

that other Members of Congress will support this bill to protect pharmacists and to enable them to continue to serve the needs of the people in this country.●

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to support and pass H.R. 5222, the Controlled Substance Registrant Protection Act of 1984. This important bill will protect pharmacists and their customers across this Nation from persons who rob and burglarize these pharmacies to obtain controlled substances. As the sponsor of H.R. 1032, a bill to make pharmacy robbery a Federal crime, I appreciate the importance of this legislation, and have co-sponsored H.R. 5222, the bill before us today.

H.R. 5222 is endorsed by the National Association of Chain Drug Stores, the National Wholesale Druggists Association, the American Pharmaceutical Association, the Drug Wholesalers Association, the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, and the Food Marketing Institute.

Pharmacies are sitting ducks for addicts or drug traffickers who are willing to risk the lives of pharmacists and customers in order to get their hands on controlled substances. One unfortunate result of pharmacy robbery is that some pharmacies no longer carry the controlled substances that legitimate customers need. This is deplorable.

I am happy to support legislation which permits Federal involvement in pharmacy robbery investigations where the Federal officials can contribute to the case.●

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity, as both a Member of this distinguished body and a pharmacist, to rise in support of legislation to amend the Controlled Substances Act. H.R. 5222 will make it a Federal crime to obtain controlled substances from a pharmacy by force or violence.

There is no doubt that violent crime is one of the major concerns of today's community pharmacy practitioner. I personally know that the property, and more importantly, personal safety of my friends and colleagues in the profession are in grave jeopardy. Greater than 99 percent of armed robberies of controlled substances were from pharmacies; 75 percent of crimes committed against drugstores were for the purpose of obtaining controlled substances, not cash. This problem is universal to all pharmacies, be they urban, suburban, or rural. A recent survey revealed that 50 percent of urban pharmacies reported the occurrence of a crime, whereas 45.3 percent of rural pharmacies also did.

One striking and very unfortunate consequence of these robberies is that as many as 40 percent of community pharmacies no longer stock some drugs that are the repeated targets for

theft and violence. I think it is obvious to all of us that this fact has serious implications for drug therapy across our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that a Federal role in this serious problem is both appropriate and necessary, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5222.●

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity to applaud the efforts of the Judiciary Committee and to express my support for H.R. 5222.

No Member is more aware of the illegal drug trade than those of us from the State of Florida. Illegal drug trafficking is big business in Florida. However, increasingly the documented cases of drug-related deaths can be attributed to the abuse of legitimate drugs, the majority of which were bought on the street from criminals who obtained these controlled substances by force.

With the enforcement of the Controlled Substances Act, prescription drugs have become more difficult to illegally obtain. Proportionately, their street value has risen, as has the incidence of robbery and burglary. Under present law, pharmacists are required to report the theft of controlled substances. Yet, Federal law does not protect these same pharmacists from the violence which is often visited upon them to obtain their drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I first introduced this type of legislation several years ago because of my concern with the safety of pharmacists. It has taken time, but the effort has brought fruition.

This is an important step in our drive to curtail pharmacy robberies. It will not end the problem, but it will make it easier to apprehend and convict those responsible. I am pleased that the House of Representatives is taking this step and hope we will soon be able to have this measure enacted into law.●

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5222 and I request that my colleagues in the House vote in support of this vital measure. Last year, the Federal Drug Enforcement Administration provided me with some alarming statistics on thefts and losses of controlled substances in Virginia and nationwide. This data illustrates clearly the need for the Congress to address the problem of thefts and armed robbery of controlled substances.

Several of my colleagues on the Select Committee on Narcotics and Drug Abuse joined me in sponsoring H.R. 2929, legislation which is somewhat broader in scope than H.R. 5222. Our bill would amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide a penalty for employee thefts, customer pilferages, robberies, and burglaries of any controlled substance from any phar-

macy practitioner, hospital, manufacturer, or distributor.

While I would prefer a more comprehensive measure, I recognize that existing Federal statutes are inadequate. H.R. 5222 is a giant step in the right direction and in my opinion, is a proper Federal response to a national problem which has reached crisis proportions.

A brief glimpse of the statistics will give you an idea of the extent of the problem we are facing. According to the DEA, in 1982 there were 2,861 thefts by night break-ins, 1,037 thefts by armed robbery, 876 employee thefts, 247 customer pilferages, and 833 incidents of loss in transit. Each one of these thefts or losses involves a large number of drugs. The average night breakin resulted in a loss of over 4,000 dosage units. This data reinforces the need for enactment of legislation.

I congratulate the committee chairman for holding hearings on this serious problem and presenting the House with a bill which addresses the problem in a responsible manner. I strongly urge the Members of the House to vote in support of H.R. 5222.●

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5222.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material thereon, on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

□ 1250

ARIZONA WILDERNESS ACT OF 1984

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL), I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4707) to designate certain national forest lands in the State of Arizona as wilderness, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4707

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Arizona Wilderness Act of 1984".

TITLE I

SEC. 101. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131-1136), the following lands in the State of Arizona are hereby designated as wilderness and therefore as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) certain lands in the Prescott National Forest, which comprise approximately five thousand four hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Apache Creek Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Apache Creek Wilderness;

(2) certain lands in the Prescott National Forest, which comprise approximately fifteen thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Arnold Mesa Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 1984, and which shall be known as the Arnold Mesa Wilderness;

(3) certain lands in the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest, which comprise approximately eleven thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Bear Wallow Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 1984, and which shall be known as the Bear Wallow Wilderness;

(4) certain lands in the Prescott National Forest, which comprise approximately twenty-nine thousand seven hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Castle Creek Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Castle Creek Wilderness;

(5) certain lands in the Coronado National Forest, which comprise approximately seventy-four thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Chiricahua Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 1984, and which are hereby incorporated in and shall be deemed a part of the Chiricahua Wilderness, as designated by Public Law 88-577;

(6) certain lands in the Coconino National Forest, which comprise approximately eleven thousand five hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Fossil Springs Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 1984, and which shall be known as the Fossil Springs Wilderness;

(7) certain lands in the Tonto National Forest which comprise approximately sixty-three thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Four Peaks Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 21, 1984, and which shall be known as the Four Peaks Wilderness;

(8) certain lands in the Coronado National Forest, which comprise approximately twenty thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Galiuro Wilderness Additions—Proposed", dated March 1984, and which are hereby incorporated in and shall be deemed a part of the Galiuro Wilderness as designated by Public Law 88-577;

(9) certain lands in the Prescott National Forest, which comprise approximately nine thousand six hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Granite Mountain Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Granite Mountain Wilderness;

(10) certain lands in the Tonto National Forest, which comprise approximately forty-three thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Hellsgate Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 1984, and which shall be known as the Hellsgate Wilderness;

(11) certain lands in the Prescott National Forest which comprise approximately seven thousand six hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Juniper Mesa Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Juniper Mesa Wilderness;

(12) certain lands in the Kaibab National Forest, which comprise approximately six thousand five hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Kendrick Mountain Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Kendrick Mountain Wilderness;

(13) certain lands in the Tonto National Forest, which comprise approximately forty-eight thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Mazatzal Wilderness Additions—Proposed", dated March 21, 1984, and which are hereby incorporated and shall be deemed a part of the Mazatzal Wilderness as designated by Public Law 88-577: Provided, That within the lands added to the Mazatzal Wilderness by this Act, the provisions of the Wilderness Act shall not be construed to prevent the installation and maintenance of hydrologic, meteorologic or telecommunications facilities, or any combination of the foregoing, or limited motorized access to such facilities when nonmotorized access means are not reasonably available or when time is of the essence, subject to such conditions as the Secretary deems desirable, where such facilities or access are essential to flood warning, flood control and water reservoir operation purposes;

(14) certain lands in the Coronado National Forest, which comprise approximately twenty thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Miller Peak Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Miller Peak Wilderness;

