislation through Congress in this session. The committee members have been most cooperative, and I want to commend Chairman ASPINALL and the members of his committee for producing this bill we have before us today. I hope that the legislation passes by an overwhelming margin.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that Mr. ASPINALL's committee has brought this much-needed legislation before the House for further consideration.

The wilderness bill has long been described as the outstanding conservation legislation before Congress.

I support this bill in its objectives to establish a strong National Wilderness Preservation System.

I believe the amendment to withdraw the already-established San Gorgonio Wild Area for a commercial ski resort is inconsistent with the purpose of this basic legislation to preserve wilderness and should be eliminated from the bill. The people are permitted now to ski in the San Gorgonio Wild Area, and many thousands have been doing so.

It has rightfully, I think, been decided that Congress after proper study should determine which areas go into the National Wilderness System. Again, to be consistent, Congress should likewise determine which primitive area if any,

are to be classified, and thus removed from consideration for the Wilderness System.

Therefore, the provision that authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to declassify a primitive area should be stricken from the bill. Congress should not relinquish its prerogative in this respect.

Another bad feature in the wilderness bill before us today is the mining provision. You cannot have mining in wilderness and still preserve wilderness. The purpose of this legislation is to leave designated lands for preservation and protection in their natural, unspoiled condition and thus secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness. This section providing for a 25-year period is much too long a period.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Chairman, it is with a deep feeling of satisfaction that I join with the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and his discerning Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in support of H.R. 9070, which has for its purpose a far-reaching proposal to assume jurisdiction by our Government over some 9 million acres of the Nation's unspoiled wilderness areas in order to preserve their natural state and prevent encroachment.

The Federal Government now owns some 61 millions of acres of undeveloped wilderness areas. The bill reserves to the Congress any future addition to preserve other areas for this specific purpose. Under the Senate version of this act the Secretary of Interior is empowered to extend this coverage to other lands held by the Government for their preservation as wilderness areas. The House bill seeks to prevent the Secretary of Interior from exercising this power by reserving to the Congress the power to extend expansion control over wild areas.

The purpose of the act seeks to prevent exploitation of these lands by humans in our increasing population and the detrimental effects on these lands of our mechanical expansion. This act guarantees to this generation and future generations of Americans the enduring resources of the wilderness as well as a great contribution to the enjoyment and its unimpaired future use for recreational purposes only experienced in such areas. The use must be protected by certain standards of control or rules that will protect and not defeat the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical uses.

A minimum requirement of roads shall be built—but autos, motorboats, motorized equipment, landing aircraft, and other form of mechanized transport, structures, or installations are barred from such areas. The exception being that where these uses are presently established, such may remain, under specific restrictions of the Secretary of Agriculture. Also as to safety control or health—fires, insects, and diseases—subject to such conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture deems desirable.

Prospecting or the gathering of information about minerals and other re-

sources is permitted if the preservation principle is respected.

Further consultations between the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture for the surveying on a planned basis in such areas again consistent with the policy of preservation through the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines to determine mineral values. The results of such surveys shall be available to the public, the President, and the Congress. All laws on mining and mineral leasing shall be applicable to this act and with the further stipulation that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior have the power to make such reasonable regulations as deemed necessary to the preservation of the area. These individuals now enjoying certain rights, leases, and so forth, are protected under certain prescriptions in this act. The rights of the several States or State in wildlife or wilderness areas are also preserved—their responsibilities and jurisdiction remain intact under this act. State and private lands surrounded by wilderness areas are permitted reasonable ingress and egress to and from their lands. Also exchange of lands may be permitted—such as similar lands within the State owned by the Federal Government for land of like value held within the wilderness area.

Secretary of Agriculture may accept gifts or bequests of land within the wilderness areas. The Secretary of the Interior also may accept gifts or contributions from private persons to be used in furtherance of this act. Advance notice must be given to the President and the Congress within 60 days of the offer. A joint annual report must be submitted to the Congress through the President of the United States.

A consideration of other areas for inclusion as wilderness areas or abandonment of such lands now under act fitting other purposes shall be determined by both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior and their recommendation submitted to the President for a report to the Congress. This program can be instigated within 10 years of the act's enactment.

Chairman ASPINALL and his conscientious committee have spent years of study and research in this field—certainly such meritorious work cannot go unnoticed. The Congress and the American people are indebted to this intelligent committee and its splendid leader, Chairman ASPINALL, for this forward-looking legislation to protect our wildlife and wilderness areas. Generations of Americans in the future through this needed legislation will have preserved for them the lands of the wilderness to enjoy its great contribution to the recreational, educational, and scientific enjoyment of areas so protected. This act is far reaching in its effect upon the Nation's citizens and its blessings will be enjoyed by the whole population now and in the future by generations of Americans.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 9070, the wilderness bill introduced by my distin-

guished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. I have long advocated the passage of such a measure. This bill accomplishes the broad objectives of legislation which I introduced early in the 88th Congress—H.R. 7877—and this is substantially the same legislation which I recently supported in testimony before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

It is hard to exaggerate the importance and urgency of this measure, a measure which has been before the Congress 8 long years. During this time the bill's fortunes have alternately risen sharply and nosedived, it has been subjected to prodigious pressures from wide ranging sets of interests in American life. In light of this, I regard it remarkable that the bill before us today so successfully solves the problem of preserving our priceless wilderness areas. The bill is a fair compromise, although I have enthusiastically supported an amendment which will eliminate the Executive's discretion to declassify existing primitive areas. These areas must be preserved in their primitive state unless both the Executive and the Congress concur.

After 8 years of hard struggle, we must seize this opportunity to preserve our national wilderness system. We must pass this bill because each year a small but irreplaceable part of our wilderness is eroded away. Each year we have less wilderness left to preserve. And, as time goes by, the opportunity to save the wilderness evaporates.

Thus, the need for this measure—which would set aside 9.1 million acres into federally designated wilderness areas—is obvious. The Saylor bill is good for a number of reasons. For one thing the bill provides that within 10 years after its enactment the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior shall review all primitive, park, and wildlife refuge areas and report to the President on the possibility of including additional areas into the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Also, and most important, the measure pinpoints final responsibility for wilderness areas in the Congress, where by the Constitution the responsibility must be. While the President can make recommendations to the Congress with respect to the creation of wilderness areas, no recommendation will become effective unless so provided by an act of Congress.

Finally, the bill is precise in preserving existing uses. The bill is careful about reasonableness. The most important existing uses—mining and grazing rights—are preserved. Wilderness areas are protected against the acquisition of further rights.

Mr. Chairman, the bill should be passed.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the San Geronio amendment. The San Geronio Wild Area is one of the last remaining wilderness areas still available to southern Californians. It comprises 34,718 acres, 70 miles of trails, 22 primitive campsites, and a considerable colony of wildlife. It is a haven for thousands of campers, hikers, sportsmen, and naturalists. Last year more than 53,000 visits were paid to

the area, an intensity of use about 20 times greater than the national average. Nearly one-half of these visitors were children.

The idea of exempting 3,500 acres of this area from the full protection of the bill currently under debate is abhorrent on both esthetic and practical grounds. The Forest Service already has rejected a ski development proposal and has recommended alternative sites. Moreover, it is not just a question of withholding safeguards from a small and apparently insignificant portion of the San Gorgonio wilderness. Although the acreage immediately affected represents 10 percent of the wild area it is located at its center. A ski development there, or almost any commercial development, will alter the natural beauty and appeal of a vast portion of the surrounding territory.

It has been argued that San Gorgonio would provide skiers with a longer season and better facilities than those afforded by existing slopes. This does not appear to be entirely the case, however. During the 1961-62 ski season, adequate snow covering for skiing on San Gorgonio would not have been available until after January, following the first big major snowfall. During the very dry 1962-63 season, only about 2 months of marginal skiing would have been possible, and this only on certain parts of the slope. The following year, skiing would have been impossible until February. The point to be made here is that, in spite of San Gorgonio's altitude, skiing there will not be especially attractive unless general heavy storms strike the whole southern California area. But when such storms hit the whole area skiing will be good at presently establish ski resorts. Moreover, recent developments in snowmaking machines enable such resorts to create good snow whenever the temperature falls below 28°. During the 1963-64 season, five local resorts made snow for 4 months. These machines offer the possibility of an early season, thus embracing such popular skiing holidays as Thanksgiving and Christmas. Climatologic data collected thus far indicate that San Gorgonio would seldom have sufficient snow so early in the winter.

These facts, together with the deleterious and irreversible effects a ski development would have on the wilderness appeal of San Gorgonio, dictate that this amendment to the bill reported out by the committee be deleted.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, passage of the measure now before us, H.R. 9070, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System, can certify congressional concern for the sanctity of a small section of our natural heritage. I enthusiastically endorse this bill and urge my colleagues to support it, too.

When we recently gave overwhelming approval to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, the House evidenced its interest in providing adequate recreational opportunities for an expanding population that is putting greater emphasis on healthy outlets for leisure-time activity. Now, we can add to that action by protecting certain federally owned acreage from commercial corrosion.

Approval of the wilderness bill will recognize wilderness areas as resources in their own right, not merely the site where development can create resources. In a country so vast, with a citizenry so varied, I believe it is perfectly proper to declare a tiny portion of the national landscape forever wild.

As I have pointed out to the House on other occasions, I represent a constituency which is distinguished by its abiding friendship toward the cause of conservation. The communications I have received from my congressional district with respect to the wilderness bill amplify this attitude.

Mrs. David Cadwallader, of Brighton, N.Y., stated:

If there is any bill which needs and deserves to be passed by Congress, it is this one [wilderness bill]. The United States is growing, developing, progressing; it is true that we need lumber, minerals, beef, etc. And to get these things man must exploit the land. But must he exploit all of it? Certainly the country is large enough so that some of our beautiful forest and mountain regions can be saved in their natural state to be shared by many in the years to come.

There are many more of us each day who are finding the beauty and peace which untouched nature can instill in us. Not from driving along a superhighway, either, but by getting out and walking. It is a thrill to come upon a place where perhaps no man has ever been and certainly no motorized vehicle. I would hate to see places like these ruined by commercialization or in constant jeopardy of it. The wilderness bill is desperately needed to save our woodlands from just such a fate—to keep them for our future generations to enjoy.

From Palmyra, N.Y., Mrs. Christopher F. Smith wrote:

More land is being used for personal gain, thereby robbing the future generations from enjoying the rightful heritage of their country.

I have toured through our present national parks and monuments and enjoyed the beauty thereon. But the increase in numbers of visitors shows me how desperately we need more.

In urging me to vote for protection of these wilderness areas, some of my constituents have expressed explicit concern over the language in the bill that will permit continuation for 25 years of mining, prospecting, and oil and gas development. In this regard, I would like to quote an excerpt from a letter sent me by Don B. Martin, of Irondequoit, N.Y.:

I certainly am not opposed to resource development but I seriously question whether this Nation must desecrate the existing wilderness areas for these purposes. I believe the value to the Nation of unspoiled wilderness will in the long run exceed whatever returns may be gained in the short run from mining in these areas.

Mrs. P. Richard Jameson, of Rochester, N.Y., also opposed the mining amendment. Her letter concludes with an eloquent statement of support for a meaningful wilderness bill:

Many who bewail previous destruction of natural treasures and scenic wonders because of man's greed and stupidity, will rejoice if our present lawmakers can halt the onward march of vandalism.

Another constituent, Mrs. William A. Sykes, conservation chairman of the

Seventh District Federated Garden Clubs of New York State, Inc., ended her letter to me on this legislation with two sentences which I believe summarize public appeal for this bill:

We have an opportunity in passing this legislation to be blessed by future generations. It would really be shortsighted not to grab such an easy opportunity for future grace.

Our society has advanced by the thoughtful and sensitive actions of our ancestors. Maintaining this dynamism demands that we leave the land conserved for our descendants. The legislation under consideration offers us this opportunity.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9070 to establish a national wilderness preservation system.

Delawareans, as reflected in their letters to my office, are generally favorable to the preservation of our natural resources particularly our ocean and bay shorelines and beaches. They have seen firsthand the disappearance of these natural resources under the impact of destructive storms such as the tidal storm which struck the Delaware coastline in March 1962.

Thousands of citizens from America's great metropolitan cities enjoy many of Delaware's seashore facilities. Rehoboth Beach is often called the Nation's "summer capital." For these people, it is their one opportunity to escape the monotony which oftentimes grips them in the confinement of manmade canyons of brick, stone, and concrete and asphalt streets and avenues.

The poet, Joyce Kilmer, said that only God can make a tree. However, it remains for man to preserve trees and the other natural gifts which He left in our care. Confronted with atomic bombs and nuclear missiles, poison gases, and other weapons created by man for mass destruction, Americans must focus their attention on the fundamental need for protecting and preserving our wilderness areas and natural resources which help us to ponder eternal truths, to instill wonder in the minds of our young people, and to reveal to them the mysteries and grandeur of our universe.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have waited a long time for the chance to consider the wilderness bill. I think it is a good bill. I would like to see it passed as an even better bill. We ought not to stop short of getting out as strong a bill as we can, in order to really protect our wilderness heritage for this and coming generations.

I believe that we can strengthen this bill measurably by deleting the provision which gives authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to declassify a primitive area without going through the legislative process which this bill provides for the inclusion of primitive areas in the wilderness system. This exception is in direct contradiction to the provision in section 3(b), page 19, lines 24 and 25, and page 20, lines 1 to 3, which states that:

Areas classified as "primitive" on the effective date of this Act shall continue to be administered under the rules and regulations affecting such areas on the effective

date of this Act until Congress has determined otherwise.

The provision which I would like to see eliminated follows the above as an exception and negates the protection provided in the preceding sentences.

I call attention to the fact that while this version of the wilderness bill includes the wild, wilderness, and boundary waters canoe area in the wilderness system on the effective day of the act, the existing San Gorgonio Wild Area, established many years ago, is specifically excluded at this time from the wilderness system.

Now, this is not only unreasonable—it would be a dangerous precedent. We would be saying that we are only giving lipservice to the creation and protection of these dedicated areas—that any time the pressures were strong enough we would back away and let the wilderness be dismembered.

The areas which are now classified as wild or wilderness were established after due study and public hearings. Once established, nothing should alter their status except a national emergency.

I believe that the guidance which this bill gives for the administration of the national forest wild and wilderness areas, should be stated in this bill with regard to the primitive areas, and the units of the national parks, and wildlife refuges and ranges, which will eventually be included in the wilderness system.

I am especially concerned with the committee amendment which allows extension of mining in wild and wilderness areas for 25 years. Mining and private mineral exploration present a serious threat to wilderness. It seems to me that a provision that would permit the gathering of information through surveys by the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines, conducted in a manner compatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment, should be an adequate safeguard in the event of future emergencies.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, as a sponsor of the wilderness bill, I should like to express my endorsement of H.R. 9070 and make a few observations I believe are pertinent.

This is a good bill. I certainly hope it can be enacted into law this year.

I commend the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for their leadership in bringing it here.

H.R. 9070 is landmark legislation. It for the first time gives congressional recognition to the principle that wilderness values should be cherished and protected for succeeding generations. It sets aside the national forest areas presently classified as "wilderness," "wind," and "canoe." It establishes a machinery by which other suitable areas of forests, parks, and wildlife refuges can be reviewed and presented to the Congress for approval for preservation as wilderness. It protects these areas during the period of review and until the Congress acts.

I am confident that the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior will move speedily to review the potential areas of wilderness under their jurisdiction, de-

veloping recommendations which the Congress can consider.

In all honesty, I must point out that I am not in accord with the mining provisions as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. To me, the wilderness bill provides for multiple use. Areas of wilderness perform important functions in water production, watershed preservation, and education in addition to offering many types of recreation, including hunting and fishing. Mining, however, is one use which simply cannot be compatible with the concept of wilderness as outlined in the bill. This is true even though the committee has taken steps to minimize part of the damage which mining activities would cause.

Of course, the gathering of information about mineral resources on areas of wilderness should be permitted if carried on in a manner compatible with wilderness preservation. I would favor studies by the appropriate Federal agencies, as provided in section 4(d)(2).

In my opinion, the bill can be strengthened immeasurably by the removal of the so-called San Gorgonio exception. Making such an exception at the outset tarnishes a piece of outstanding basic legislation. The Forest Service has studied the proposed ski development, which would include roads, a parking area, and other facilities in a wild area. The proposed development was rejected, with alternate skiing development sites recommended. It is my hope that the Secretary of Agriculture soon will concur with the Forest Service recommendation. I think we will regret it if we override the Department on this proposition.

Finally, I believe it is inconsistent for the Secretary of Agriculture to be given the authority to declassify national forest primitive areas. Throughout the history of this legislation the point has been made that the Congress should assume the responsibility for passing on areas to be classified as wilderness. It is not consistent, therefore, for the Secretary of Agriculture to be authorized to declassify primitive areas. If the Congress should act in one instance it should act on the other.

But overall, the committee has done a fine job. It is to be commended for bringing so many diverse ideas together into one bill which is acceptable to so many people. I urge it be enacted.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 9070, the wilderness bill.

Last week the House passed the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act which would provide the means to enable the States and various of the Federal agencies to meet the needs of the American people for outdoor recreation now and in the future. In large part this bill is consistent with the long-range program urged by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission which was chaired by Laurance S. Rockefeller. I supported the passage of this vital legislation, and it is my hope that it will stimulate the various States to plan thoughtfully their recreational systems, to acquire land, and to provide facilities for the ever-increasing needs of our expanding population.

Today, Mr. Chairman, we are considering an equally important piece of legislation which also is the outgrowth of the Rockefeller Commission's work—a bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System.

Specifically, the bill provides for the inclusion of about 9 million acres of land classified as "wilderness, wild, or canoe" in the system. Within 10 years after enactment, the Congress would have the option of including, upon the recommendation of the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior and the President, additional areas for designation as wilderness.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, we must preserve our wilderness and wild-life areas for generations yet to come. I also speak for my constituents who overwhelmingly support legislation of this type. In response to a questionnaire sent to all registered voters in New York's 26th Congressional District last year, over 80 percent indicated they favored a wilderness bill to preserve our wildlife and natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will be overwhelmingly supported.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, someone once said that politics is the process of solving problems. This bill which we pass here, this afternoon, does just that. It solves problems of today and of countless tomorrows by setting aside a portion of our land from the competition of economics for the quiet enjoyment that all but a few of us want even now, and which will be even more needed as our population increases and the available land shrinks. The passage of this bill will rank with the creation of Yellowstone Park in the history of conservation and will stand as a tribute to the "problem solving" abilities of the chairman of the Interior Committee and the ranking minority member of that committee.

I am especially pleased that the so-called San Gorgonia amendment added by the Interior Committee was deleted here today. Such a special use provision does not belong in a wilderness bill. I supported such action both in the legislative committee and on the floor and offered my substitute amendment only as a compromise in apprehension that the amendment of the Interior Committee might be upheld.

Time will prove the wisdom of our action.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Chairman, at long last Congress is recognizing that our Nation must safeguard a substantial undeveloped and unspoiled portion of our country for our people to use for recreation and enjoyment. We in New Jersey have certainly seen what happens when urban and suburban areas expand without adequate protection of the public interest and thorough planning for the future. This wilderness bill is basically an insurance program to prevent the inadvertent and improper development of lands owned by the Federal Government that should be made available for the use and enjoyment of the public.

Each year as our metropolitan areas expand, we see much greater use of local, State, and Federal parks and recreation areas. As the population continues to

grow by leaps and bounds it is of the utmost importance that our wilderness areas be preserved. They serve as a refuge from the fast-paced life of our modern, mechanized, and urban world. Who does not find solace in the silence of pristine woods, or draw strength from the majestic mountains of our country, or find the ripple of our streams and lakes relaxing? Even those who thrive in the great metropolitan areas of our country long to escape the pavement of the city, the snarls of traffic and the smokestack skyline. Areas of natural beauty are a mecca for all of us who want a brief escape from the pressures of the modern world.

It is vitally important that we preserve the recreational resources of our land. All Americans should have an opportunity to enjoy the wonders of nature that are still a part of our great land.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my strong support of the wilderness bill. I have favored this type of legislation for many years in the belief that we must save priceless bits of nature, as created by God, for future generations to enjoy.

On May 17, 1962, I wrote of the wilderness bill in my weekly news and feature column. Though this was written some time ago, it still expresses my present views. In that column I said:

I shall always feel sorry for the kid who never lived in the country. The city boy can get to the ball game when he has the money, he can play in a fancy asphalt-covered playground, and go to a movie anytime. But these don't match the thrill of watching life emerge on exactly the 21st day after the hen starts to "set," or enduring the sting of nettles to get at fresh wild blackberries, ripping one's pants on the barbed wire fence, and learning to tell mushrooms from toadstools. City surroundings are built by mere men and will be replaced by what bigger men will some day build. But the world which surrounds the country boy is made only by God. In it there is more to encourage selflessness and less to prevent the peace of mind which is necessary when problems get bigger than humans.

Nature is almost a spiritual thing to many of us. We have no desire to inflict our spiritual beliefs upon others who prefer concrete pavement and city parks to the wide open spaces. But we do feel that we are entitled to the preservation of some natural wilderness before the rest of society ruins it for all time. We feel that future generations also have the right to see some of what God created as he created it without highways and beer cans, road signs, gas stations, junkyards, and taverns. This is the reason we are strongly supporting S. 174, the "wilderness bill," which has passed the Senate and is now under heavy attack in the House by commercial interests.

What we are asking is that a very small fraction of today's primitive and wilderness area be kept that way. We are not asking that future development of the great majority of public lands be stopped nor are we asking that all mining and lumbering be prohibited. We sincerely feel that we have a right to this unspoiled little bit of what God gave to all of us.

Mr. Chairman, this is a great day for those of us who strongly believe in conservation. I know this bill will be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, passage today of H.R. 9070, to establish a

National Wilderness Preservation System, can be a momentous step in the history of conservation. It embodies a program which is of serious concern to the people of Connecticut as it is to the rest of the country. We are seeking to conserve beauty, natural beauty, the original beauty of the land in which our forefathers settled and built this great Nation.

Frederick Law Olmsted, when he first reported on the Yosemite grant lands in 1865, warned about the harm that could be done to natural scenery by the masses of human visitors who visit our park lands. This Hartford native, perhaps the most distinguished landscape architect of our early history, sought to preserve the natural beauties of our land and to embellish the great gifts which nature sought to afford us all.

The increasing population of the land, the need and insistent demand for the resources with which our country has been blessed, have placed a premium on unspoiled land. That is the purpose of this bill, to preserve something of the wilderness, the natural environment of nature, which remains within our boundaries. The rapid expansion of civilization, the growth of urban centers, the increase of such areas as New England and Connecticut have created a special awareness of the need to take steps before it is too late to maintain the beauties of the wild and of nature.

Residents in our State's highly urbanized area have written to me in support of this measure. They have urged that the recreational and scenic values be protected. Through their travels, they have visited these areas and they hope to have their children, in their time, find it possible to visit them as well.

The experiences of a former U.S. attorney for Connecticut, a widely respected member of the legal profession, Robert P. Butler of Hartford, are relevant to this plea for support of this bill. Mr. Butler, with whom I have exchanged views on the measure, is intensely sincere in his belief that it must and should be enacted into law. Now in his eighties, Mr. Butler has been traveling throughout the American West and Northwest during summers since 1928, and has come to feel a close attachment to the land and its beauty, an attachment reflected in his warm, personal communications about the fundamental values they represent.

Passage of the wilderness bill will insure that the land which has provided invaluable pleasure to those who first discovered the beauties of the untouched and unspoiled land we are discussing today can be preserved. In time, the same pleasures which our generation and past generations have felt in venturing into these areas can be available to future generations, so that our children may know the same thrills of seeing nature in its untouched state.

The need for this measure has been expressed many times and in eloquent ways. It has been a long time reaching this point of legislation today, and I want to congratulate the members of the committee which has had to consider the conflicting claims and issues of priorities which were argued before it. I be-

lieve this bill, while it may not represent all that some had hoped, will meet the needs that I have expressed.

It can be a source of special pride to Members of a Congress privileged to take steps to preserve and treasure the beauties and the values of this Nation. I fully support H.R. 9070 and urge its passage.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am immensely impressed with the urgent need for such legislation as the wilderness bill and the objectives that it seeks to attain. Personally, I am fully convinced that in view of the population explosion in our Nation, that steps must be taken now to preserve and set aside existing areas of natural beauty to meet the needs of not only our own generation, but future generations yet unborn.

Surely, we cannot continue to let our vast wilderness areas be rapidly ravaged by the advances of civilization. How much poorer civilization will be if we do not provide and protect specific examples of unmodified islands of nature for the use and fulfillment of man's recreational needs.

Indeed, we are at a point in conservation history which can be likened to the memorable milestone which resulted in the first of the national parks whose beauty and splendor have become wonderful to behold for millions of American who continue to journey great distances and in greater numbers to drink in the beauty of nature and enjoy these breathtaking vistas.

Mr. Chairman, we are all aware that nothing is so awe inspiring as these gifts of nature, which are so fulfilling and refreshing to those who are fortunate to observe them. This great splendor and these strangely beautiful vistas deserve the protection of Congress. The wilderness preservation program to me would be indicative of the fulfillment of the responsibility of Congress under the U.S. Constitution to exercise jurisdiction over the public lands.

Mr. Chairman, it is gratifying to witness the culmination of the long effort to gain passage of an effective wilderness bill. This represents a great stride in the development of a policy and program for the protection of our wild lands in the national forests, wildlife refuges and ranges, and in the national parks and monuments.

I want to compliment the committee, its chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for the careful and painstaking work that they have done in bringing this bill to the floor. Their achievement will be recognized as one of the major contributions to our public land laws in the century.

I also wish to support the amendments to the bill offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] to strengthen its wilderness protection features. These include the deletion from the bill of the language that would authorize commercial skiing development in the San Geronio wild area of California. This provision, which would open this unit of wilderness to commercial exploitation,

would set a dangerous precedent in this basic legislation.

The amendment that would remove the Secretary of Agriculture's authority to declassify national forest primitive areas is equally important. This declassification authority is wholly inconsistent with the section of the bill that calls for the continuing protection of these units of national forest wilderness until Congress has acted upon proposals relating to them. I see no justification for the Congress to relinquish its prerogative by permitting the Secretary to declassify the primitive areas and thus determine the fate of the wilderness which has been protected within these units over the decades.

I would add only that the provisions of this measure which encourage wide-open mining in wilderness areas of the national forest for 25 years are an unfortunate and unnecessary concession to mining interests. I hope this defect will be remedied before the bill is signed into law by the President.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to urge the passage of this bill with the strengthening amendments. It is my firm conviction that it is destined to become one of the greatest of our public land laws.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, during the 64 years since the turn of the century, much of the scenic wealth of the wilderness in the United States has been wiped out, but parts of it do remain. However, without protection, only a small fraction of what does remain would have a possibility of surviving for others to know in future years. Through enactment of H.R. 9070, the National Wilderness Preservation System bill, approximately 2 percent of the more than 2 billion acres of our national land area will be preserved for posterity.

Wilderness is a valuable resource which increases in value as it shrinks in size both on maps and with respect to the number of people it must serve. This is so demonstrably true that wilderness legislation, which some thought would lose its impact shortly after it was introduced, is more alive today than ever.