(15) certain lands in the Coronado National Forest, which comprise approximately twenty-five thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Mt. Wrightson Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Mount Wrightson Wilderness;

(16) certain lands in the Coconino National Forest, which comprise approximately sixteen thousand six hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Munds Mountain Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 21, 1984, and which shall be known as the Munds Mountain Wilderness;

(17) certain lands in the Coronado National Forest, which comprise approximately seven thousand five hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Pajarita Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 1984, and which shall be known as the Pajarita Wilderness;

(18) certain lands in the Coconino National Forest, which comprise approximately fifty-three thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Red Rock-Secret Mountain Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 21, 1984, and which shall be known as the Red Rock-Secret Mountain Wilderness;

(19) certain lands in the Coronado National Forest, which comprise approximately thirty-eight thousand five hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Rincon Mountain Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Rincon Mountain Wilderness;

(20) certain lands in the Tonto National Forest, which comprise approximately twenty-one thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Salome Wilder-

ness—Proposed", dated March 1984, and which shall be known as the Salome Wilderness;

(21) certain lands in the Tonto National Forest, which comprise approximately forty thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Salt River Canyon Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 21, 1984, and which shall be known as the Salt River Canyon Wilderness;

(22) certain lands in the Coconino National Forest, which comprise approximately eighteen thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "San Francisco Peaks Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 21, 1984, and which shall be known as the San Francisco Peaks Wilderness;

(23) certain lands in the Coronado National Forest, which comprise approximately twenty-seven thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Santa Teresa Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Santa Teresa Wilderness; reasonable access shall be permitted to continue on the existing right-of-way from the United States Route 70 along Black Rock Wash to the vicinity of Black Rock;

(24) certain lands in the Prescott National Forest, which comprise approximately thirty-eight thousand five hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Sheridan Mountain Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the "Sheridan Mountain Wilderness";

(25) certain lands in the Tonto National Forest, which comprise approximately thirty-seven thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Superstition Wilderness Additions—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which are hereby incorporated in and shall be deemed to be a part of the Superstition Wilderness as designated by Public Law 88-577;

(26) certain lands in the Coconino and Prescott National Forest, which comprise approximately nine thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Additions—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which are hereby incorporated in and shall be deemed a part of the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness as designated by Public Law 92-241;

(27) certain lands in the Coconino National Forest, which comprise approximately fourteen thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "West Clear Creek Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 1984, and which shall be known as the West Clear Creek Wilderness;

(28) certain lands in the Coconino National Forest, which comprise approximately six thousand seven hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Wet Beaver Wilderness—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which shall be known as the Wet Beaver Wilderness;

(29) certain lands in the Prescott National Forest, which comprise approximately six thousand two hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Woodchute Wilderness—Proposed", dated March 21, 1984, and which shall be known as the Woodchute Wilderness.

(b) Subject to valid existing rights, the wilderness areas designated under this section shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act (or

any similar reference) shall be deemed to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) As soon as practicable after enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and a legal description of each wilderness area designated under this section with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate. Such map and description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made. Such map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture.

(d) The Congress does not intend that designation of wilderness areas in the State of Arizona lead to the creation of protective perimeters or buffer zones around each wilderness area. The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from areas within a wilderness shall not, of itself, preclude such activities or uses up to the boundary of the wilderness area.

(e)(1) As provided in paragraph (6) of section 4(d) of the Wilderness Act, nothing in this Act or in the Wilderness Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from Arizona State water laws.

(2) As provided in paragraph (7) of section 4(d) of the Wilderness Act, nothing in this Act or in the Wilderness Act shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the State of Arizona with respect to wildlife and fish in the national forests located in that State.

(f)(1) Grazing of livestock in wilderness areas established by this Act, where established prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be administered in accordance with section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act and section 108 of Public Law 96-560.

(2) The Secretary is directed to review all policies, practices, and regulations of the Department of Agriculture regarding livestock grazing in national forest wilderness areas in Arizona in order to insure that such policies, practices, and regulations fully conform with and implement the intent of Congress regarding grazing in such areas, as such intent is expressed in this Act.

(3) Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and at least every five years thereafter, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate a report detailing the progress made by the Forest Service in carrying out the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this section.

SEC. 102. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall review the following as to their suitability or nonsuitability for preservation as wilderness and shall submit his recommendations to the President:

(1) certain lands in the Coronado National Forest, which comprise approximately seven hundred and forty acres as generally depicted on a map entitled "Bunk Robinson Wilderness Study Area Additions—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which are hereby incorporated in the Bunk Robinson Wilderness Study Area as designated by Public Law 96-550;

(2) certain lands in the Coronado National Forest which comprise approximately

five thousand and eighty acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Whitmire Canyon Study Area Additions—Proposed", dated February 1984, and which are hereby incorporated in the Whitmire Canyon Wilderness Study Area as designated by Public Law 96-550;

(3) certain lands in the Coronado National Forest which comprise approximately sixty-five thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Mount Graham Wilderness Study Area", dated March 21, 1984, and which shall be known as the Mount Graham Wilderness Study Area.

With respect to the areas named in paragraphs (1) and (2), the President shall submit his recommendations to the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate no later than January 1, 1986.

(b) Subject to valid existing rights, the wilderness study areas designated by this section shall, until Congress determines otherwise, be administered by the Secretary so as to maintain their presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

SEC. 103. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the Department of Agriculture has completed the second roadless area review and evaluation program (RARE II); and

(2) the Congress has made its own review and examination of national forest system roadless areas in the State of Arizona and of the environmental impacts associated with alternative allocations of such areas.

(b) On the basis of such review, the Congress hereby determines and directs that—

(1) without passing on the question of the legal and factual sufficiency of the RARE II final environmental statement (dated January 1979) with respect to national forest system lands in States other than Arizona such statement shall not be subject to judicial review with respect to national forest system lands in the State of Arizona;

(2) with respect to the national forest system lands in the State of Arizona which were reviewed by the Department of Agriculture in the second Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE II), except those lands designated for wilderness study in section 2 of this Act or by previous Acts of Congress that review and evaluation shall be deemed for the purposes of the initial land management plans required for such lands by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976 to be an adequate consideration of the suitability of such lands for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System and the Department of Agriculture shall not be required to review the wilderness option prior to the revision of the initial plans and in no case prior to the date established by law for completion of the initial planning cycle;

(3) areas in the State of Arizona reviewed in such final environmental statement and not designated as wilderness or wilderness study by Congress need not be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation pending revision of the initial plans; and

(4) unless expressly authorized by Congress, the Department of Agriculture shall not conduct any further statewide roadless area review and evaluation of national forest system lands in the State of Arizona for the purpose of determining their suitability for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

SEC. 104. Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274) is amended by inserting the following after paragraph (50):

"(51) VERDE, ARIZONA.—The segment from the boundary between national forest and private land in sections 26 and 27, township 13 north, range 5 east, Gila Salt River meridian, downstream to the confluence with Red Creek, as generally depicted on a map entitled 'Verde River—Wild and Scenic River', dated March 1984, which is on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief, Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture; to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture. This designation shall not prevent water users receiving Central Arizona Project water allocations from diverting that water through an exchange agreement with downstream water users in accordance with Arizona water law. After consultation with State and local governments and the interested public and within two years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall take such action as is required under subsection (b) of this section."

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Congress finds that—

(1) the Aravaipa Canyon, situated in the Galiuro Mountains in the Sonoran desert region of southern Arizona, is a primitive place of great natural beauty that, due to the rare presence of a perennial stream, supports an extraordinary abundance and diversity of native plant, fish, and wildlife, making it a resource of national significance; and

(2) the Aravaipa Canyon should, together with certain adjoining public lands, be incorporated within the national wilderness preservation system in order to provide for the preservation and protection of this relatively undisturbed but fragile complex of desert, riparian and aquatic ecosystems, and the native plant, fish, and wildlife communities dependent on it, as well as to protect and preserve the area's great scenic, geologic, and historical values, to a greater degree than would be possible in the absence of wilderness designation.