True wilderness is not a renewable resource. Once cut over or otherwise exploited, it is no longer an undisturbed natural area. Although quasi-wilderness areas for recreational use can be redeveloped over a century in once-exploited regions, the chain of natural forces responsible for the existence of soil, microscopic biological life, for plants and wildlife will have been interrupted and ended, and an entirely new ecological cycle—the result of man's influence—will have resulted.

Unless the existing areas of true wilderness are reserved now, the influence of man is inevitably going to consume all that we have. There will be roads and commercial operations, campsites, and facilities which will not only mar scenic beauty but destroy natural values found only in undisturbed areas.

Ultimately the U.S. Government is going to have to provide areas affording its citizens an opportunity to "get back to

nature," and to escape the pressures of modern life.

We can do it now, without expense to the National Treasury and with little or no disturbance to established private rights and community economies, or we can wait and spend tens of millions of dollars later trying to recapture a few tracts to rebuild into secondhand, quasi-wilderness.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the purpose of the wilderness bill. It is simply an effort to achieve a highly desirable national objective—the preservation of significant wilderness tracts still owned by the U.S. Government—with as little adverse effect as possible on individuals, on private institutions, and on the economy of communities, regions, and the Nation.

Vigorous opposition to the wilderness bill has come from groups with a real and legitimate concern over the restriction of the use of portions of federally owned lands. The opponents have said that the commodity resource value on all unexploited lands are greater than the wilderness values, and make wilderness preservation a luxury the Nation cannot afford. But the measure before us today does not envisage the dedication of all unexploited lands. Commercial timberlands in dedicated wilderness areas comprise just a small percentage of the total acreage, and are small indeed when compared with the vast acreage outside wilderness which, once cut, still needs to be restocked. There exists no need for known or unknown mineral values in dedicated wilderness and, if present, such minerals should be our bequest to the future in case of dire need.

Opponents also say that wilderness legislation will "lock up" needed commodity resources forever. This, I believe, simply is not true. No law, no matter how strong, can withstand the pressures of a real need. By passing this badly-needed wilderness legislation at this time, both wilderness and other resources can be delivered to the future in one package. Then, if our technology fails to give us new materials which will be needed in the future, the entire wilderness concept can be reviewed in the light of the needs then existing.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of H.R. 9070.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, the cause of conservation must be zealously defended by Congress. Passage of the House wilderness bill is an historic act for conservation which I heartily endorse and fully support. This action is particularly meaningful to me as an individual who has been interested in and worked for conservation for many years. The wilderness bill along with the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act which we passed recently offer hopeful promise that the United States will always possess adequate parklands in the years ahead and that free open spaces of mountains, valleys, forests, lakes, and streams will endure for generations yet unborn. I am gratified to see this progress made in preparing the United States for its future needs for recreation and conservation space. I commend the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for

their patient and careful deliberations. Their diligence and study is in happy contrast to the politically motivated rush that has unfortunately characterized some committees' work as they grind out hastily conceived proposals now being manhandled through legislative channels.

The wilderness bill will insure the preservation of more than 9 million acres of land in a wilderness state as our forefathers found it and makes provisions for the potential inclusion of additional acres of primitive, wildlife refuge, and national park areas within the next 10 years. In passing this legislation we meet a solemn obligation to future generations to see that areas of our country shall be permanently protected from commercial development so that future generations may have the opportunity of studying and enjoying the unspoiled beauty and splendor of our country's majestic land resources.

SPIRITUAL VALUE

The wilderness bill guarantees that these lands will be kept in their original untouched natural state. No future administrator will be able arbitrarily to remove the wilderness classification of these areas. Unless this vital legislation is enacted now, we are in danger of losing a priceless resource that can never be regained.

Setting aside a portion of our land as wilderness area means that despite our rapidly growing population and burgeoning commercial development, there will always be places in our country where wilderness beauty is unmarred and unscarred by civilization, where individuals may explore the wilds, and where biologists and naturalists may come to study wild plant and animal life in their untouched natural state. Above all there is a spiritual value to a wilderness area that in this materialistic age should not be overlooked. It is important that we preserve places where one can truly "lift up mine eyes unto the hills from whence cometh my help."

IMPROVEMENT OVER SENATE BILL

The bill is not perfect but legislation seldom is. The provision on 25-year mining is disturbing to many but should be accepted in the spirit of reasonable compromise. The feature included in the bill requiring congressional approval before new lands are added or removed from the system is a definite and meaningful improvement over the Senate-passed version. Instead of decisions on additions or deletions of land being made by administrative order, Congress, the voice of the people, is rightly given final say in H.R. 9070. This action by the House vindicates those in the Senate who objected there to passage of S. 4. I strongly opposed that bill and voiced my objections strenuously. Thanks to the carefully considered deliberations and improvements by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I can now gladly support this bill.

NEW HAMPSHIRE HAS WILDERNESS AREA

My State of New Hampshire has 5,400 acres to be included in the wilderness system—the only area in the northeast to be so included. This is a source of

pride to New Hampshire's citizens. The Great Gulf Wild Area in my district is bordered by the magnificent Presidential Range in the heart of the White Mountains, already preserved in the White Mountain National Forest. This includes Mount Washington, with an elevation of 6,288 feet, highest peak in northeast America. It is an area of unique grandeur to which visitors have repaired over the years, for spiritual refreshment and strength.

IN TRADITION OF THE WEEKS LAW

Let us hope this legislation can be worked out in conference and put into final form for the President's signature. This law is significant because it indicates our Nation's awareness that conservation must start today, not tomorrow. Teddy Roosevelt would be proud of us for passing this bill. It is in the tradition, especially meaningful in New Hampshire, of the Weeks' law which in 1911 established a new national policy for the purchase by the Federal Government of forest lands east of the Great Plains thus making possible the White Mountain National Forest. Weeks was a U.S. Congressman and Senator from Massachusetts but was born in New Hampshire where his family still lives. His son, Sinclair Weeks, a constituent of mine, served with great distinction as Secretary of Commerce under President Eisenhower. The conservation legislation which Weeks sponsored is today responsible for our possession in the eastern United States, including New Hampshire of invaluable national forests—forests that were threatened with destruction before Weeks saved them. The wilderness bill is another landmark in America's struggle to preserve and conserve its natural heritage.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Wilderness Act".

WILDERNESS SYSTEM ESTABLISHED STATEMENT OF POLICY

Sec. 2. (a) In order to assure that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, does not occupy and modify all areas within the United States and its possessions, leaving no lands designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness. For this purpose there is hereby established a National Wilderness Preservation System to be composed of federally owned areas designated by Congress as "wilderness areas", and these shall be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness, and so as to provide for the protection of these areas, the

preservation of their wilderness character, and for the gathering and dissemination of information regarding their use and enjoyment as wilderness; and no Federal lands shall be designated as "wilderness areas" except as provided for in this Act or by a subsequent Act.

(b) The inclusion of an area in the National Wilderness Preservation System notwithstanding, the area shall continue to be managed by the Department and agency having jurisdiction thereover immediately before its inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System unless otherwise provided by Act of Congress. No appropriation shall be available for the payment of expenses or salaries for the administration of the National Wilderness Preservation System as a separate unit nor shall any appropriations be available for additional personnel stated as being required solely for the purpose of managing or administering areas solely because they are included within the National Wilderness Preservation System.

DEFINITION OF WILDERNESS

(c) A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this Act an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; (3) has at least five thousand acres of land and is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition; and (4) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM—
EXTENT OF SYSTEM

Sec. 3. (a) All areas, except the San Geronio Wild Area, within the national forests classified at least 60 days before the effective date of this Act by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as "wilderness", "wild", or "canoe" are hereby designated as wilderness areas. The Secretary of Agriculture shall—

(1) Within one year after the effective date of this Act, file a map and legal description of each wilderness area with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and such descriptions shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal descriptions and maps may be made.

(2) Maintain, available to the public, records pertaining to said wilderness areas, including maps and legal descriptions, copies of regulations governing them, copies of public notices of, and reports submitted to Congress regarding pending additions, eliminations, or modifications. Maps, legal descriptions, and regulations pertaining to wilderness areas within their respective jurisdictions also shall be available to the public in the offices of regional foresters, national forest supervisors, and forest rangers.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture shall, within ten years after the enactment of this Act, review, as to its suitability or nonsuitability for preservation as wilderness, each area in the national forests classified on the effective date of this Act by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as "primitive" and report his findings to the President. The President

shall advise the United States Senate and House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the designation as "wilderness" or other reclassification of each area on which review has been completed, together with maps and a definition of boundaries. Such advice shall be given with respect to not less than one-third of all the areas now classified as "primitive" within three years after the enactment of this Act, not less than two-thirds within seven years after the enactment of this Act, and the remaining areas within ten years after the enactment of this Act. Each recommendation of the President for designation as "wilderness" shall become effective only if so provided by an Act of Congress. Areas classified as "primitive" on the effective date of this Act shall continue to be administered under the rules and regulations affecting such areas on the effective date of this Act until Congress has determined otherwise; except that (1) the Secretary of Agriculture, with the approval of the President, may determine that any portion of such primitive areas may be declassified and administered as other unclassified national forest land and upon such determination shall cause the same to be done, but no such determination shall become effective with respect to any primitive area or any portion of a primitive area which exceeds five thousand acres until sixty calendar days (which sixty days, however, shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain or an adjournment sine die) after the Secretary has notified the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of his intention to declassify such primitive area or portion of a primitive area; (2) primitive areas, as constituted on the effective date of this Act, may be increased in size by the President at the time he submits his recommendations to the Congress provided no such area is increased by more than five thousand acres with not more than one thousand two hundred and eighty acres of such increase in any one compact unit; and (3) if it is proposed to increase any primitive area by more than five thousand acres or by more than one thousand two hundred and eighty acres in any one compact unit such increase in size shall not become effective until acted upon by Congress. Nothing herein contained shall limit the President in proposing, as part of his recommendations to Congress, the alteration of existing boundaries of primitive areas or recommending the addition of any contiguous area of national forest lands predominantly of wilderness value.

(c) Within ten years after the effective date of this Act the Secretary of the Interior shall review roadless portions of parks, monuments, and other units of the national park system, and portions of wildlife refuges and game ranges under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior on the effective date of this Act and shall report to the President his recommendations. The President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to each such portion for which review has been completed, together with maps and definitions of boundaries. Each such recommendation calling for a change in status shall become effective only if so provided by an Act of Congress. Nothing contained herein shall, by implication or otherwise, be construed to lessen the present statutory authority of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the maintenance of roadless areas within units of the national park system.

(d) (1) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall, prior to submitting any recommendations to the

President with respect to the suitability of any area for preservation as wilderness—

(A) give such public notice of the proposed action as they deem appropriate, including publication in the Federal Register and in a newspaper having general circulation in the area or areas in the vicinity of the affected land;

(B) hold a public hearing or hearings at a location or locations convenient to the area affected. The hearings shall be announced through such means as the respective Secretaries involved deem appropriate, including notices in the Federal Register and in newspapers of general circulation in the area: *Provided*, That if the lands involved are located in more than one State, at least one hearing shall be held in each State in which a portion of the land lies;

(C) at least thirty days before the date of a hearing advise the Governor of each State and the governing board of each county, or in Alaska the borough, in which the lands are located, and Federal departments and agencies concerned, and invite such officials and Federal agencies to submit their views on the proposed action at the hearing or by no later than thirty days following the date of the hearing.

(2) Any views submitted to the appropriate Secretary under the provisions of (1) of this subsection with respect to any area shall be included with any recommendations to the President and to Congress with respect to such area.

(3) There shall further be included, with any recommendations to the President and to Congress with respect to the suitability of any area for preservation as wilderness, a concise statement identifying the specific values in the particular area that warrant the preservation of the area as wilderness, together with an identification of any other wilderness areas being preserved because of the presence of similar values, indicating the acreage of each such area and the total acreage of all areas preserved by reason of the presence of the same or similar values.

(e) Any modification or adjustment of boundaries of any wilderness area shall be recommended by the appropriate Secretary after public notice of such proposal and public hearing or hearings as provided in subsection (d) of this section. The proposed modification or adjustment shall then be recommended with map and description thereof to the President. The President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to such modification or adjustment and such recommendations shall become effective only in the same manner as provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of this section.

USE OF WILDERNESS AREAS

SEC. 4. (a) The purposes of this Act are hereby declared to be within and supplemental to the purposes for which national forests and units of the national park and national wildlife refuge systems are established and administered and—

(1) Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to be in interference with the purpose for which national forests are established as set forth in the Act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 11), and the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 215).

(2) Nothing in this Act shall modify the restrictions and provisions of the Shipstead-Nolan Act (Public Law 539, Seventy-first Congress, July 10, 1930; 46 Stat. 1020), the Thye-Blatnik Act (Public Law 733, Eightieth Congress, June 22, 1948; 62 Stat. 568), and the Humphrey-Thye-Blatnik-Anderson Act (Public Law 607, Eighty-fourth Congress, June 22, 1956; 70 Stat. 326), as applying to the Superior National Forest or the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture.

(3) Nothing in this Act shall modify the statutory authority under which units of the

national park system are created. Further, the designation of any area of any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system as a wilderness area pursuant to this Act shall in no manner lower the standards evolved for the use and preservation of such park, monument, or other unit of the national park system in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916, the statutory authority under which the area was created, or any other Act of Congress which might pertain to or affect such area, including, but not limited to, the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225; 16 U.S.C. 432 et seq.); section 3(2) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796(2)); and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(b) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, each agency administering any area designated as wilderness shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area and shall so administer such area for such other purposes for which it may have been established as also to preserve its wilderness character. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, wilderness areas shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use.

PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN USES

(c) Except as specifically provided for in this Act, and subject to existing private rights, there shall be no commercial enterprise and no permanent road within any wilderness area designated by this Act and, except as necessary to meet minimum requirements for the administration of the area for the purpose of this Act (including measures required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within the area), there shall be no temporary road, no use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment or motorboats, no landing of aircraft, no other form of mechanical transport, and no structure or installation within any such area.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS

(d) The following special provisions are hereby made:

(1) Within wilderness areas designated by this Act the use of aircraft or motorboats, where these uses have already become established, may be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions as the Secretary of Agriculture deems desirable. In addition, such measures may be taken as may be necessary in the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such conditions as the Secretary deems desirable.

(2) Nothing in this Act shall prevent within national forest wilderness areas any activity, including prospecting, for the purpose of gathering information about mineral or other resources, if such activity is carried on in a manner compatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment. Furthermore, in accordance with such program as the Secretary of the Interior shall develop and conduct in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, such areas shall be surveyed on a planned, recurring basis consistent with the concept of wilderness preservation by the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines to determine the mineral values, if any, that may be present; and the results of such surveys shall be made available to the public and submitted to the President and Congress.

(3) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, until midnight December 31, 1989, the United States mining laws and all laws pertaining to mineral leasing shall, to the same extent as applicable prior to the effective date of this Act, extend to those national forest lands designated by this Act as "wilderness areas"; subject, however, to such reasonable regulations governing ingress and egress as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture consistent with the use of the land for mineral location and development

and exploration, drilling, and production, and use of land for transmission lines, waterlines, telephone lines, or facilities necessary in exploring, drilling, producing, mining, and processing operations, including where essential the use of mechanized ground or air equipment and restoration as near as practicable of the surface of the land disturbed in performing prospecting, location, and, in oil and gas leasing, discovery work, exploration, drilling, and production, as soon as they have served their purpose. Mining locations lying within the boundaries of said wilderness areas shall be held and used solely for mining or processing operations and uses reasonably incident thereto; and hereafter, subject to valid existing rights, all patents issued under the mining laws of the United States affecting national forest lands designated by this Act as wilderness areas shall convey title to the mineral deposits within the claim, together with the right to cut and use so much of the mature timber therefrom as may be needed in the extraction, removal, and beneficiation of the mineral deposits, if needed timber is not otherwise reasonably available, and if the timber is cut under sound principles of forest management as defined by the national forest rules and regulations, but each such patent shall reserve to the United States all title in or to the surface of the lands and products thereof, and no use of the surface of the claim or the resources therefrom not reasonably required for carrying on mining or prospecting shall be allowed except as otherwise expressly provided in this Act: *Provided*, That, unless hereafter specifically authorized, no patent within wilderness areas designated by this Act shall issue after December 31, 1989, except for the valid claims existing on or before December 31, 1989. Mining claims located after the effective date of this Act within the boundaries of wilderness areas designated by this Act shall create no rights in excess of those rights which may be patented under the provisions of this subsection. Mineral leases, permits, and licenses covering lands within national forest wilderness areas designated by this Act shall contain such reasonable stipulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture for the protection of the wilderness character of the land consistent with the use of the land for the purposes for which they are leased, permitted, or licensed. Subject to valid rights then existing, effective January 1, 1990, the minerals in lands designated by this Act as wilderness areas are withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the mining laws and from disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral leasing and all amendments thereto.

(4) Within wilderness areas in the national forests designated by this Act, (1) the President may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize prospecting for water resources, the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water-conservation works, power projects, transmission lines, and other facilities needed in the public interest, including the road construction and maintenance essential to development and use thereof, upon his determination that such use or uses in the specific area will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial; and (2) the grazing of livestock, where established prior to the effective date of this Act, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(5) Other provisions of this Act to the contrary notwithstanding, the management of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, formerly designated as the Superior, Little Indian Sloux, and Caribou Roadless Areas, in the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, shall be in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary of Agriculture in accord-

ance 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 motor-boats.

(6) Commercial services may be performed within the wilderness areas designated by this Act to the extent necessary for activities which are proper for realizing the recreational or other wilderness purposes of the areas.

(7) 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.

(8) To the extent that it is not incompatible with wilderness preservation, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, in national forest wilderness areas designated by this Act, permit hunting and fishing: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the several States with respect to wildlife and fish in wilderness areas.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture shall identify, set aside, and classify for public recreational use an area of approximately three thousand five hundred acres within the San Gorgonio Wild Area on the San Bernardino National Forest that he finds most suitable for the installation and development of facilities necessary for skiing utilization. The Secretary shall, within three years after the enactment of this Act, review the suitability of the other lands within the San Gorgonio Wild Area as constituted on the effective date of this Act, for preservation as wilderness, identify those portions that he believes should be classified as "wilderness", and report his findings to the President. The President shall advise the United States Senate and House of Representatives of his recommendation with respect to the designation as "wilderness" or other reclassification of lands presently within the San Gorgonio Wild Area, submitting therewith maps and a definition of boundaries. Pending review by the Secretary of Agriculture, the submission of recommendations by the President, and action by Congress on the President's recommendations, the Secretary of Agriculture may: (1) continue to manage lands not required for public skiing within the San Gorgonio Wild Area under regulations governing management of wild areas on the effective date of this Act; or (2) with the approval of the President, declassify any of the lands presently within the San Gorgonio Wild Area not suitable for management as "wilderness" and not required for skiing development and administer them as other unclassified national forest land.

STATE AND PRIVATE LANDS WITHIN WILDERNESS AREAS

SEC. 6. (a) In any case where State-owned or privately owned land is completely surrounded by national forest lands within areas designated by this Act as wilderness, such State or private owner shall be given such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access to such State-owned or privately owned land by such State or private owner and their successors in interest, or the State-owned land or privately owned land shall be exchanged for federally owned land in the same State of approximately equal value under authorities available to the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided, however*, That the United States shall not transfer to a State or private owner any mineral interests unless the State or private owner relinquishes or causes to be relinquished to the United States the mineral interest in the surrounded land.

(b) In any case where valid mining claims, or other valid occupancies are wholly within

a designated national forest wilderness area, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, by reasonable regulations consistent with the preservation of the area as wilderness, permit ingress and egress to such surrounded areas by means which have been or are being customarily enjoyed with respect to other such areas similarly situated.

(c) Subject to the appropriation of funds by Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire privately owned land within the perimeter of any area designated by this Act as wilderness if (1) the owner concurs in such acquisition or (2) the acquisition is specifically authorized by Congress.

GIFTS, BEQUESTS, AND CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture may accept gifts or bequests of land within wilderness areas designated by this Act for presentation as wilderness. The Secretary of Agriculture may also accept gifts or bequests of land adjacent to wilderness areas designated by this Act for preservation as wilderness if he has given sixty days advance notice thereof to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Land accepted by the Secretary of Agriculture under this section shall become part of the wilderness area involved. Regulations with regard to any such land may be in accordance with such agreements, consistent with the policy of this Act, as are made at the time of such gift, or such conditions, consistent with such policy, as may be included in, and accepted with, such bequest.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept private contributions and gifts to be used to further the purposes of this Act.

ANNUAL REPORTS

SEC. 8. At the opening of each session of Congress, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior shall jointly report to the President for transmission to Congress on the status of the wilderness system, including a list and descriptions of the area in the system, regulations in effect, and other pertinent information, together with any recommendations they may care to make.

Mr. ASPINALL (interrupting the reading of the substitute committee amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD in full.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments. I ask that they be read en bloc because they apply to the same situation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. SAYLOR: Page 18, line 7, after "areas" strike out ", except the San Gorgonio Wild Area."

Page 31, line 5, strike out the whole of section 5 and renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was before our subcommittee and the full committee they adopted an amendment that I hope will be corrected in the House at this time. This amendment I have offered would eliminate the exception of the San Gorgonio area. The San Gorgonio area is not far removed from the metropolitan area of Los Angeles. It is, in the words of the For-

est Service, one of the few real gems of wild area to be found anywhere in the world. It is an area that has more use by the people who live in the metropolitan area of Los Angeles than any other wild or wilderness or primitive area in the United States. There are more groups of schoolchildren, there are more groups of Girl and Boy Scouts, there are more groups of campers, there are more groups from YMCA's and YWCA's who go into this area than any other wilderness, wild, or canoe area in our system that we are discussing. There have been some people who claim that this area should be set aside not for the multiple use which my amendment would make possible, but that it should be set aside for a special use of a class of people known as skiers.

Now, the reason that I am opposing the setting aside of this area for skiers is as follows:

"The natural heritage of our Nation must be preserved in two senses" involving (1) protection of some areas in a manner "as nearly in their original state as possible" and (2) "opportunity for a wide variety of recreation uses that do not require the strict preservation of resources in their natural condition."

The second goal of the Commission was set forth as "the wise development of our recreation resources" pointing out that the larger number of our citizens require outdoor recreation serviced with "basic facilities—roads, picnic tables, sanitation."

"A third basic goal" according to the Commission report—"is accessibility—an opportunity for all Americans to know and enjoy the outdoors." This goal was identified as "one of the central problems of outdoor recreation over the next 40 years. To achieve accessibility, existing areas must be further developed, and in many instances new sites must be acquired" [pages 11-12, committee print No. 26].

In southern California, close to the teeming population of the Los Angeles megalopolis, there are 1,654,000 acres of national forest land (Cleveland N.F., Angeles N.F., San Bernardino N.F.). Of this, 90,000 acres (San Gorgonio wild area 33,400 acres, San Jacinto wild area 20,600 acres, Aqua Tibia primitive area 26,700 acres, Cucamonga wild area 9,000 acres) or but 5 percent of the total, is in wilderness, wild or primitive category. In terms of ORRRC's first finding above, only 5 percent of national forest acreage in southern California would be maintained in a manner "as nearly in their original state as possible" and 95 percent would continue to be available "for a wide variety of recreation uses that do not require the strict preservation of resources in their natural condition."

Thus, it cannot be argued logically that the continued protection of the San Gorgonio wild area ignores this basic finding of ORRRC, nor by the same token that it would frustrate the second basic finding of ORRRC that the "larger number of our citizens require outdoor recreation serviced with basic facilities. "Ninety-five percent of the National Forest property in the Los Angeles area will continue to be available for development of recreation facilities for mass use.

"Accessibility," as the third basic ORRRC finding cited, must be put in context with other ORRRC findings. In considering the whole outdoor recreation problem ORRRC found that wilderness offered the greatest imbalance between supply and demand, because, by the very nature of things and the manner in which our Nation developed, areas of remaining wilderness value today are generally located where the people are not. San Gorgonio Wild Area is one of

the very few located so as to serve adjacent centers of large population. Moreover, it is accessible by peripheral paved road and it is now heavily used by the public as wilderness. Thus the San Gorgonio Wild Area meets the ORRRC test of "accessibility" and provides opportunity for the people of southern California to know and enjoy the outdoors in its nearly original state.

It seems clear, consequently that the issue is not between the opportunity for wilderness recreation and the opportunity for a "wide variety of recreation uses;" rather, it lies between the continuing opportunity for wilderness recreation, in a population density region where it is in critically short supply, and one highly specialized use—a commercially developed ski resort.

Throughout the ORRRC report is found a central theme or core which can be translated as a fervent plea for comprehensive planning, balanced planning, a recognition of the essential, integral importance of all aspects of the outdoor recreation picture. The ORRRC report in total does not support the dissolution of the San Gorgonio Wild Area in favor of a single outdoor recreation use—commercial ski development—which is available now and can be made much more available outside the wild area. Rather it supports the retention of the San Gorgonio Wild Area.

"Once an area has been placed in class V (wild, wilderness, canoe) it should be managed so as to preserve the primitive condition and the isolation that qualified it for inclusion. There should be no development of public roads, permanent habitations, or recreation facilities of any sort" (Outdoor Recreation for America, p. 113). And—

"The purpose of legislation to designate outstanding areas in this class—as wilderness areas is to give the increased assurance of attaining this objective (to preserve primitive conditions) that action by the Congress will provide." (Outdoor Recreation for America, p. 132.)

Here again, the San Gorgonio Wild Area meets the stern test of the ORRRC report. It was first set aside in 1931. It was the subject of intense study in 1948. It was finally placed in the "wild" category in 1956, after repeated studies, during which the same issues we are debating now were fully debated and resolved by the determination that the highest value of the area for all the people will be achieved by its retention as wilderness.

The former Secretary of Agriculture and the present Secretary of Agriculture have directed the Forest Service to make a study of this area to determine its highest and best use; and both the former Secretary and the present Secretary of Agriculture have had reports submitted to them by the Forest Service that the highest and best use that this area could be put to is to continue it as a wild area. The wild area will be destroyed if it is allowed to become a ski area. I would hope that the Congress would do what the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Directors of the Forest Service have asked them to do and that is to keep this area a wild area.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman is saying that a four-lane highway and a huge parking lot would be needed if this were to be used for skiing; is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. If this area is to be set aside for the type of skiing that is contemplated it will be necessary to have a

four-lane highway into this area; not just for skiing but for the type of skiing and ski lifts and ski tows that would be put in there. The traffic problem there is such that you would need a four-lane highway then. It just so happens that you have not too far from this area two either eight-lane or six-lane highways that converge across the southern end of this district.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Six.

Mr. SAYLOR. Two six-lane highways. If you are going to have two six-lane highways leading into this area and you are going to have skiers who will use them to get out there, you are going to have to have a way to get into this area, to park and to get out of the area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman, Mr. SAYLOR, has expired.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. If you do not have a four-lane highway, two lanes in and two lanes out, you are going to have the greatest traffic jam there that they have ever had in southern California.

Some people have said that this area should be set aside for this purpose because it is such an excellent skiing area. I can tell you that the Forest Service has had surveys made showing that there is no snow in this area unless there is snow in every other high area in southern California. The snow comes in a pattern. It does one thing in this area, it stays a little longer in the spring.

Let me call the attention of the members of this committee to the fact that just a short time ago in the great country of Switzerland two or three of the world's finest skiers, together with a dozen others, lost their lives, not because they were inexperienced skiers but, coupled with climatic conditions in the spring of the year, their skiing caused a disturbance in the snowpack which resulted in an avalanche which cost them their lives.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. The reason I ask about all this traffic and the necessity for this highway and these parking lots is that this actually pleads the case of these people who want to make it an area for recreation, because there is such a tremendous need that they will need highways and parking lots for hundreds of thousands of people.

Mr. SAYLOR. But the important thing is that those who want to use this as a multiple-purpose area for camping and recreation have not found it necessary to build this kind of a highway.

They have been willing to put their packs on their backs and walk into this area.

This is the kind of area that should be preserved for all of the people and not for just a little special group.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be concluded at not later than 4:15 p.m. this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this is one of the amendments to which I made reference when I began the debate on this legislation. This is a controversial matter. It was controversial in the committee and it is controversial here on the floor. The support for it I would say is about 50-50 as far as the people in the area are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I will say to my colleagues that, as I said earlier, according to the Forest Service, there were 53,500 visitors in the San Gorgonio Wild Area during 1963, which represents much less people. In the testimony before the subcommittee the opponents of skiing development—and this is what the wilderness people told us—they estimated there would be about 61,000 skiers in southern California who would use the area, while the proponents told us that there will be in the neighborhood of 250,000 skiers within the proximity of this particular area who would use the area for ski purposes.

Now, what is involved here, of course, as my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] has stated, is to set aside 3,500 acres of this medium-sized wild area of 33,898 acres and use it, not as my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania would tell you as a single use, but rather as a multipurpose use also, because it will be used by the wilderness people in winter and it will, of course, be used by them in the summertime when the ski operations are not available.

Mr. Chairman, what the subcommittee did, rather than follow the position of the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture, the subcommittee saw fit to follow the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, an instrument, if you please, of the Congress of the United States.

The committee position is supported by the findings and conclusions of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission whose recommendations were based first on the premise that "the natural heritage of our Nation must be preserved in two senses," involving first, protection of some areas in a manner "as nearly in their original state as possible" and second, "opportunity for a wide variety of recreation uses that do not require the strict preservation of resources in their natural condition."

The second goal of the Commission was set forth as "the wise development of our recreation resources," pointing out that the larger number of our citizens require outdoor recreation serviced with "basic facilities—roads, picnic tables, sanitation."

"A third basic goal," according to the Commission report, which was submitted to the President January 31, 1962, "is

accessibility—an opportunity for all Americans to know and enjoy the outdoors.”

May I say to the members of the committee when we had finished the debate on the bill in executive session and were marking it up one member asked the chairman this question:

How does a person without legs, a person who is aged and grown old in years, with heart trouble, use these areas?

One of the members from the minority side asked the chairman to yield and, after I yielded, he said:

The answer is he don't.

Mr. Chairman, the English might be a little incorrect, but the meaning is clear. Those people just do not use wilderness areas, because they cannot use them. I at one time used them while I was a young man but no longer may I use wilderness areas, unless I take some of my friends to the wilderness border and just step across and say, “You are in a wilderness now; breathe this good air.”

The issue on this amendment is whether we will make the area accessible to the people. In order to make it accessible, I oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute which has four parts to it. I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. DUNCAN: Page 31, beginning in line 5, strike out “shall identify” and all that follows down through “Secretary” in line 11.

Page 31, line 12, strike out “other”.

Page 31, line 25, strike out “not required for public skiing”.

Page 32, beginning in line 5, strike out “and not required for skiing development”.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is obvious from the discussion on the floor that the item that concerns us most and over which there was most disagreement in committee was this San Gorgonio ski area. There were some who thought it should be included in this bill, and there were some who thought it would be unwise to have it a special ski area in a bill that is devoted to establishing a wilderness; to engraft on the bill a section dealing with special purposes in this one area of San Gorgonio.

My substitute, in effect, would be a compromise between these two positions. I think it has a lot of merit because the net effect of it would be to remove the San Gorgonio area from the wilderness system. It would preserve that area as a wild area for a 3-year period of time. In effect we would be withdrawing the controversy over whether they should ski in San Gorgonio from the wilderness bill and postponing a congressional decision on it for 3 years. It is basically unwise, in a bill that is devoted to the

establishment of a wilderness system, one over which the committees have struggled for many years, to engraft on it a special purpose of this sort.

My substitute, as far as the wilderness people are concerned, would preserve the status of San Gorgonio as a wild area just as it now is. It is protected for a 3-year period. So far as the ski devotees are concerned, they are in the same position they have been in. They will still have the opportunity to make their case. All we are doing is removing this highly controversial and indeed unwise San Gorgonio amendment to this wilderness system so as to leave it in status quo as a wild area pending a presidential recommendation and action by the Congress. It would give the Congress an opportunity to reexamine the question free from the controversy that has surrounded this wilderness bill. It would permit the ski people to come in and make a case that theirs is the highest and best use. This is what the entire committee wants. There was no agreement in committee as to what that highest and best use is. It seems to me there is lots of merit to removing this ski controversy from the wilderness bill so that we have a bill go through here which is clean and which is devoted to the creation of a wilderness system alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], and against the substitute offered by the gentleman from Oregon.

It seems to me that the basic principle of this bill should govern our decision on this particular use. The basic principle of this approach—and is it the decision and will of this House?—that we are going to establish a wilderness system and put in that wilderness system all areas now classified as wild wilderness.

Now, why should we vary from that principle in the event that bill is passed? If you adopt the wording in the bill or if you adopt the substitute offered by the gentleman from Oregon you are making such a variation from the principle we are endeavoring to establish today. It seems to me we should establish the principle at this time and that we should consider all wilderness, wild, and canoe areas of the same nature.

The area that is involved in this particular amendment has been classified as a primitive or a wild area for some 30 years. There have been two petitions by ski groups that want to establish a ski lift that have been heard by the Forest Service and rejected by the Forest Service. Now that same group that wants a ski lift, because they have been rightfully refused by the Forest Service, on the ground that the highest and best use is to continue this as a wild area, now that they have been rejected they are trying to come in here and have us make an exception here on the floor. I do not think we should deviate from the present type of wilderness by granting a special permit for a ski lift under the circumstances. This is the most funda-

mental time that we should establish a set of principles. The only way we can establish a set or sets of principles and not vary from them is to adopt the Saylor amendment and reject the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, the San Gorgonio Wild Area is the only existing wild area which would be excluded, by this bill, from the National Wilderness Preservation System. It is patently an unwise, an unwarranted, and an unnecessary exclusion, and I rise in vigorous support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the view that this unique area would best be utilized by a group of commercial developers to establish a ski resort has been emphatically denied by the U.S. Forest Service, by the San Bernardino Board of Supervisors, in whose district it would lie, and by numerous, broadly based citizen groups of the immediate, user area. It has been denied on the basis of several soundly reasoned conclusions.

First. The exclusion of San Gorgonio would establish a dangerous precedent. Many areas which are included in this proposed wilderness system today will, inevitably, be subjected to pressures by various segments of our rapidly expanding population. The exclusion of this area at this time could establish a practice which would result in the eventual commercial development and effective destruction of much of this system which the committee is encouraging, and which I am confident the majority of the House is supporting.

Second. This exclusion will lead to the destruction of San Gorgonio itself as a meaningful wilderness area. The developers, it is true, would have us believe that their ski resort would place a very small burden on the area; a burden which would not be incompatible with its preservation and use as wilderness.

But their assertion will be proven disastrously false if we allow this development to take place. For in the center of this previously unspoiled wilderness area, a ski lift and supporting facilities will be erected. Near one of the few lakes, in this previously unspoiled wilderness, a large parking lot will be constructed. And access roads will be developed which will further and permanently destroy the heart of an irreplaceable, unspoiled wilderness. This is certainly not consistent with the provisions of this act which has been so long sought, and so long desired, by so many.

Third, and the tragedy of this provision, is that there are other areas, in the same vicinity, to serve this otherwise desirable recreational requirement.

As a matter of fact, the U.S. Forest Service which is trained and experienced in the development of national forest lands for recreational purposes, has determined, over the period of 30 years, that it is in the public interest to preserve San Gorgonio in its present status as a wilderness area. It has determined that there are other areas, in the immediate vicinity, which could be utilized as well or better for skiing facilities, and which would triple present capacity.

Much has been made of the assertion by those who would develop this area commercially, that the demands of the people for mass recreation must be met and that this seemingly little used wild area must be put to more intensive use. But this assertion is based upon a false premise—the premise that there is not a great demand for wilderness recreation. For the fact is, according to the very conservative figures of the U.S. Forest Service, that more than 53,000 people utilized the San Gorgonio Wild Area last year alone. And every indication is that this use, and this demand, is growing by persons who want a true wilderness for the enjoyment and education of their children and themselves.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would preserve a small, but vital, portion of one of our vanishing national assets—a resource of accessible wilderness. It is an asset which should be preserved, in consideration of the years and Americans to come, and I urge that the House include the San Gorgonio Wild Area in the national wilderness system.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Saylor amendment. Despite my age and shape, I am myself a skier and have skied with much pleasure at many of the outstanding ski resorts in my State, including those in the Los Angeles area and those in northern California at Mammoth and Lake Tahoe. And I have observed that skiers are generally well-to-do. In fact, the statistics indicate that they, as a group, earn twice the average income. Thus they are able to spend a considerable amount of money in pursuit of their hobby and usually enjoy every opportunity to do so.

At the present time, the abundant resources of this beautiful area are being well used in the public interest to provide for those who cannot afford expensive vacations. Concerned civic and private organizations are bringing the underprivileged youth of the Los Angeles area out of the crowded city into the mountains of San Gorgonio to camp. For most of these youngsters, many of whom come from minority ethnic backgrounds, this experience at San Gorgonio is their first opportunity to see a virgin wilderness. The leaders of the YMCA and church groups that bring them there argue convincingly that their stay in the mountains is a valuable contribution to their healthy growth. I should like to see their good work continued. For the interest of my colleagues, I am including at the end of my comments a partial list of these service organizations and other youth groups that are using the resources of this area.

In addition to the activities of the many Scout groups who also use San Gorgonio, the outstanding program of the University Religious Conference of UCLA, with which I am quite familiar, is particularly worthy of mention. Young men and women from UCLA and Los Angeles City College volunteer their time to supervise the learning and play of hundreds of underprivileged chil-

dren, 40 percent of whom are members of minority groups—many of Mexican heritage—who are brought to the Conference's Unicamp and College Camp at San Gorgonio. During special sessions and under the direction of trained doctors and nurses the conference brings blind and diabetic youngsters to camp for a memorable week. This is the kind of work which must be continued.

In spite of my very sincere desire to see an expansion of skiing areas in southern California, I think that it would not be in the public interest to take an action in this case which would deprive those who, in my opinion, have the greatest need, in order to provide for those who are much better able to satisfy their needs elsewhere. For this reason, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in my support of the Saylor amendment, thereby permitting the continued use of San Gorgonio for the education and enrichment of the underprivileged children of Los Angeles.

PRIVATELY OWNED ORGANIZATION CAMPS IN THE BARTON FLATS AREA AS OF JUNE 1, 1960

Boy's Club of Pasadena, Camp Norris, 5 acres.

Boy Scouts of America, Arrowhead Council, Camp Arataba, 5.29 acres.

Boy Scouts of America, Orange Empire Council, Camp Ro-ki-II, 11.86 acres.

Boy Scouts of America, troop 91, Camp Fullerton, 5 acres.

Boy Scouts of America, Greyback Council, Camp Tulakes, 12.49 acres.

California District Pilgrim Young People, Camp Mile High Pines, 6.03 acres.

Compton Camp Fire Girls, Camp Li-Tanda, 6.03 acres.

Camp Fire Girls, Los Angeles Area Council, Camp Yalanle, 12.19 acres.

Camp Fire Girls, Mt. San Antonio Council, Camp Nawakwa, 7 acres.

Camp Fire Girls, San Gabriel Valley Area Council, Camp Wasawagon, 7.14 acres.

Girl Scout Council of Glendale, Camp River Glen, 7.14 acres.

Tautona Girl Scout Council, Camp Tautona, 10 acres.

Camp Evangel, Inc., Camp Evangel, 5 acres.

Forest Home, Inc., Camp Forest Homes, 1.29 acres.

Jewish Centers Association, Camp JCA, 8 acres.

Pasadena Methodist Foundation, Camp Sky Meadows, 4.62 acres.

Santa Ana Job's Daughters Lodge, 4.59 acres.

Southern California-Arizona Church of the Brethren, Camp La Verne, 14.43 acres.

Southern California Association of Seventh-Day Adventists, Camp Cedar Falls, 11.8 acres.

University Religious Conference, Camp University, 11.31 acres.

University Religious Conference at Los Angeles City and State colleges, 11.32 acres.

Young Men's Christian Association of Redlands, Camp Edwards, 4.98 acres.

Young Men's Christian Association of Centinela Valley, Camp Conrad, 5 acres.

Young Men's Christian Association of Los Angeles, Camp Round Meadows, 28.79 acres.

Orange County YMCA Camp Committee, Camp Osceola, 14.75 acres.

Young Men's Christian Association of Whittier, Camp Arbolata, 14.90 acres.

Young Men's Christian Association, Alhambra district, Camp Ta-Ta-Po-Chon, 11.8 acres.

Los Angeles Playground Department, Camp Radford, 82 acres.

Universalist Church of America, Camp de Benneville Pines, 15.9 acres.

Camp Roosevelt, Inc., Camp Roosevelt, 30 acres.