SEC. 202. In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 890, 16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) and consistent with the policies and provisions of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (90 Stat. 2743; 43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), certain public lands in Graham and Pinal Counties, Arizona, which comprise approximately six thousand six hundred and seventy acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness—Proposed" and dated May 1980, are hereby designated as the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness and, therefore, as a component of the national wilderness preservation system.

SEC. 203. Subject to valid existing rights, the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness. For purposes of this title, any references in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act and any reference to the Secretary of Agriculture with regard to administration of such areas shall be deemed to be a reference to the Secretary of the Interior, and any reference to wilderness areas designated by the Wilderness Act or designated national forest wilderness areas shall be deemed to be a reference to the Aravaipa

Canyon Wilderness. For purposes of this title, the reference to national forest rules and regulations in the second sentence of section 4(d)(3) of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to rules and regulations applicable to public lands, as defined in section 103(e) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701, 1702).

SEC. 204. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of the Interior shall file a map and a legal description of the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate and with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives, and such map and description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: Provided, That correction of clerical and typographical errors in the legal description and map may be made. The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

SEC. 205. Except as further provided in this section, the Aravaipa Primitive Area designations of January 16, 1969, and April 28, 1971, are hereby revoked.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act, the following lands are hereby designated as wilderness and therefore, as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System—

(1) certain lands in the Arizona Strip District of the Bureau of Land Management, Arizona, which comprise approximately six thousand five hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Cottonwood Point Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1983, and which shall be known as the Cottonwood Point Wilderness;

(2) certain lands in the Arizona Strip District of the Bureau of Land Management, Arizona, which comprise approximately thirty-six thousand three hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Grand Wash Cliffs Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1983, and which shall be known as the Grand Wash Cliffs Wilderness;

(3) certain lands in the Kaibab National Forest and in the Arizona Strip District of the Bureau of Land Management, Arizona, which comprise approximately seventy-seven thousand one hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Kanab Creek Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1983, and which shall be known as the Kanab Creek Wilderness;

(4) certain lands in the Arizona Strip District of the Bureau of Land Management, Arizona, which comprise approximately fourteen thousand six hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Mt. Logan Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1983, and which shall be known as the Mount Logan Wilderness;

(5) certain lands in the Arizona Strip District of the Bureau of Land Management, Arizona, which comprise approximately seven thousand nine hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Mt. Trumbull Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1983, and which shall be known as the Mount Trumbull Wilderness;

(6) certain lands in the Arizona Strip District of the Bureau of Land Management, Arizona, which comprise approximately eighty-four thousand seven hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Paiute Wilderness—Proposed", dated May

1983, and which shall be known as the Paiute Wilderness;

(7) certain lands in the Arizona Strip District, Arizona, and in the Cedar City District, Utah, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately one hundred and ten thousand acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1983, and which shall be known as the Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness;

(8) certain lands in the Kaibab National Forest, Arizona, which comprise approximately thirty-eight thousand two hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Saddle Mountain Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1983, and which shall be known as the Saddle Mountain Wilderness; and

(9) certain lands in the Arizona Strip District, Arizona, and in the Cedar City District, Utah, of the Bureau of Land Management, which comprise approximately nineteen thousand six hundred acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Beaver Dam Mountains Wilderness—Proposed", dated May 1983, and which shall be known as the Beaver Dam Mountains Wilderness.

(b) The previous classifications of the Paiute Primitive Area and the Paria Canyon Primitive Area are hereby abolished.

SEC. 302. (a) Subject to valid existing rights, each wilderness area designated by this title shall be administered by the Secretary concerned in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act: Provided, That any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act, and any reference to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be deemed to be a reference to the Secretary who has administrative jurisdiction over the area.

(b) Within the wilderness areas designated by this title, the grazing of livestock, where established prior to the date of enactment of this Act, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary concerned deems necessary, as long as such regulations, policies, and practices fully conform with and implement the intent of Congress regarding grazing in such areas as such intent is expressed in the Wilderness Act and this title.

SEC. 303. As soon as practicable after enactment of this Act, a map and a legal description on each wilderness area designated by this title shall be filed by the Secretary concerned with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, and each such map and description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: Provided, That correction of clerical and typographical errors in each such legal description and map may be made by the Secretary concerned subsequent to such filings. Each such map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture or in the Office of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, as is appropriate.

SEC. 304. (a) The Congress hereby finds and directs that lands in the Arizona Strip District of the Bureau of Land Management, Arizona, and those portions of the Starvation Point Wilderness Study Area (UT-040-057) and Paria Canyon Instant Study Area

and contiguous Utah units in the Cedar City District of the Bureau of Land Management, Utah, not designated as wilderness by this Act have been adequately studied for wilderness designation pursuant to section 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (Public Law 94-579), and are no longer subject to the requirement of section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act pertaining to management in a manner that does not impair suitability for preservation as wilderness.

(b) The Congress hereby determines and directs that—

(1) certain lands in the Kaibab National Forest known as the Red Point (03063), Big Ridge (03064), Burro Canyon (03065) and Willis Canyon (03066) roadless areas, as identified in executive communication numbered 1504, Ninety-sixth Congress (House Document numbered 96-119), and the portion of the Kanab Creek RARE II roadless area (B3-060) not designated wilderness by this Act have been adequately studied for Wilderness in the RARE II Final Environmental Statement (dated January 1979);

(2) such studies shall constitute an adequate consideration of the suitability of such lands for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System and the Department of Agriculture shall not be required to review the wilderness option for such areas prior to revision of the initial plans required for such lands by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976 and in no case prior to the date established by law for completion of the initial planning cycle; and

(3) such areas need not be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation pending revision of the initial plans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. McNULTY) will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. McCAIN) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. McNULTY).

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Arizona Wilderness bill, perhaps appropriately should be called the first Arizona Wilderness bill, would place in wilderness designation 1.2 million acres of ground and would include some of the most gorgeous scenery in the State of Arizona.

What is probably, from a political standpoint, most important about it is the degree of contribution made by the many user interests. This bill has been under study and under criticism and under construction for a period of something more than 6 months now. There have been extensive reviews

made by the mining interests for example, and by the timbering interests.

In my case, I have certainly had a substantial opportunity to meet with the members of the Arizona Cattle Growers Association; people representing wilderness interests and environmental interest have had a chance to participate. Out of that I think has come a bill which represents, to the highest degree possible, a fairly decent consensus.

If politics is as I believe it to be the art of compromise and the science of the achievable, then I think H.R. 4707 richly deserves your consideration and your approbation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RUDD).

Mr. RUDD. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4707, the Arizona Wilderness Act. This measure proposes to deny Arizonans and the people of our country the use of an additional 722,300 acres of their land by adding it to the existing designated wilderness in the State.

Wilderness designation by the Federal Government removes valuable land from multiple use where it would be available under Government management for recreation, wildlife habitat, timber production, grazing, mineral exploration, and commercial development for the benefit of all Arizonans.

Our Founding Fathers fought a revolution against those who sought to control public lands for their own narrow purposes. I therefore do not believe the majority should be denied the right to benefit from their lands through restrictive wilderness designations which will benefit only a few.

I have long advocated multiple-use management as the best alternative to accommodate the many needs of our citizens, whether they be development and respectful use of the natural resources within the lands, recreation or wilderness preservation. Those who work and depend upon the land—miners, cattlemen, timbermen, and others—not only have the greatest incentive to protect it—it is their livelihood—but they also generate billions of dollars worth of direct and indirect social and economic benefits for their fellow citizens in Arizona and in America.

My constituents in Arizona have consistently, and in overwhelming numbers, opposed additional wilderness designations. Eighty-six percent of those who have written me on the wilderness issue have expressed opposition to more wilderness.