Girl Scouts, De Anza Council, Camp Azalea Trails, 10.57 acres.

Camps for Hebrew Arts, Camp Hi, 25.92 acres.

MEMBERS OF THE BARTON FLATS CAMP ASSOCIATION

Boy Scouts of America: Arrowhead Area Council, Orange Empire Area Council, Greyback Council, Long Beach Area Council.

Girl Scouts: Glendale-Crescenta, San Bernardino Council.

Camp Fire Girls: Compton Council, Mt. San Antonio Council, San Gabriel Valley Council, Los Angeles Area Council.

YMCA: Whittier, Centinela Valley, Redlands, Orange County, Los Angeles, Alhambra district.

Church camps: Southern California Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Camp Evangel, Azusa; Church of the Brethren, California district, Pilgrim Young People, First Methodist Church, Pasadena; University Religious Conference; Jewish Centers Association, Boy's Club of Pasadena.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, the committee which considered this legislation has seen fit to exclude the existing San Gorgonio Wild Area in California.

Mail I have received, articles I have read, comments during personal visits raise grave doubts as to whether this is in the interest of the general public. There appears to be relatively little public support for this in California and in other States for that matter.

We became a great nation because there were men of vision, men who dared to gamble in an unknown field of operation, but to place a ski development in the heart of a wild area appears to be carrying commercialization too far. Certainly this would defeat the whole purpose of establishing wilderness areas.

Precedents may be either good or bad. If we make this concession today, how could we in good conscience refuse a similar request from mercenary-minded individuals in any other area?

This is the first mass recreation versus wilderness conflict. If we yield here, many similar incidences will rise up to haunt us in the future. If we do not face up to this problem realistically we are establishing a policy favoring such losses in the future. Remember this: A ski resort is as damaging to a wilderness area as a mining operation.

On two occasions, ski developers applied to the U.S. Forest Service for a permit to enter the wild area. Permission was denied both times. An appeal from the latest decision of the Chief of the Forest Service against that ski development is presently on the desk of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Forest Service rejected both applications for a ski development because that agency believes continuance of that area in its wilderness condition and its present use by thousands of youngsters and their parents is far more in the long-term public interest than being invaded by mechanized skiing, lodges, and other facilities. I subscribe to the thinking of the Forest Service.

Interested persons can ski in the San Gorgonio Wild Area now, but they must

walk or ski in rather than ride. They must also climb the slopes rather than be transported on tows. Is not this the mark of a true outdoorsman?

I have information, Mr. Chairman, that there are presently a dozen or more established ski developments in southern California that provide all kinds of mechanized skiing for the "pantywaists" and "shrinking violets."

The inclusion of this area would accomplish nothing new in the way of skiing. It would do one thing, and this would be tragic—it would destroy a 34,000-acre wild area for all time. This country is not so rich that it can afford to destroy wilderness for mercenary reasons nor is it so poor that it cannot save the remaining wilderness areas we are fortunate to have today.

I am in complete support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Saylor amendment and in opposition to the Duncan amendment.

I have received a substantial amount of correspondence from my congressional district as well as from people from my area who have changed their residence to the southern part of California.

I want to reiterate some of the comments made by my colleagues, the gentlemen from California [Mr. BROWN and Mr. BALDWIN], relating to the fact that people in the educational field use the San Gorgonio area in many ways for educational purposes, on trips, hikes and outdoor classroom activities. Mr. Oden Hanson, a superintendent of one of the school districts has written a lengthy letter detailing the specific uses his students have for the San Gorgonio area in question.

I wish to add that I represent the area north of San Francisco, where the Point Reyes National Seashore now exists. I can testify specifically to the overwhelming demand of people living in major populated areas who need immediate access to park, recreation, and wilderness areas. It is certainly in our interest to encourage this principle, whenever possible. I believe Los Angeles fits into this same category.

Therefore, I ask support of the Saylor amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON].

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the California delegation, Hon. HARRY SHEPPARD, retires this year after 28 years of outstanding service to California and the Nation at large.

Congressman SHEPPARD is asking our support for the pending bill which is of direct concern to his own congressional district and without amendment. This will be the last request of this nature our colleague will make of us, and I am sure we will want to consider the matter carefully.

H.R. 9070—the wilderness bill—contains a provision that would exclude a small 3,500-acre section of San Gorgonio Mountain from regular wilderness coverage, and allow its development as a ski area. Congressman SHEPPARD supports this provision, and as the Representative from this region of California we can assume he is well acquainted with all pertinent facts.

However, a well-organized campaign has been launched against this proposed ski area. Letters similar in structure and content have poured into my office from nature lovers, hikers, and rock collectors opposed to the project, and I am sure many of my colleagues have received the same communications.

Only 10 percent of the San Gorgonio wilderness area will be set aside for development as a ski resort, and seemingly the organized nature lovers cannot fully enjoy themselves in the remaining 90 percent of the wild area.

Congressman SHEPPARD has spent a lifetime in this region and he says:

The upper part of the San Gorgonio Wild Area is not being effectively used because the skiers and winter recreationists are being kept out. The hikers want to keep their monopoly of the entire San Gorgonio Wild Area by forbidding skiing use of the upper part which is presently unused, and unusable. San Gorgonio on its upper north facing slopes has the potential of another Sun Valley at a southerly latitude.

The Los Angeles Herald Examiner in a recent editorial said:

The San Gorgonio mountain area is important to southern California winter sports enthusiasts and for those training as prospective skiing competitors in the Olympic games. This is because it is the only high area in the southland where snow for winter sports exists firmly packed and unmelted during most of the season * * *. As we stated in a previous editorial, we believe that places are for people. We believe the San Gorgonio proposal, which sets aside only one-tenth of this tremendous mountain area for winter sports and retains the other nine-tenths for those desiring to keep the area in its natural state, is a fair division of these places for people.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this newspaper statement strikes close to the heart of the matter at hand. Within a hundred-mile radius of San Gorgonio live only approximately 12 million people. Only a very small number of these people will ever enjoy the wild area as hikers or rock collectors. However, many thousands may well develop an interest in skiing and winter sports. Southern California is extremely sports-minded, and there is every reason to assume that winter sports will excite public attention—once reasonable facilities are available.

I believe the Congress should do everything possible to encourage large numbers of people to participate in healthy, outdoor activities. We can take a major step in this direction by approving the present wilderness bill with the San Gorgonio provision included and unamended.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the proposed amendment and fully support Congressman SHEPPARD's position on this question, and pay a most distinguished Member a personal tribute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment and also the Saylor amendment. I support the bill as it was reported by the full committee.

In the bill consideration is asked of 3,500 acres in the San Gorgonio Wild Area, to be considered as a ski development. The bill asks the Secretary of Agriculture to make the necessary study. With that study the Forest Service would offer a prospectus, which would be necessary for a ski development in the area.

At the present time the San Gorgonio area is used for the most part by summer recreationists. They use only the lower portion of the San Gorgonio area. Most of the activities in the ski resort area would be above the 7,200-foot level and would be at a level where mostly there are rocky cliffs and rocky parking areas.

In developing the upper reaches of San Gorgonio, they would put in ski lifts for day use only. This is being asked for as a day use ski area. It is not like the ski areas which exist in my area where we have 24 of them operating now where they have resort facilities and overnight accommodations and the balance of the facilities necessary for that type of an operation.

The question was raised as to access roads. At the present time in each of the ski areas there is one access. That access is necessary in order to bring in approximately 3,000 or 4,000 skiers on a given day. It is operating very well, and certainly we have traffic controls. These traffic controls are placed wherever masses of people gather for skiing. In this particular area the parking area could be the same as was used in Squaw Valley for that matter. It is about 1,200 feet higher in elevation, and they have much colder temperatures there. When the Olympic games were held at Squaw Valley this question was raised of what we were going to do with the meadow where parking was to be placed. They parked the cars on packed snow and there was no deterioration in that meadow area whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. One of the difficulties in writing legislation such as is before us today is the deep emotion which is felt, the deep emotion which destroys logic. I am interested in this single proposition solely because it represents and dramatizes the kind of a selection which is going to have to be made every single time we establish any kind of a preserve or recreation area from this point on. How do we best use the land which is available? Now, we get a lot of malarkey here which ought to be completely discounted by each Member of the House. We are going to take care of the lame and the halt by putting a pack on their back and taking them 9,000 feet up in the mountains. What kind of silliness is this? We are either going to use this area here as wilderness for those who are healthy enough and wealthy enough

and with time enough to spend some time in the wilderness, or we are going to use it for a mass recreation purpose, 2 hours away from 12 million people in southern California.

You have to make a decision as to which you think is the wiser choice. We are not talking about destroying all the wild and wilderness areas in California. We have 1,820,000 acres of this stuff out there. We are talking here about 3,500 acres. There are 1,820,000 acres, I repeat, there, and we are talking about 3,500 here. I do not care what area you would select. It would all be the most unique and the most desirable. There is no question about that, and you can discount that. If this is such an essential operation to the State of California where we are taking this tiny portion, then what happens to us poor folks in the other 36 States that have not one acre of wilderness?

I say again, Mr. Chairman, that the only question which we have before us here is one which must be satisfied on the basis of logical thought: How can we best use this particular area? Do we use it as a wilderness area or as a mass recreation area?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, the committee considered in this legislation 88 separate wilderness-type areas in more than a dozen States. The San Gorgonio area is the only one of those areas that we undertake to deal with specifically in the bill before us. The bill as now written says that the San Gorgonio area is going to remain a wild area but all we are going to do is cut the heart out of it and take 3,500 acres right in the middle and turn this into a commercial ski operation.

Now, all of the arguments on the side of those who want to pass this amendment—and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] made some very brilliant arguments the other way—are arguments you have heard. We have argued this for months. I have listened to all of the testimony and read all that which I did not hear, and it is my solemn judgment that the Saylor amendment ought to be passed and that the Duncan substitute ought to be defeated. It is not a question of skiing or not skiing. They ski there now and they will continue to ski there after the Saylor amendment is adopted, and this is preserved as a wild area. The sole question is whether you are going to have a big commercial ski operation with broad highways and resort and parking areas and lifts and all that go with it. I think the thing that finally convinced me was a study made by the Forest Service in May of this year. They surveyed southern California and they agreed that they needed skiing. These 12 million people that the gentleman referred to are there and they should be helped. The question was: Should they ski in San Gorgonio or are there other places available? And they concluded by saying:

The amount of public funds which would be required to make San Gorgonio accessible

for ski development could equally well be spent on improving existing roads to Mineral King, Slate Mountain, or Horse Meadow and open up a greater public use capacity. These sites are available now for development under the Forest Service multiple-use policy. National controversy such as results from a wilderness-invasion proposal is not inherent in any of these alternate sites.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, we have here in a very excellent bill to preserve the wilderness a loophole being shot to protect certain interests which desire to use a precious wilderness area for a purpose altogether inconsistent with that fundamental use. This legislation as drawn without the Saylor amendment simply says that we are setting up a wilderness program in a lot of areas but that in one area we shall essentially declassify the wilderness area to set up an inconsistent use.

Beyond this I think there are certain vices. We are legislatively here overruling a twice-made determination by the Forest Service that wilderness was the predominant value and that winter sports development should be rejected. Perhaps the Congress in its wisdom could do this if there were no other ski resources, no other ski areas available. But the facts of the matter are that there are at least 12 other areas in the immediate vicinity which are already open, which are already developed, which are already being heavily used and which with appropriate development, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Arizona, could be made available to take care of larger numbers of people.

Just let me read one thing from the report which shows the evil of the language which would take away from the wilderness system this San Gorgonio area:

It was maintained quite convincingly that the introduction of ski lifts, access roads to the ski lifts, and adjacent parking areas would be incompatible with the continued designation of the immediate surrounding area for wilderness preservation.

This is the report. It is the report of the committee itself which says it should not be done.

Let me conclude by saying one further thing. I have the highest regard for the distinguished gentleman from California, and I would very much like to do something for him, but I believe the price of this is too high.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] to close the debate.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I think we have pretty well highlighted the issue that is involved in this debate: the question of whether or not we are going to permit other users who have just as much right to the use of the outdoors the same privileges as we permit a certain group that now uses the area. This will not spoil all the wilderness aspects of San Gorgonio. It is not quite as picturesque as the statement of my friend from Arizona would have you believe. This is not taking the heart out of the particular area. It is taking a part of the San Gorgonio area. The

operation could be entirely separate and apart from a remaining wilderness area.

May I say also that this area, properly developed, would be a very fine facility for the use of some of these boys and girls, these young people, and especially people with not too good health, and the cripples, so that they, too, could enjoy some of God's great outdoors without too much trouble. Otherwise they are not going to get into this area. Regardless of what you say, surely the boys and girls of the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts and Campfire Girls will still be able to get out there.

But, also, these other youth of the land have a right to expect the use of some of the outdoors close to their homes, and I see no reason why the decision made by the subcommittee and by the full committee should not be upheld by this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired. All time has expired on the proposed amendments.

The question is on the substitute amendments offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN] to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

The substitute amendments to the amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAYLOR) there were—ayes 73, noes 39.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 20, line 3, strike out the semicolon and the remainder of the subsection through page 21, line 7 and insert a period and the following:

"Any such area may be increased in size by the President at the time he submits his recommendations to the Congress by not more than five thousand acres with no more than one thousand two hundred and eighty acres of such increase in any one compact unit; if it is proposed to increase the size of any such area by more than five thousand acres or by more than one thousand two hundred and eighty acres in any one compact unit the increase in size shall not become effective until acted upon by Congress. Nothing herein contained shall limit the President in proposing, as part of his recommendations to Congress, the alteration of existing boundaries of primitive areas or recommending the addition of any contiguous area of national forest lands predominantly of wilderness value."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the basic difference between the wilderness bill that we are now discussing and all other wilderness bills that have ever been introduced is whether or not Congress shall have complete control and jurisdiction over the establishment of such areas.

In the wisdom of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee we have adopted the philosophy that the Con-

gress of the United States, having been charged in the Constitution with jurisdiction over our public lands, must establish wilderness areas. That is the heart of this bill.

Congress by the passage of this bill will establish as wilderness all areas that are now classified as wilderness, wild, and canoe. The areas which are primitive and will hereafter be classified and covered into the system when they have been studied by the Secretary of Agriculture can only be done by a positive act of Congress. There is a provision in the bill which says that the Secretary of Agriculture can declassify any area. All my amendment does is to say that if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that it should be declassified he shall recommend that to the President and the President recommend it to the Congress, but it shall not become effective until Congress takes action, either declassifying or continuing it in the wilderness system.

If we are going to insist upon congressional approval, I suggest this amendment be adopted so that the Congress will have complete control of all of the land that has been classified as primitive by the Secretary of Agriculture. I hope that this amendment will be adopted because it will make it a better bill and make it consistent with the basic provisions of the legislation.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would deny an administrative agency, in this case the Department of Agriculture, the authority to declassify a primitive area. The language in the bill is inconsistent in that we ask the President to submit to Congress all existing primitive areas, national park and wildlife areas proposed from inclusion in the wilderness preservation system.

Under the bill as written, a recommendation to elevate an existing national forest primitive area to wilderness status would require an affirmative act of Congress. In section 3, b(1) Congress would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to eliminate a primitive area and manage it. An affirmative act of Congress would not be required.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and other House committees stress the duties and responsibilities of the committees under the Constitution. The position in this case is that Congress should assert its duty and responsibility in matters concerning public lands.

I am in no position to say how much or how little administrative authority should be vested in a public land managing agency. It must be enabled to do a satisfactory job in the public interest. No agency should be required to come to Congress for decisions on details. I do want to point out the irregularity existing in this bill. On the one hand, Congress is telling the administrative agency that full wilderness protection cannot be conferred on an existing primitive area

without its approval. On the other hand, Congress is giving the administrative agency authority to delete a primitive area if it desires.

This is an inconsistent position. If the Congress is to pass on America's wilderness that is to be preserved as such, it should also pass on areas proposed to be abandoned. The rules should be the same whether we seek to create or condemn wilderness area. Public interest in each case is identical.

Too many inconsistencies already exist in Government. Let us eliminate them whenever and wherever possible. Here we have an opportunity to do just that.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment, and, pending that, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto and on the bill itself conclude not later than 4:50.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, this is a basic provision of the bill which is now before the Committee. It is not quite as pictured by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. The reason that we have primitive areas at the present time and the reason those are not ready for inclusion in the wilderness area is because of the fact they have never been studied. They are a part of the forest system. They have been set aside by the Secretary of Agriculture under the theory they do have wilderness potentialities. There is no reason in the world why, once the Secretary of Agriculture has studied the primitive areas which remain, 5 million-plus acres which remain, and has made his determination and he is ready to have the matter come to the President of the United States, we should not permit the part that does not qualify as wilderness to return immediately to the status of other national forest land, and not be managed as primitive areas. This to me is limiting, rather than increasing the authority that the Congress would have in this matter.

The action of Congress is to determine the final restricted status and the final usage permitted in these areas. Once the area has been found by the administrative branch of the Government as not having a value sufficiently present to entitle it to the wilderness status, then in my opinion it should revert immediately.

We have made it abundantly clear in the legislation which we bring before the Committee that any Member of Congress who might be interested in one of these areas that is declassified would have at least 60 days to get to the Secretary of Agriculture to find out whether a study was made in accordance with the correct procedures; and if he finds everything to be in order, then of course the area should be returned to ordinary national forest multiple use status and not be allowed to remain in limbo as part of a primitive area when it has no wilderness value attached to it.

It seems to me that the Congress of the United States should know when its authority is present and when its authority should stop. It should also respect the authority and the administrative responsibility of the executive department having jurisdiction over a matter.

I feel that the subcommittee amendment protects the wilderness areas. I feel that the decision of the Congress when finally made on the recommendation as to whether or not a primitive area should be included in the wilderness system, after the recommendation of the Department and the President, is all that is necessary. It seems to me further that we can go just a step too far in trying to determine the procedures of an administrative branch of the Government.

I feel that the subcommittee amendment is in order, that it is a necessary part of the bill, that everybody is protected, and that the administration of the forest lands themselves will be furthered by the defeat of the Saylor amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAYLOR) there were—ayes 67, noes 38.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute amendment, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9070) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 804, reported the bill back to the House with amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the first Saylor amendment, the San Gorgonio amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 18, line 7, after "areas" strike out " , except the San Gorgonio Wild Area."

On page 31, line 5, strike out the whole of section 5 and renumber the following sections accordingly.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Seventeen Members have arisen, not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee substitute amendment, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 374, nays 1, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 197]

YEAS—374

Abbutt	Curtin	Harsha
Abele	Curtis	Harvey, Ind.
Abernethy	Daddario	Harvey, Mich.
Adair	Dague	Hawkins
Addabbo	Daniels	Healey
Albert	Davis, Ga.	Hechler
Anderson	Delaney	Henderson
Andrews, Ala.	Dent	Herlong
Andrews, N. Dak.	Denton	Hoeven
Ashbrook	Derwinski	Hollifield
Ashley	Devine	Horan
Aspinall	Diggs	Horton
Auchincloss	Dingell	Hosmer
Ayres	Dole	Huddleston
Baker	Donohue	Hutchinson
Baldwin	Dorn	Jarman
Barry	Dowdy	Jennings
Bates	Downing	Jennings
Battin	Dulski	Jensen
Becker	Duncan	Joelson
Beckworth	Dwyer	Johansen
Beermann	Edmondson	Johnson, Calif.
Beicher	Edwards	Johnson, Pa.
Bell	Elliott	Johnson, Wis.
Bennett, Fla.	Ellsworth	Jonas
Berry	Everett	Jones, Ala.
Betts	Fallon	Karsten
Blatnik	Farbstein	Karsten
Boggs	Fascell	Kastemeler
Boland	Feighan	Keith
Bolton	Findley	Kelly
Bolton, Frances P.	Finnegan	Keogh
Bolton, Oliver P.	Fisher	Kilgore
Bow	Flood	King, Calif.
Bray	Flynt	King, N.Y.
Brock	Fogarty	Kirwan
Bromwell	Ford	Kluczynski
Brooks	Foreman	Knox
Broomfield	Forrester	Kornegay
Brotzman	Fountain	Kunkel
Brown, Calif.	Fraser	Kyl
Brown, Ohio	Frellinghuysen	Laird
Broyhill, N.C.	Friedel	Langen
Broyhill, Va.	Fulton, Pa.	Latta
Bruce	Fulton, Tenn.	Leggett
Burke	Fuqua	Lennon
Burkhalter	Gallagher	Libonati
Burleson	Garmatz	Lindsay
Burton, Calif.	Gary	Lipscomb
Burton, Utah	Gathings	Long, La.
Byrne, Pa.	Gialmo	Long, Md.
Byrnes, Wis.	Gibbons	McClary
Cahill	Gilbert	McCulloch
Cameron	Gill	McDade
Carey	Glenn	McDowell
Casey	Gonzalez	McFall
Cederberg	Goodell	McLoskey
Celler	Goodling	MacGregor
Chamberlain	Grabowski	Madden
Chelf	Grant	Mahon
Chenoweth	Gray	Mailliard
Clancy	Green, Oreg.	Marsh
Clark	Green, Pa.	Martin, Calif.
Clauson, Don H.	Griffiths	Martin, Nebr.
Clawson, Del.	Gross	Mathias
Cleveland	Grover	Matsunaga
Collan	Gubser	Matthews
Collier	Gurney	May
Colmer	Hagan, Ga.	Meador
Conte	Hagen, Calif.	Michel
Cooley	Haley	Miller, Calif.
Corbett	Hall	Miller, N.Y.
Corman	Halpern	Milliken
Cramer	Hanna	Mills
Cunningham	Hansen	Minish
	Harding	Minshall
	Hardy	Monagan
	Harrison	Montoya
		Moore

Moorhead	Rivers, Alaska	Steed
Morgan	Rivers, S.C.	Stephens
Morris	Roberts, Ala.	Stinson
Morrison	Roberts, Tex.	Stratton
Morse	Robison	Stubblefield
Morton	Rodino	Sullivan
Mosher	Rogers, Colo.	Taft
Moss	Rogers, Fla.	Talcott
Multer	Rogers, Tex.	Taylor
Murphy, Ill.	Rooney, N.Y.	Teague, Calif.
Murphy, N.Y.	Rooney, Pa.	Thomas
Murray	Roosevelt	Thompson, N.J.
Natcher	Rosenthal	Thompson, Tex.
Nedzi	Rostenkowski	Thomson, Wis.
Nelsen	Roudebush	Tollefson
O'Brien, N.Y.	Roush	Trimble
O'Hara, Ill.	Roybal	Tuck
O'Hara, Mich.	Rumsfeld	Tuten
O'Konski	Ryan, N.Y.	Udall
Olsen, Mont.	St. George	Ullman
Olson, Minn.	St. Germain	Utt
O'Neill	St. Onge	Van Deerin
Osmers	Saylor	Vank
Ostertag	Schadeberg	Waggonner
Patman	Schenck	Watson
Patten	Schneebell	Watts
Pelly	Schweiker	Weaver
Pepper	Schwengel	Weitner
Perkins	Scott	Westland
Philbin	Secret	Whalley
Pickle	Selden	Wharton
Pike	Senner	White
Pillon	Sheppard	Whitener
Plrnie	Short	Whitten
Poage	Shriver	Wickersham
Poff	Sibal	Widnall
Powell	Sickles	Williams
Price	Sikes	Wilson
Pucinski	Siler	Charles H.
Purcell	Sisk	Wilson, Ind.
Quile	Skubitiz	Winstead
Quillen	Smith, Calif.	Wright
Randall	Smith, Iowa	Wydler
Reid, Ill.	Smith, Va.	Wyman
Reid, N.Y.	Snyder	Young
Reuss	Springer	Younger
Rhodes, Ariz.	Staebler	Zablocki
Rhodes, Pa.	Stafford	
Rich	Staggers	

NAYS—1

Pool
NOT VOTING—56

Alger	Harris	Norblad
Arends	Hays	Passman
Ashmore	Hébert	Plicher
Avery	Hoffman	Rains
Baring	Holland	Reifel
Barrett	Hull	Riehlman
Bass	Ichord	Ryan, Mich.
Bennett, Mich.	Jones, Mo.	Shipley
Bolling	Kee	Slack
Bonner	Kilburn	Teague, Tex.
Brademas	Landrum	Thompson, La.
Buckley	Lankford	Toll
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Tupper
Dawson	Lloyd	Van Pelt
Derounian	McIntire	Vinson
Evins	McMillan	Wallhauser
Fino	Macdonald	Willis
Griffin	Martin, Mass.	Wilson, Bob
Halleck	Nix	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Derounian.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Bass with Mr. Alger.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Wallhauser.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Holland.
Mr. Landrum with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Lankford.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Hull with Mr. McMillan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes, a similar bill to the one just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Wilderness Act".

WILDERNESS SYSTEM ESTABLISHED

Statement of policy

SEC. 2. (a) 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 and its possessions except those that are designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition. It is accordingly declared to be the policy of the Congress of the United States to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness. For this purpose there is hereby established a National Wilderness Preservation System to be composed of federally owned areas in the United States and its possessions to be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness, and so as to provide for the protection of these areas, the preservation of their wilderness character, and for the gathering and dissemination of information regarding their use and enjoyment as wilderness.

Definition of wilderness

(b) 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. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this Act an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's works substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; (3) is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition; and (4) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Extent of system

SEC. 3. (a) The National Wilderness Preservation System (hereafter referred to in this Act as the wilderness system) shall comprise (subject to existing private rights) such fed-

erally owned areas as are established as part of such system under the provisions of this Act.

National forest areas

(b) (1) The wilderness system shall include all areas within the national forests classified on the effective date of this Act by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, primitive, or canoe: *Provided*, That the areas classified as primitive shall be subject to review as hereinafter provided. Following enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within ten years, review, in accordance with paragraph C, section 251.20 of the Code of Federal Regulations, title 36, effective January 1, 1959, the suitability of each primitive area in the national forests for preservation as wilderness and shall report his findings to the President. Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the continued inclusion within the wilderness system, or exclusion therefrom, of each area on which review has been completed in the preceding year, together with maps and definition of boundaries: *Provided*, That the President may, as a part of his recommendations, alter the boundaries existing on the date of this Act for any primitive area to be continued in the wilderness system, recommending the exclusion and return to national forest land status of any portions not predominantly of wilderness value, or recommending the addition of any contiguous area of national forest lands predominantly of wilderness value: *Provided further*, That following such exclusions and additions any primitive area recommended to be continued in the wilderness system shall not exceed the area classified as primitive on the date of this Act. The recommendation of the President with respect to the continued inclusion in the wilderness system, or the exclusion therefrom of a primitive area, or portions thereof, shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section: *Provided*, That if Congress rejects a recommendation of the President and no revised recommendation is made to Congress with respect to that primitive area within two years, the land shall cease to be a part of the wilderness system and shall be administered as other national forest lands: *And provided further*, That, primitive areas with respect to which recommendations are submitted to Congress on the eighth, ninth, and tenth years of the review period herein provided shall retain their status as a part of the wilderness system until the expiration, in respect to each area, of a full session of Congress, two years for resubmission of revised recommendations to Congress by the President, and, if so resubmitted, until the expiration of a full session of Congress thereafter. Recommendations on all primitive areas not previously submitted to the Congress shall be made during the tenth year of the review period. Any primitive area, or portion thereof, on which a recommendation for continued inclusion in the wilderness system has not become effective within fourteen years following the enactment of this Act shall cease to be a part of the wilderness system and shall be administered as other national forest land.