Despite this strong concern, however, most everyone agrees that the roadless area review and evaluation

process (RARE) will go on forever unless we take action. Arizonans have therefore been working together to reach an acceptable compromise to put an end to the long drawn out RARE process once and for all.

Because of these good faith efforts, I was particularly concerned to learn that various-user groups, which will have to live with the consequences of wilderness designations, had not received up-to-date maps of the proposed wilderness area until the day before the Interior Committee markup on March 21 and the several days following the committee's action. I was advised by representatives of the Southwestern Minerals Exploration Association and the Arizona Mining & Prospecting Association that they had not received maps until even last week. Certainly any effort to reach a reasonable compromise demand that those affected be allowed sufficient time to thoroughly review and comment on the specific areas targeted under this bill. I do not believe they have had that opportunity.

In all, H.R. 4707 designates an unacceptable 722,300 acres of Arizona land as wilderness. It designates approximately 215,000 acres on the Tonto National Forest in my district as wilderness, about 30 percent of the total wilderness designated in the bill.

Of those areas in my district, most are prime grazing areas or lands with important mineral or energy potential.

For example, in the Four Peaks area, mining claims are numerous; amethyst, tungsten, beryllium, and lithium have been found. Four Peaks is prime cattle country. The area is also suitable for watershed management that would increase the water yield into the Salt River. Furthermore, numerous existing jeep roads, holding pasture, pipeline, and fencing make the area's suitability for wilderness questionable.

Salome has been identified as having potential for fluorspar, barite, uranium, and precious metals. It is prime grazing area for livestock. Range improvements, including water storage tanks, pipelines, and fences are planned by the current permittee to improve the area for grazing and wildlife, and to eliminate overgrazing.

Hellsgate is underlain by tin-bearing formations; associated with anomalous tin are tantalum, yttrium, and beryllium. There are existing trails and roads and brush clearing and burning projects.

The Salt area has potential for both chrysolite and uranium. Again, this is prime grazing land and range improvements are necessary for the permittee's operations. There has also been vegetation manipulation and brush burning.

Of the areas proposed for designation as wilderness outside my district, I have received comments in opposi-

tion to inclusion of Mount Wrightson on the Coronado National Forest, Castle Creek, Arnold Mesa, Sheridan Mountain, and Woodchute on the Prescott National Forest, and Bear Wallow to the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest.

All these areas, rich in natural resources, should not be locked away into restrictive wilderness designations. Instead, they should be opened to multiple use for the benefit of the majority of Arizonans.

Beside the areas proposed for wilderness, I strongly oppose this bill's release language. The bill provides that the Department of Agriculture "shall not be required to review the wilderness option prior to the review of the initial plans and in no case prior to the date established by law for completion of the initial planning cycle." It does not specify a certain date before which the Department would be precluded from reviewing the wilderness option.

For myself, I would prefer that those lands not designated as wilderness be released to multiple use once and for all, and not be subject to any further review by the Forest Service.

However, user groups and others in Arizona have asked only that language be included in the bill designating a specific date, January 1, 1998, before which the Forest Service would be precluded from reviewing the land for wilderness potential. This is only reasonable. Those who must rely upon the lands for their livelihood must have some certainty about the status of their land for long-range planning and credit purposes.

Furthermore, specific language ought to be included in the bill to insure motorized access to ranchers for range maintenance and improvements. Ranchers are not out to destroy the land, but to protect it. They have already protected the land so well in fact, that many of these areas are still considered suitable for wilderness.

I also object to the provisions of titles II and III being included in this legislation. These provisions are identical to those of H.R. 2724, the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness bill, and H.R. 3562, the Arizona Strip Wilderness bill, respectively, H.R. 3562, in particular, came about as a result of long and careful negotiations and compromise between user groups and environmentalists in Arizona. These two bills are noncontroversial and ought to be considered on their own merit. The efforts of those who developed the legislation should not be ignored by placing its provisions in this still-controversial wilderness bill, H.R. 4707.

Finally, I oppose the wild and scenic river designation of the Verde River. While efforts have been made to accommodate the proposed construction of Cliff Dam, there are still serious

questions about flood control and water management on account of the designation.

The people of Arizona will have to live with the consequences of this body's decision with regard to this legislation. I strongly oppose H.R. 4707 on behalf of the vast majority of my constituents, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4707, the Arizona Wilderness Act of 1984. This is the 11th wilderness bill, and the 8th wilderness package to be considered by the House during the 98th Congress, and it is especially pleasing to me to note the progress we are making in finally putting the RARE II/wilderness issue to rest in most States. It is to be hoped that by the time this Congress ends we will have settled the national forest wilderness issue in most instances.

I will not take the time to discuss the specific wilderness proposals and attributes of H.R. 4707. Chairman UDALL can do that far better than I could on this bill. However, I note that the bill contains many wilderness proposals that, by virtue of careful negotiation and compromise on the part of the major interest groups involved, have been crafted to eliminate resource conflicts or other potential problems. As such, the bill appears to enjoy a broad degree of support, which attests to the tremendous effort Chairman UDALL has made to consult all affected parties and interest groups.

I would also like to address one other issue, the issue of so-called release language, because I believe H.R. 4707 may help resolve a partial impasse which appears to be stalling consideration of wilderness bills in the other body. As many Members are aware, our State wilderness packages contain not only wilderness designations, but they also address the question of how undeveloped lands not designated as wilderness may be managed by the Forest Service. We have provided, in all national forest wilderness bills passed since the completion of RARE II in 1979, that lands not designated as wilderness or wilderness study may be managed for such uses as the Forest Service determines appropriate in its land management planning process. In short, we have restated Congress 1976 decision that national forest lands will be managed pursuant to the 1976 National Forest Management Act. Our so-called release language formula, which was negotiated with representatives of the Forest Service, the National Forest Products Association and several major environmental groups in 1980,

provides that nonwilderness lands can be developed, if the Forest Service determines, as part of its statutory planning process, that development is appropriate. It also reaffirms NFMA's provisions that wilderness values will not have to be restudied on eligible lands until national forest management plans are completely revised some 10 to 15 years from now.

Despite what I believe is clear statutory language in this regard, the Forest Service and others have raised questions concerning possible interpretation of some of the provisions of our standard release formula. I have reviewed their concerns, and have seen nothing that I think necessitates changes in the statutory language. Indeed, most of the comments appear to involve technical or other issues which we specifically discussed and addressed with committee report language in 1980. Nevertheless, there are several points which were raised which probably can benefit by citing additional examples of Congress intentions, and by further illustrating how the release formula ties in with the National Forest Management Act planning process.

Thus, after discussions with the Forest Service and numerous individuals and interest groups, we have worked with our Republican colleagues to draft additional committee report language. Since its circulation last week, I have been told by the Chief of the Forest Service and several Members of Congress that it is very helpful language, which addresses major areas of concern, I am therefore hopeful that this language will help break the release logjam which has developed in the Senate, and I would ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

I am aware that there are those who would like some of this language to be included in the statute, but I believe that after reviewing it most Members will agree with my assessment that the types of hypotheticals and examples used in the report language do not lend themselves to statutory promulgation. Further, although I have spent countless hours over the past 4 years attempting to determine whether it might be possible to legislate the committee report language, I have thus far been unable to see any need or justification for additional statutory language which would amend or otherwise impinge on the provisions of the National Forest Management Act. I am, therefore, hopeful that when those concerned with our standard release formula have a full opportunity to examine the formula, as further clarified by the committee report language of H.R. 4707, they will conclude that we have gone as far as we can to allay their concerns without amending the National Forest Management Act.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I believe H.R. 4707 is exceptionally meritorious legislation, which may help break the release impasse. I urge my colleagues to support it and I commend Chairman UDALL and the other Members of the Arizona delegation who have done such an outstanding job of producing this consensus bill.

RELEASE/SUFFICIENCY

Section 103 of H.R. 4707 contains the "release/sufficiency" language which has been incorporated by the Congress in seven State wilderness bills enacted over the past several years. This language statutorily confirms the April 1979 administrative "release" of certain RARE II nonwilderness recommended lands and releases other lands not designated as wilderness or wilderness study by H.R. 4707.

The language continues to trouble a number of affected industry groups, and in an effort to address their concerns, the Committee wishes to further clarify the purpose and intent of the provisions of this section and elaborate on certain issues not specifically discussed in previous bills.

The question of "release" (i.e., making lands available for non-wilderness management and possible development) arises from the interest in the future management of areas reviewed during the RARE II process. The controversy focuses on the point at which those lands not designated as wilderness or wilderness study by this Act, but reviewed in the RARE II process, can again be considered for possible recommendation to the Congress for designation as wilderness, and on the question of how these lands will be managed.

The "sufficiency" aspect of this question arose subsequently because of a decision in Federal District Court in California. Soon after the completion of RARE II, the State of California brought suit against the Secretary of Agriculture challenging the legal and factual sufficiency of the RARE II Final Environmental Impact Statement insofar as its consideration of wilderness in some 46 areas in the State of California was concerned.

In January 1980 Judge Lawrence Karlton of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, in *State of California v. Bergland*, 483 F. Supp. 465 (1980), held that the RARE II Final Environmental Statement had insufficiently considered the wilderness alternative for the specific areas challenged. Judge Karlton enjoined any development which would "change the wilderness character" of these areas until subsequent consideration of the wilderness values in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act is completed by the Department of Agriculture. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed in District Court opinion in *California v. Block* (690 F. 2d 653) in 1982.

While the decision applied specifically only to the 46 roadless areas in California for which the plaintiffs sought relief, the overall conclusions in the case are binding in states such as Arizona that are located in the Ninth Circuit. The net effect is that development activities on roadless areas in such states may be held up if appealed in administrative or judicial forums. This has, in fact, already happened in several instances, and has thrown a cloud of uncertainty over the development of some roadless areas, whereas development has occurred in others.

The Wilderness Act of 1964 provides that only Congress can designate land for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System. Since the Committee has, in the course of developing this bill, very carefully reviewed the roadless areas in Arizona for possible inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System, the Committee believes that judicial review of the RARE II Final Environmental Statement insofar as national forest system lands in Arizona are concerned is unnecessary. Therefore, the bill provides that the Final Environmental Statement is not subject to judicial review with respect to national forest system lands in Arizona.

The Committee does wish to reemphasize that the sufficiency language in this Act only holds the RARE II EIS to be legally sufficient for the roadless areas in the State of Arizona and only on the basis of the full review undertaken by the Congress. Similar language will be necessary to resolve the issue in the other states.

MANAGEMENT AND FUTURE WILDERNESS CONSIDERATION OF ROADLESS AREAS NOT DESIGNATED AS WILDERNESS OR WILDERNESS STUDY

The RARE II process during 1977-1979 took place concurrently with the development by the Forest Service of a new land management planning process mandated by the National Forest Management Act of 1976. That process requires that the forest land management plans be reviewed and revised periodically to provide for a variety of uses. During the review and revision process the Forest Service is required to study a broad range of potential uses and options. In conjunction with the National Environmental Policy Act, NFMA provides that the option of recommending land to Congress for inclusion in National Wilderness Preservation System is one of the many options which must be considered during the planning process for those lands which may be suited for wilderness. The Forest Service is presently developing the initial, or "first generation", plan for each national forest. These are the so-called "section 6" plans, and they are targeted for completion by September 30, 1985. For the six national forests in Arizona some plans may not actually be completed and implemented until 1986 or later due to administrative problems including delay resulting from the cloud of the California lawsuit and the debate taking place as a result of pending legislation.

One of the goals of RARE II was to consider the wilderness potential of national forest roadless areas. The Committee believes that further consideration of wilderness during development of the initial plans for the national forest system roadless areas in Arizona not designated as wilderness or wilderness study upon enactment of H.R. 4707 would be duplicative of the study and review which has recently taken place by both the Forest Service and the Congress. Therefore, the release language of H.R. 4707, and previous bills, provides that wilderness values need not be reviewed again during development of the "first generation plans."

Beyond the initial plans lies the issue of when the wilderness option for roadless areas should again be considered. As noted, the initial plans are targeted for completion by September 30, 1985. The National Forest Management Act provides that a plan shall be in effect for no longer than 15 years before it is revised. The Forest Service regulations, however provide that a forest plan "shall ordinarily be revised on a 10-year

cycle or at least every 15 years." (36 CFR § 219.10(g).)

The bill, as reported, provides that the Department of Agriculture shall not be required to review the wilderness option until it revises the initial plans. By using the word "revision" the Committee intends to make it clear, consistent with NFMA and the Forest Service regulations, that amendments or even amendments which might "result in a significant change" in a plan, would not trigger the need for reconsideration of the wilderness option. The wilderness option does not need to be reconsidered until the Forest Service determines, based on a review of the lands covered by a plan, that conditions or demands in the area covered by a plan have changed so significantly that the entire plan needs to be completely revised.

A revision of a forest plan will be a costly undertaking in terms of dollars and manpower and the Committee does not expect such an effort to be undertaken lightly. Every effort will be made to address local changes through the amendment process leaving the revision option only for major, forest wide changes in conditions or demands.

For example, if a new powerline were proposed to be built across a forest, this would be accomplished by an amendment, not a revision, and therefore the wilderness option would not have to be reexamined. Likewise, the construction of new range improvements or adjustments in livestock allotments for permittees would not constitute a "revision". It is only when a proposed change in management would significantly affect overall goals or uses for the entire forest concern, that a "revision" would occur. For example, the recent eruption of Mt. St. Helens, because it affected so much of the land on the entire Gifford Pinchot National Forest, including the forest's overall timber harvest scenario, would likely have forced a "revision" of the plan. Likewise, decisions to significantly increase timber harvest levels on an entire forest or to change a multiplicity of uses in order to accommodate dramatically increased recreation demands might force a "revision". In this regard, the Committee wishes to note, however, that in the vast majority of cases the 10-15 year planning cycle established by NFMA and the existing regulations is short enough to accommodate most changes. Conditions are highly unlikely to change so dramatically prior to 10-15 years that more frequent "revisions" would be required. For example, it would be hard to envision a scenario under which demands for primitive, semi-primitive or motorized recreation would increase so rapidly over an entire National Forest that the Forest Service would feel obliged to revise a plan prior to the normal 10-15 life span. Recreation demands might increase in a specific area or areas, but such demands could be met by amending the plan, as opposed to revising it.

Forest Service Chief Max Peterson has indicated that, in his view, most plans will be in existence for approximately ten years before they are revised. The Committee shares this view and anticipates that the vast majority of plans will not be revised significantly in advance of their anticipated maximum life span absent extraordinary circumstances. The Committee understands and expects that with first generation plans to be in effect by late 1985, or slightly later, the time of revision for most plans will be around 1995. In almost every case, the Committee, therefore, expects that the consider-

ation of wilderness for these roadless areas will not be reexamined until approximately 1995. The Committee notes that administrative or judicial appeals may mean that many first generation plans are not actually implemented until the late 1980's, in which case plan revisions would be unlikely to occur until around the year 2000, or beyond. Or, if the full 15 years allowed by NFMA runs before a revision is undertaken, the wilderness option may not in some cases be reviewed until the year 2000 or later.