(2) The purposes of this Act are hereby 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. 11), and the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960, Public Law 86-517 (74 Stat. 215).

National park system areas

(c) (1) There shall be incorporated into the wilderness system, subject to the provisions of and at the time provided in this section, each portion of each park, monument, or other unit in the national park system

which on the effective date of this Act embraces a continuous area of five thousand acres or more without roads. Within ten years after the effective date of this Act the Secretary of the Interior shall review the units of the national park system and shall report his recommendations for the incorporation of each such portion into the wilderness system to the President. Before the convening of Congress each year, the President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the incorporation into the wilderness system of each such portion for which review has been completed in the preceding year, together with maps and definitions of boundaries. The recommendation of the President with respect to each such portion shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

(2) The Secretary of the Interior shall include, as part of his recommendations to the President under the provisions of this subsection, a description of the parts of each park, monument, or other unit submitted which should be reserved for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, and administrative installations. Such parts shall be determined in accordance with the procedures for rulemaking under section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1003), except that the public notice required under such section shall be at least ninety days prior to the determination proceedings. 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; 16 U.S.C. 1 and 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 area of any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system within the wilderness system pursuant to this Act shall in no manner lower the standards evolved for the use and preservation of such area in accordance with such Act of August 25, 1916, the statutory authority under which the area was created, or any other Act of Congress which might pertain to or affect such area, including, but not limited to, the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225; 16 U.S.C. 432 and following); section 3(2) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C., sec. 796(2)); and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C., sec. 461 and following).

National wildlife refuges and game ranges

(d) There shall be incorporated into the wilderness system, subject to the provisions of and at the time provided in this section, such portions of the wildlife refuges and game ranges established prior to the effective date of this Act under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior as he may recommend for such incorporation to the President within ten years following the effective date of this Act. Before the convening of Congress each year the President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the incorporation into the wilderness system of each area recommended for such incorporation by the Secretary of the Interior during the preceding year, together with maps and definitions of boundaries. The recommendation of the President with respect to each area shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

Modification of boundaries

(e) Any proposed minor modification or adjustment of boundaries of any portion of

the wilderness system established in accordance with this Act shall be made by the appropriate Secretary after public notice of such proposal by publication in a newspaper having general circulation in the vicinity of such boundaries and public hearing to be held in such vicinity not less than ninety days after such notice if there is sufficient demand during such ninety days for such hearing. The proposed modification or adjustment shall then be recommended with map and description thereof to the President. The President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to such modification or adjustment and such recommendations shall become effective subject to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

Effective date of President's recommendations

(f) Any recommendation of the President made in accordance with the provisions of this section shall take effect upon the day following the adjournment sine die of the first complete session of the Congress following the date or dates on which such recommendation was received by the United States Senate and the House of Representatives; but only if prior to such adjournment neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives shall have approved a resolution declaring itself opposed to such recommendation: *Provided*, That in the case of a recommendation covering two or more separate areas, such resolution of opposition may be limited to one or more of the areas covered, in which event the balance of the recommendation shall take effect as before provided: *Provided further*, That where a resolution of opposition to any such recommendation has been introduced, a hearing thereon shall be held within thirty days by the committee to which such resolution has been referred. Any such resolution shall be subject to the procedures provided under the provisions of sections 203 through 206 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C., secs. 1332-12-1332-15) for a resolution of either House of Congress: *And provided further*, That a motion to discharge the Committee shall not be in order until the time for the Committee to hold a hearing has elapsed.

Effect of public notice of proposed addition to wilderness system

(g) Public notice when given by either the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture that any area is to be proposed under the provisions of this Act for incorporation as part of the wilderness system shall segregate such area from any or all appropriation under the public land laws to the extent deemed necessary by such Secretary. Such segregation shall terminate (1) upon rejection of such proposal by the President, (2) upon approval by the Senate or the House of Representatives of a resolution opposing the incorporation of such area in the wilderness system, or (3) five years after the date of such notice if the proposal to incorporate such area as part of the wilderness system has not been submitted to both Houses of Congress prior to the expiration of such five years.

Addition or elimination not provided for in this Act

(h) The addition of any area to, or the elimination of any area from, the wilderness system which is not specifically provided for under the provisions of this Act shall be made only after specific affirmative authorization by law for such addition or elimination.

Additional requirements with respect to recommendations

(i) (1) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall, prior to substituting any recommendations to the President with respect to any area's retention

in or incorporation into the wilderness system—

(A) give such public notice of the proposed action as they deem appropriate, including publication in the Federal Register and in a newspaper having general circulation in the area or areas in the vicinity of the affected land;

(B) hold a public hearing or hearings at a location or locations convenient to the area affected. The hearings shall be announced through such means as the respective Secretaries involved deem appropriate, including notices in the Federal Register and in newspapers of general circulation in the area: *Provided*, That if the lands involved are located in more than one State, at least one hearing shall be held in each State in which a portion of the land lies;

(C) at least thirty days before the date of a hearing advise the Governor of each State and the county, or in Alaska the borough, governing board of each county, or in Alaska the borough, in which the lands are located, the United States Forest Service, the United States Soil Conservation Service, the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Mines, the United States Geological Survey, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Federal Power Commission, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Federal Communications Commission, inviting each to set forth its views at the hearing. It shall be the responsibility of each named Federal agency to submit its independent views concerning the designation of an area as "wilderness", giving an analysis of the comparative values that may be involved as between wilderness and that type of development or uses for which the Federal agency has administrative responsibility.

(2) Views submitted to the President under the provisions of (1) of this subsection with respect to any area shall be included with any recommendations to Congress with respect to such area.

State lands surrounded by wilderness system

(j) In any case where State-owned land is completely surrounded by land incorporated into the wilderness system, such State shall be given either (1) such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access to such State-owned land by such State and its successors in interest, or (2) vacant, unappropriated, and unoccupied Federal land in the same State, equal in value to the surrounded land: *Provided*, That if the State does not reserve mineral rights in the surrounded land conveyed to the United States, the United States need not reserve mineral rights in the land conveyed to the State in exchange.

Acquisition of certain privately owned lands within the wilderness system

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are each authorized to acquire as part of the wilderness system any privately owned land within any portion of such system under his jurisdiction, subject to the approval of any necessary appropriations by the Congress: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this Act shall be construed to confer a right of condemnation with respect to privately owned land within the boundaries of a wilderness area, or to impair any customary right or privilege heretofore enjoyed by the owners of such land, respecting access to it or to its ordinary use and maintenance.

GIFTS OF BEQUESTS OF LAND

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior may each accept gifts or bequests of land for preservation as wilderness, and such land shall on acceptance become part of the wilderness system. Regulations with regard to any such land may be in accordance with such agreements,

consistent with the policy of this Act, as are made at the time of such gift, or such conditions, consistent with such policy, as may be included in, and accepted with, such bequest.

USE OF THE WILDERNESS

Other provisions of law

SEC. 6. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purposes stated in the establishment of, or pertaining to, any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system, or any national forest, wildlife refuge, game range, or other 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. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the wilderness system shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historic use. Subject to the provisions of this Act, all such use shall be in harmony, both in kind and degree, with the wilderness environment and with its preservation.

Prohibition of certain uses

(b) Except as specifically provided for in this Act and subject to any existing private rights, there shall be no commercial enterprise within the wilderness system, 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, including such measures as may be required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within such areas.

Special provisions

(c) The following special provisions are hereby made:

(1) Within the wilderness system the use of aircraft or motorboats where these practices have already become established shall be permitted to continue subject to such regulations as the appropriate Secretary finds necessary. In addition, such measures may be taken as are necessary in the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such regulations as the appropriate Secretary finds necessary.

(2) Within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, (A) the President may, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize prospecting (including but not limited to exploration for oil and gas), mining (including but not limited to the production of oil and gas), and the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water-conservation works, transmission lines, and other facilities needed in the public interest, including the road construction and maintenance essential to development and use thereof, upon his determination that such use or uses in the specific area will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial; and (B) the grazing of livestock, where established prior to the effective date of this Act with respect to areas established as part of the wilderness system by this Act, or prior to the date of public notice thereof with respect to any area to be recommended for incorporation in the wilderness system, shall be permitted to continue subject to such regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary having jurisdiction over such area.

(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, July 10, 1930 (46 Stat. 1020), the Thye-Blatnik Act, Public Law 733, Eightieth Congress, June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and the Humphrey-Thye-Blatnik-Andresen Act, Public Law 607, Eighty-fourth Congress, June 22, 1956 (70 Stat. 326) 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 manner provided in section 3(e).

(4) Commercial services may be performed within the wilderness system to the extent necessary for activities which are proper for realizing the recreational or other purposes of the system as established in this Act.

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

(6) 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.

(7) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the several States with respect to wildlife and fish in the national forests.

(8) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent, within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, any activity, including prospecting, for the purpose of gathering information about mineral or water resources or to prevent the completely subsurface use of such areas, if such activity or subsurface use is carried on, in a manner which is not incompatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment.

RECORDS AND REPORTS

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall each maintain available to the public, records of portions of the wilderness system under his jurisdiction, including maps and legal descriptions, copies of regulations governing them, copies of public notices of, and reports submitted to Congress regarding, pending additions, eliminations, or modifications. Within a year following the establishment of any area within the national forests as a part of the wilderness system, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and legal description of such area with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and such descriptions shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however*, That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal descriptions and maps may be made with the approval of such committees. Within a year following the establishment of any area in the national park system or in a wildlife refuge or range as a part of the wilderness system, the Secretary of the Interior shall file a map and legal description of such area with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. Clerical and typographical errors in such legal descriptions and maps may be corrected with the approval of such committees. Copies of maps and

legal descriptions of all areas of the wilderness system within their respective jurisdictions shall be kept available for public inspection in the offices of regional foresters, national forest supervisors, forest rangers, offices of the units of the national park system, wildlife refuge, or range.

CONTRIBUTIONS AND GIFTS

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are each authorized to accept private contributions and gifts to be used to further the purposes of this Act. Any such contributions or gifts shall, for purposes of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, be considered a contribution or gift to or for the use of the United States for an exclusively public purpose, and may be deducted as such under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, subject to all applicable limitations and restrictions contained therein.

Land use commissions

SEC. 9. With respect to any State having more than 90 per centum of its total land area owned by the Federal Government on January 1, 1961, there shall be established for each such State a Presidential Land Use Commission (hereinafter called the Commission). The Commission shall be composed of five persons appointed by the President, not more than three of whom shall be members of the same political party, and at least three of whom shall be residents of the State concerned. The Commission shall advise and consult with the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture on the current utilization of federally owned land in such State and shall make recommendations to the appropriate Secretary as to how the federally owned land can best be utilized, developed, protected, and preserved. Any recommendations made to the President by the Secretary of Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture and any recommendations made to the Congress by the President pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be accompanied by the recommendations and reports made with respect thereto by the Commission.

SEC. 10. At the opening of each session of Congress, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior shall jointly report to the President for transmission to Congress on the status of the wilderness system, including a list and descriptions of the areas in the system, regulations in effect, and other pertinent information, together with any recommendations they may care to make.

SEC. 11. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as superseding, modifying, repealing, or otherwise affecting the provisions of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 792-825r).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 4 and insert the provisions of H.R. 9070.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 9070) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 9070.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight, Friday, July 31, to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 10939, the Defense Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1965.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

H.R. 11904

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 11904.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of this week and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman's inquiry, we have completed the legislative program for this week and I shall ask unanimous consent to go over after announcing the program.

For next week the program is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day, and there are 13 suspensions, as follows:

S. 3001, increasing the rate of basic pay for members of the uniformed services.

H.R. 4018, authorizing establishment of the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, N.H.

H.R. 1096, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin.

H.R. 931, to establish the Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site and the Johnstown Flood National Memorial, Pa.

H.R. 4010, providing an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Ariz. and Nev.

H.R. 946, establishing the Fort Bowie National Historic Site, Ariz.

H.R. 439, establishing the John Muir National Historic Site, Calif.

H.R. 3071, establishing Fort Larned as a national historic site.

H.R. 3672, providing for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Savery-Pot Hook, Bostwick Park, and Fruitland Mesa participating reclamation projects under the Colorado River Storage Project Act.

H.R. 7662, to amend the Federal Employees Compensation Act to provide appeal rights to employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company.

H.R. 11211, to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949.

H.R. 10446, to permit the use of statistical sampling procedures in the examination of vouchers.

S. 1991, to charter by act of Congress the National Tropical Botanical Gardens.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

Also on Tuesday we will consider H.R. 6793, the Securities Acts amendments of 1964. This will come up under an open rule, with 2 hours of general debate.

Also on Tuesday the Committee on Armed Services may call up under unanimous consent four House joint resolutions, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 113, to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy two citizens and subjects of the Republic of Vietnam.

House Joint Resolution 1048, to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand.

House Joint Resolution 1072, to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy a citizen and subject of the Empire of Iran.

House Joint Resolution 1115, to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand.

Also on Tuesday, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has advised he will call up under unanimous consent three bills, as follows:

H.R. 2855, manufactures' excise tax on sets or strings of electric light bulbs.

H.R. 5986, duty on brooms made of broom corn.

H.R. 8050, nonprofit nurses' professional registries.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 11377, Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This will come up under an open rule, with 6 hours of general debate. This is the so-called antipoverty bill. It is expected the vote on final passage will come on Friday.

Also on Friday there will be considered H.R. 1803, relating to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Mo. This will be considered under an open rule, with 1 hour of general debate.

This announcement, of course, is made subject to the general and usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and that any further program will be announced later.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.