The question has also arisen as to whether a "revision" would be triggered if the Forest Service is forced by the courts to modify or rework an initial plan, or if the Forest Service withdrew an initial plan to correct technical errors or to address issues raised by an administrative appeal. The Committee wishes to state in the most emphatic terms possible, that any reworking of an initial plan for such reasons would obviously not constitute a "revision" of the plan that would reopen the wilderness question. Rather, any such reworking would constitute proper implementation of the plan. The logic for the Committee's reasoning in this regard is that any such court ordered or administrative reworkings or modifications of a plan would come about to resolve questions related to the preparation and implementation of the plan in accordance with the requirements of NFMA and other applicable law. So such reworking or modification would not be a "revision" (which pursuant to NFMA and the implementing regulations is to be based on changed conditions or demands on the land), because a plan must be properly prepared and implemented before it can be "revised".

The fact that the wilderness option for roadless areas will be considered in the future during the planning process raises the hypothetical argument that the areas must be managed to preserve their wilderness attributes so these may be considered in the future. Such an interpretation would result in all roadless areas being kept in de facto wilderness for a succession of future planning processes. Such a requirement would completely frustrate the orderly management of non-wilderness lands and the goals of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act.

To eliminate any possible misunderstanding on this point, the bill provides that areas not designated as wilderness or wilderness study need not be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for further wilderness review pending revision of the initial plans. The Committee believes the Forest Service already has statutory authority to manage roadless areas for multiple use, nonwilderness purposes. It wishes to make clear, however, that study of the wilderness option in future generations of Section 6 plans is required only for those lands which may be suited for wilderness at the time of the implementation of the future plans. Between the planning cycles, the uses authorized in the plan in effect can proceed until a new plan is implemented. In short, one plan will remain in effect until the second plan is implemented. There is no bar to management which may, as a practical matter, result in the land no longer being suited for wilderness. Thus it is likely that many areas studied for wilderness in one generation of plans may not physically qualify for wilderness consideration by the time the next generation of plans is prepared. As an example of this, the Committee notes that many areas studied for wilderness in RARE II and recommended for non-wilder-

ness have already been developed since their administrative "release" in April of 1979.

Therefore, under this language, the Forest Service may conduct a timber sale in a roadless area and not be challenged on the basis that the area must be considered for wilderness in a future planning cycle. Once into a second-generation plan, the Forest Service may, of course, manage a roadless area according to that plan without the necessity of preserving the wilderness option for the third-generation planning process. Should the particular area still be suited for possible wilderness at the time of the third-generation planning process, the wilderness option would be considered at that time. In short, the wilderness option must be considered in each future planning generation if the particular land in question still possess wilderness attributes. But there is no requirement that these attributes be preserved solely for the purpose of their future evaluation in the planning process.

In short, this language means that the Forest Service cannot be forced by any individual or group through a lawsuit, administrative appeal, or otherwise to manage lands in a "de facto" wilderness manner. Of course, the Forest Service can, if it determines it appropriate, manage lands in an undeveloped manner, just as it can, if through the Land Management Planning process it determines it appropriate, develop released lands. The emphasis here is that the Forest Service will be able to manage released lands in the manner determined appropriate through the land management planning process.

The Committee has reached this position after careful thought and a balancing of all the wishes and concerns of the groups involved, and wishes to emphasize the vital importance of getting the forest plans in place in Arizona and ending the state of limbo which now exists.

NO FURTHER STATEWIDE REVIEW

The final issue addressed by the Committee in Section 103 of H.R. 4707 pertains to the possibility of future administrative reviews similar to RARE I and RARE II. With the National Forest Management Act planning process now in place, the Committee wishes to see the development of any future wilderness recommendations by the Forest Service take place only through that planning process, unless Congress expressly asks for other additional evaluations. Therefore, the legislation directs the Department of Agriculture not to conduct any further statewide roadless area review and evaluation of national forest system lands in Arizona for the purpose of determining their suitability for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

The Committee recognizes that this directive might technically be evaded by conducting such a study on some basis slightly smaller than statewide. The Committee is confident, however, that the Department recognizes the spirit as well as the letter of this language and that the Committee can expect there will be no "RARE III".

□ 1300

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA), the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like briefly to discuss a matter of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Agriculture relating to H.R. 4707.

This bill has been referred jointly to the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The bill contains so-called release-sufficiency language which relates to the management of areas in the national forests with which the bill is concerned which are not designated as wilderness. In order to expedite consideration of this bill, I do not object to its being taken up on the floor of the House without consideration by the Committee on Agriculture. I take this position without in any respect waiving jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture with regard to the release-sufficiency issues as addressed in this bill or in similar bills. If the provisions of H.R. 4707 relating to matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture should become an issue with the Senate—in the event that the bill passes the House—I intend to request that the Committee on Agriculture be represented in any conference which may be held.

I appreciate this opportunity to make clear the jurisdictional interest of my committee in the release-sufficiency issues that are present in this bill and in most bills designating wilderness areas in the national forests.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his cooperative attitude and assure him that the statements he just made will be carried out by us with regard to the conference or other changes.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP).

Mr. STUMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, last July, I signed a letter, with my colleagues in the Arizona delegation, soliciting the advice and recommendations of interested parties in Arizona regarding the multiple use and wilderness designations for Forest Service lands in our State. We sent that letter because the uncertainty of future public land use needs to be resolved.

Significant progress has been made toward reaching a decision, but I believe we have more work to do.

While I do not generally support wilderness, the necessity for a RARE II reevaluation affords us both the opportunity and challenge to resolve the multiple use/wilderness issues facing our State. The decisions should be

made now so that the uncertainty of land use designations is removed and those who use the forests are able to plan for their future. More importantly, the decisions must be made by Arizonans—especially those who will be directly affected by such designations.

The purpose of our efforts should be the determination of which of our forest lands in Arizona truly reflect the intent of the 1964 Wilderness Act. Wilderness is defined in that act as an area of Federal land that "generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature." Our determinations must not be preconceived in terms of numbers of acres. Nor should we lose sight of our responsibility in realistically assessing when public benefits from additional wilderness preservation no longer exceed the public losses from other resources remaining unused. The discussions necessary to make such an important determination cannot be rushed if we are to make reasonable assessments and decisions.

Within the bill we are considering today, 57 percent of the acres to be designated as wilderness are located in Arizona's Third District. From the comments I continue to receive, there is no doubt in my mind that there is still a need for compromise among concerns such as the ranchers, miners, and environmental interests. Not only are some of the areas included in the bill too encompassing, and indeed some not worthy of designation, but I feel that we have failed to address some of the concerns of traditional public land users—most specifically in the areas of release and grazing language.

In addition, I cannot support the bill's inclusion of the provision of the Arizona Strip Wilderness Act. The introduction of that bill, as a separate piece of legislation, represents many long months of intense negotiation and the result is a proposal which enjoys unanimous support. The appeal and success of the strip bill is that it is a product of those who have a direct interest and use of the land in the strip, rather than a congressional mandate. The diversity of interests among ranchers, miners, timber companies, environmentalists, local governments, and Federal agencies normally would not lend itself to successfully dealing with the wilderness question. Yet in this case, those same diverse interests proved that with the give and take on the part of all parties involved, a strong consensus resolving the question can be reached. The result of the actions on the strip will be a plan with which everyone can live, strongly facilitating the implementation of land use management.

At the same time the strip bill was being negotiated, it was done so as an issue in and of itself, not as a part of a

larger package. The provisions of the strip bill can and should stand alone, and their inclusion in this bill jeopardizes its support and acceptance.

Mr. Speaker, I must also oppose the provisions in the bill regarding release language and grazing provisions. Rather than the "soft" release language included in the bill, I believe that adoption of language which would provide that lands not designated as wilderness shall not be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation pending revision of initial Forest Service plans, and in no event prior to January 1, 2000, would be a clearer reflection of the concerns in our State. Adoption of that language would clearly state our intent to resolve the wilderness/multiple use question so that responsible land use planning and activities could proceed, yet at the same time remove any doubt as to the direction for Forest Service land management. That language does not require development, but significantly reduces the planning of Forest Service lands for wilderness through the management plan process.

While there appears to be widespread agreement with regard to the continuation of grazing within designated wilderness areas, I do not believe that agreement is adequately reflected in the provisions of the bill itself. The normal management problems between the Forest Service and the cattle industry will no doubt continue, but I do not believe that we should add to those problems by failing to adequately address the grazing issue in this bill. I am concerned that we have once again clouded the grazing issue through the incorporation, by reference, of guidelines and policies. We are encouraging widespread interpretation of those guidelines, leading to further problems, especially in the area of mechanized equipment. I am also concerned that because we are incorporating guidelines rather than substantive requirements, a court may emphasize the lack of amendment to the Wilderness Act, and view the incorporation of the guidelines hostilely as a new twist on retroactive legislative history, and give it little effect. For that reason, I believe that language should have been included in this bill which not only provides for livestock grazing, but also the use of mechanized equipment.

The amount of land in our State in existing or potential wilderness is substantial, in addition to the more than 3 million acres in the State preserved for national parks and wildlife refuges. As one of the fastest growing States, we cannot afford to disregard the adverse potential of putting unreasonable amounts of unsuited lands in wilderness. We can ill afford to mortgage our future, ignoring the needs of current public land users, as well as the

general public which owns the land and benefits from its resources. Better management of our existing resources and an improved realization of existing public land uses as well as the State's vast untapped resource potentials are essential to reasonably provide for our continued growth.

I applaud the efforts which have been made so far by those Arizonans who realize the necessity for our resolving the question of multiple-use/wilderness in our State, and who have assumed the responsibility for reaching a consensus. Employing the same sense of give and take as was done in developing the Arizona strip bill and taking the time to insure that we have addressed all concerns, I hope that we could have a similar success in resolving this issue. However, I believe that there is ample evidence to show that we still have more work to be done before an agreement is reached which truly reflects the needs and interests of those parties which have a direct interest in our public lands. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I must oppose this legislation.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4707, the Arizona wilderness bill.

Title I of the bill would designate 29 new Forest Service wilderness areas totaling some 722,300 acres. Titles II and III are the so-called Aravaipa Canyon and Arizona strip wilderness proposals. The strip bill would designate 9 new Forest Service and BLM wilderness areas totaling 394,900 acres. The Aravaipa Canyon is a BLM instant wilderness proposal encompassing 6,670 acres. In other words, we have an omnibus bill for Arizona before us designating approximately 1.1 million acres of wilderness and releasing or returning to multiple use almost 2 million acres of Forest Service and BLM land.

While none of the proposed wilderness areas are in my congressional district—as I represent portion of the Phoenix metropolitan area—I am deeply concerned about the wilderness issue and I am pleased to have played a role in developing this legislation.

My distinguished predecessor who represented this district for 30 years in this House, former Congressman John Rhodes, supports this bill, and I note that the administration has no objection to the bill.

My constituents will use and benefit from the nearby wilderness areas, particularly the Four Peaks and Superstition additions. Many of my constituents are also concerned about the creation of too much wilderness and will benefit from the release of the remaining lands.

I have learned during the debate on this bill that there are many tradeoffs involved in wilderness designations. There are many uses of the land which are compatible, such as grazing

and recreation, and there are others which will not be allowed. In every case, there are economic concerns and even national security issues such as in the case of strategic or critical minerals.

The pressures brought to bear on the members of the Arizona delegation have been tremendous and I personally have spent hundreds of hours visiting the proposed areas and meeting with the interested groups.

While I believe there are additional modifications which may need to be made such as Congressman STUMP and Congressman RUDD will point out and have pointed out; I believe Chairman UDALL has done an excellent job of bringing the various groups together and minimizing the conflicts.

For example, the Salt River project, a major flood control project serving Phoenix, worked out with the committee language to allow them to maintain, relocate, or install new flood control gates using motorized access when necessary. Without this authority, the Salt River project would be severely hampered in its efforts to monitor water levels in the streams and rivers above Phoenix.

Chairman SEIBERLING expressed concern that this type of language might set a precedent or in some way impede similar activities on already existing wilderness areas. I am pleased to say that a consensus was worked out which best suits the needs of the Salt River project and Arizona. As a result, the Salt River project now supports the legislation.

Two other major concerns have been the Arizona Mining Association and the Arizona Cattlegrowers. The chairman has made numerous boundary modifications and excluded a number of areas of importance to these groups. A few troublesome areas still remain in the bill but I am confident that these will also be worked out.

Aside from actual areas and boundaries, two major issues also trouble these groups—the release provisions and the grazing language. I understand Chairman SEIBERLING intends to enter in the RECORD the report language which he just did, which he and I worked out. I believe this would be helpful. We spent considerable effort attempting to clarify the release provisions and addressed a number of issues which have come up since its enactment in other bills.

Of particular concern is the duration of the first generation of forest management plans. In other words, when can the wilderness question be reopened? We discuss this in some detail in the report language and go to considerable effort to point out that it is our intention that these plans last 10 years or more. Suggestions have been made that we actually legislate a date certain or a 10-year planning cycle for

wilderness, and I believe these suggestions deserve consideration.

On the grazing issue, the concern we heard the most often was the possible arbitrary enforcement of the so-called guidelines or regulations worked out by our committee and the Forest Service. Our report language includes the guidelines in full and the bill requires a report to Congress on the progress being made in carrying out the guidelines.

Overall, I believe the legislation is balanced. Its passage will lift the cloud imposed on all Forest Service activities by the California lawsuit and will allow us to get on with the enjoyment and proper management of these lands.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4707.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am very proud and happy to bring before the House, H.R. 4707, the Arizona Wilderness Act. As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs I have brought many wilderness bills to this floor, but never before have I had the opportunity to present such a far-reaching piece of wilderness legislation for my own State of Arizona. All my life I have loved the land with which we as Americans have been uniquely blessed. All my career I have worked to preserve and protect the best of it. Now, I ask my colleagues in the House for their help in preserving and protecting some of the land for which I have a special feeling—the land of Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out here, this represents a lot of work and a lot of compromise. The three of us from Arizona, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. McNULTY), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. McCAIN), and myself all serve on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and have had the heavy responsibility of trying to put together this compromise.

As has been noted, the administration has no objection. I took great pride in the fact that Senator GOLDWATER, our senior Senator, introduced the RARE II portion of the bill exactly as I had introduced it on the House side.

I know that many people think of Arizona as all desert and cactus and we do have a lot of extraordinary desert and cactus. But the environment of my State is exceptionally diverse and surprising. This bill I bring before you today would protect more

than 1 million acres of this rich and unusual land from the Utah border to the international border. Another 2 million acres would be released to multiple-use management.

Arizona is towering mountains of great magnificence, many of them known as Arizona "Sky Islands." The famed San Francisco Peaks near Flagstaff are the site of the highest peak in Arizona. They are sacred to the Navaho and Hopi peoples who believe that the kachinas come from there. They are also considered by many to be the birthplace of the modern science of ecology. Granite Mountain near Prescott is the dominant feature of the area and from its top there are sweeping views of the surrounding valley. Four Peaks can be seen from Phoenix 40 miles away and its rugged topography falling rapidly off steep cliffs into the Salt River provides some of the most uncommon recreation opportunities in Arizona. Mount Graham is the highest point in all of southern Arizona and the source of a wealth of wildlife, including some that are thought unique to the mountain. Mount Wrightson can be seen from Tucson and is famous throughout the world for its abundance of birds and other wildlife. These are among the "Sky Islands" the bill would protect.

Arizona is canyon country and the bill protects many of the twisting, spectacular gorges. The Mogollon Rim, which marks the edge of the Colorado Plateau, opens onto many of these extraordinary environments. West Beaver Creek, West Clear Creek, Fossil Springs, Hellgate, and the Kanab Creek adjacent to the Grand Canyon and the Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs are wilderness lands of unmatched beauty on the Arizona Strip.

Arizona is red rock country where the colorful cliffs and bluffs of fantastic geologic formation have inspired awe and wonder in people from all over the world. Red Rock-Secret Mountain and Munds Mountain both near Sedona, Ariz., are two of the new wilderness areas in this bill that would preserve these sights.

Water is especially precious in Arizona and we have made a special effort to preserve the State's rapidly diminishing riparian areas. In addition to some of the canyon-country wilderness areas, incomparable places like Bear Wallow, the Salt River Canyon and the Salome wilderness, where streams have carved surreal shapes out of bedrock, are protected by this bill.

And, finally, Arizona is indeed semi-arid desert. The Chiricahuas, the Galiuros and portions of several other proposed wilderness units preserve example of this most delicate, misunderstood and underappreciated environment.

In addition, the bill designates a 41-mile stretch of the Verde River as a component of the National Wild and

Scenic Rivers System. The Congress has not added a new river segment to our protected rivers inventory for more than 5 years and it has never placed a desert river in the system. It is time to end this unfortunate record on both counts. I am happy to say that the administration also supports this designation.

All in all, H.R. 4707 would designate 39 new wilderness areas in Arizona. Thirty-one areas totaling 834,000 acres are on national forest land and eight areas totaling nearly 290,000 acres are governed by the Bureau of Land Management. Only three forest areas totaling 71,000 acres are designated for additional wilderness study, two of them to complete study units already created in New Mexico. I think it is one of the major accomplishments of this legislation that we virtually eliminate the limbo of the further planning category on Arizona's forest lands.

Let me say something about how we arrived at this bill, which I think is rather remarkable for its level of support. More than 1 year ago I began to urge interested parties in Arizona to focus on how they would sort out the RARE II question. I was pleased to be joined by the entire Arizona delegation in that effort last summer. Since that time, we have been in almost constant discussion and negotiation with environmentalists, miners, timber people, cattlemen, and many, many others in trying to hammer out an acceptable proposal. We made every effort to have this built from the bottom up in Arizona, not imposed on Arizona from Washington. A lot of voices in Arizona said it could never be done. But I think this bill before the House today, while it does not completely satisfy the interest of any group, fairly and adequately addresses the interest of all groups in our State.

We have incorporated the RARE II proposal with a bill already passed by the Senate to designate the Aravaipa Canyon, a very meritorious proposal sponsored by my good friend, BARRY GOLDWATER. We incorporated another proposal, cosponsored by the entire Arizona delegation, dealing with BLM and Forest Service lands in the Arizona Strip. This measure, too, was built from the bottom up over several years of difficult, painstaking negotiations. It is an extraordinary example of what cooperation and compromise between business and conservation groups can produce, even when the subject is as emotional and controversial a subject as wilderness.

So I am proud to bring this bill before the House today: Proud of a bill that settles the land management question on nearly 3 million acres of public lands for the foreseeable future so that ranchers, miners, timber people, and other users of the land can get on with intelligent planning for

their business; proud of a bill that was put together by the hard work, cooperation and spirit of compromise of so many Arizonans; and most of all, proud of a bill that preserves more than 1 million acres of my State as my father and my father's father knew it when they came to Arizona and helped to build it, as I have known and enjoyed it throughout my life, and so my children and my children's children can know it and enjoy it throughout their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. McNULTY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4707, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1310

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT AND MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON TOMORROW OR ANY DAY THEREAFTER ON H.R. 4072, WHEAT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1983

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 4072) to provide for an improved program for wheat, that it may be in order to consider the conference report on Tuesday, April 3, 1984, or any day thereafter, and to waive all points of order against the conference report and its consideration, except under clause 4, rule XXVIII, and that the conference report be considered as read when it is called up for consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take this time simply to confirm with the gentleman that this has been checked with the minority. That is my understanding, and am I correct?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, it has been cleared. We are in agreement, and it has been cleared with

both my ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MADIGAN), and the minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE MEDIA ACCENTUATES THE NEGATIVE IN COVERAGE OF REAGAN ECONOMIC RECOVERY

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal reported recently on a survey of national media coverage of the Reagan economic recovery conducted by Holmes Brown, president of the Institute of Applied Economics. Mr. Brown concluded that the networks, instead of being nonpartisan annotators, were in reality alchemists who turned good news into bad. The media accentuated the negative in their coverage, implying that underneath the waves of prosperity tugged an undercurrent of economic misery.

I submit Mr. Brown's article for the RECORD. I think it provides a healthy dose of reality after living in the never-never-wonderland of the nightly news.

For example, in 1983, 95 percent of all economic statistics were very positive. Yet, the 3 networks, reporting on them 104 times during that year, ended their report 86 percent of the time on a negative note.

I guess you could say that to the national news media, Mr. Speaker, a round of silver lining is a dark cloud.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 16, 1984]

HOW TV REPORTED THE RECOVERY
(By Holmes M. Brown)

The national economy improved dramatically during 1983—but you might not have realized it if your only source of information had been the nightly news programs of the three major television networks.

How did the networks manage to turn the good news into bad news? According to a recent survey by the Institute for Applied Economics, the transposition was done by concentrating on the pockets of recession within the overall recovery, thereby implying that behind the good news of falling inflation and rising employment there were black clouds of economic misery.

SIX-MONTH SURVEY

When the sea change in economic news occurred in 1983, one might have expected that the networks would follow their practice during the recession of concentrating on the economic news and substantiating it with human-interest stories. To find out, the Institute for Applied Economics helped conduct a six-month, seven-night-a-week

survey of the three major networks. We examined three key questions concerning network performance:

Did the networks fully report the news of the economic recovery?

Did the networks bias their reporting to play down the positive impact of the economy?

Did the networks use negative case studies to detract from the generally positive economic news?

Unemployment fell to 8.2% in December 1983 from 10.7% a year earlier. Total employment grew by four million during 1983.

On July 8, the Labor Department announced a drop in unemployment. CBS reported that while the Labor Department said the figures didn't justify claims of a true economic recovery, the president's top economist was calling the unemployment figures a new milestone in the business upturn. Dan Rather's coverage undercut the credibility of the administration's interpretation of the statistics. Reporter Ray Brady emphasized there were 1,250,000 jobless people seeking only 350,000 available jobs, and focused on worsening unemployment in certain industrial states. The entire emphasis of the report was on those who remained out of work—not on those who were returning to work.

In October, unemployment continued to fall, this time to 8.7% from 9.1% a month earlier, the lowest rate in 20 months. The three industries hit hardest by the recession—construction, mining and manufacturing—all showed improvement.

On Nov. 4, ABC stated that the unemployment drop was the result of many jobless Americans ending their search for work. The overall interpretation was that the "news is not as good as it sounds." Again the focus was not on the enormous number required, but on those yet to be rehired. ABC then implied that the Reagan administration's economic policy was a complete failure, and that there was a "chorus of demands that the government develop a national industrial policy" for which ABC turned to Democratic presidential candidates for their views. The news report that began with a 0.4-percentage-point drop in unemployment concluded: "With so many factory workers unemployed, political pressure for an industrial policy will continue to grow."

In November, unemployment dropped sharply to 8.4% from 8.7% a month earlier, the lowest level in two years. In just two months, the total of unemployed Americans dropped well over a million.

ABC used the Dec. 2 unemployment announcement to focus on those left behind by the recovery. Although the November unemployment figures in 45 of the 50 states were down, ABC did a story that began, "Now those unemployment figures again; it's here in the Midwest that unemployment is most severe." They located two upper-middle-class men who had been unemployed for 1½ years and focused on their experiences, with a story that lasted more than four minutes. A story that began with a 0.3-percentage-point drop in unemployment ended in complete despair and talk of suicide.

Another major positive statistic during the time of the study was the increase in the gross national product. In the third quarter, it grew at a robust 7.7% inflation-adjusted annual pace, surprising even the most optimistic economists.

NBC reporter Irving R. Levine, on Oct. 22 when the GNP boost was announced, deliv-